

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, August 16, 1972

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

See that none render evil for evil, but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves and to all men.—I Thessalonians 5: 15.

Eternal Father, as we bow in Thy presence, grant that Thy grace may so possess our hearts that our words may be generous, our ways gentle, and our work gratifying to Thee.

Cleanse us from all unrighteousness and fill us with Thy spirit that we may think clearly, speak wisely, and live nobly as we labor for the good of our country and for peace in our world.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE 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. 2806. An act to authorize appropriations for additional costs of land acquisition for the national park system.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3726) entitled "An act to extend and amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 to afford more equal export opportunity, to establish a Council on International Economic Policy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15097) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15580) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes."

ADDITIONAL 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 to the House that later in the day a resolution will be called up suspending the 3-day rule for the consideration of conference reports. This is necessary in order to consider conference reports between now and the recess of the Congress.

A DOUBLE STANDARD FOR GENERALS AND COAL MINERS?

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is there a double standard for generals and coal miners?

There has been some mumbling and grumbling by certain high administration officials, including former Secretary of the Treasury John Connally, that payments for coal miners' black lung may exceed the budget.

The New York Times of August 11 carries a report of the medical record of retiring Air Force Gen. John D. Lavelle. It seems that General Lavelle has been awarded 70 percent disability for emphysema, a heart murmur, and a back problem. According to the New York Times account:

A copy of a "pulmonary function study" performed by Air Force doctors on General Lavelle April 3, four days before he retired, showed the vital capacity of his lungs, which is the total amount of air that can be exhaled, to be 101 percent of normal.

A second test was conducted to measure the amount of air that could be expelled in one second. The general obtained a rating of 72 on this test.

According to the sixth edition of Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, a score of 69 is considered normal for a man of General Lavelle's age. The general's score on this test also exceeded the Air Force's own standard score of 70, which must be met by pilots before they can qualify for flight duty.

There are thousands of coal miners who have pneumoconiosis from the inhalation of coal dust into their lungs who cannot collect compensation. The Congress has recognized this problem and passed a new law in May of this year to enable many of these disabled miners to qualify. It is outrageous that the administration now wants to establish a double standard for generals and coal miners. Why should General Lavelle get a fat, tax-free retirement, claiming he has disabling emphysema while playing tennis every day, and the coal miner gasping for breath is told that to pay him would unbalance the budget?

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEWS ON GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 12077, a bill to ban the sale of domestic Saturday night specials—the cheap handguns which are widely used in robberies, murders, and other violent crimes—I was pleased to note that President Nixon has urged the House of Representatives to pass legislation outlawing these weapons. For the information of my colleagues and the public I will insert at this point an article from the Washington Post of August 11, 1972, on this matter.

NIXON URGES HOUSE TO PASS HANDGUN BILL

The White House yesterday urged the House of Representatives to act this year on Senate-passed legislation to ban the sale of the cheap, easily concealed guns called "Saturday night specials."

Ronald L. Ziegler, presidential press secretary, did not specifically endorse the measure approved Wednesday by the Senate but said President Nixon "supports elimination of Saturday night specials."

Declining to deal directly with the specifics of the Senate bill, he said Mr. Nixon believes legislation "should be worded in such a way as not to penalize the many legitimate sportsmen and target shooters."

In a CBS interview, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), who unsuccessfully sought to require licensing and registration of gun owners and certain firearms, said "It defies reason, it defies rationality" not to do so.

ONE THOUSAND PERCENT BACKING

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the morning mail I received a form letter from the Democrat nominee for President of the United States. He suggested that I give him "my heart and my hand, along with a \$25 campaign contribution."

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am unable to comply with the Senator's request for I fear that if by some remote chance he would be elected, he would not only have my heart and my hand, but my wallet, my security, my freedom, and my scalp, to say nothing of other vital and treasured although vestigial parts of my anatomy.

Mr. Speaker, the only reply that I can make to the Senator is that while I do not choose to contribute to his campaign, I can offer him the same kind of "1,000 percent backing" that he gave the junior Senator from Missouri, who was one of his eight or 10 choices for vice president.

OUR FAILURE TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, later in today's RECORD, I shall discuss in some detail the failures of the Congress and the Nixon administration to protect the public on monetary policy.

Many Americans question how it is possible for their elected representatives to allow a Federal agency—the Federal Reserve System—to operate without an audit by the General Accounting Office and without coming to Congress for appropriations. The constituents of Members of this House are asking how we could allow this agency to continue to retain Government securities which have been paid for once by the credit of the United States.

These bonds—approaching \$71 billion—should be retired and subtracted from the national debt. Instead, the U.S. Treasury continues to pay interest to the tune of \$4 billion annually on these bonds and the Federal Reserve uses this slush fund to finance its far-flung operations and to ignore the will of the people and their elected representatives.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1819, RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1819) to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the act, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KLUCZYNSKI, WRIGHT, COLLINS of Illinois, HARSHA, and DON H. CLAUSEN.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON THE SAME DAY REPORTED

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1094 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1094

Resolved, That during the remainder of this week it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when was CXVIII—1786—Part 22

permission granted for the filing of this rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the resolution was reported yesterday.

The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 328]

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abourezk | Edwards, Ala. | McMillan |
| Anderson, | Esch | Michel |
| Tenn. | Frelinghuysen | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Badillo | Gallagher | Nichols |
| Baker | Gallagher | O'Neill |
| Baring | Goldwater | Passman |
| Betts | Gray | Pelly |
| Blanton | Hagan | Pryor, Ark. |
| Carney | Harrington | Rarick |
| Carter | Harvey | Reld |
| Chamberlain | Hawkins | Rhodes |
| Clancy | Hébert | Riegle |
| Clark | Heckler, Mass. | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Clay | Hogan | Roussot |
| Conte | Hull | Ryan |
| Conyers | Jarman | Schmitz |
| Curlin | Keith | Springer |
| Davis, Wis. | Kyros | Staggers |
| Dellums | Landrum | Teague, Calif. |
| Dennis | Leggett | Teague, Tex. |
| Dingell | Lennon | Ullman |
| Dowdy | Lent | Veysey |
| Dwyer | Long, La. | Waldie |
| Edmondson | McCloskey | |

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.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON THE SAME DAY REPORTED

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe just before the quorum call, I had yielded the usual 30 minutes to the minority, to the able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH); pending which, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such brief time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a simple resolution providing for a simple objective, namely, to permit the House in these 2 or 3 remaining days of the session prior to our taking a vacation beginning at the end of this week, to wit, Friday, to consider conference re-

ports without having to wait the prerequisite number of days required under the rules of the House and that is all there is to it. From my point of view, I always prefer the orderly procedure, but you cannot eat your cake and have it, too. We are either going to have to go through the procedure of waiving the 3-day rule, or we are going to have to remain in session past the recess date, or we are going to have to let these conference reports go over; it is just that simple.

I yield to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I should like to ask my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, if there is any expectation of that "fat cat" cattle baron bill coming in here before we recess as a conference committee report.

Mr. COLMER. I am always happy to cooperate with my good friend from Massachusetts, but I am sure he would not want me to mislead him. I can only answer that question by simply saying I have no knowledge whatever on the subject of what conference reports will be called up.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I just wish to point out to my good friend here that I understand from the rumors that I hear from the page boys outside—and that is the most reliable source of information one can find around here—that this "fat cat" cattle baron bill will be coming in here, and the Members are not going to have too much of a chance to read what the conference committee has done. If that is so, very reluctantly I will have to oppose the gentleman's motion here today, because up in the Northeast section of this country we have hundreds of people who are losing their jobs in the tanneries of America as a result of their closing, because the cattle people of this country are sending their best hides overseas and we are getting the lower end of the barrel.

I do not see how we in the eastern part of this country can support this rule if this is going to take place.

We find the administration, Mr. Speaker, in two positions. In one position the Secretary of Commerce is assuring the hide people that he is taking care of them; he has got this restriction on a 1971 level; and in the other position we have got the Secretary of Commerce assuring the cattle people that they are going to be taken care of because they are going to remove the restrictions on exports.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we can act on the gentleman's motion here today in a fair and equitable way in view of the unemployment situation in this country, and in view of the fact that the cattle producers of this country are presently organizing—presently organizing—great campaign committees; and you and I know what they want to do. I do not think we should rush this through, and I certainly oppose the motion of the gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker,

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the matter was heard in executive session yesterday in the Rules Committee. I supported it in the Rules Committee. I find myself a little bit confused, Mr. Speaker, because I thought we were trying to expedite the matters which were, for the most part, noncontroversial conference reports.

Now the first thing I am told here today is that some of the Members apparently have objection to S. 3726, the Export Administration Act extension, which I think would probably be the first measure called up. I think probably the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) was just talking about that. In addition to that of course all the matters that could be brought up are listed on pages 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the calendar. As best I can determine in looking over them, we could possibly have H.R. 13089, national accelerated reforestation, that was filed in the House on August 14; possibly H.R. 15495, military procurement authorization, 1973, if they get the conference report in, and of course that is very important. I just mentioned S. 3796, Export Administration Act extension. Then there could be H.R. 15641, military construction authorization, 1973, and that, too, Mr. Speaker, is very important. Then we have this one which would be eligible if this resolution passes, H.R. 15580, District of Columbia police and firemen salary increases, filed in the House on August 15.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the gentleman I am not opposed to this resolution if we can have the assurance of the leadership that this export bill is not going to be taken up before we leave here.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is something I have no control over. This is simply a matter of the individual's own opinion as to our procedure when we try to dispose of as much as we can. The Republicans hope we can get out of here Friday night so we can have our convention, so I will leave the situation up to the individual Members. I am sure I speak correctly when I say the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), our minority leader, supports this resolution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me respond. I do support the resolution and I do wish to point out there are certain matters that in my judgment and in the judgment of others do require some action prior to when we recess or adjourn by Friday. I do not think it is an unreasonable request. Therefore I intend to support the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have three requests for time.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. We have heard everyone speaking in favor of it saying, well, we do not need to observe all these procedures because we are getting into the closing hours of the session and we have so much necessary legislation that must be dealt with. Therefore we have the kind of resolution which we are now told is necessary.

Gentlemen, I am reminded of the words of, I believe, Mr. Justice Holmes, who was dealing with a lawsuit. A lawyer brought his case to the Supreme Court. He said, "Well, I have been thrown out of court on just a mere technicality, just a matter of procedure which I failed to observe in filing my lawsuit. I was maybe a little bit too late but why should my client lose his rights because I have slipped up on a procedural defect?" Justice Holmes made this observation, that is as applicable today as it was then, it seems to me. He said: "Law without form is chaos."

I have noticed a tendency in the House of Representatives during the 6 years I have been here that when we get into the closing hours of any session chaos becomes the order of the day and we begin to waive such technicalities as that which suggests all Members should know what we are voting on before we vote. Then we find ourselves saddled with laws we have to explain much later when we go back to our people.

It has been brought up that we must have some of these laws or it will create hardship in the country. If such procedures are needed, let us deal with them on a unanimous-consent request basis. Members of this House are responsible individuals. If they recognize a genuine need for some legislation and see that the country will suffer for some reason, we are not going to have opposition; but, we are going to have opposition when we have controversial matters which should be explained before they are passed.

I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the reason this general resolution is being sought in advance is because it is known there will be opposition when this Export Administration Act extension is brought up. This is a typical example of what we find in the closing hours of Congress. The Banking and Currency Committee has a bill providing much needed authority for the President, which is going to expire shortly.

The conferees have attached a provision which the House has rejected: they have attached a provision to require the establishment of a council for advising the President on international economic matters.

We debated this matter very thoroughly several weeks ago. We pointed out that there are some 650 councils in existence now, and it was very questionable as to why we needed to establish a new

bureaucracy, with their never-ending requests for funds.

Yes, there is a great deal of controversy attached to this measure, and the House, very roughly, I would say, by three out of four, judging by the voice vote, was opposed to the establishment of this council.

But, with the typical conference type of fashion, the conferees of the House Banking and Currency Committee have submitted to the will of the Senate.

Gentlemen, what is involved here is the integrity of the House of Representatives itself. Is there a need for a House of Representatives? Do we need to go through the exercise of debating and voting on resolutions and amendments to bills, when every time we go to conference at the other end of the hall we accept anything the Senate throws in our direction?

Gentlemen, if this were not a matter about which I have such strong feelings, I assure you I would not be here resisting this motion today; but we have to resist this resolution, to pass the message through to the Senate and to anybody else who happens to be in earshot that the House of Representatives is not going to be run over roughshod.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rejection of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am firmly in opposition to this resolution. I speak as the chairman of the minority Committee on the Consent Calendar Objectors and also as a member of the Joint Committee on Continued Congressional Operations.

This is the kind of a rule that brings chaos at the end of, or as we approach the end of any session, or adjournment sine die, by agreement between the two bodies.

We have tried to cooperate by allowing long lists of extra unanimous-consent requests to be brought up during this past week. Indeed, I will remind the Members that we have allowed, by unanimous consent, an extra day for suspension of the rules, on the calendar this week.

As the previous speaker said, any thinking Member will allow these things in good faith if a need is demonstrated, but this proposal gives carte blanche elimination of orderly process and foretells chaos. Many of us truly do our homework and read these bills and reports in advance. This resolution obviously waives all points of order, by definition. There is no opportunity for prior study. We obviate the 3-day rule for printing prior to consideration, as developed by the Joint Commission on the Reorganization of the Congress.

There must be an undue fear of denial of unanimous-consent requests.

We would be legislating in the dark on controversial legislation, to be sure.

There is an available and easy way to do this. We can do it by a two-thirds vote under a rule of suspension at any time, if not granted on a unanimous-consent re-

quest. This rule, of course, only requires a simple majority, and therein lies the subterfuge of bringing it about this way.

I repeat it defies the representative process and will lead to every elected Member obviating his elected and bounden duties, by legislating in the dark.

There is no emergency need for most of these proposals. If so, that can be handled, and the legislation should be covered under a procedure that goes both ways.

In the old days the Committee on Rules often "pocketed" legislation that should not embarrass all of the individually elected legislators by being brought prematurely to the floor. So this type of legislation, to be properly considered and voted on with a "yea" vote, should be so constructed and drafted that it would regulate stopping some of the bad legislation or conference reports that need not come before us as an emergency prior to the recess, yet open the door for emergency and good reports.

This does neither. It simply opens the door to a blind, dark alley for legislating without the Members having an opportunity to see what the managers on the part of the House have agreed to, or how many times we have receded to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, we are simply putting the "ring in the nose" of the House of Representatives to be led by the other body in this Congress, and as the people's representatives we should not do it. I recommend a strong vote against House Resolution 1094, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply means that the chairman or someone in charge of a conference report can walk through any door of the House with the conference papers in his hand, obtain recognition of the Speaker, and without prior notification to anyone else call the conference report up with no information in the hands of the Members. The House then has the opportunity, on a sight-unseen basis, to reject or accept the conference report.

The proponents of this resolution contend it is necessary to expedite the business of the House. They ignore the reason why at this late date they feel they must resort to this kind of drastic action to expedite the business of the House. Where, for instance, was the Export Administration extension bill until this late date in this session? The statutory date expired, I believe, on August 1. Everyone on the Committee on Banking and Currency, including the chairman, knew the act would expire on August 1. They knew that weeks and months ago. Where was the committee that it did not bring this bill out long ago so that we would not be confronted with this kind of a situation on the House floor whereby it is proposed that the rules of the House be raped in behalf of expedition?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution is defeated.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which would waive the 3-day requirement for the consideration of conference reports.

It is important to remember that a conference report often contains very complex provisions which have been considered by the other body and not necessarily by this body or previously rejected by this body.

The 3-day interim period is provided in the rules of the House for a very, very important reason, so that the Members of this body can consider the substance of a conference report and be informed on what is in it.

Now, a resolution of this type is frequently adopted at the end of a session when there is very little time remaining before adjournment sine die. That is not the situation before us today. We will be back after the recess, and there is still ample time to consider anything which is in any of these conference reports we are trying to rush through today.

Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that the real reason for the adoption of this rule is to rush through the bill to which Congressman BLACKBURN referred (H.R. 15989), a bill to establish a Council on International Economic Policy.

The House has receded and concurred in the Senate amendments to H.R. 15989 as we almost always do in conference with the other body and the other body has acted on the conference report already, which precludes us from doing anything but voting the conference report up or down. All we can do is say yes or no. I object to that, especially in view of the fact that title I of the House bill was overwhelmingly rejected by this body.

I refer to the remarks of Senator MONDALE when he presented the conference report yesterday.

Mr. President, this measure returns from conference in almost identical form as was adopted by the Senate some time back.

So what did they do? They adopted the conference report, of course, by a voice vote.

I therefore strongly urge defeat of this resolution so that the House can consider the various conference reports in a responsible manner and not in haste.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, and commend the gentleman. As usual he thinks and speaks well to matters of proved principle. Surely every Member of this House is keenly aware of the fact that within the rules of the House there is a technique if the sine die adjournment has been firmly set, where any reasonable procedures could be handled in the terminal 6 days.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his supporting remarks.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say as emphatically as I can, and I think my record bears it out, that I stand as strongly as anybody in this body for the rights and the privileges of the House of Representatives vis-a-vis the other body. I do not think we have capitulated. We have lost some, but there has not been a capitulation. There are some measures that are in the wings where I, along with others, will continue to fight for the views and the decisions of this body vis-a-vis the other body.

The real problem we are confronted with today is this one legislative proposal, the conference report from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The gentleman from Georgia and my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, had strong feelings, and those strong feelings against that legislation were in the committee report when this legislation came before us, and they were joined in the supplemental views and the additional views by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Let me say that when that legislation was before the House, to refresh your memories, I joined with them to a degree in opposing one or more amendments, as I recall, proposed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER). Unfortunately, from our viewpoint, we lost those amendments and as a consequence then the choice was: did we want section 2, or a title II that had been amended stricken from the bill with title I remaining? And the conscious decision was made by the House that with the Culver amendment or amendments that the title should be stricken.

The gentleman from California, the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Georgia know that I personally, for whatever impact that had, was for title II as it came from the committee. And I add parenthetically a majority of the Members on this side of the aisle in the committee favored title II as it came out of the committee.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the gentleman will permit me to finish, I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that some other alternative would be arrived at for the consideration of this conference report before we recess or adjourn on Friday. I hope that maybe some negotiations might result that would permit the consideration of this conference report either tomorrow or Friday. But I do not want this one issue to becloud the possibility of the consideration prior to Friday of any other conference report or conference reports that may be essential to the proper functioning of our Government in the 3 weeks while we will be in recess.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minority leader the reason I am objecting today is not only to protect my right, but also protect the rights of two of my colleagues from New England who sit on the other side of the aisle, the two gentlemen from New Hampshire who have strong feelings on this legislation. I do not think that they would relish it any more than I would to find this conference committee report coming in here not knowing what is in the bill and finding their constituencies being left bereft of any representation as a result of this hasty action.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. The gentlemen from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND and Mr. WYMAN) have very, very strong feelings on this legislation, and I do not think they would relish it any more than I do to find out that the hide bill was being rushed through here in the closing days.

I know, speaking for the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) that he would stay here till hell freezes over to fight this legislation.

And I believe the same is true for the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

So I hope that the minority leader will take into consideration the Members on his side of the aisle who also have some real problems in this area.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) for his remarks. My colleague Mr. WYMAN and I are indeed dedicated to the fight to protect the shoe industry and other industries from unfair trade. I urge the defeat of this resolution. Three days are little enough time to consider complex conference reports. The passage of this resolution would be a retreat from efforts to reform congressional procedures.

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

Mr. GERALD F. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman, my leader, yielding to me.

I do not want to take much of his time. I think I was in identically the same position he was in, when we gave consideration to this bill in the House. But I think that avoids the issue. The issue before us now is House Resolution 1094, and not whether we consider the trade export bill. I happen to be in favor of that in general, but I can see why some of the Members would be against the method by which it is coming up. But, the issue here is whether we open up all bills and conference reports without a chance to study same. The fact of the matter, and the thing that has not been said, is that the trade export bill including—or without—the

Export Trade Advisory Council has expired and is going forward in the Department of Commerce and the administration under the War Powers Act, and they can survive on that until we get back. Therefore, this is a poor excuse and a thinly disguised excuse for the purpose of waiving all the rules for bringing up any conference report sight unseen, during the balance of the week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

The conferees of both Houses of the Congress are meeting this afternoon at 2 o'clock on the Office of Economic Opportunity Act extension.

We could finish that conference report today. Yet if we adopt this rule, we would enable that conference report to be brought up almost at once.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 more minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. So I would have to say in all honesty to the gentleman from Michigan that I would not want to see us get bogged down on the export-import question, and lose sight of the fact that there are other conferences on other bills and the Members of the House would be precluded with the adoption of this resolution from knowing what is in these bills, and I think they should have that right. I urge rejection of this resolution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me even 3 days does not really give an adequate amount of time to consider a very complicated and long conference report. I hesitate to think how much consideration Members could give to various expenditures in a multibillion-dollar bill if the rule allows the conference report to be considered the same day it is signed.

I am getting a little bit weary hearing just about tax reform. We can have all the tax reform everyone wants, but if we do not have the time and the opportunity to exercise some judgment on how all those tax dollars are spent—we still will not solve our social problems.

It seems to me the other side of that coin of "tax reform" is "spending reform," and I wish those who are talking so much about tax reform would give equal consideration to spending reform. Conceding that many Members would like some reform, how much can one do without a conference report in advance.

When we had the HEW conference

report, as I recall, it came back from conference with over \$2 billion more than the original House bill.

When we had the higher education conference report, some of the highest figures of the Senate bill and some of the highest figures in the House bill that were possible under the rules were approved by the conferees. So we had the increased authorization.

Now I suggest that there is another conference that may be completed today or tomorrow and that is on the OEO conference report—the war on poverty legislation.

This resolution, as I understand it, allows the conference report to be considered the same day it is finished. We might not even have the opportunity to read what the conferees recommend.

If I have ever seen any reckless spending, it is in the OEO program over the years. This program desperately needs "spending reform." I suggest three things to my colleagues: that perhaps this year because of the presidential and vice-presidential races—there just might be an added interest between now and next November 7 on the part of constituents about what has been and is being spent in OEO. I think I do not need to elaborate. I would suggest that maybe there will be much closer scrutiny of the OEO programs from 1964 to now than any of us imagined prior to Miami and the mini-convention.

I suggest that everyone who is running for offices this November ought to have a right to find out what is in that conference report on the war on poverty before they are required to vote on it on the floor of the House. The recent publicized European travel of 60-some young recipients of poverty funds is just one of the countless examples of what I am talking about in needed "spending reform." Millions or hundreds of millions wasted in Office of Education or OEO deprives others of benefits Congress has promised. Millions wasted or actually misspent on contracts and grants in HEW and OEO mean that legitimate services are not provided. So if we are interested in some kind of "spending reform," it does seem to me that we ought not to allow conference reports to come in and the Members given insufficient time to study such complicated legislation and then be expected to give or deny approval with no opportunity to indicate priorities or even to know how well the conferees defended the House position.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oregon yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding.

I might say this is a good discussion and probably one that is good for the soul as well as for the mind. It is not the first time we have attempted this. We have attempted it many times in the past since I have been a Member of Congress, but some of the issues of this year came to the point where we have had an awakening, a new awakening as to why Congress should be more responsible to itself.

For instance, not too many days ago this House refused me, as a chairman of a committee, the right to even go to conference because I could not in good conscience commit myself to a program preordained by the House. Now we are talking about taking conference reports and putting them through without anybody knowing anything that is in them. Three days is little enough time.

Just this week the weakness of our position was shown when we swallowed the Senate amendment to the disaster relief bill, which not in any minute measure of responsibility should have ever allowed us to say that we counted as a disaster—as a disaster—the slowing up of the manufacturing of munitions because of the SALT talks and tied it to a bill where no person in this House in good conscience could really vote against relief for the flood victims of Pennsylvania and Ohio and Maryland, and other States. Yet our hands were tied. We had no say in this House. We have now put on record that we consider any move to cut down the making of munitions to be a compensable disaster in this country. The taxpayers are going to have to pay for that kind of disaster from now on.

We should have more time and a better understanding of what is going on. I admit that there is a weakness in our conferences when we go to the Senate. I have been on many of them.

I have had to take many Senate provisions in order to save some part of what the House wanted. You cannot understand unless you have served on these committees and conferences the strength of the Senate in its peculiar position. They do not have the same kind of operation we do. One Republican Member speaks for the whole Republican conference; one Democratic Member speaks for the whole Democratic conference. Sometimes it is not even the Member who expresses the Senate position. Our House conferees speak and fight for each provision, each to his belief.

This is the style that we have to combat, and we should not condemn House conferees too severely. The Senate re-instituted into the conference report the Council Commission, and they took away from the House the right to interrogate the members of that Commission. We have the right to interrogate into what they intended to do and what they were doing. By taking this conference report without time to read and study its contents is setting aside all of the House efforts to eliminate both the Commission and immunity of its members from interrogation. If that is what we are going to have to buy without debate, without knowledge, and without argument, I think it is very much wrong.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the House's first orders of business today appears to be House Resolution 1094, reported favorably in record time by the Rules Committee yes-

terday afternoon making it an order for the balance of this week to consider conference reports without compliance to the 3-day rule.

I know that time is ticking by on this week. Today is Wednesday and another convention is almost upon us and beyond that, election day and various State primaries. There is so much legislation that remains to be considered by both Houses—legislation vital to so many people that there is an understandable pressure to try to accomplish as much as possible in the remaining day or two this week. What I fear most is best exemplified by the resolution before us today—that there is going to be a rush to pass legislation willy-nilly in pellmell fashion without due deliberation. These days just before conventions and election or before an adjournment or a recess probably have been responsible for more bad, hastily thought out legislation than anything else I can think of. We should be wary of making more mistakes like this today.

What this resolution is allowing the House to do today is to suspend the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act which was designed to prevent legislating in haste without proper time for due consideration and deliberation by each and every Member of the House of the legislation before us. In other words, we are defeating the very purpose of the act itself. What was the point in passing the act if every time the pressure begins to build up before a recess or an adjournment, a simple majority can suspend the rules to railroad through in record time far-reaching legislation?

Now, if there were some vital bills that absolutely had to pass before this Congress recesses for the Republican Convention, I would be prepared to consider such emergency cases on their merit after listening to a strong argument for suspending the rules. But, we have not heard such a plea today. To my understanding, there is nothing in the conference stage that is likely to be presented to us which could not wait another 2 weeks where failure to act precipitously would imperil the security or well-being of this Nation. Instead, what we seem to have is legislation as usual, routine legislation which could well have been considered several weeks ago more calmly, more deliberately. At times I think there are those who deliberately schedule controversial conference reports for rushed sessions such as these last few days before recess so that the full glare of publicity and careful study cannot be focused on the legislation in question.

I am referring particularly to the conference report which this resolution seems designed to cover to provide special treatment and that is the conference report on S. 3726, the Equal Export Opportunity Act and International Economic Policy Act of 1972. This has to be one of the most poorly conceived and drafted bills to come before the House this session. We were treated to the spectacle of having the bill largely rewritten on the floor of this House, much of the rewriting done by members of the com-

mittee which rushed it through executive sessions. The statutory creation of yet another agency in the Federal Government; namely, the Council on International Economic Policy, was carefully considered on the floor of this House just a few days ago and after considerable rewriting and restricting and attempts to make it more responsible to Congress, instead of creating yet another agency in the White House with no responsibility to answer to anyone other than the President, the House decided that statutory recognition was not really necessary and deleted the whole title from the bill before it.

What are we treated to in this conference report? We are treated to the spectacle where the conferees went ahead and simply receded to the Senate and put right back into the bill that which the House rejected—with this important difference—with no strings attached and no recognition of the limitations put upon the agency by the House while the title was still in the bill. Lately, there has been much controversy over moves in the House to instruct conferees. I have been unwilling to go along with such instructions in the past, but if this is an example of how conferees protect the interests of the House, then I am afraid instructing conferees may well be the wave of the future in this body.

Gentlemen, we are going to be asked to approve today, probably on a voice vote, a conference report that until yesterday afternoon was not available to a single Member of this House unless by the chairman of the committee in question and his close intimates on the committee. I know, my office tried to get this report because many of those provisions are far reaching indeed and are of vital economic interest to my constituents and the shoe industry across the country. However, I was told at every turn the report was not available. And thus, what are we treated to today? In this morning's RECORD we find spread before us for the first time four pages of conference report constituting one of the biggest cave-ins in recent memory. The whole atmosphere of secrecy surrounding this particular conference report, given the magnitude of the changes and their economic implications, can only strike me as repugnant and legislative railroading of the worst variety. They are trying to jam this thing down our throats. My suspicions are aroused. I detect a distinct odor which seems to suggest that the powerful cattle industry and the international free trade lobby are really behind the efforts to railroad this thing through the House today or tomorrow.

At a time when the country's balance of payments and trade is at its lowest point in 100 years, we find statutory recognition for a council whose instructions are to protect and improve the earnings of foreign investments. If this is not giving official blessing by Congress to the present unbridled growth and concentration of economic power in the hands of a few multinational corporations, I do not know what it is. Tying employment to international economic activity where

there has been floundering for so long will apparently be another assignment for the council. Greater freedom of capital movement, irrespective of its impact on the domestic economy seems to be the order of the day. In short, I question not only the need for yet another agency but specifically the need for an agency with these guidelines. What this country needs now is serious, in-depth detailed hearings on this country's trade policies, not hastily drafted legislation such as that before us today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the more I read this conference report that there would be much to be gained by postponing consideration of the report in question until a later date and how much harm were to be gained if it were rushed through this House today or tomorrow. The issues are of vital importance and not something to be passed casually over on a sunny afternoon before recessing for a convention. I am convinced the Legislative Reorganization Act had such situations as this in mind when it was drafted and I, for one, hope that the House today will not suspend its provisions to permit such fancy footwork as contained in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the 2 minutes. I merely want to point out to this House that in addition to that export bill that is over there, there are several other conference committee reports that could come in here and affect the economy of your districts. I am only asking for assurances from the leadership that the trade export bill will not come in here in the rush of adjournment for the week, or recess, so that we have time to look over what the conference committee has done. This is not only true of this particular bill I am interested in, but of several other bills that are buried in those conference committees. You could very well be committing political suicide by voting for this resolution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Export Control Act expired August 1. This, of course, would renew the Export Control Act. It is not contemplated by the Banking and Currency Committee to bring up the conference report until Thursday afternoon after the antibusing bill has been disposed of even though this resolution should pass, or Friday morning, but it is necessary that we dispose of that legislation in some way. I will just state we do not expect to bring it up before Thursday afternoon or Friday, even if this rule were to pass.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, actually what the gentleman is telling the House is that he will not bring it up until after many, many quorum calls and other calls will be made in the House before they get to this bill. We are likely to be here until Saturday midnight before the gentleman comes in with that bill.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a decision for the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. It is not my decision. It is a decision for many, many Members here who object to these steamroller tactics. All we are asking for is a little bit of fairness to those of us who have a problem of unemployment in our districts so we may be able to look at this conference report and have a chance to study it and be able to debate intelligently.

Mr. PATMAN. It was in the RECORD yesterday morning. There are no steamroller tactics intended or contemplated. Every Member will be treated fairly. It is not contemplated to have rollcalls to filibuster. We are not going to have rollcalls, so the gentleman is in error on that.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I assure the gentleman there will be rollcalls and quorum calls.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate or clarify in my own words what I believe the gentleman said, that if this resolution passes he does not intend to bring up the conference report on the export control bill until the conclusion of the House action on the antibusing legislation, whenever that might take place.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk about this resolution today. This is a resolution which I thought was a very simple matter and it was intended to achieve one objective. It is a simple matter. What we must do here is to make a decision as to whether we are going to complete our calendar by Friday night or whether we are not going to complete it in time for the scheduled recess.

I want to reiterate what I said in the beginning. This is frankly no skin off my back and I do not want anybody, even in spite of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who talks about steamrolling, to feel that I am steamrolling. I am merely serving here at the request of the Speaker, as a chore boy, to bring this matter to the attention of the House and let the House decide. Frankly I do not give a hoot what decision is made. If the Members want to stay here until Saturday, if this matter is regarded as being that important, I will be here Saturday. We will just go right along, but we have got to make this decision now as to whether we are going to waive the 3-day rule or not.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I never accused my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, of steamrolling tactics.

In fact, he is the last man in the House who would be guilty of such action.

Mr. COLMER. I accept that.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I am not accusing him. I like my good friend. He has been the greatest chairman of the Rules Committee since Judge Smith. I would not accuse him, because he is the fairest man in the House.

Mr. COLMER. Before I yield to my friend from Iowa, I have to respond to this dubious accolade I just received.

I want to say that I appreciate this great compliment the gentleman paid me, particularly since I happen to be the only chairman of the Rules Committee since my great friend, that great statesman, Judge Smith, retired. I appreciate that.

In response, and in the same spirit, I would like to say to my friend—and I hope I do not offend anyone whose name I might mention—the gentleman from Massachusetts has been the greatest campaign manager of any candidate for the Presidency prior to the Massachusetts primary.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry; there must be an end to this someplace. We will finish this later.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend from Iowa, my great leader, a man whom I frequently follow.

Mr. GROSS. If we can get this discussion out of politics and back on the track, I should like to ask if the gentleman is giving us the official word of the leadership of the House that, unless this resolution is adopted, we will be in session this coming Saturday and next week. Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. COLMER. What I am saying to my friend is that this is my understanding. I am not authorized to speak for the leadership. It is my understanding that this matter has to be disposed of before we recess.

Mr. GROSS. What matter?

Mr. COLMER. The conference report that the gentleman and so many others have been talking about here.

Mr. GROSS. I am not limiting my opposition to this rule, and it is not limited to the conference report from the Committee on Banking and Currency. The chairman of that committee knew that law would expire on August 1. The chairman could have had a bill on the House floor weeks ago.

I continue to wonder if we are being threatened that, unless we pass this specific resolution here today, we will be kept in session next week. This word I would like to have from the lips of the leadership.

Mr. COLMER. That is where the gentleman will have to get it, because I am not authorized to speak for the leadership.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. 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 159, nays 223, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—159

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbutt | Gonzalez | Pike |
| Adams | Gray | Pirnie |
| Andrews | Gude | Poage |
| N. Dak. | Hanna | Price, Tex. |
| Archer | Hansen, Idaho | Purcell |
| Arends | Harsha | Quile |
| Ashley | Hicks, Wash. | Quillen |
| Aspinall | Howard | Randall |
| Barrett | Ichord | Reuss |
| Begich | Jarman | Roberts |
| Belcher | Johnson, Calif. | Robison, N.Y. |
| Bell | Johnson, Pa. | Rogers |
| Bennett | Jonas | Roy |
| Bergland | Jones, Ala. | Ruppe |
| Blanton | Karh | Sandman |
| Blatnik | Kazen | Saylor |
| Boggs | Kee | Scherle |
| Bolling | Kuykendall | Schwengel |
| Bow | Kyl | Sebelius |
| Brooks | Latta | Shoup |
| Broomfield | Link | Shriver |
| Brown, Mich. | McClory | Sikes |
| Broyhill, Va. | McCormack | Sisk |
| Burleson, Tex. | McCulloch | Smith, Calif. |
| Burlison, Mo. | McEwen | Smith, Iowa |
| Byrnes, Wis. | McFall | Smith, N.Y. |
| Cabell | McKay | Snyder |
| Camp | McKevitt | Stanton |
| Carlson | Mahon | J. William |
| Casey, Tex. | Martin | Stanton |
| Cederberg | Matsunaga | James V. |
| Collier | Mayne | Steed |
| Colmer | Meeds | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Conable | Meicher | Stephens |
| Corman | Miller, Calif. | Stratton |
| Culver | Miller, Ohio | Stubblefield |
| Curlin | Mills, Ark. | Teague, Tex. |
| Davis, Ga. | Minshall | Thomson, Wis. |
| de la Garza | Mizell | Udall |
| Delaney | Mollohan | Ullman |
| Denholm | Montgomery | Waggonner |
| Downing | Morgan | Ware |
| Eckhardt | Mosher | Whitehurst |
| Erlenborn | Murphy, N.Y. | Whitten |
| Esch | Natcher | Widnall |
| Evins, Tenn. | Nelson | Williams |
| Fascell | O'Hara | Wilson, Bob |
| Fisher | O'Konski | Winn |
| Flowers | Patman | Wright |
| Foley | Pepper | Wyatt |
| Ford, Gerald R. | Perkins | Wylder |
| Forsythe | Pettis | Young, Tex. |
| Fuqua | Peyster | Zion |
| Garmatz | Pickle | Zwach |

NAYS—223

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy | Burke, Mass. | Dennis |
| Abzug | Burton | Dent |
| Addabbo | Byrne, Pa. | Derwinski |
| Alexander | Byron | Devine |
| Anderson | Caffery | Dickinson |
| Calif. | Carey, N.Y. | Diggs |
| Anderson, Ill. | Celler | Dingell |
| Andrews, Ala. | Chappell | Donohue |
| Annunzio | Chisholm | Dorn |
| Ashbrook | Clark | Dow |
| Aspin | Clausen | Drinan |
| Baring | Don H. | Dulski |
| Bevill | Clawson, Del | Duncan |
| Biaggi | Cleveland | du Pont |
| Blester | Collins, Ill. | Edwards, Calif. |
| Bingham | Collins, Tex. | Ellberg |
| Blackburn | Conover | Eshleman |
| Boland | Conyers | Evans, Colo. |
| Brademas | Cotter | Findley |
| Brasco | Coughlin | Fish |
| Bray | Crane | Flood |
| Brinkley | Daniel, Va. | Flynt |
| Brotzman | Daniels, N.J. | Ford |
| Brown, Ohio | Danielson | William D. |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Davis, S.C. | Fountain |
| Buchanan | Dellenback | Fraser |
| Burke, Fla. | Dellums | Frenzel |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Frey | Landgrebe | Rosenthal |
| Fulton | Lloyd | Rostenkowski |
| Galifianakis | Long, Md. | Roush |
| Gaydos | Lujan | Roybal |
| Gettys | McClure | Runnels |
| Glaime | McCollister | Ruth |
| Gibbons | McDade | St Germain |
| Goldwater | McDonald, | Sarbanes |
| Goodling | Mich. | Satterfield |
| Grasso | McKinney | Scheuer |
| Green, Oreg. | Macdonald, | Schneebell |
| Green, Pa. | Mass. | Scott |
| Madden | Mallard | Seiberling |
| Griffiths | Mallory | Shipley |
| Gross | Mann | Skubitz |
| Gubser | Mathias, Calif. | Slack |
| Haley | Mathis, Ga. | Spence |
| Hall | Mazzoli | Steele |
| Halpern | Metcalfe | Steiger, Wis. |
| Hamilton | Mikva | Stokes |
| Hammer- | Mills, Md. | Stuckey |
| schmidt | Minish | Sullivan |
| Hanley | Mink | Symington |
| Hastings | Mitchell | Talcott |
| Hathaway | Monagan | Taylor |
| Hawkins | Moorhead | Teague, Calif. |
| Hays | Moss | Terry |
| Hechler, W. Va. | Murphy, Ill. | Thompson, Ga. |
| Heinz | Myers | Thompson, N.J. |
| Helstoski | Nedzi | Thone |
| Henderson | Nix | Tiernan |
| Hicks, Mass. | Obey | Van Deerlin |
| Hillis | Patten | Vander Jagt |
| Holifield | Podell | Vanik |
| Horton | Poff | Vigorito |
| Hosmer | Powell | Wampler |
| Hungate | Preyer, N.C. | Whalen |
| Hunt | Price, Ill. | Whalley |
| Hutchinson | Pryor, Ark. | White |
| Jacobs | Pucinski | Wiggins |
| Jones, N.C. | Railsback | Wilson |
| Jones, Tenn. | Rangel | Charles H. |
| Kastenmeier | Rees | Wolf |
| Keating | Reid | Wyllie |
| Kemp | Robinson, Va. | Wyman |
| King | Rodino | Yates |
| Kluczynski | Roe | Yatron |
| Koch | Roncalio | Young, Fla. |
| Kyros | Rooney, Pa. | Zablocki |

NOT VOTING—50

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Abourezk | Frelinghuysen | McMillan |
| Anderson | Gallagher | Michel |
| Tenn. | Hagan | Nichols |
| Badillo | Hansen, Wash. | O'Neill |
| Baker | Harrington | Passman |
| Betts | Harvey | Pelly |
| Carney | Hébert | Rarick |
| Carter | Heckler, Mass. | Rhodes |
| Chamberlain | Hogan | Riegle |
| Clancy | Hull | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Clay | Keith | Rousselot |
| Conte | Landrum | Ryan |
| Davis, Wis. | Leggett | Schmitz |
| Dowdy | Lennon | Springer |
| Dwyer | Lent | Staggers |
| Edmondson | Long, La. | Veysey |
| Edwards, Ala. | McCloskey | Waldie |

So the resolution was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Harrington with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Carney with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Springer with Mr. Schmitz.

Messrs. JAMES V. STANTON, ROY, PURCELL, POAGE, SCHERLE, and ROBERTS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and Messrs. RODINO, PATTEN, TAYLOR, and SKUBITZ changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on August 14, 1972, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 631. An act for the relief of the village of River Forest, Ill.;

H.R. 15093. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15635. An act to assist elementary and secondary schools, community agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies to prevent juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 12652, COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12652) to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights, to expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include discrimination because of sex, to authorize appropriations for the Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree with the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, BROOKS, HUNGATE, McCULLOCH, and HUTCHINSON.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3323, NATIONAL HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD ACT OF 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts (on behalf of Mr. STAGGERS) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3323) to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against diseases of the heart and blood vessels, the lungs, and blood, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1349)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3323) to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against diseases of the heart and blood vessels, the lungs, and blood, 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 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:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act of 1972".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) Congress finds and declares that—

(1) diseases of the heart and blood vessels collectively cause more than half of all the deaths each year in the United States and the combined effect of the disabilities and deaths from such diseases is having a major social and economic impact on the Nation;

(2) elimination of heart and blood vessel diseases as significant causes of disability and death could increase the average American's life expectancy by about eleven years and could provide for annual savings to the economy in lost wages, productivity, and costs of medical care of more than \$30,000,000,000 per year;

(3) chronic lung diseases have been gaining steadily in recent years as important causes of disability and death, with emphysema alone being the fastest rising cause of death in the United States;

(4) chronic respiratory diseases affect an estimated ten million Americans, emphysema an estimated one million, chronic bronchitis an estimated four million, and asthma an estimated five million;

(5) thrombosis (the formation of blood clots in the vessels) may cause, directly or in combination with other problems, many deaths and disabilities from heart disease and stroke which can now be prevented;

(6) blood and blood products are essential human resources whose value in saving life and promoting health cannot be assessed in terms of dollars;

(7) the provision of prompt and effective emergency medical services utilizing to the fullest extent possible advances in transportation and communications and other electronic systems and specially trained professional and paraprofessional health care personnel can reduce substantially the number of fatalities and severe disabilities due to critical illnesses in connection with heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases; and

(8) the greatest potential for advancement against heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases lies in the National Heart and Lung Institute, but advancement against such diseases depends not only on the research programs of that Institute but also on the research programs of other research institutes of the National Institutes of Health.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack upon heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases.

HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASE PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended (1) by redesignating section 413 as section 419A, (2) by redesignating section 414 as section 418, and

(3) by adding after section 412 the following new sections:

"NATIONAL HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASE PROGRAM"

"SEC. 413. (a) The Director of the Institute, with the advice of the Council, shall develop a plan for a National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Disease Program (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Program') to expand, intensify, and coordinate the activities of the Institute respecting heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases (including its activities under section 412) and shall carry out the Program in accordance with such plan. The Program shall be coordinated with the other research institutes of the National Institutes of Health to the extent that they have responsibilities respecting such diseases and shall provide for—

"(1) investigation into the epidemiology, etiology, and prevention of all forms and aspects of heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases, including investigations into the social, environmental, behavioral, nutritional, biological, and genetic determinants and influences involved in the epidemiology, etiology, and prevention of such diseases;

"(2) studies and research into the basic biological processes and mechanisms involved in the underlying normal and abnormal heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood phenomena;

"(3) research into the development, trial, and evaluation of techniques, drugs, and devices (including computers) used in, and approaches to, the diagnosis, treatment (including emergency medical service), and prevention of heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases and the rehabilitation of patients suffering from such diseases;

"(4) establishment of programs that will focus and apply scientific and technological efforts involving biological, physical, and engineering sciences to all facets of heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases with emphasis on refinement, development, and evaluation of technological devices that will assist, replace, or monitor vital organs and improve instrumentation for detection, diagnosis, and treatment of those diseases;

"(5) establishment of programs for the conduct and direction of field studies, large-scale testing and evaluation, and demonstration of preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, and rehabilitative approaches to, and emergency medical services for, such diseases;

"(6) studies and research into blood diseases and blood, and into the use of blood for clinical purposes and all aspects of the management of its resources in this country, including the collection, preservation, fractionalization, and distribution of it and its products;

"(7) the education and training of scientists, clinicians, and educators, in fields and specialties (including computer sciences) requisite to the conduct of programs respecting heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases;

"(8) public and professional education relating to all aspects of such diseases and the use of blood and blood products and the management of blood resources;

"(9) establishment of programs for study and research into heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases of children (including cystic fibrosis, hyaline membrane, and hemolytic and hemophilic diseases) and for the development and demonstration of diagnostic, treatment, and preventive approaches to these diseases; and

"(10) establishment of programs for study, research, development, demonstrations and evaluation of emergency medical services for people who become critically ill in connection with heart, blood vessel, lung, or blood diseases, which programs shall include programs for (A) the training of paraprofessionals in (i) emergency treatment procedures, and (ii) utilization and operation of emergency medical equipment, (B) the development and operation of (i) mobile critical care units (including helicopters and other airborne units where appropriate), (ii) radio, telecommunications, and other means of communications, and (iii) electronic monitoring systems, and (C) the coordination with other community services and agencies in the joint use of all forms of emergency vehicles, communications systems, and other appropriate services.

The Program shall give special emphasis to the continued development in the Institute of programs relating to atherosclerosis, hypertension, thrombosis, and congenital abnormalities of the blood vessels as causes of stroke, and to effective coordination of such programs with related stroke programs in the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke.

"(b) (1) The plan required by subsection (a) of this section shall (A) be developed within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this section, (B) be transmitted to the Congress, and (C) set out the Institute's staff requirements to carry out the Program and recommendations for appropriations for the Program.

"(2) The Director of the Institute shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, prepare in consultation with the Council and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report on the activities, progress, and accomplishments under the Program during the preceding calendar year and a plan for the Program during the next five years.

"(c) In carrying out the Program, the Director of the Institute, under policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and after consultation with the Council and without regard to any other provision of this Act, may—

"(1) if authorized by the Council, obtain (in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but without regard to the limitation in such section on the number of days or the period of such service) the services of not more than fifty experts or consultants who have scientific or professional qualifications;

"(2) acquire, construct, improve, repair, operate, and maintain heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood disease laboratory, research, training, and other necessary facilities and equipment, and related accommodations as may be necessary, and such other real or personal property (including patents) as the Director deems necessary; and acquire, without regard to the Act of March 3, 1877 (40 U.S.C. 34), by lease or otherwise, through the Administrator of General Services, buildings or parts of buildings in the District of Columbia or communities located adjacent to the District of Columbia for the use of the Institute for a period not to exceed ten years; and

"(3) enter into such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5), as may be necessary in the conduct of his functions, with any public agency, or with any person, firm, association, corporation, or educational institution.

"(d) There shall be in the Institute an Assistant Director for Health Information Programs who shall be appointed by the Director of the Institute. The Director of the Institute, acting through the Assistant Director for Health Information Programs, shall conduct a program to provide the public and the health professions with health information with regard to cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases. In the conduct of such program, special emphasis shall be placed upon dissemination of information regarding diet, exercise, stress, hypertension, cigarette smok-

ing, weight control, and other factors affecting the prevention of arteriosclerosis and other cardiovascular diseases and of pulmonary diseases.

"HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASE PREVENTION AND CONTROL PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 414. (a) The Director of the Institute, under policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and after consultation with the Council, shall establish programs as necessary for cooperation with other Federal health agencies, State, local, and regional public health agencies, and nonprofit private health agencies in the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment (including the provision of emergency medical services) of heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases, appropriately emphasizing the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such diseases of children.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"NATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION CENTERS FOR HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASES"

"SEC. 415. (a) (1) The Director of the Institute may provide for the development of—

"(A) fifteen new centers for basic and clinical research into, training in, and demonstration of, advanced diagnostic, prevention, and treatment methods (including methods of providing emergency medical services) for heart, blood vessel, and blood diseases; and

"(B) fifteen new centers for basic and clinical research into, training in, and demonstration of, advanced diagnostic, prevention, and treatment methods (including methods of providing emergency medical services) for chronic lung diseases (including bronchitis, emphysema, asthma, cystic fibrosis, and other lung diseases of children).

"(2) The centers developed under paragraph (1)(A) shall, in addition to being utilized for research, training, and demonstrations, be utilized for the following prevention programs for cardiovascular diseases:

"(A) Programs to develop improved methods of detecting individuals with a high risk of developing cardiovascular disease.

"(B) Programs to develop improved methods of intervention against those factors which cause individuals to have a high risk of developing such disease.

"(C) Programs to develop health professions and allied health professions personnel highly skilled in the prevention of such diseases.

"(D) Programs to develop improved methods of providing emergency medical services for persons with such disease.

"(3) Centers developed under this subsection may be supported under subsection (b) or under any other applicable provision of law. The research, training, and demonstration activities carried out through any such center may relate to any one or more of the diseases referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(b) The Director of the Institute, under policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and after consultation with the Council, may enter into cooperative agreements with public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions to pay all or part of the cost of planning, establishing, or strengthening, and providing basic operating support for, existing or new centers (including centers established under subsection (a)) for basic or clinical research into, training in, and demonstration of, advanced diagnostic, prevention, and treatment methods for heart, blood vessel, lung, or blood diseases. Funds paid to centers under cooperative agreements under this subsection may be used for—

"(1) construction, notwithstanding section 405,

"(2) staffing and other basic operating costs, including such patient care costs as are required for research,

"(3) training, including training for allied health professions personnel, and

"(4) demonstration purposes.

The aggregate of payments (other than payments for construction) made to any center under such an agreement may not exceed \$5,000,000 in any year. Support of a center under this subsection may be for a period of not to exceed five years and may be extended by the Director of the Institute for additional periods of not more than five years each, after review of the operations of such center by an appropriate scientific review group established by the Director. As used in this section, the term 'construction' does not include the acquisition of land.

"INTERAGENCY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE"

"SEC. 416. (a) The Secretary shall establish an Interagency Technical Committee on Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Diseases and Blood Resources which shall be responsible for coordinating those aspects of all Federal health programs and activities relating to heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases and to blood resources to assure the adequacy and technical soundness of such programs and activities and to provide for the full communication and exchange of information necessary to maintain adequate coordination of such programs and activities.

"(b) The Director of the Institute shall serve as Chairman of the Committee and the Committee shall include representation from all Federal departments and agencies whose programs involve health functions or responsibilities as determined by the Secretary.

"NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG ADVISORY COUNCIL"

SEC. 417. (a) There is established in the Institute a National Heart and Lung Advisory Council to be composed of twenty-three members as follows:

"(1) The Secretary, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration (or their designees), and a medical officer designated by the Secretary of Defense, shall be ex officio members of the Council.

"(2) Eighteen members appointed by the Secretary.

Eleven of the appointed members shall be selected from among the leading medical or scientific authorities who are skilled in the sciences relating to diseases of the heart, blood vessels, lungs, and blood; two of the appointed members shall be selected from persons enrolled in residency programs providing training in heart, blood vessel, lung, or blood diseases; and five of the appointed members shall be selected from members of the general public who are leaders in the fields of fundamental or medical sciences or in public affairs.

"(b) (1) Each appointed member of the Council shall be appointed for a term of four years, except that—

"(A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

"(B) of the members first appointed after the effective date of this section, five shall be appointed for a term of four years, five shall be appointed for a term of three years, five shall be appointed for a term of two years, and three shall be appointed for a term of one year, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment.

Appointed members may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

"(2) A vacancy in the Council shall not af-

fect its activities, and twelve members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

"(3) The Council shall supersede the existing National Advisory Heart Council appointed under section 217, and the appointed members of the National Advisory Heart Council serving on the effective date of this section shall serve as additional members of the National Heart and Lung Advisory Council for the duration of their terms then existing, or for such shorter time as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(4) Members of the Council who are not officers or employees of the United States shall receive for each day they are engaged in the performance of the functions of the Council compensation at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule, including traveltime; and all members, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as such expenses are authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(c) The Secretary (or his designee) shall be the Chairman of the Council.

"(d) The Director of the Institute shall (1) designate a member of the staff of the Institute to act as Executive Secretary of the Council, and (2) make available to the Council such staff, information, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its functions.

"(e) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less often than four times a year."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PART B OF TITLE IV OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 4. Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 419B. For the purpose of carrying out this part (other than section 414), there is authorized to be appropriated \$375,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$425,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$475,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Of the sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year, not less than 15 per centum of such sums shall be reserved for programs under this part respecting diseases of the lung and not less than 15 per centum of such sums shall be reserved for programs under this part for programs respecting diseases of the blood."

AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE TO APPROVE GRANTS

SEC. 5. Section 419A of the Public Health Service Act (as so redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out "grants-in-aid" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "except as provided in subsection (c), grants-in-aid"; and

(2) by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Under procedures approved by the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute may approve grants under this Act for research and training in heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood diseases—

"(1) in amounts not to exceed \$35,000 after appropriate review for scientific merit but without review and recommendation by the Council, and

"(2) in amounts exceeding \$35,000 after appropriate review for scientific merit and recommendation for approval by the council."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PART B OF TITLE IV OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 6. (a) Section 411 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "National Heart Institute" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Heart and Lung Institute".

(b) Section 412 of such Act is amended—
(1) by striking out "heart" each place it occurs (except in the heading) and inserting in lieu thereof "heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood";

(2) by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out "National Advisory Heart Council" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Heart and Lung Advisory Council";

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(5) by amending the section heading to read as follows:

"RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN DISEASES OF THE HEART, BLOOD VESSELS, LUNG, AND BLOOD"

(c) Section 418 of such Act (as so redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 418." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) The Council shall advise and assist the Director of the Institute with respect to the Program established under section 413. The Council may hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places, as the Council deems advisable to investigate programs and activities of the Program.

"(2) The Council shall submit a report to the President for transmittal to the Congress not later than January 31 of each year on the progress of the Program toward the accomplishment of its objectives."

(2) by striking out "Surgeon General" each place it occurs (except paragraph (f)) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary";

(3) by striking out "heart" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood";

(4) by striking out "Surgeon General" in paragraph (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, and the Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute"; and

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

(d) Section 419A of such Act (as so redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by (A) striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary", and (B) striking out "heart" and inserting in lieu thereof "heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by (A) striking out "The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Secretary acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501," and inserting in lieu thereof "The Secretary may, in accordance with section 501, accept conditional gifts", and (B) striking out "heart" and inserting in lieu thereof "heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood".

(e) The heading for part B of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART B—NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG INSTITUTE"

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 7. (a) Section 217 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "the National Advisory Heart Council," each place it occurs in subsection (a);

(2) by striking out "heart diseases" in subsection (a) and by striking out "heart," in subsection (b).

(b) Sections 301(d) and 301(l) of such Act are each amended by striking out "National Advisory Heart Council" and inserting in lieu thereof "National Heart and Lung Advisory Council".

REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall carry out a review of all administrative processes under which the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Disease Program, established under part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, will operate, including the processes of advisory council and peer group reviews, in order to assure the most expeditious accomplishment of the objectives of the Program. Within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress of the findings of such review and the actions taken to facilitate the conduct of the Program, together with recommendations for any needed legislative changes.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act or on such prior date after the date of enactment of this Act as the President shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register.

And the House agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
GAYLORD NELSON,
TOM EAGLETON,
ALAN CRANSTON,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
BOB PACKWOOD,
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,
ROBERT TAFT, 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 House to the bill (S. 3323) to amend the Public Health Service Act to enlarge the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute in order to advance the national attack against diseases of the heart and blood vessels, the lungs, and blood, 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:

I.—FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF PURPOSE

(1) In certain instances in the bill and the amendments to part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act, the Senate bill refers to "cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases".

In general, the House amendment substitutes "heart, blood vessel, and lung diseases" for "cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases".

The conference substitute adopts the terminology of the House amendment.

(2) The Senate bill contains a finding with regard to utilization of emergency medical services.

The House amendment has no comparable finding.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

(3) The Senate bill contains a finding with regard to the potential for advancement against diseases of the heart and blood vessels, the lungs, and blood in the National Heart and Lung Institute.

The House amendment is the same as the Senate finding, but also emphasizes the roles played by other research institutes within the National Institutes of Health.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

II.—HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASE PROGRAMS

(1) The Senate bill does not require the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Disease Program to be coordinated with other relevant programs in the National Institutes of Health.

The House amendment requires the Director of the Institute to carry out the Program in coordination with other relevant programs within the National Institutes of Health.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

(2) The Senate bill requires research into the development, trial, and evaluation of techniques, drugs, and devices used in, and approaches to, the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of the diseases and includes a reference to emergency medical services as a form of treatment.

The House amendment is similar to the Senate bill, except that it includes a reference to computers as a type of device and contains no reference to emergency medical services.

The conference substitute includes the references in the Senate bill and in the House amendment.

(3) The Senate bill establishes programs to refine, develop, and evaluate technological devices and instrumentation for diagnosis, detection, and treatment of cardiovascular, pulmonary, and related diseases.

The House amendment has no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the Senate bill, conforming the terminology to the House amendment.

(4) The Senate bill provides for the establishment of centers for testing, evaluation, and demonstration of preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, and rehabilitative approaches (including emergency medical services) to cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases.

The House amendment is similar except that it does not authorize the establishment of centers and it contains no reference to emergency medical services.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment but with a reference to emergency medical services.

(5) The Senate bill provides for studies and research into blood diseases such as sickle cell anemia and hemophilia.

The House amendment is similar to the Senate bill except that it does not specifically refer to sickle cell anemia and hemophilia.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment. The conferees gave serious consideration to including in the legislation the reference to sickle cell anemia and hemophilia. The deletion of such reference in the conference substitute does not in any way exclude the study of such diseases from the scope of this legislation. In fact, it is the intention of the conferees that such studies and research include sickle cell anemia, hemophilia, Cooley's anemia, and similar diseases of the blood.

(6) The Senate bill provides for the education and training of scientists, clinicians, and educators in fields and specialties relevant to programs under this legislation.

The House amendment is similar to the Senate bill except that it does not include the education of educators, and refers to computer sciences as a specialty for which education and training is authorized.

The conference substitute combines the provision of the Senate bill and the House amendment.

(7) The Senate bill provides for the establishment of programs and centers for study and research with regard to cardiovascular, pulmonary, and blood diseases of children.

The House amendment provides for the establishment of only programs for such study and research.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

(8) The Senate bill provides for programs for the study, research, development, demonstrations, and evaluation of emergency medical services for persons who sustain critical illnesses in connection with heart, blood vessel, lung, or blood diseases, including training and related programs.

The House amendment is similar, except that it does not provide for the establishment of development and demonstration programs and contains no reference to training and related programs.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill.

(9) The House amendment specifies that the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Disease Program shall give special emphasis to programs in the National Heart and Lung Institute dealing with the underlying causes of stroke and to coordination with related programs at the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke.

The Senate bill has no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

(10) The House amendment provides that the Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute shall carry out the program in accordance with policies established by the Director of the National Institutes of Health. The Senate bill has no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

(11) The Senate bill authorizes the Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute to acquire, construct, improve, repair, operate, and maintain cardiovascular and pulmonary disease centers, laboratories, research, training, and other necessary facilities and equipment.

The House amendment is similar, except that it does not give authority for centers and for training facilities and equipment. In addition, it makes it clear that the authority may be exercised in connection with blood disease activities.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment, except that the authority for training facilities and equipment is included. The conferees intend that training programs conducted with the use of facilities and equipment authorized by this provision are not to be considered as substitutes for training programs authorized by title VII or VIII of the public Health Service Act.

(12) The Senate bill establishes an Office of Heart and Lung Health Education within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The House amendment requires the Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute to conduct an information program for the public and health professions with regard to cardiovascular and pulmonary diseases.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment, except that it establishes in the Institute the position of Assistant Director for Health Informa-

tion through whom the program authorized by this provision is to be carried out.

III. HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASE PREVENTION, AND CONTROL PROGRAMS

(1) The Senate bill includes a reference to emergency medical services as a form of treatment.

The House amendment does not include such a reference.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

(2) The Senate bill provides in a separate provision for the establishment of 10 model cardiovascular disease prevention clinics in the United States for the purpose of—

(1) improving methods of detecting high risk individuals;

(2) improving methods of intervention against risk factors;

(3) developing cardiovascular disease manpower; and

(4) developing improved methods of providing emergency medical services.

The House amendment contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute contains no separate provision for the establishment of such clinics but includes their prevention functions as an additional specific responsibility for the research, training, and demonstration centers authorized by the new section 415 of the Public Health Service Act (see item IV *infra*).

(3) The Senate bill authorizes appropriations for heart, blood vessel, lung, and blood disease prevention and control programs of \$30 million for fiscal year 1973; \$40 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$50 million for fiscal year 1975.

The House amendment authorizes appropriations for similar programs of \$20 million in fiscal year 1973; \$30 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$40 million for fiscal year 1975.

The conference substitute authorizes appropriations for such programs of \$25 million for fiscal year 1973; \$35 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$45 million for fiscal year 1975.

IV.—NATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION CENTERS FOR HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD DISEASES

(1) The Senate bill authorizes the development of 15 new research, training, and demonstration centers for advanced diagnosis and treatment methods for cardiovascular diseases, and also authorizes the development of 15 new centers for such activities regarding chronic pulmonary diseases. Emergency medical services are referred to as a type of treatment method which may be included in programs of such centers.

The House amendment is similar, except that the centers may be used for prevention methods and there is no specific reference to emergency medical services.

The conference substitute combines the provisions of the Senate bill and the House amendment.

(2) The House amendment permits such centers to be utilized in connection with activities respecting any of the diseases with which this legislation is concerned.

The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

(3) The House amendment makes it clear that such centers may be used for basic as well as clinical research.

The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

V.—CONSTRUCTION

The House amendment specifically states that the term "construction" does not include the acquisition of land.

The Senate bill contains no comparable provision.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

VI.—NATIONAL HEART AND LUNG ADVISORY COUNCIL

(1) The Senate bill establishes a National Heart and Lung Advisory Council consisting of 23 members. The Secretary, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration, and a medical officer designated by the Secretary of Defense are to be ex officio members of the Council. In addition there are to be 18 members appointed by the Secretary. Of the appointed members not more than 12 shall be medical or scientific authorities in relevant disciplines and not more than eight shall be members of the general public.

The House amendment also establishes such a Council, except that the Directors of NIH and OST are not included as ex officio members and of the appointed members nine shall be medical or scientific authorities; two shall be enrolled in relevant residency programs; and seven shall be members of the general public and leaders in their fields.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the Senate bill, except that of the appointed members 11 shall be medical and scientific authorities in relevant disciplines; two shall be enrolled in relevant residency programs; and five shall be members of the general public and leaders in their fields.

(2) The Senate bill provides that a quorum of the Council shall consist of 12 members.

The House amendment provides that a quorum of the Council shall consist of 11 members.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

(3) The Senate bill provides that the Chairman of the Council shall be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from among the members of the Council and shall serve for 2 years.

The House amendment provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designee, shall be Chairman of the Council.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

(4) The Senate amendment provides that the Council shall meet at the call of the Director of the National Heart and Lung Institute or the Chairman.

The House amendment provides that the Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

The conference substitute adopts the provision of the House amendment.

VII.—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(1) The Senate bill authorizes appropriation for this legislation (exclusive of section 414) of \$400 million for fiscal year 1973; \$450 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$500 million for fiscal year 1975.

The House amendment authorizes appropriations for this legislation (exclusive of section 414) of \$350 million for fiscal year 1973; \$400 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$450 million for fiscal year 1975.

The conference substitute authorizes appropriations for this legislation (exclusive of section 414) of \$375 million for fiscal year 1973; \$425 million for fiscal year 1974; and \$475 million for fiscal year 1975.

(2) The Senate bill provides that not less than 20 percent of the funds annually appropriated under this section shall be reserved for programs in diseases of the lung and not less than 20 percent for programs in diseases of the blood. In addition the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has discretionary authority to transfer not more than 10 percent of the allotted funds from any program or activity under part B of title

IV of the Public Health Service Act to any other program or activity under the same title.

The House amendment has no comparable provisions.

The conference substitute provides that of the funds annually appropriated under this section not less than 15 percent shall be reserved for programs in diseases of the lung and not less than 15 percent shall be reserved for programs in diseases of the blood.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD,
ANCHER NELSEN,
TIM LEE CARTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
GAYLORD NELSON,
TOM EAGLETON,
ALAN CRANSTON,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
WALTER F. MONDALE,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
PETER H. DOMINICK,
BOB PACKWOOD,
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,
ROBERT TAFT, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2, UNIFORMED SERVICES HEALTH PROFESSIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. PRICE of Illinois (on behalf of Mr. HEBERT) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2) to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-1350)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions, 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 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 Senate amendment to the text of the bill insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Uniformed Services Health Professions Revitalization Act of 1972".

Sec. 2. (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new chapters after chapter 103:

"CHAPTER 104.—UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

"Sec.

"2112. Establishment.

"2113. Board of regents.

"2114. Students: selection; status; obligation.

"2115. Graduates: limitation on number electing to perform civilian Federal duty.

"2116. Reports to Congress.

"2117. Authorization for appropriations.

"§ 2112. Establishment

"(a) There is hereby authorized to be established within 25 miles of the District of

Columbia a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (hereinafter referred to as the 'University'), at a site or sites to be selected by the Secretary of Defense, with authority to grant appropriate advanced degrees. It shall be so organized as to graduate not less than 100 medical students annually, with the first class graduating not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of this chapter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the numbers of persons to be graduated from the University shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(c) The development of the University may be by such phases as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, subject to the requirements of subsection (a).

"§ 2113. Board of Regents

"(a) The business of the University shall be conducted by a Board of Regents (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') with funds appropriated for and provided by the Department of Defense. The Board shall consist of—

"(1) nine persons outstanding in the fields of health and health education who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(2) the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, who shall be an ex officio member;

"(3) the surgeons general of the uniformed services, who shall be ex officio members; and

"(4) the person referred to in subsection (d).

"(b) The term of office of each member of the Board (other than ex officio members) shall be six years except that—

"(1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

"(2) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, three at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of six years.

"(c) One of the members of the Board (other than an ex officio member) shall be designated by the President as Chairman. He shall be the presiding officer of the Board.

"(d) The Board shall appoint a Dean of the University (hereinafter referred to as the 'Dean') who shall also serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Board.

"(e) Members of the Board (other than ex officio members) while attending conferences or meetings or while otherwise performing their duties as members shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Defense, but not exceeding \$100 per diem and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for necessary travel expenses while so serving away from their place of residence.

"(f) The Board, after considering the recommendations of the Dean, shall obtain the services of such military and civilian professors, instructors, and administrative and other employees as may be necessary to operate the University. Civilian members of the faculty and staff shall be employed under salary schedules and granted retirement and other related benefits prescribed by the Secretary of Defense so as to place the employees of the University on a comparable basis with the employees of fully accredited schools of the health professions within the vicinity of the District of Columbia. The Board may confer academic titles, as appropriate, upon military and civilian members of the faculty. The military members of the faculty shall include a professor of military, naval, or air science as the Board may determine.

"(g) The Board is authorized to negotiate agreements with agencies of the Federal Government to utilize on a reimbursable

basis appropriate existing Federal medical resources located in or near the District of Columbia. Under such agreements the facilities concerned will retain their identities and basic missions. The Board is also authorized to negotiate affiliation agreements with an accredited university or universities in or near the District of Columbia. Such agreements may include provisions for payments for educational services provided students participating in Department of Defense educational programs. The Board may also, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, enter into an agreement under which the University would become part of a national university of health sciences should such an institution be established in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

"(h) The Board may establish postdoctoral, postgraduate, and technological institutes.

"(i) The Board shall also establish programs in continuing medical education for military members of the health professions to the end that high standards of health care may be maintained within the military medical services.

"§ 2114. Students: selection; status; obligation

"(a) Students at the University shall be selected under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. In so prescribing, the Secretary shall consider the recommendations of the Board. However, selection procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense shall emphasize the basic requirement that students demonstrate sincere motivation and dedication to a career in the uniformed services (as defined in section 1072(1) of this title).

"(b) Students shall be commissioned officers of a uniform service as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense after consulting with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, they shall serve on active duty in pay grade O-1 with full pay and allowances of that grade, but shall not be counted against any prescribed military strengths. Upon graduation they shall be appointed in a regular component, if qualified, unless they are covered by section 2115 of this title. Students who graduate shall be required, except as provided in section 2115 of this title, to serve thereafter on active duty under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, may prescribe for not less than seven years, unless sooner released. The service credit exclusions specified in section 2126 of this title shall apply to students covered by this section.

"(c) A period of time spent in military intern or residency training shall not be creditable in satisfying an active duty obligation imposed by this section.

"(d) A member of the program who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, is dropped from the program for deficiency in conduct or studies, or for other reasons, may be required to perform active duty in an appropriate military capacity in accordance with the active duty obligation imposed by this section. In no case shall any such member be required to serve on active duty for any period in excess of a period equal to the period he participated in the program, except that in no case may any such member be required to serve on active duty less than one year.

"2115. Graduates: limitation on number electing to perform civilian Federal duty

"Not more than 20 percent of the graduates of any one class at the University may agree in writing to perform civilian Federal duty for not less than seven years following the completion of their professional education in lieu of active duty in a uniformed service.

Such persons shall be released from active duty upon the completion of their professional education. The location and type of their duty shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the heads of Federal agencies concerned.

“§ 2116. Reports to Congress

“The Secretary of Defense shall report periodically to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the feasibility of establishing educational institutions similar or identical to the University at any other locations he deems appropriate. The last such report shall be submitted by June 30, 1976.

“§ 2117. Authorization for appropriations

“There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for the planning, construction, development, improvement, operation, and maintenance of the University, and to otherwise accomplish the purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, the sum of \$15,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sum as may be authorized in the annual military construction authorization Act for such year.

“Chapter 105—ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

“Sec.

“2120. Definitions.

“2121. Establishment.

“2122. Eligibility for participation.

“2123. Members of the program; active duty obligation; failure to complete training; release from program.

“2124. Members of the program; numbers appointed.

“2125. Members of the program; exclusion from authorized strengths.

“2126. Members of the program; service credit.

“2127. Contracts for scholarships; payments.

“§ 2120. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) ‘Program’ means the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship program provided for in this chapter.

“(2) ‘Member of the program’ means a person appointed a commissioned officer in a reserve component of the armed forces who is enrolled in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship program.

“(3) ‘Course of study’ means education received at an accredited college, university, or institution in medicine, dentistry, or other health profession, leading, respectively, to a degree related to the health professions as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

“§ 2121. Establishment

“(a) For the purpose of obtaining adequate numbers of commissioned officers on active duty who are qualified in the various health professions, the Secretary of each military department, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may establish and maintain a health professions scholarship program for his department.

“(b) The program shall consist of courses of study in designated health professions, with obligatory periods of military training.

“(c) Persons participating in the program shall be commissioned officers in reserve components of the armed forces. Members of the program shall serve on active duty in pay grade O-1 with full pay and allowances of that grade for a period of 45 days during each year of participation in the program. They shall be detailed as students at accredited civilian institutions, located in the United States or Puerto Rico, for the purpose of acquiring knowledge or training in a designated health profession. In addition, members of the program shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, receive military and professional training and instruction.

“(d) Except when serving on active duty

pursuant to subsection (c), a member of the program shall be entitled to a stipend at the rate of \$400 per month.

“§ 2122. Eligibility for participation

“To be eligible for participation as a member of the program, a person must be a citizen of the United States and must—

“(1) be accepted for admission to, or enrolled in, an institution in a course of study, as that term is defined in section 2120(3) of this title;

“(2) sign an agreement that unless sooner separated he will—

“(A) complete the educational phase of the program;

“(B) accept an appropriate reappointment or designation within his military service, if tendered, based upon his health profession, following satisfactory completion of the program;

“(C) participate in the intern program of his service if selected for such participation;

“(D) participate in the residency program of his service, if selected, or be released from active duty for the period required to undergo civilian residency if selected for such training; and

“(E) because of his sincere motivation and dedication to a career in the uniformed services, participate in military training while he is in the program, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense; and

“(3) meet the requirements for appointment as a commissioned officer.

“§ 2123. Members of the program: active duty obligation; failure to complete training; release from program

“(a) A member of the program incurs an active duty obligation. The amount of his obligation shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, but those regulations may not provide for a period of obligation of less than one year for each year of participation in the program.

“(b) A period of time spent in military intern or residency training shall not be creditable in satisfying an active duty obligation imposed by this section.

“(c) A member of the program who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, is dropped from the program for deficiency in conduct or studies, or for other reasons, may be required to perform active duty in an appropriate military capacity in accordance with the active duty obligation imposed by this section.

“(d) The Secretary of a military department, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may relieve a member of the program who is dropped from the program from any active duty obligation imposed by this section, but such relief shall not relieve him from any military obligation imposed by any other law.

“(e) Any member of the program relieved of his active duty obligation under this chapter before the completion of such obligation may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, be assigned to an area of health manpower shortage designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for a period equal to the period of obligation from which he was relieved.

“§ 2124. Members of the program: numbers appointed

“The number of persons who may be designated as members of the program for training in each health profession shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, except that the total number of persons so designated in all of the programs authorized by this chapter shall not, at any time, exceed 5,000.

“§ 2125. Members of the program: exclusion from authorized strengths

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, members of the program shall not be counted against any prescribed military strengths.

“§ 2126. Members of the program: service credit

“Service performed while a member of the program shall not be counted—

“(1) in determining eligibility for retirement other than by reason of a physical disability incurred while on active duty as a member of the program; or

“(2) in computing years of service creditable under section 205, other than subsection (a) (7) and (8), of title 37.

“§ 2127. Contracts for scholarships: payments

“(a) The Secretary of Defense may provide for the payment of all educational expenses incurred by a member of the program, including tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses. Such payments, however, shall be limited to those educational expenses normally incurred by students at the institution and in the health profession concerned who are not members of the program.

“(b) The Secretary of Defense may contract with an accredited civilian educational institution for the payment of tuition and other educational expenses of members of the program authorized by this chapter. Payment to such institutions may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529).

“(c) Payments made under subsection (b) shall not cover any expenses other than those covered by subsection (a).

“(d) When the Secretary of Defense determines, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that an accredited civilian educational institution has increased its total enrollment for the sole purpose of accepting members of the program covered by this chapter, he may provide under a contract with such an institution for additional payments to cover the portion of the increased costs of the additional enrollment which are not covered by the institution's normal tuition and fees.”

“(b) The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A and at the beginning of part III of such subtitle of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by adding

“104. Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences..... 2112

“105. Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program... 2120”

immediately below

“103. Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps..... 2101.”

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

F. EDW. HEBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
DURWARD G. HALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LLOYD BENTSEN,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
WM. SAXBE,
MARGARET SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2), to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions, 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:

BACKGROUND

The House of Representatives, on November 3, 1971, by a vote of 351 Yeas to 31 Nays, passed and sent to the Senate the bill H.R. 2.

The Senate, on June 6, 1972, amended H.R. 2 by striking all after the enacting clause and substituting new language in the form of an amendment.

As a consequence of the Senate action, there existed a number of major differences in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 2. Each of these substantive differences are identified below, together with an explanation of the action taken thereon in the conference to resolve the differences.

Difference No. 1—The Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

Under the House-passed bill, authority was provided to establish the university within a radius of 25 miles of the District of Columbia. The university would be so organized as to graduate not less than 100 medical students annually, with the first class graduating not less than ten years after enactment of the legislation.

The Senate amendment deleted authority for the establishment of a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and substituted a provision providing for "a feasibility study" to determine the desirability of establishing such a university as provided in the House language. The "feasibility study" proposed by the Senate amendment was essentially designed to re-examine the entire proposal as contained in the House-passed bill. In accordance with the Senate language, the study was to be conducted by the Secretary of Defense and the results reported back to the President and the Congress not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Act.

A detailed explanation of the differing views of the respective legislative bodies on this issue is available in House Report 92-524 and Senate Report 92-827.

Both the House and Senate conferees were adamant in supporting the respective positions of both bodies as regards this very crucial issue. However, the House conferees, among other things, pointed out that a feasibility study as recommended by the Senate would serve no effective purpose since this subject had been more than adequately reviewed and studied both within and outside the Department of Defense.

House conferees also called attention to the strong endorsement for the establishment of a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences provided by the Secretary of Defense. Because of the pertinency of the Secretary's views on this subject, and since they coincide with those of the House conferees, a portion of his statement is set out below:

"As ranking member of the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Committee and Defense Committee, I joined with you in support of the establishment of a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. Since leaving the Congress and taking on the responsibilities as Secretary of Defense, my personal support for this legislation has been strengthened. The urgent need still exists for the establishment of a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to make the military medical departments producers of physicians and members of other health professions rather than merely large-scale consumers of scarce categories of health personnel. It would also add significantly to the total number of members of the health professions available in the national medical manpower pool. It would afford us a means of attracting a significant number of members of the health professions into the military departments. It would also

greatly assist us in retaining highly qualified members of the health professions, for we have concluded that one of the most important retention factors for physicians and other members of the health professions is the opportunity of functioning in a professional environment of the highest caliber. The proposed university would contribute measurably toward the attainment of that environment by providing academic teaching positions for military health professionals and university cooperation in establishing and monitoring training programs throughout the military departments. Ultimately, we would expect that it would result in improved medical care and treatment of all beneficiaries of our health care system.

I am still convinced that the establishment of such an institution will provide the professional stimulus to staunch the annual severe losses of military physicians and other health professionals that we have experienced in recent years. I personally continue to believe that it would become the cornerstone of the foundation we need to attain an all-volunteer medical force."

The Senate conferees, on the other hand, disagreed with the House conferees' views and questioned the overall philosophy embodied in the principle of establishing a university of this type entirely supported by Federal funds. The Senate conferees pointed out their concern over the apparent lack of any clear consensus in the government and the health professions as to the need and desirability of establishing such a university.

Notwithstanding the strong representations made by the Senate conferees on this issue, the Senate conferees ultimately receded from their position with an amendment which reduced the first-year authorization for funding for design, planning, construction, et cetera, for the university to \$15,000,000 rather than the \$20,000,000 contained in the House-passed bill. Also the amendment would require future line item annual authorizations before appropriations for construction could be provided in subsequent years.

Difference No. 2—Scholarship program and benefits

Under the House-passed bill, the Armed Forces would have been authorized a medical scholarship training program in the health professions under which a maximum of 5,000 scholarships, at any one time, would be provided to enable persons to attend civilian schools providing training in medical, dental, and allied health disciplines. Under the House version of the scholarship program, the full cost of the student's school tuition and fees would be paid by the Federal government and such students would serve on active duty as reserve officers in Grade O-1 (Second Lieutenant/Ensign).

The Senate version of the scholarship program provided:

A. The full cost of the student's medical school tuition and fees be paid by the Federal government (same as House version).

B. Each student serve on inactive duty as a Reserve officer in Grade O-1 (2nd Lt./Ensign) except for 45 days per year when he would serve on active duty in Grade O-1.

C. Each student receive a monthly stipend of \$400 except when he is on active duty when he would receive the full pay and allowances of Grade O-1. Under the Senate version a student with dependents would receive in pay and allowances about \$5,285 per year and one without dependents \$5,235 (in addition to medical school tuition and fees).

After considerable discussion, the House conferees agreed to the Senate version of the scholarship program with the qualification that in the event the \$400 monthly stipend would not be adequate to attract the number and quality of students essential to the program, both the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services will give serious consideration

to the desirability of increasing this stipend by appropriate legislation.

The House therefore recedes and accepts the Senate provisions on this issue.

Difference No. 3—Scholarship student attending a university which either disestablished ROTC or barred armed services' recruiters from its campus

The House version of H.R. 2 contained a provision which prohibited the detaching of scholarship students to any institution of higher learning if that institution had adopted a policy which bars recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces from the premises of that institution, or if such institution of higher learning had directed the disestablishment of Reserve Officer Training Corps units at the institution despite the desire of the Armed Forces to continue such training at the institution.

The Senate version of H.R. 2 permitted a scholarship student to attend such schools.

The House conferees believe that the schools in question should not receive any benefits under this legislation from the Department of Defense either directly or indirectly in view of the apparent policy of the institutions to divorce themselves completely from any affiliation with the Armed Forces of the United States. However, the Senate conferees were of the view that adoption of the House prohibition would have a serious impact on the Department's ability to attract the numbers and quality of students required by the scholarship program. The Senate conferees pointed out that approximately 9% of all students now attending medical schools are in schools which would be directly affected by this prohibition. Therefore, they argued that notwithstanding the merits or demerits of the principle embodied in the House prohibition, they believe that the overriding urgency of the physician shortage problem required elimination of the House prohibition.

The House conferees therefore reluctantly receded and concurred in the Senate action.

Difference No. 4—Statutory numerical limitations on promotion of medical and dental officers to general and flag officer rank

The House version of H.R. 2 removed all the statutory numerical limitations on the promotion of medical and dental officers to general and flag officer rank. This action was taken to provide the Armed Services with additional career incentives for medical and dental officers.

The Senate did not concur in this House action, although it conceded that increased promotion opportunity was essential for officers in the Medical and Dental Corps. The Senate report therefore requires the Department of Defense to study the question of increased promotion opportunities for medical and dental officers and to report the findings of the Department to the responsible legislative Committees not later than January 1, 1973.

In view of the adamant position of the Senate conferees on this issue, the House conferees reluctantly receded with the understanding that the respective Committees on Armed Services would, if necessary, take early legislative action on this problem shortly after the convening of the 93d Congress.

Difference No. 5—Length of Scholarship program

Under the House version of H. R. 2, the scholarship program was limited to courses of study of not more than four years' duration.

Under the Senate version of H. R. 2, courses of study could extend to as much as six years' duration.

The Senate conferees pointed out that recent changes and innovations in medical training, and medical school curricula, have

resulted in some courses, for example, requiring as much as six years for the completion of training for a medical degree. Therefore, the Senate conferees urged that the language be made sufficiently flexible to encompass these innovations in medical training as well as others that might occur in future years.

The House concurred with the Senate conferees, and therefore receded without amendment to accept the Senate provision in this regard.

Difference No. 6—Technical changes

The House-Senate conferees also considered and made several technical changes to both the House and Senate versions of H. R. 2 in accordance with recommendations made by the Department of Defense. None of these changes are substantive in nature, and therefore require no explanation.

During the discussion of the provisions relating to the establishment of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, it was the general consensus of the conferees that the provisions, as written, should remain deliberately broad so as to provide the Secretary of Defense and the Board of Regents, in establishing and administering the university, sufficient executive authority to ensure the kind of administrative flexibility that will be necessary to make this the finest medical school in the world in the shortest possible time.

F. EDW. HÉBERT,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
DURWARD G. HALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD, JR.,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LLOYD BENTSEN,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
WM. SAXBE,
MARGARET SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO FURNISH INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO U.S. OPERATIONS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 1078 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1078

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense, to the extent not incompatible with the public interest, is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, not later than seven days following the adoption of this resolution, the following information with respect to the American bombing and naval bombardment of North Vietnam since March 1, 1972:

1. number of sorties flown and types and tonnage of ordnance used each month;
2. after action reports and bomb damage assessments, both written and photographic;
3. specific descriptions and photographic evidence of all damage to (a) the primary and secondary dike and hydraulic systems of North Vietnam, and (b) villages and cities of North Vietnam.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this resolution was adversely reported by the House Committee on Armed Services by a rollcall vote of 27 to 5, I move to lay House Resolution 1078 on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

The motion to table was agreed to.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO FURNISH INFORMATION CONCERNING MILITARY OPERATIONS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 1079 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1079

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense, to the extent not incompatible with the public interest, is directed to furnish to the House of Representatives, not later than seven days following the adoption of this resolution:

1. maps showing the location of all known or suspected prisoner-of-war camps in North Vietnam;
2. maps showing the location of all bombing strikes and naval bombardments against North Vietnam for the period March 1, 1972, to date;
3. the rules of engagement promulgated for the bombing of North Vietnam from March 1, 1972, to date, and a description of the procedures, policies, and actions taken by American Armed Forces for the purpose of assuring the avoidance of danger to American prisoners of war.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this resolution was ordered adversely reported to the House on a vote of 31 to 1 by the House Armed Services Committee, I move to lay House Resolution 1079 on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

The motion to table was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on both motions to table was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 16071, PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1098 and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1098

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 Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16071) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, 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 Public Works now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under

the five-minute rule, and all points of order against sections 3 and 5 of said substitute are hereby waived for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI. 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 in the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1098 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 16071 to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act. It shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and, because of reappropriations, points of order are waived against sections 3 and 5 for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI.

The purpose of H.R. 16071 is to make improving amendments to the existing law and to extend the economic programs for an additional year—to June 30, 1974.

Changes are made in a number of areas including: grants and supplementary grants for public facilities, the public works impact program, business development, technical assistance, vocational training facilities, coordination, special impact programs in urban and rural areas.

A new title is added entitled "Environmental Effects," which is designed to provide assistance to individuals who are unemployed because of Federal actions to improve the environment.

The moratorium on dedesignation of redevelopment areas is extended to June 1, 1974.

A number of changes are made to improve the administration of the economic development program and authorizations for funding these programs through fiscal year 1974 are included to provide for their continued operation.

The total authorization in the bill is \$3,177,500,000.

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

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

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

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

Could the gentleman say upon whose request the waiver of the points of order was granted?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I am not certain, but I believe the matter came up in executive session, and it was pointed out that the Parliamentarian indicated that points of order would have to be waived to section 3 and section 5, because of

reappropriations in the authorization bill. That is my recollection.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying then by way of an answer that the waiver of points of order to section 3 and section 5 was not requested by the committee but was requested by the Parliamentarian?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. That is my recollection, but I am not clear on it. But I believe it was pointed out by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), that the Parliamentarian had indicated that points of order would have to be waived to section 3 and section 5, or they would be subject to a point of order.

In any event, though, the motion to grant the rule did contain a provision that points of order would be waived to section 3 and section 5—I do know that.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Certainly; I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to be disrespectful, but has the Rules Committee become the handmaiden of the Parliamentarian? I am surprised that, if a waiver of points of order was necessary, the committee did not request the waiver.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) has pointed out the main provisions in this resolution.

The primary purpose of H.R. 16071 is to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act for 1 year through fiscal year 1974. The existing law authorizes funds through fiscal year 1973. This bill also includes additional authorization for fiscal year 1973.

The object of the programs authorized in this bill is to provide Federal assistance to economically depressed areas. In order to achieve this goal, the bill provides technical assistance, public facility grants, business loans and vocational training.

One controversial provision in this bill is in a new title dealing with environmental effects. Section 801 provides assistance to individuals who lose their jobs as a result of Federal actions to improve the environment. Such individuals who have worked at least 26 of the 78 preceding weeks in the plant or industry affected, will be eligible for benefits. The benefits include, first, unemployment compensation equal to 60 percent of a worker's former weekly wage until he is reemployed or retires, for a period of up to 78 weeks, second, temporary mortgage or rental payment assistance in hardship cases, and third, moving expenses to a new job if the worker is unable to find work in the vicinity of his previous home, but does find a job elsewhere.

The total of new costs in this bill is \$3,177,500,000, of which \$977,500,000 is for additional funding in fiscal year 1973, and \$2,200,000,000 is for total funding in fiscal year 1974.

There are no departmental letters in the Committee report.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker,

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation which was reported out of the Committee on Public Works under the chairmanship of Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, is probably one of the most outstanding bills to aid the American economy that has been presented to the Congress in many years.

The Rules Committee reported unanimously on a rule to consider this bill. It is a multi-billion dollar public works bill which will greatly stimulate our economy and eventually give employment to many of our unemployed and increase the buying power of millions of our people throughout the Nation. It will help the construction industry, including building trades, which suffers from an unemployment rate double the national average which is now over 6 percent of the Nation's working force. Chairman MORGAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee yesterday testified before the Rules Committee that \$1,300 billion has been spent on the military and defense here and over the globe since World War II—about \$100 billion on foreign aid in the same period of time. We should now start spending a small fraction of our taxes on local problems.

This legislation will also aid in the urban localities in the construction of public necessities such as water purification plants, sewage treatment systems, libraries, police stations, community centers, street lighting, public transportation and airport facilities, hospital construction, warehouses, traffic congestion, and so forth.

This legislation has the support of business and construction contractors. Labor organizations have been calling for an expanding accelerated public works construction program for several years.

This bill would provide grants for State and local governments to initiate and speed up public investment projects in areas of high unemployment. American workers realize that unemployment depression and our most critical economic problems stem from inadequate public facilities which are much needed in every metropolitan area throughout the Nation. Over 100 Members of Congress from both parties are cosponsoring this legislation for the benefit of our economic recovery and which should affect our prosperity after the legislation is enacted and grants are set aside to the various localities requesting financial aid for projects.

The accelerated public works program provides 80 percent construction grants to local governments in high unemployment and special impacted areas. These programs are important as they provide help on two fronts by assisting local government in building much needed public works facilities such as sewage treatment plants, transportation, facilities for health problems and provides immediate employment to persons in the building trades which are about the hardest hit groups by unemployment.

During the last session of Congress I was one of the sponsors and supporters of the legislation known as the "acceler-

ated public works project" which would have given the Nation an earlier start to combat depression and unemployment but the bill was vetoed by the President. At that time this bill passed the House by a vote of 320 to 67. The veto by the President of this bill created such strong criticism and opposition that the administration reconsidered and cooperated on a more modified bill.

The older Members of Congress vividly remember the depression in the early 1930's. I well remember that immediately previous to the devastating stock market crash of 1929, corporations, big business, banks, and so forth, were reaping great benefits; profits, prices were rising rapidly; and unemployment was increasing yearly until millions of American workers and their families were without money to purchase the necessities of life, including adequate food supplies. This inflation was the cause of bringing the Nation into the most devastating economic turmoil, creating discontented elements that were marching on Washington demanding relief for the unemployed and the destitute. It was only through the miraculous cooperation of big business, Government, and labor under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt during the middle and late 1930's that our Government was saved from economic destruction.

Today we are reading about the fabulous profits of industry, conglomerates, business cartels, banks, insurance companies, and so forth, and the same unemployment scourge is now creeping up which, if not curbed, will result in another crash of our economy similar to the early 1930's.

This legislation, if enacted without crippling amendments, will be the first major step to restore employment and keep our factories and industries operating and return prosperity to the Nation.

I do hope the Congress will enact this legislation by a large majority vote and the President will not repeat his veto of the last major public works bill which indirectly helped to create our present unemployment and economic dilemma.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a very fortunate thing that the House is to consider this bill. The rule should be approved, and the bill should be adopted overwhelmingly. There is a need throughout the Nation for sound public works projects. Obviously, in many communities there is a serious problem of unemployment. The two will work hand in glove to give us needed programs and better economic conditions. They will help to give employment to skilled people who particularly need work. We talk about taking people off welfare; we talk about substituting work for welfare. This is a work program for people who are skilled but who are unable to find work and who want to work. I strongly approve it.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have before us today the vehicle whereby we

can come to grips with the growing problem of unemployment in America.

For a long time we have been hearing about programs which increase the drain on public funds for those who refuse to work, but we have heard far too little about plans to provide work for those trained and willing to work. That is the object of the bill now before us.

This is not the first time we have been down this road, Mr. Speaker. Last June the President vetoed a similar proposal which would have provided \$2 billion for an accelerated public works program. As a result of that veto, public projects which need building have gone unbuilt and men who seek work have been denied that work solely because the Federal Government did not make the necessary funds available.

It is a shame—the shame of us all—that we have allowed so much discussion of welfare programs for those unwilling to work while devoting so little time and attention to the creation of jobs for those who need and want work.

Sewer systems, water-purification projects, hospitals, nursing homes, libraries, schools, public buildings, community projects, and recreational facilities are badly needed in this country. No member of this body could say there is not a need in every congressional district in America for projects such as I have mentioned. Certainly, few Members of this body can say there is full employment in every district.

While the proposal before us today will not return full employment to our country, it will go a long way toward helping those in the brick-and-mortar trades who have been especially hard hit by unemployment.

We have heard the fear expressed that the accelerated public works proposal now under consideration would create some kind of WPA monster. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what was wrong with the WPA. It provided jobs for people and badly needed permanent facilities for our Nation. True, the program was conceived at a time of great stress in America, but I suggest it was unemployment that was the monster, not the program conceived with which to deal with it.

We face a situation today similar in many respects. Unemployment continues to be a problem in many areas of the Nation while sorely needed public programs go begging. The Congress should accept responsibility to provide the means whereby these two segments of public need are brought together—the need for facilities and the need of men for work.

The proposal now before us, frankly, falls short of what I believe we need in this regard. But it is a realistic program. The fiscal year soon will be half gone but much good can still be accomplished. A larger program very probably would produce a presidential veto.

So let us get on with the business of making available to as many citizens as possible the opportunity for meaningful, honest work. What is proposed here today is an expenditure of public funds for the highest goals, providing jobs and the construction of needed public works facilities.

This is not the time to tarry over detail or be stampeded into an alley of fear because a few among us throw up specters. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it was not the WPA which was bad. It was the situation which required the creation of a WPA.

Times have not changed. The Congress in the 1930's met the challenge and the Nation recovered from that crisis. Now we face another crisis and this Congress must meet that challenge.

I urge approval of the accelerated public works proposal now before us so that Americans can get back to work.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. 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 upon the table.

SHORESIDE VISITORS' FACILITIES AT THE U.S.S. "ARIZONA" MEMORIAL

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16201) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct and provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor and to transfer responsibility for their operation and maintenance to the National Park Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 16201

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to provide for the construction, establishment, and maintenance of permanent shoreside facilities (including, but not limited to, a theater and museum) within the Pearl Harbor Naval Base, Hawaii, to provide for the education and convenience of visitors to the United States Ship *Arizona* Memorial.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy, after consultation called for in section 3 hereof, may include and display in the theater and museum such personal property, relics, documents, memorabilia, films, and exhibits as he deems appropriate to assist visitors to enhance their understanding of the history and American interest in the Pacific Ocean areas, and to deepen their appreciation of the great heroism and patriotism of the men who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and in the Pacific Ocean areas during World War II.

SEC. 3. In carrying out his duties under this Act, including (but not limited to) the planning, construction, equipping, and furnishing of the shoreside facilities, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to consult with, seek the advice and assistance of, and receive and accept gifts from, any interested individuals, agencies, groups, or organizations, including the Pacific War Memorial Commission of the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to consult and negotiate with the Secretary of the Interior for the transfer of responsibility to the National Park Service, De-

partment of Interior, for the maintenance and operation of the shoreside facilities immediately upon completion of their construction.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed \$2,500,000 for the planning, construction, equipping, and furnishing of the shoreside facilities authorized in section 1 hereof.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 16201 is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct and provide shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor and to transfer the responsibility for their operation and maintenance to the National Park Service. H.R. 16201 describes the facilities as including, but not limited to, a theater and museum to provide for the education and convenience of visitors to the *Arizona* Memorial. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy may include and display in the theater and museum such personal property, relics, documents, memorabilia, films, and exhibits as he deems appropriate. H.R. 16201 authorizes the sum of \$2,500,000 for the planning, construction, equipping, and furnishing of the shoreside facilities. On April 23, 1970 hearings were conducted at the end of which a decision was made to defer action pending further investigation of the operation and maintenance of the proposed facilities. Hearings were again held in March 1972 and August 1972 on other bills which were introduced in the 92d Congress which were almost identical to the ones introduced in the 91st Congress. The Navy currently provides for visitor transportation to and from the *Arizona* Memorial as well as its regular maintenance at a cost of approximately \$95,000 annually. It is estimated that if the facilities described in this bill are erected, additional funding would be required upon completion of the facilities for maintenance and additional personnel salaries. The total cost is estimated to be about \$162,000 annually. The bill passed by the committee authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to construct and negotiate with the Secretary of the Interior for the transfer of responsibility to the National Park Service for the maintenance and operation of the shoreside facilities immediately upon the completion of their construction.

The hearings conducted in the 92d Congress by this committee were based upon H.R. 11723 which indicated a clear intention to charge the Secretary of the Navy with the responsibility for both construction and maintenance, as well as operation, of the facilities. The Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, did not recommend enactment of any bill with that proviso. The Department of the Interior, in their report of August 1, 1972, on H.R. 11723, urged deferral of further action until more study could be conducted jointly with the Navy. This committee, even in view of the Navy position and the Department of the Interior position, recommends enactment of H.R. 16201.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as one who helped to establish the U.S.S.

Arizona Memorial itself, I rise in support of H.R. 16201, which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of much-needed shoreside facilities for the education and convenience of visitors to the Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

Ten years have passed since Congress authorized the construction of a memorial at the site of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, "in honor and in commemoration of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States who gave their lives to their country during the attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941." (Public Law 87-210.)

In 1962, I was a member of the Pacific War Memorial Commission which was charged with the responsibility, among other things, of raising funds for the construction of the memorial in part through public subscription. The U.S.S. *Arizona* Memorial, first opened to the public in 1962, has truly become a national shrine. Erected over the sunken hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, the memorial is dedicated to all those who died in the Pearl Harbor attack, particularly the 1,177 men killed from the *Arizona* itself, most of whose bodies remain entombed in the ship's hull to this day. These brave men hailed from nearly every State in the Union and from Guam, the Philippine Islands, and Canada.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Americans in increasing numbers are making the pilgrimage to the watery shrine and spending a few moments in silent meditation at the gleaming white monument. More than 4 million visitors, from every State in the Union, have taken the short boat trip to the memorial since it opened. Ten years ago the memorial had only 62,000 visitors via Navy boats. Last year, that figure had risen to 367,816, with an approximately equal number visiting by commercial tour boats—bringing the total to nearly three-fourths of a million visitors in 1971.

Not only were the visitors impressive in their increase in numbers, but also in their diverse geographical origins. Many foreign countries were represented, predominantly, and perhaps ironically, Japan. Moreover, every State had its share of visitors.

Despite this rapid and staggering increase of visitors, the memorial itself remains adequate to handle the load. However, shoreside facilities are painfully inadequate. Perhaps because of the nature of their visit to Pearl Harbor and the touch of solemnity associated with it, visitors to the Arizona Memorial have been observed patiently waiting in line for lengthy periods of time, exposed to Hawaiian rain as well as sunshine, for the opportunity to make the short boat trip from the landing to the memorial.

The growing problem of inadequate facilities on shore to accommodate the burgeoning number of visitors led me and certain cosponsors to introduce the legislation which is now before this body. H.R. 16201 authorizes \$2.5 million for the construction of a theater, museum, and other visitor conveniences by the Secretary of the Navy. After completion, these facilities would be maintained and operated by the National Park Service.

The proposed shoreside facilities would serve as a memorial not only to our fallen heroes at Pearl Harbor, but also to our fighting men who spanned the vast reaches of the Pacific and displayed the same courage and personal sacrifice as that of the men who went to their watery graves on December 7, 1941. It would be fitting, in this larger context, for the visitor at Pearl Harbor to gain, first in the theater-museum, a meaningful perspective of World War II in the Pacific, and then to proceed to the Arizona Memorial, which he will then view with infinitely greater understanding and appreciation. A visitor would have the opportunity to learn about Pearl Harbor and the war in the Pacific, just as he does at other national shrines, such as Valley Forge, Fort McHenry, the Alamo, Fort Sumter, and Gettysburg.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16201 and the related bills are important legislation, with impact and significance for all of America and, indeed, the world. Over three decades have passed since the attack on Pearl Harbor, making this an appropriate time to begin this project which, by recalling the horrors of war, would serve as a reminder of the desperate need to preserve peace.

I strongly urge favorable consideration of H.R. 16201.

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.

TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS FROM DEED TO COLUMBIA MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16251) to release the conditions in a deed with respect to certain property heretofore conveyed by the United States to the Columbia Military Academy and its successors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 16251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions and conditions in the deed of conveyance from the Assistant Secretary of War, dated May 10, 1904, to the Columbia Military Academy, and its successors, of record in book 105, page 495, Register's Office, Maury County, Tennessee, restricting use of the property conveyed therein for educational purposes only, providing for prescribing of rules and regulations by the Secretary of War, providing for revision of title to the United States under specified circumstances and providing for use for military purposes on demand of the President, shall be released and free simple title to the property, free of such provisions and conditions, shall vest in the Columbia Military Academy, a Tennessee corporation, the charter of which is of record in Charter Book B, page 487 in such Register's Office, upon payment of \$10,000 in cash by such Academy to the United States as provided for in section 2 of Public Law 71-529 (46 Stat. 1009-1010).

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to release the provisions and conditions contained in the deed of conveyance from the Assistant Secretary of War dated May 10, 1904, to the Columbia Military Academy and its successors, of record in book 105, page 495, Register's Office, Maury County, Tenn., and to vest fee simple title to the property, free of such provisions and conditions in the Columbia Military Academy School.

The property involved comprises approximately 67 acres of land near Columbia in Maury County, Tenn., acquired by the United States in 1888 for the establishment of the Columbia Arsenal. The purchase price of \$15,250 was paid by citizens of Maury County. In 1901 the arsenal was abandoned.

The act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. 296) authorized and directed the Secretary of War to convey the Columbia Arsenal property to "Columbia Military Academy, an educational corporation organized under the laws of the State of Tennessee, and its successors," with the proviso that the estate shall continue so long as the property shall be used for educational purposes only and in conformity with other terms of the act including the following:

(a) The Secretary of War shall have visitation privileges and the right to prescribe the military curriculum of the school; upon failure of the school to comply with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary or other terms of the act, the Secretary is authorized to declare the estate has determined and the property shall revert to the United States, in which event the Secretary of War is authorized to take possession of the property on behalf of the United States.

(b) The United States shall have the right to use the property for military purposes at any time upon demand by the President of the United States.

The above-mentioned deed of conveyance to Columbia Military Academy, issued pursuant to this act and described in the bill, contained these provisions and terms.

By deed dated April 20, 1905, Columbia Military Academy conveyed the above-described property under the same terms and conditions to the Columbia Military Academy, a Tennessee corporation, the charter of which is recorded in Charter Book B, page 487, Register's Office, Maury County, Tenn.

The Department of the Army has no requirement for use of the former Columbia Arsenal property. To the contrary, authority has existed since 1928 for the extinguishment of all rights therein reserved to the United States. By the act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 766), the Secretary of War was authorized to sell to the Columbia Military Academy all rights reserved to the United States in the deed of May 10, 1904, and the act of April 23, 1904, for a consideration not less than the appraised value of the land alone. This statute was repealed by the act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1009) which substantially restated the 1928 act, and reduced the purchase price to a sum of \$10,000. Due to the school's financial difficulties, a sale was never consummated. However, the authority to sell still exists.

I urge your support for this legislation.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the two bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF STUDENTS AT STATE MARITIME ACADEMIES AND COLLEGES AS U.S. NAVAL RESERVE MIDSHIPMEN

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 16233) to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students at State maritime academies and colleges as Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

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:

H.R. 16233

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 (46 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) is amended by adding the following new section:

"RESERVE STATUS OF STUDENTS

"Sec. 11. Students appointed to any maritime academy or college which is assisted under any provisions of this Act may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy as Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy and may be commissioned as Reserve ensigns in the United States Navy upon graduation from the academy or college."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to enable the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students enrolled at any maritime academy or college which is assisted under the provisions of the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy and to appoint them as Reserve ensigns in the U.S. Navy upon their graduation. This would provide equal treatment for students of the State maritime academies as that now provided for students at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y.

Prior to passage of the most recent draft law amendments on September 28, 1971, students enrolled at State maritime academies received draft exemption status. However, the passage of that law resulted in a change in draft exemption for maritime cadets along with other college students. The proposed legislation would permit State maritime academy or college students to affiliate with the U.S. Naval Reserve as midshipmen and thus receive draft exempt status, thereby permitting them to complete

their maritime education. Upon graduation, midshipmen would be commissioned in the Naval Reserve and given the option of serving on active duty with the Navy or sailing on their licenses with the merchant marine.

There are presently six State maritime academies receiving assistance under the Maritime Academy Act of 1958. Five of these schools supply approximately 350 commissioned officers in the Naval Reserve each year.

The schools, their location and average enrollment are:

| | Students |
|--|----------|
| Texas Maritime Academy of Texas A. & M. University, Galveston, Tex. | 90 |
| California Maritime Academy, Vallejo, Calif. | 225 |
| Maine Maritime Academy, Castine, Maine | 560 |
| Massachusetts Maritime College, Buzzards Bay, Mass. | 425 |
| State University of New York, State Maritime College, Fort Schuyler, N.Y. | 748 |
| Great Lakes Maritime Academy in Michigan: A new school which will not qualify since baccalaureate degrees are not granted. | |

These schools under the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 may receive assistance from the Federal Government for maintenance and support of the schools not to exceed \$75,000 per grant period that must be matched by State aid. Students enrolled in the schools may receive up to \$600 per academic year for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence.

It is anticipated that approximately 1,000 students from these five schools will apply and be processed annually if the legislation is enacted at a minimal annual cost of approximately \$25,000. The cost will not result in increased budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

We urge favorable consideration of this legislation. Its enactment will enable young men enrolled in State maritime academies and colleges to complete their education without interruption and will result in increased numbers of well-qualified officers for the naval and merchant marine services.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for many years the graduates of the State maritime academies in the United States have made valuable contributions not only to the merchant marine service but also the U.S. Navy—particularly during time of national emergency and war. In June of 1941 the Secretary of the Navy established a classification of midshipmen. Merchant Marine Reserve, which resulted in the commissioning of many Naval Reserve officers with deck and engineering qualifications who rendered outstanding service during World War II and during the Korean conflict. In addition, those officers who did not serve on active duty for the Navy were commissioned in the Naval Reserve and through their service in the merchant marine established a splendid record in logistical transportation at sea around the world.

In the intervening years from 1953 when appointment in the Merchant Marine Reserve was no longer authorized by law, the cadets at the State merchant marine academies served without military reserve status. While there were at-

tempts to revive the merchant marine midshipmen reserve program, the situation did not become critical until the draft legislation of 1971, which resulted in merchant marine cadets along with other college students losing their deferred status. Accordingly, a number of bills were introduced in Congress which would revive the Naval Reserve midshipmen program in the State maritime academies to duplicate the Naval Reserve program existing at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y. H.R. 16233 is the final product of these efforts.

At the present time there are five State merchant marine academies authorized to grant baccalaureate degrees. Thus, their students are eligible for the program proposed by this legislation whereby the Secretary of the Navy could appoint the undergraduates as midshipmen, U.S. Naval Reserve and subsequently consider them for appointment by the President as ensign, U.S. Naval Reserve upon graduation.

The Federal Government shows a continuing interest in the progress of these schools and the success of the undergraduate programs through assistance rendered under the provisions of the Maritime Academy Act of 1958. Thus, as is the case of the Reserve Officers Training Corps programs, the Federal Government has good reason to promote the successful completion of the undergraduate work of all students in these State maritime academies. Thus, I urge upon my colleagues their support of this legislation.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 16233. This bill will exempt State maritime academy students from the draft, by amending the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students of State maritime academies as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy.

This legislation is urgently needed to correct an inequity which has arisen with the elimination of student deferments under the new selective service law passed by this Congress last September.

That change meant that students at the Maine Maritime Academy and other State maritime academies lost their right to deferment from the draft during their course of training—a right which is held by students at the other service academies, such as the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis and the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point.

Students at the Maine Maritime Academy and the other academies undergo the same training and education by the U.S. Navy as do these other students.

Furthermore, the State maritime academy student must, as a condition of his acceptance, sign a contract with the Maritime Administration stating that he agrees "At an appropriate time, prior to my graduation to apply for a commission as an ensign in the U.S. Naval Reserve and to accept such commission if tendered." Thus he is in a position similar to that of the cadet at the U.S. Maritime Academy at Kings Point, but without the attendant benefit of being by law exempt from the draft.

Since September 1971, my office has received a number of anxious letters from Maine Maritime Academy students, and from their parents, all asking why a man who has already committed himself to a course of training in naval science and a possible service obligation subsequently should now be made subject to the draft.

They ask why their studies and careers should be curtailed prematurely to fill a draft quota, when it is in the country's interest as well as their own that they complete the course before fulfilling their military obligation. They ask why they are treated differently from their peers at other service academies. They say that the situation is unjust and must be changed.

I agree with them, and I am determined that this problem must be remedied.

It was my own firm belief, as well as a tenet of national policy, that this country must maintain a strong merchant marine. The Maine Maritime Academy and other State Maritime Academies have established a solid tradition of turning out capable and well-trained officers for our merchant marine fleet. Anything that threatens these academies threatens that fleet as well, and the loss of the student draft exemption is a serious threat to attracting and retaining able students.

Several months ago, I joined with Members from affected States and other interested Members to introduce legislation specifically exempting State maritime academy students from the draft.

I commend the House Armed Services Committee for acting so swiftly on this bill, after receiving favorable reports from the affected Federal agencies.

Now I call on my colleagues in the House to pass H.R. 16233, so that the inequities now suffered by State maritime academy students will be rectified.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill for which I have been working during the last year. I want to commend the Committee on Armed Services and its distinguished chairman as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) for recognizing the need for this legislation. I also want to thank my many colleagues who joined in cosponsoring this measure.

The bill, which would authorize the Secretary to appoint cadets of the State maritime academies as midshipmen in the U.S. Naval Reserve, simply recognized the longstanding contribution that these institutions have made to the defense of this Nation. In times of war, they have been quick to respond to the call for more trained men. In the recent Vietnam war buildup, these schools increased their capability at the request of the Department of Commerce to meet the need to supply our troops in Southeast Asia.

Moreover, the cadets graduating from these schools go on to serve the Government and private industry in the many maritime-related fields such as oceanography, the marine sciences, navigation, and transportation. As efforts are made to restore America's merchant fleet to its proper place in world commerce, more well-trained officers will be needed.

The cadets at these schools go through 4 years of rigorous military and maritime training. They are instructed by active duty Navy personnel assigned to the schools. They wear uniforms and are required to meet all the standards of the Armed Forces. Also, they participate in shipboard training cruises each year. They differ from cadets at the Federal Academy in only two areas: They are not designated midshipmen and they do not receive a 100-percent subsidy of their education.

When these men go to sea upon graduation as required, they are among the best trained in the Navy or the merchant marine.

By providing this authorization, these cadets will be assured that they will be able to continue their education and training without interruption by the draft. Moreover, it will be a recognition of their close affiliation with the Navy and their important role in the defense of this Nation.

This measure will assure a steady flow of top-grade merchant marine and Naval Reserve officers from these schools. I have been closely associated with the New York State University Maritime College at Fort Schuyler and can attest without reservation to the excellence of their program and of the cadets at the school.

I urge my colleagues to approve the measure and hope that the other body will take swift action as well.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 16233 which would amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to provide that students at State maritime academies and colleges may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy and to commission them as Reserve ensigns in the U.S. Navy upon their graduation from the academy or college. This legislation is similar to H.R. 13166 which I introduced earlier this year.

In November 1971, a constituent of mine brought to my attention and protested the fact that cadets attending State maritime academies are eligible for the draft while cadets attending the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., are deferred from being drafted even though the cadets attending State maritime academies receive the same training and have the same service obligations. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, James E. Johnson, has stated:

As cadets in the U.S. Maritime Service, and as members of a quasi-military organization, they are required to take naval science courses and accept U.S. Naval Reserve Commissions upon graduation. They appear, from the viewpoint of the Navy, to be entitled to deferments in much the same manner as midshipmen at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

This inconsistent and inequitable situation came about with the passage of the draft amendments of 1971 to the Military Selective Service Act of 1967. Deferral authority for undergraduate students was restored to the President and subsequently college deferrals were not extended. Cadets at State maritime colleges and academies had been deferred from induction as college students prior

to the enactment of 1971 draft amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, in permitting the Secretary of the Navy to appoint maritime academy students as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy and to commission them as Reserve ensigns in the U.S. Navy upon their graduation from the academy or college, will restore that lost deferred treatment of these cadets. They will be treated on an equal basis with the cadets at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

It will also help to insure that our Nation will have an adequate number of qualified naval officers in those times of need such as World War II and the Korean conflict when graduates of these State maritime academies and colleges served with distinction both in the Navy and in our merchant marine fleet.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation to effectively remedy the inconsistent and inequitable selective service treatment of cadets in State maritime academies and colleges.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are about to consider, H.R. 16233, is designed to remedy one of the unfortunate inequities of the Selective Service System.

The bill would amend the Maritime Act of 1968 to authorize students at State maritime academies to be designated midshipmen in the U.S. Naval Reserve by the Secretary of the Navy. Such designation would confer upon State maritime students the same status as midshipmen at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, thus entitling them to the same 1-D classification before the Selective Service.

Students at State maritime academies lost their draft deferments when general student deferments were abolished. These students go through a 4-year military training program and are trained by active duty Navy personnel. After graduating, they accept commissions as ensigns in the U.S. Naval Reserve with an accompanying service obligation. It is, therefore, grossly unfair that these students at State maritime institutions are subject to the draft, while midshipmen at the Federal Merchant Marine Academy are deferred.

There are State maritime academies located in New York, Michigan, California, Texas, Maine, and Massachusetts. Their cadets are highly trained and qualified individuals and are a very important source of naval reserve officers. They are already serving their country admirably as part of the Naval Reserve; their eligibility for the draft is unnecessary and unfair.

I thus urge my colleagues to act favorably on H.R. 16233 and thereby give State maritime cadets the consideration they well deserve.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have

5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 16233.

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

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. 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. 16071) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16071, with Mr. SLACK 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 California (Mr. JOHNSON) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding. He is the House floor manager for this bill. I think this is an excellent bill. I want to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle and I will call on them later to explain the bill. I compliment them for their contribution in making possible the bringing of this legislation to the floor. There was nearly unanimous support for this bill in the full Public Works Committee, with one minor exception.

Mr. Chairman, amendment of the Public Works and Economic Development Act (H.R. 16071) which we are acting upon today, is of vital importance to the economic well-being of the Nation.

This bill contains a number of much-needed provisions aimed at speeding recovery from the current recession and at building a sound base for our future economic growth. Among these provisions are increased funding authority for accelerated public works, new mechanisms for coordinating economic development programs, assistance to individuals who lose their jobs because of Federal environmental quality standards, and funding for implementing long-range programs prepared by the Regional Economic Development Commissions.

After passage of H.R. 16071, \$4 billion would be authorized for these vital economic development programs—\$2.2 billion for fiscal 1973 and \$2.2 billion for fiscal 1974.

Of the \$2.2 billion available for fiscal 1973, \$1,222,500,000 is already authorized under current law; \$977,500,000 is new money authorized by H.R. 16071.

The entire \$2.2 billion authorized for fiscal 1974 is new money, bringing total new authorizations in H.R. 16071 to \$3,177,500,000.

Included in these new authorizations is \$500 million per fiscal year for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for an expanded accelerated public works program.

On April 22, 1971, the Public Works Committee brought a large-scale accelerated public works program before the House. This program, passed by the Congress, was subsequently vetoed by the President.

At the time of the veto, the Nation had approximately five million unemployed—despite the existence of a large backlog of public works projects in communities across the land.

Today, well over a year later, the unemployment picture is virtually unchanged. We still have almost five million unemployed as well as a large backlog of badly needed public works projects, such as nursing homes, road improvements, public buildings and the like.

The President's economic program, which was supposed to reduce unemployment to 5 percent—an unacceptably high goal—by December 1971 has not succeeded. In fact, it has been more than 2 years since unemployment was below 5 percent.

A small-scale version of our original accelerated public works program, which was signed into law, on the other hand, has operated very well during the past year, putting thousands of people to work.

For these reasons, the Public Works Committee has again brought before the House a measure which will put people to work quickly on construction of public works projects, utilizing resources now used for unemployment compensation and public assistance payments for gainful employment in constructing badly needed public facilities.

We are currently spending \$1.5 billion per month for welfare and \$500 million per month for unemployment compensation. This totals to \$24 billion per year—\$18 billion for welfare and \$6 billion for unemployment compensation.

This money—\$24 billion per year—is being used to pay people not to work. In contrast, under H.R. 16071, we could pay out some of this money to people for performing meaningful work on construction of all kinds of public facilities in communities across the Nation.

Under H.R. 16071, we can put people on the job instead of on the dole.

H.R. 16071 includes a number of mechanisms for strengthening coordination among the governmental units which work to bring about economic development in lagging areas.

The bill would help assure that State economic development programs mesh with those of sub-State economic development districts and local communities, as well as with those of the multi-State regional economic development commissions. Coordination would be accom-

plished by a number of mechanisms such as providing funds for review by States of development district programs and review by districts of local projects.

Another problem dealt with in this bill is that of unemployment caused by Federal environmental quality standards and orders.

Implementation of environmental quality standards may in some instances lead to closing of a plant and loss of employment by workers. This is a severe burden placed on certain individuals by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist those individuals during the time of hardship.

For this reason, provisions are included in H.R. 16071, to provide unemployment compensation, mortgage or rental payments, moving expenses and reemployment assistance for workers who lost their jobs because of Federal environmental quality standards and orders.

H.R. 16071 provides funds for implementation of plans prepared by the regional commissions created by title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

There were five such commissions formed to foster economic development in lagging areas of the Nation when the act was first implemented, and two more commissions have recently been designated. Four of the original commissions have now completed the long-range economic development programs required by the act. These programs are now ready to be funded.

It is of vital importance to the entire Nation, as well as to the people of these regions, that the long-range programs now completed be provided with funds for implementation. Only through such implementation will the economically lagging regions served by these commissions be brought into the mainstream of the Nation's economy, to the benefit both of the people of the regions and the entire Nation.

H.R. 16071 is not a panacea for all the economic ills of the Nation. But the bill will make a direct and effective attack on many of our economic problems. Its acceptance is vital to the best interests of the Nation.

Mr. LATTI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. Now I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to congratulate him and his committee for bringing this legislation forward. I think it is needed as are some of the revisions.

I take this time just to ask a couple of questions about some matters discussed by the gentleman, particularly planning and construction grants for sewage treatment and water treatment facilities in smaller communities.

Yesterday when this matter was before the Committee on Rules I raised this question, and I raise it now so that the people administering the program can have no doubt as to what the committee and this Congress intends this legislation to accomplish.

I ask the gentleman if it is not his

intention and the committee's intention in this legislation to see to it that planning money is provided in this bill for communities and especially the smaller communities to go forward with their water and sewage treatment facilities so that they can attract industry and provide jobs for their people.

Without planning grants from the Federal Government, many of these communities cannot go forward with these needed projects. Technical assistance certainly includes planning grants.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. I have discussed this with the gentleman, and I believe he is raising a very valid point.

My interpretation is that technical assistance includes planning and planning is therefore covered and eligible for funds. The intent of the law is clear. I make this statement for the record in support of the gentleman's position.

I certainly construe planning money to be equally eligible.

Mr. LATTA. I am certainly pleased that the chairman has emphasized this point, as there has been some misinterpretations in this regard in the department. I have a case in my district, which I pointed out to the chairman and the committee, where they were giving priority to what the Department considers "technical assistance" over planning grants. I find nothing in this legislation which gives the Department the authority to do this.

If we are going to keep people in our small communities and out of our crowded cities, they will have to have water and sewer to attract industry to provide jobs for their people. If they do not have the financial capability to sell bonds to finance such projects, then we must assist them. I am pleased to hear the chairman say that he interprets the law as I do.

I hope during the amendment stage of the bill, we could further clarify this matter so that there can be no misunderstanding downtown.

Mr. BLATNIK. I can only interpret it that way, and I strongly support that position.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I might say that historically we have assumed technical assistance to include planning, and that is the law. Let me refer the gentleman to page 22 of the report where the gentleman will see in section 301, subsection (a), that it says:

Such assistance shall include project planning and feasibility studies, management and operational assistance, and studies evaluating the need of—

And so forth. So this would include planning within technical assistance.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield a little further, I would say that that has always been my interpretation of the law, but apparently some of the Department are attempting to give it their own interpretation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the gentlemen will yield further, I hope that our

discussion here will dispel any notion that planning is not included in technical assistance.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to have an opportunity to co-sponsor H.R. 16071 and would like at this time to thank my colleague, JOHN McFALL, for his interest—and I might say perseverance—in seeing that the accelerated public works impact program remained an active issue—despite last year's veto by the President. I would also like to commend my colleague from Minnesota, Chairman JOHN BLATNIK, for the good work of the Public Works Committee in clearing the way for the full House membership to have the opportunity to consider increasing the APW impact program funding and extend its life for another year.

As a freshman Congressman, I have had the privilege and opportunity to cast my vote for and even lend my name to a number of legislative programs designed to improve the living conditions in our rural areas—many of which are economically distressed areas. H.R. 16071 is a bill designed to do just this.

The accelerated public works program provides 80-percent construction grants to local governments in high unemployment "special impact" areas. It makes possible—in providing these grants—the building of a much-needed sewage treatment plant, a community center, or a fire station. The APW program could be an answer to those mayors and community leaders who have written, phoned, or met with me seeking Federal funds to assist them in providing these facilities—facilities their limited local resources cannot provide.

And so, I urge your favorable vote on H.R. 16071—not only because it provides a tool to fight the serious unemployment problem—but because it provides a tool as well for revitalizing our rural areas—making them a better place in which to live.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his fine cooperation and his unstinting support of this legislation throughout the course of the hearings. The gentleman has been of invaluable help.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would ask the gentleman if there is anything in the fine print of this bill that would permit the use of any of the funds authorized to be used to build a convention center or a sports arena in the city of Washington, D.C.?

Mr. BLATNIK. I would state to the gentleman from Iowa that there is nothing whatsoever in the bill even remotely related to any convention center or any arena for sports.

Mr. GROSS. Not even under section 202 of this bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, not only in that section, but in any other section any more than there is to provide for a pavilion in Waterloo, Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Iowa asked whether or not there was some hidden language for the bicentennial celebration in Washington, or any other place, and I said no, not even in Waterloo, Iowa.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that any request had been made by the people in Waterloo, Iowa, for a pavilion, and I might add that they do not crawl on their hands and knees seeking alms as they do in Washington, D.C.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I might add that we have had as many requests from Washington, D.C., in that respect as we have had from Waterloo, Iowa, and that is none.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield still further where is the legislation that would provide for a convention center for Washington, D.C. Is that not before the Committee on Public Works?

Mr. BLATNIK. If I may respond to the gentleman from Iowa, it is before us, it is in the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) would say he stands corrected, would he not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It is not in this bill, but it is before the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) realizes that in the Committee on Public Works we have numerous requests.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that the answer I seem to get from the gentleman, when he says that not all such requests are rewarded, is that the so-called convention center in Washington, D.C., will be accorded a fast rejection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot make any prediction about that, but I am quite sure that in whatever form the measure comes before the House, it will be in a proper form where the gentleman from Iowa can fully discuss it.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071 as reported by the Committee on Public Works. Efforts to improve the Public Works and Economic Development Act were begun with this session of Congress and the committee has worked diligently, and generally in bipartisan fashion, in determining the need for improvements to this legislation. In 15 days of hearings, 125 witnesses testified in support of this program and urged its improvement and increased funding.

We have before us the product of over 7 months effort aimed at strengthening this program's attack on those areas in our Nation which do not enjoy the same degree of prosperity being experienced by other areas in our Nation. This legislation attacks joblessness and low income with a long-range planned approach and at the same time provides immediate useful work through its public works impact program.

PUBLIC WORKS IMPACT PROGRAM

I would like to speak, Mr. Chairman, to a few of the features this bill would provide. I have just referred to the public works impact programs being administered under the act. This program was added in the 1971 amendments to provide immediate useful work to unemployed and underemployed in areas of threatened or high unemployment, a concentration of low income, or substantial outmigration. The committee intended that combined grants and supplementary grants up to 100 percent of the cost of a project be expeditiously made available to such areas.

EDA accepted the challenge that this program demanded so that by spring of this year all of the fiscal year 1972 funds appropriated for this purpose, as well as the supplemental funds appropriated, had been totally obligated. From the 203 approved projects under this program, an estimate of almost 11,000 jobs resulted, 76 percent of which were filled by the unemployed or underemployed in the area.

I submitted for the RECORD a list of these projects and the job estimates by State. This list can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1972, on pages 28305 through 28309.

In H.R. 16071, the committee expanded the public works impact program by providing a separate section for its criteria, administration and authorization.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

Some of the most enthusiastic testimony before our committee dealt with the success stories of the economic development districts. Each of these multicounty grassroots organizations have usually managed to pull together within the framework of a locally organized board of directors, a cross section of government, business, labor, industry, and other diverse interests to devote themselves to joint planning and programming aimed at developing the economic potential of an area. The committee was advised that in some instances adjoining county officials had not been cooperative or conversant—with one another—on matters that vitally affected each area's interest in economic growth until they became board members for an economic development district.

Since the enactment of this legislation in 1965, the number of these districts has grown to the point that today over 100 are designated and funded with the very real prospect of this figure being doubled. In fiscal year 1972, \$5½ million was funded for administrative and planning for these districts and the need is ever growing. That amount represents a very small investment indeed when

compared to the economy of proper planning and the knowledge of what programs are available to increase economic viability and from whom, which service is performed by the district staff for each community within its boundary.

The multicounty district concept has received the approval of and is being utilized by the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as for programs under LEAA and OEO. Many such districts have been designated by the State in which they are located to carry out the A-95 review process.

In fact, so widely accepted is this principle of local representation that over 40 States have subdivided into sub-State regions or districts. In addition, almost 100 districts are waiting to be designated and funded as economic development districts and would be so designated now were sufficient funding available.

For these reasons, H.R. 16071 would provide for the first time a separate annual authorization of \$20 million for district planning and administrative expenses. Under current law, such district costs are allocated from funding for all technical assistance and research under the act and the growing success of the districts has placed an increasing burden on that appropriation.

In addition, the bill would reduce the current requirement from two or more redevelopment areas for the creation of a district to one redevelopment area. This would permit greater flexibility in putting together the best combination of counties in a district. In some cases it would permit the desirable effect of having economic development district boundaries coterminous with sub-State regional boundaries. It would further permit expansion of the district program and would bring districts to isolated single redevelopment areas.

When redevelopment areas, designated as such usually because of high unemployment or low income, make sufficient economic recovery to be dedesignated, the success of the program is demonstrated. However, an adverse side effect may easily take place. A district which is struggling to get organized may find one of its required redevelopment areas suddenly dedesignated which results in the termination of the district before it has had an opportunity to become functional enough to support itself.

To provide for this eventuality, H.R. 16071 would permit a designated district to be eligible for a minimum of 5 years, the duration of a realistic planning cycle, for grants for administrative and planning expenses up to 75 and 100 percent, respectively, the same rate as provided under current law.

EDA grant and loan assistance may, under current law, be made only to projects in redevelopment areas or designated economic growth centers within a district. Frequently, however, projects which would be of significant benefit in alleviating the problems of these needy areas cannot be undertaken because they would be located outside the redevelopment area. H.R. 16071 would ease such rigid geographical limitation by providing that grant and loan assistance may

be provided to those parts of an economic development district when such assistance would be of significant direct benefit to a redevelopment area within that district.

TITLE V REGIONS

H.R. 16071 would expand the funding for the Regional Action Planning Commissions—the so-called title V regions—to authorize \$100 million annually for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for each regional commission with an approved plan and \$20 million for each regional commission without an approved plan. Five of these regional commissions were designated in 1966—Ozarks, New England, Upper Great Lakes, Four Corners, and Coastal Plains—and two were designated this year—Old West and Pacific Northwest. Four of the original five regions have their comprehensive long-range economic plans approved, and are eligible for the annual \$100 million authorization for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The other three regions would be eligible for \$20 million annually for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. Upon approval of the plans of these three regions they would be eligible for the \$100 million authorization.

The difference in the authorization for regions lies in the fact that when much time is invested in preparing and having approved a region's blueprint to upgrade its lagging economic areas, it is then ready to carry out this plan with the help of adequate funding. The \$100 million authorization appears to be realistic enough when compared with the appropriation for the Appalachian region which has, for the last three fiscal years, exceeded \$100 million annually, exclusive of highway appropriations. Highway appropriations alone have averaged for the Appalachian region over the past 3 fiscal years \$175 million annually. Title V regions, however, have averaged over the same period an appropriation of less than \$34 million annually and that amount to be divided among all five regions.

Testimony during the committee hearings revealed that the regional commissions desired to fund some portion of administrative expenses of the economic development districts within their boundaries in order to better coordinate their planning activities with those of the regions. It was further revealed that interpretation of the existing law precluded such regional assistance to districts. To overcome this objection, H.R. 16071 would clearly authorize regional commissions to pay administrative expenses to further the purposes of this act.

Mr. Chairman, I highly commend the distinguished acting chairman of our subcommittee hearings, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN) as well as our acting chairman today, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) and, of course, our chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

Mr. Chairman, I warn the Members of this House there is a section—Section 801—that has not yet been discussed that speaks to unemployment compensation benefits to people who have been adversely affected by Federal rulings on environmental matters as they pertain

to loss of jobs through plant closings. I am sure that will be expounded on by other members of the committee, but I want to warn the Members that this is a sleeper. It should not be in this bill for many reasons. For now I will only state that I know of no hearings that were held on that section.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and the other members of the minority, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) who participated in the handling of this bill. I think they have done a really effective job. They labored for many tedious hours in marking up the bill and they have brought forth a bill which I think represents the consensus of the members of the Public Works Committee.

To be sure there are provisions in this bill which do not particularly appeal to me as part of this legislation. There are amendments which other members of the committee wanted to incorporate into the bill but which were not. Therefore, there are parts of the bill that do not appeal to them. But I think the legislation by and large is an effort to resolve a problem through a compromise in the best interests of a program that has been highly successful throughout a number of years, particularly in the last several years since it has been administered by Assistant Secretary Podesta.

For several years now the administration has been assisting areas which are in economic decline throughout this country. They have attempted to aid these areas through assistance to develop their capabilities and capital structures in order that these communities can have better facilities, and their people better standards of living so that they can enjoy some of the good life enjoyed by other communities in the Nation.

Past experience has shown that through the investment by the Federal Government in these programs, many communities which would not otherwise have been able to do so, have become able to construct the necessary water and sewer lines, industrial parks and training centers, hospitals and the like, which will enable them to participate to some small degree in the economic progress made by the rest of the country over the last several years.

I think this has been one of our most successful Federal programs. It has been administered very successfully by Assistant Secretary Podesta and his staff. This is the sort of program I would term as a partnership between local governmental officials and the Federal Government because the initiation of any project must begin at the local level with local officials who know their problems and understand them better and who

are better able to evaluate what they need to upgrade the economy in their particular areas. Upon initiation at the local level, the Federal Government is ready to consider the needs of the community. This has been truly a Federal-local partnership.

Not only will construction of basic facilities in itself create jobs, but also it will attract new industry and expansion of existing industry, which will create additional jobs, all of which enables the citizens in these economically depressed areas to maintain a better standard of living, and to participate in growth and progress in the same fashion as have other parts of this Nation over the last several years.

One of the main problems we have noted in this program, in spite of the success the program has enjoyed, has been the fact that it has been underfunded. Sufficient money has not been available to meet the authorizations which Congress has made available.

I am not critical of that. I understand we have a number of priorities and a number of programs with which we have to deal.

In this legislation, as I understand it, what we endeavor to do is not to create new programs but to implement existing successful programs and to make some changes which we feel are called for under the circumstances, and which we have learned through experience are beneficial to the expeditious administration of this act.

In addition to that, we have provided for additional funds in order to more fully and more adequately fund a program that has been so successful.

As I said earlier, while I know there are provisions in this legislation that in their entirety do not meet the approval of everyone, this is a consensus measure which I believe does warrant the support of the House, and I would urge the House to adopt this legislation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I especially thank him for his outstanding leadership as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works. I agree with his remarks. Economic Development Administration activities stemming from legislation developed in our committee are doing a good job across our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, one of the members of the committee on the majority side, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD) I believe plans to further amplify some of the statistics as to the salutary effects this program has had and the low cost per job placement the Economic Development Administration has been able to put into effect. I hope he will bring that up later in the general debate.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 16071, a bill which will amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of

1965 and authorize the spending of \$500 million for each of the next 2 years.

I would like to first commend Chairman BLATNIK and the Public Works Committee for their fine work on this needed legislation.

We are all aware that serious pockets of unemployment exist within our country. We are also very well aware that there are a great many needed public works projects. Often we have found that the same cities and communities which are the "special impact areas" of very high unemployment are also those in most need of constructing or rehabilitating public facilities such as sewage treatment plants, storm drains and public buildings.

In my own district in southern California I am very cognizant of this situation. For example, in Ventura County the City of San Buenaventura, which has a disturbing amount of unemployment, has an admirable plan to renovate a historic and beautiful courthouse which has been condemned as unsafe. Not only could this courthouse serve as a fine city hall for the people of Ventura, but the process of renovating the building would employ many citizens and enhance the local employment situation.

I know that there are many similar situations to this throughout the United States. And I believe that this legislation, by providing \$500 million through 80 percent Federal construction grants to high unemployment areas, will greatly assist the people of the cities and communities throughout the Nation.

I urge my fellow Congressmen to approve this measure.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071 as reported by the Committee on Public Works. I have closely followed this legislation since its inception.

As ranking minority member of the Economic Development Subcommittee from its creation until the present Congress when similar duties with the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight were assigned to me—economic development has been one of my chief interests. This has led to participation in hearings held on this legislation both in Washington and in the field. I have seen firsthand where badly needed jobs were created but also watched a "one-industry town" lose its major employer down the pollution drain while the agency stood helplessly by.

I introduced in April of this year, to correct this latter problem, H.R. 14670, which provides long-term, low-interest loans to enterprises when an environmental standard or order against such enterprises would otherwise create job loss. The major portion of this bill is included in the legislation before us.

Let me discuss now three aspects of this bill of special interest to me.

ONE: PUBLIC WORKS IMPACT PROGRAM

When the Public Works and Economic Development Act was amended last year

a new program to provide immediate useful work to the unemployed and underemployed was added. This program, later referred to as the public works impact program—PWIP—was a departure from the long-range planned attack on high unemployment and low income. The funding of basic public works projects to make a community attractive to industry and business loans at an attractive rate of interest are well known for their success in creating jobs and in increasing income. Such economic development can be most effective when carried out in connection with a locally agreed upon long-range plan.

But something else was needed. In the transition period of deescalating military effort and the resulting changing economy, there is a need for immediately available jobs. As one answer to this problem the PWIP program was devised. For the first time EDA was in the business of providing jobs quickly where they were most needed. This was accomplished by funding those needed, ready-to-go public works projects in any area, without regard to political boundaries and with no requirement for long-range planning.

The results of the first year's administration were very encouraging—203 projects in 198 areas generating an estimate of nearly 11,000 jobs, over 8,000 of which were filled by the unemployed or underemployed in the problem areas.

The committee in H.R. 16071 created a new section 107 for PWIP setting forth its criteria, its administrative guidelines and its authorization of \$500 million annually for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

TWO: APPLICATION ASSISTANCE

In my district, as in many of those in the Nation, a large community may be regarded as one which has a population of 10,000. Many of the communities in my district have little or no staff. They are unaccustomed to the expertise enjoyed by their urban cousins whose city hall staffs include planners, accountants, attorneys, engineers and other such experts wise in the ways of applying for and obtaining Federal assistance. Rarely do the budgets of these smaller communities permit the hiring of such experts even when needed to assist in making applications. Usually by the time the smaller communities find out that some Federal program exists and how they can apply for such assistance, there is very little left to apply for.

To eliminate this injustice, I proposed and the committee accepted an amendment, now in section 5 of the bill, which provides that EDA may aid an applicant in applying for its assistance if the applicant does not possess the expertise nor the ability to obtain the expertise necessary to perform the technical aspects of application.

THREE: ENVIRONMENTAL LOANS

Section 802 appears in this bill as the result of testimony the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs heard during its hearings on this legislation. This testimony revealed that environmental legislation and regulations have threatened the closing down of busi-

nesses with a loss of jobs. Now I am not here to question the wisdom of environmental standards but to accept the fact that they exist and may result in future closings. However, there is no reason why we cannot protect the environment and at the same time preserve jobs. If section 802 works as it should—the provisions of 801 may never have to be used.

Section 802 seeks to preserve both the environment and jobs. In so doing, it would benefit, of course, the industrial plants and commercial establishments that avail themselves of its benefits. More important perhaps it would benefit those who would find themselves jobless if an environmental order caused a shutdown. It would benefit those who live in communities that rely for their livelihood on the economic base provided by one or more of these enterprises. It would benefit all political entities by maintaining the tax base which might otherwise be lost. Finally, it would benefit the United States and its people by helping to eliminate adverse effects upon the environment.

It would do this by long-term, low-interest loans to those business enterprises who need them and have been certified as needing them by the State or a political subdivision concerned with economic development. These loans must be used to provide for acquiring, constructing, or altering pollution control facilities. A pollution control facility must in its turn be a facility, or equipment used, or a modification of methods, processes, or operations where the primary purpose is to abate or control water or atmospheric pollution or contamination. It may do this by removing, altering, recycling or restoring pollutants.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency must certify to the Secretary of Commerce that the pollution control facility is in accordance with applicable regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency and all other Federal agencies. Before the Administrator can do that, he must receive certification from the State that the facility is in accordance with State requirements.

An authorization for \$100 million for each of fiscal years 1973 and 1974 is provided. It appears that this would be a small amount to make available for loans that must be repaid for the purpose of saving jobs and keeping our manufacturing potential strong.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the committee in its deliberations on this bill took into account the historical experiences we had with the Accelerated Public Works Act which started in the early part of the 1960's. We gained considerable knowledge and information from observation of administrative practices which were engaged in during that period of time.

We also took into consideration the acts that preceded this, and it is because of that we bring this legislation here today for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I think that members

of the Committee on Public Works have had a considerable length of time to consider this matter so that they can be mature in their judgments, not upon a new subject, but upon an old subject dealing with a chronic situation which exists in this country, namely, trying to deal with unemployment and underemployment.

In writing the bill we ran across probably the most difficult section of the bill contained in the committee report on page 25 in trying to define those pockets or areas which were geographically subject to underemployment or unemployment.

So we have written a formula here which I think is as close as we could possibly conceive of to utilizing this aid program so that it will meet the total requirements of the distressed areas of our country. It has universal application throughout the country.

As the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) just stated, in title V we deal with the various commissions that were created by law a number of years ago. Consequently we feel under the terms and the arrangements and categories that we have set up here under this act we come as close to a total application of our efforts as we could possibly arrive at.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the members of the Committee on Public Works who have worked diligently and patiently in understanding the problems that were required to be surmounted and in putting them into their proper perspective.

I hope all of these differences can be resolved and we can go out into every community in the country with this program. I do hope the House will give us in the Committee on Public Works their approbation and approval through the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in order to develop the legislative history on section 4 which is dealt with on page 25 of the committee report, where you have an area of substantial and persistent unemployment which has existed for a considerably long period of time, is any population criterion required of a subdivision of a State, such as a county or a city, to qualify for assistance?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No. You will recall, I say to my friend from New Jersey, when we had the Farberstein amendment up a few years ago we took care of that question, so that question does not arise in this bill.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. So where a municipality has had persistent and substantial unemployment in excess of 6 percent and which has existed for a period of maybe 2 or 3 years and it is further injured by plant closings which will result in further substantial unemployment, then it could qualify for assistance under the EDA?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not only a county, but a subdivision of a community within a county could qualify.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I thank

the gentleman, and I appreciate his response.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for yielding. I wholeheartedly support the pending legislation, H.R. 16071, and urge its passage.

During the past year the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs of the Committee on Public Works has conducted an extensive evaluation of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The legislation is now in its seventh year of operation.

The results of these evaluations have demonstrated without question that the programs authorized under this legislation have been effective in generating permanent jobs in economically distressed areas. Both the urban and rural areas of the State of Illinois have received substantial help in the establishment of stable and diversified local economies. The amendments which are found in Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972 provide new tools, increased appropriations and new coordinating mechanisms to help make a very successful program even more effective.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1961 when John F. Kennedy became President of the United States, the State of West Virginia was suffering from its most severe and most prolonged economic recession since the depression of the 1930's. The January 1961 unemployment rate had reached a bruising high of 16.7 percent, and more than 105,000 men and women were looking for jobs in West Virginia which did not exist.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration moved rapidly to establish new programs and enact new laws to begin pumping economic development and public works funds into West Virginia and into other economically depressed areas across the country.

And so in quick succession, the new administration proposed and the Congress adopted the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Area Redevelopment Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act, and later the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The purpose of these acts was clear and direct—to create jobs as fast as possible in a period of extremely high unemployment; and to stimulate overall economic development through the construction of needed public works such as roads, water works, libraries, airports, public streets, community centers, and so forth.

That is why we are here today debating this absolutely vital extension and expansion of the Public Works and Economic Development Act—with special emphasis on \$500 million in fiscal year 1973 and \$500 million in fiscal year 1974 for special public works programs under the accelerated public works programs.

We have faced for almost 4 years the

same rising unemployment rates and slippage of the American economy which we saw in the late 1950's. Today's national unemployment of 5.5 million people is not something we can look at and say—as some cold observers have said—this level of joblessness is "acceptable." It may be "acceptable" to some, but it is clearly not acceptable to the bipartisan Public Works Committee of Democrats and Republicans which unanimously supports \$1 billion in the next 2 years for the accelerated public works section of this bill.

In my State of West Virginia, this past January, the unemployment rate again hit another high of 9.1 percent. As late as June, there were still 45,500 people out of work.

In the First Congressional District which I am privileged to represent, the U.S. Department of Labor still continues to designate the labor areas of Wood, Marshall, Ohio, Tyler and Wetzel Counties—containing some of the largest urban centers in the district, including Wheeling—as areas of substantial or high unemployment.

This means, as we all know, that the labor area so designated has had a 6-percent unemployment rate for at least the preceding calendar year. But in many labor areas—rural and urban—in West Virginia, the unemployment rate for 1971 was double the 6-percent rate.

We cannot ignore the hardships such joblessness works on the lives, hopes and futures of thousands of West Virginia families and millions of families across the country.

These are the areas that need jobs. These are the areas that need quick public economic investment. These are the labor areas along with some 30 others in West Virginia which will again be eligible for Federal grants under one of the several titles of the act we are extending and expanding today.

We are asking for \$500 million this year, and \$500 million for the next fiscal year. This is not too much public money for a disaster—and that is what unemployment is to millions of American families—a personal and human disaster. After all, this House yesterday just voted almost \$1.6 billion for victims of flood disaster. It should show no less sympathy for those dislocated or driven out of work by the misguided economic policies of the past 4 years.

So, I rise in support of this bill. It is an initiative of the Congress which created the Economic Development and Public Works Act of 1965 and has now had 7 years to evaluate its results. The report accompanying this bill said, in part:

The programs authorized under this legislation have been effective in generating permanent jobs in economically distressed areas and have contributed substantially to the establishment of stable and diversified local economies. The continuation of this tested legislation is essential in order to assist lagging areas so that they may be brought into the main stream of our Nation's economic growth.

I hope that this measure will move swiftly through both Houses, with bipartisan support to the President for fast enactment into law. An economy which

stands still, is going backwards, and we must all join together to get this country's prosperity moving again.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 16071 merits the overwhelming approval of this body. The bill is the product of a carefully wrought compromise involving senior members from both political parties on the Public Works Committee. As such, it should be veto-proof, as well as popular on both sides of the aisle both here and in the other body. But these days, you cannot take very much for granted from the White House, and accordingly I await with some trepidation the Presidential decision on this legislation.

Our colleagues, Messrs. BLATNIK and JOHNSON, deserve particular praise for the manner in which they have honed the conventional public works and special "impact" sections of the bill.

In particular, I am pleased to be one of the cosponsors, with Mr. McFALL, of the provisions which, as recommended by the Public Works Committee, would authorize \$500 million over each of the next 2 years for the accelerated public works program.

As I understand it, eligibility for the special impact assistance would be based on unemployment within political subdivisions ranging downward in size to individual neighborhoods. This in itself is a vast improvement over the old APW effort, which determined eligibility on the basis of countywide unemployment rates. Under these criteria, an impoverished community in a heavily populated county such as Los Angeles, could not qualify because countywide, the jobs picture was fairly bright.

The McFall-Blatnik approach would provide the aid, for construction of useful public projects, where it was truly needed.

I urge Mr. Nixon to accept this bill, when it is sent to him, as I am sure it will be in the near future, for his signature.

The entire Nation stands to benefit from enactment of H.R. 16071.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join in support of H.R. 16071.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that H.R. 16071 has moved so promptly through the Public Works Committee, and the Rules Committee, and is before us for consideration today. I am pleased also with the bipartisan support for this legislation within the Public Works Committee. Almost every member of the committee has joined in sponsoring this legislation. To me, this speaks eloquently of its importance and of the conviction on the part of the members of the committee that this legislation should be enacted into law without delay.

Last year, this Congress enacted similar legislation authorizing \$2 billion over a period of 2 years for the purpose of accelerated public works programs which had already been approved for Federal support through one of the existing Federal agencies. Unfortunately, this legislation was vetoed by the President. I regretted this veto, particularly because this legislation would have meant so much to the State of Washington and to the Fourth Congressional District where unemployment is so very high.

It is common knowledge, Mr. Chairman, that Washington State has the highest unemployment of any of the 48 contiguous States. However, it is not generally understood that this unemployment is general throughout the State—that it is not strictly a phenomenon caused by cutbacks at the Boeing Aircraft plant. Unemployment is generally as high in eastern Washington, 200 miles away from Seattle, as it is in Seattle. Many of these unemployed are skilled craftsmen who are actively seeking employment. The public works projects which are available and ready for funding in the small and medium-sized communities of eastern Washington will easily consume all the funds that can be made available under this program, and as rapidly as they can be made available.

Mr. Chairman, while the accelerated public works bill was being considered by the House last year, I conducted conferences in my home district with mayors, county commissioners, city managers, and other public officials from throughout eastern Washington. They brought with them lists of projects ready to be funded. Storm drainage systems, sewer systems, hospitals, bridges, sidewalk improvements, public buildings, community centers, water purification plants, water supply systems were all included in the list.

All the ingredients for a successful program are available except for this authorization and subsequent funding. There can be no healthier program, administered as it will be through existing agencies such as EDA and the local political subdivisions of each State. No additional bureaucracy will be created. The programs can commence immediately and with maximum efficiency. Men and women who have sought employment will find it in constructive work. Welfare and unemployment compensation roles will be reduced. A sagging economy will be boosted. Free men and women will walk with a greater degree of pride.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the situation I am describing for my district in eastern Washington can be repeated in hundreds of others across the country.

An accelerated public works program is no panacea. It will not solve our long-range problems. It authorizes only \$500 million each year for 2 years for accelerated public works programs. However, it is a major and healthy step forward, and it will help many Americans solve many of their economic problems in the least possible time and the most constructive way. I urge my colleagues to support this bill so overwhelmingly that it will be promptly passed by the other

body, and signed into law by the President.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to explain in more detail my views on the economic growth center concept that is included in the legislation before us today.

This provision marks another step forward in an effort to initiate a comprehensive and positive program of decentralization of our population in order to revitalize and diversify the economy of rural America.

It should be perfectly obvious to any perceptive observer of American society that the most significant trend on our domestic scene in the years since World War II, has been the abandonment of rural America. Paradoxically, this abandonment has been the source of two of the major problems our Nation faces today—the weakness of the rural economy and the deterioration of our urban centers.

Unfortunately, most planners have failed to grasp the cause for these related problems and their past attempted solutions have not only failed from a lack of appreciation of the source of the problem, but have fueled the growth and continuation of the problem by adding incentives for many people to continue to migrate to the cities.

It is for this reason that I have been working to check and reverse this trend. The amendment I offered to the 1970 Federal-aid Highway Act was a major effort in this direction since it constituted congressional recognition of the problem, and at the same time, expressed a commitment to help rural and urban areas through rural growth opportunities to reduce and reverse the migratory trend to the big cities.

This amendment established a program of "economic growth center development highways" to inventory and assist in the development of those roads which would assist in bringing economic rejuvenation to rural America. Quite frankly, I would like to see this program adopted for all other modes of transportation as well—both public and private.

The Economic Development Administration's goal is simply to provide jobs by aiding the construction of worthwhile projects that are needed but for one reason or another could not otherwise be undertaken.

While the initial jobs in the construction of an EDA project are important, it is the new job opportunities that are created by the project that are most valuable and vital. For this reason, I strongly believe the main thrust of EDA's efforts should be to help revitalize rural areas and smaller communities which have the potential for growth and which need economic diversification.

With this background in mind, Mr. Chairman, it is important to recog-

nize that the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1972 contains a version of the Clausen amendment and will give EDA needed flexibility and emphasis in joining the effort to advance a program of planned, orderly growth in rural America.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, several of my colleagues have already outlined the specifics of these economic development and public works amendments, which extend the Economic Development Administration and the title V commissions for an additional year and make a number of improvements in these development efforts.

I would like to take just a moment, Mr. Speaker, to commend my colleagues on the Public Works Commission for the excellent work they have done in preparing this legislation.

It has been my privilege to serve on this committee during this 92d Congress, and I have come to appreciate and admire the great talent of my committee colleagues in the field of economic development.

Scores of development projects, planned and funded through EDA and the title V commissions, as well as the Appalachian Regional Commission, provide lasting testimony to the vision and the wisdom of the Public Works Committee which has fashioned some of the most innovative and effective Government programs and structures ever devised.

The popularity of these programs within the Congress, and among the people these programs were created to serve, gives further evidence that the job of economic development has been a job well done under the leadership of the Public Works Committee.

But the amendments also make several worthwhile improvements in these programs, including new flexibility in the basic and supplementary grant programs of the Economic Development Administration.

Also provided is an expansion of loan and lease guarantee programs for business development, an improved technical assistance service to promote even more successful development, and a much-improved system of coordination between Federal agencies and local officials working in partnership toward responsible economic development.

In addition, these amendments authorize appropriations for those title V commissions which have completed their extensive planning assignments to go forward with implementation of the projects proposed in their plans. This is a giant step forward for these commissions, and I am sure their expanded work will greatly benefit these affected regions.

And there are other improvements as well, which are being discussed in greater detail by others here today.

I enthusiastically recommend that my colleagues join me in voting for passage

of these amendments, in view of the improvements I have noted, and in recognition of the fact that these programs have succeeded in the past and can be counted on to succeed in the future.

Witness after witness in our recent economic development hearings praised the ingenuity and practicality of our economic development efforts, citing specific examples in which EDA or one of the title V commissions provided services or facilities that people in some areas could only have dreamed about in the past.

A network of roads and industrial parks, schools and health clinics, sewage and water treatment facilities, and so many other essential facilities and services, has given people in these designated areas of economic distress, a whole new way of life in some cases, and we can be proud of our part in that success.

Now again, under the skillful leadership of Chairman BLATNIK and ranking member BILL HARSHA, JOHN HAMMERSCHMIDT, JIM CLEVELAND, BOB JONES, BRYAN DORN, HAROLD JOHNSON, and with the valuable contribution of expertise and good advice from many of my other colleagues on the committee, we have reported what I believe to be a series of amendments that follow in the best traditions of the committee's, and the Congress' past economic development efforts.

First of all, these amendments extend the Economic Development Administration and the title V commissions for an additional year, through June 30, 1974, giving local officials assurance that these excellent programs will be there to assist them for the foreseeable future and permitting plans to be made accordingly.

But I think it is time we asked the question, Mr. Chairman, where do we go from here?

Extension and expansion of these programs is a step forward, a step in the right direction, but it does not take us as far as we should go.

Even with these improvements, we are still treating the problems of development in a piecemeal fashion which, while benefiting some areas to a remarkable degree, leaves others still facing the problems of economic and social decay, with little or no hope for improvement.

And it leaves the Nation as a whole with no plan to correct the current pattern of imbalanced growth, which finds our central cities suffering from overpopulation and all its ills, while rural areas and small-town America decline into poverty, isolation, and despair.

I have proposed legislation which would expand nationwide the proven successful formula of planned development followed by EDA, the title V commissions, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

I am convinced this approach will work as well throughout the Nation as it has in the multistate regions in which it has already been tested, and I invite my colleagues' consideration of my proposed National Development Act of 1972.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is an idea whose time has come. I believe the legislation I have proposed can have a dramatic effect on balancing economic and population growth in America by

providing essential public services and employment opportunities in areas of the country where those services and opportunities are in short supply.

My bill would establish a \$3 billion National Development Agency to coordinate the work of a new system of multistate regional commissions which would carry out locally initiated development programs.

Projects would be concentrated in the areas of transportation, industrial growth, manpower training, education, health, housing, environmental protection, and planning.

A special impact fund of \$1 billion would be authorized for use exclusively in rural areas.

By creating new opportunities for jobs, health and education services, more and better housing, improved transportation systems, the attraction of new industry and protection of the environment, my bill can help fulfill the promise of a richer and more rewarding life in areas of the country where those opportunities do not now exist.

It is the lack of just these kinds of opportunities that has caused the massive outmigration of people to the great urban centers and the desertion of much of smalltown and rural America.

Unfortunately, the glowing promise of opportunity in the major cities has too often given way to the harsh reality of despair and poverty and a growing welfare state.

The latest census report showed that 70 percent of the U.S. population—more than 140 million people—now live on less than 2 percent of the total land area of the country.

My legislation would help relieve the overcrowded conditions in the cities by encouraging and fostering economic and social development in less densely populated regions.

The National Development Agency I am proposing would be comprised of a presidentially appointed Administrator and the States' cochairmen of the various regional commissions throughout the Nation. Each State cochairman would be the Governor of one of the States from each commission, elected by his fellow Governors.

Each of the regional commissions would be comprised of a Federal cochairman responsible to the Administrator and representing the Federal Government, and the Governors of States within the commission's venue.

This structure is patterned after the highly successful Appalachian Regional Commission, which has worked so well and so effectively for the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina and for people throughout the 13-State region.

And heavy emphasis would be given to the development of projects at the local level where people are best suited to know both the needs of the area and the means of meeting those needs.

My legislation encouraging the establishment of multicounty local development districts to plan and coordinate development efforts on the local level just as the Appalachian Commission and Economic Development Administration have done with such great results.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of governmental structure and this kind of development program has worked extremely well with the Appalachian Commission, EDA, and the title V commissions, and I believe it can be applied just as successfully nationwide to develop this Nation and its great people to their fullest potential.

I invite my colleague's close consideration of this legislation and solicit their support for its passage.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to compliment the gentleman in the well, Mr. MIZELL, for the very excellent statement he is making. And I believe I speak for all of the members of the Committee on Public Works when I state that his leadership in advancing his rural revitalization and rural development ideas and concepts has been extremely beneficial to the Public Works Committee. And the fact that this is the gentleman's first term of service in Congress, I believe the gentleman has gained the respect of all our colleagues and is recognized as one of the most constructive, creative and innovative Members of the House, and our House Public Works Committee.

I just cannot let this opportunity pass by and not state on the record my strong feeling and respect for the gentleman in the well.

Mr. MIZELL. I certainly thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for his comments. Certainly he and I share something in common since we both served as county commissioners and supervisors in local government and no one is more aware of the problems and of the needs of the local communities than my friend, the gentleman from California. I thank the gentleman for his compliment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MIZELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. This is the reason, in my judgment, that so many constructive proposals have evolved from our committee, because of the input from a number of members that have served in local government. My friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) served in local government. And there are a number of other members who, I believe, have made an exceptional contribution because of previous experience in State legislatures and local units of government throughout the entire Federal system.

Mr. MIZELL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MIZELL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman, my friend from Arkansas, the ranking minority member whose leadership has been invaluable in bringing this legislation to the House today.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) in complimenting the gentleman from North Carolina for his diligent work in

the committee. I know he was a most efficient member of the subcommittee hearings, which were quite lengthy, and I want to personally thank him at this time.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the special subcommittee who held the hearings on the bill that is before us today, Congressman DORN of South Carolina.

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is one of our hardest workers, a local and dependable member of the committee, who for years has been making substantial contributions to many pieces of legislation, beginning with water pollution 16 years ago, in 1956, the Appalachia program, community facilities, public works, ARA, and EDA.

The committee last year, I should like the record to show, had bogged down with an enormous, monumental water pollution bill, with the longest hearings of any bill in 26 years—in a quarter of a century. We are still in conference on this bill, and if it were not for the extra work and the extra time which the gentleman from South Carolina put in as acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, we would not have had this economic development bill up on the floor today.

I want to commend the gentleman and express my appreciation on behalf of the full committee.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my distinguished chairman for his gracious and kind—overgenerous but deeply appreciated—remarks. It has been a great pleasure serving with the chairman, a great American, and it has been a personal pleasure to cooperate and work with him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of New York, who has been a very diligent, able member of the committee, and who has contributed greatly to the deliberations of the subcommittee and the full committee. Mr. Chairman, it is with special pleasure that I yield to the lovely and distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG).

Mrs. ABZUG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join with my chairman (Mr. BLATNIK) in complimenting the gentleman from South Carolina for his very excellent work in husbanding through these new amendments to the Economic Development Act, and I also want to compliment the chairman and other members of the committee in bringing this act to the floor.

I am pleased to rise in support of this bill, of which I am a sponsor. H.R. 16071 will strengthen and broaden the Economic Development program, giving greater recognition to the need for EDA activity in our urban areas without sacrificing any of the needs of rural areas and adding flexibility to the grant and loan

programs administered by the Economic Development Administration.

There are many excellent features in this legislation, and I would like to take just a few minutes to address myself to three of them.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Under existing law, the Economic Development Administration has the power to make loans for capital investment in land and facilities. The difficulty here is that money for such a loan must actually be laid out by the agency and cannot be utilized for other purposes until it has been repaid. The bill before us would expand the authority of EDA in this area by permitting it to guarantee loans for capital investment, including loans for leasehold purposes. Since the money for a loan which is guaranteed by the agency, but actually made by a private lender, does not have to be paid until and unless there is a default, many more loans will be possible without a substantial increase in the appropriation for this purpose.

Furthermore, expanding the guarantee to leaseholds on property, as well as to property actually owned by the lender, permits lenders to rent space rather than having to buy it. In urban areas, where space is increasingly limited and expensive, this added flexibility will allow many enterprises to come into being which otherwise could not exist.

In addition, authority to increase the Federal participation in loans would be increased from 65 to 75 percent of project cost under this bill.

SPECIAL IMPACT AREAS

Section 401(a)(6) of the existing Economic Development Act is designed to assist urban areas on a long-term basis by establishing permanent employment for the unemployed. While this provision and related provisions of existing law appear to contain adequate working tools for the job, funding under this section has been woefully inadequate.

As the report on this bill indicates:

The Committee expects more attention to be given pockets of high unemployment in urban areas without sacrificing the limited funding available to other areas under the program. No new authorizations are necessary for this purpose since appropriations under this legislation have been funded at approximately one-fourth of the amount authorized. *It is expected that appropriations will be increased for this purpose.* (Emphasis added.)

The bill itself adds language to section 401(a)(6) to clarify the fact that it is intended to cover urban as well as rural areas which meet the criteria enumerated in the section.

With increased funding under section 401(a)(6), EDA can become as effective in the cities as it has been in our rural areas. It has often been claimed that the Federal Government already spends too much money on the cities compared to the amount it spends on rural areas. While it is true that there are many programs aimed at city problems—from HUD, from HEW, from the Small Business Administration, from the OEO—their purposes are narrow and quite specific, and they are rarely coordinated with one another. None of these pro-

grams takes an overall view, drawing together the various elements of a development problem and providing aid at more than one point.

One program builds sewers, another provides some health care, a third offers manpower training; often, they work at cross purposes. Furthermore, many of our largest cities, including New York, are often excluded from these programs because of the intensity of the problems and the small amount of funding available. Yet, these so-called high risk areas are the places that need help the most.

I hope—and fully expect—that the Appropriations Committee and the Economic Development Administration will take due note of the intent of our committee to secure full funding under section 401(a)(6), so that EDA can get down to doing the same excellent job for urban areas that it has been doing thus far for rural areas.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The bill before us would add a new title VIII to the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Section 801 of that title would provide for certain assistance to working people whose jobs are lost due to the issuance of a Federal environmental quality standard or order. The workers whose jobs are jeopardized or lost under such circumstances are wholly innocent parties who should not suffer because environmental regulations are being enforced. Workers who lost their jobs under such conditions should be made as nearly whole as possible, receiving full salaries, fringe benefits, and accrued pension rights, as well as necessary retraining, placement, and relocation assistance.

Under the proposed section 801, workers who lose their jobs will receive some unemployment compensation for a limited period only, plus some assistance for housing and relocation expenses. In contrast to these relatively meager provisions for workers, section 802 provides for 3 percent loans to business for the purchase of pollution abatement equipment; these loans will allow the business to remain in the same location without suffering any loss whatever. If businesses will not only suffer no loss and no inconvenience, but also get such inexpensive loans, working men and women who lose their jobs should not be shortchanged. Section 801 goes part of the way toward making them whole, and it should most definitely be retained in this bill.

I think this is a very equitable way of realizing the problems of environmental orders, and I think that this bill is beneficial to both business and labor, and to rural and urban areas in this country. That is why I think that it should receive the support of all Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle and from all sections of the country.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, again I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York. She not only represents ably her own district but also the urban and depressed rural areas of the entire Nation with which we are all

concerned. She is truly an all-American representative.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to indicate my very strong support for this legislation, the Public Works and Economic Development Amendments of 1972. As a representative of one of the areas must hard hit by the economic slump—the Puget Sound region of Washington State—I believe this job-creating legislation is of vital importance in sparking economic recovery.

I joined the gentlemen from California (Mr. McFALL) in cosponsoring accelerated public works legislation similar to that contained in this bill. As reported, H.R. 16071 also includes aid to areas affected by environmental plant shutdowns.

Congress has repeatedly expressed a desire for fast unemployment relief through accelerated public works of emergency employment programs. But the White House vetoed last year's accelerated public works bill. The Congress has responded by decreasing the authorization in hopes that the President will sign this bill. I support the accelerated public works approach because it gets jobs and money directly into the local community fast. There are \$200 million in projects ready to go in the Second Congressional District of Washington State—if funds become available. Those are jobs building public facilities such as water sewer projects, libraries, hospitals, and nursing homes. We need those jobs now—not after the lengthy bureaucratic trickle-down approaches that the administration seems to favor—when it favors aid at all.

The administration's floating statistics games would make it appear that unemployment has withered away. How I wish it were true. The national jobless statistics are essentially irrelevant in the Pacific Northwest.

More than 97,000 Washington residents are hanging on with Federal extended unemployment benefits. Another 53,000 unemployed workers have exhausted all State and Federal benefits—except welfare. When soaring food prices are considered, it is tragically true that it costs more to be out of work in Washington State than it did last year.

This bill authorizes \$500 million a year for 2 years to create accelerated public works jobs through a special impact program. It would assist communities through 80 percent matching funds to build public facilities.

Another portion of H.R. 16071 would aid workers and communities hit by plant shutdowns resulting from enforcement of Federal antipollution laws. Under this bill \$100 million in unemployment benefits would be authorized for the laid-off employees. Benefits could include mortgage and rental aid for families facing foreclosures. Workers could receive 60 percent of former weekly wages for up to 78 weeks.

The environmental effects section also authorizes \$100 million in low-interest

loans to aid enterprises that would otherwise have to shut down. The funds would go to construct needed pollution control facilities.

The largest city in the Second Congressional District of Washington, Everett, now faces the shutdowns of two aging pulpmills because the corporation involved felt unable to make large investments in pollution control facilities.

Approval of section 801 would make 30-year, 3-percent loans available to build the necessary pollution control equipment—or at least aid the workers while the community gets some economic breathing time to find new jobs.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is an economic recovery package that can go a long way to help hard hit areas. It can create new jobs and offer long-range help to communities such as those in the Puget Sound area hard hit by unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I extend to the gentleman in the well my thanks and commendation.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to another distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I add my voice to the others in complimenting the gentleman in the well for bringing this bill from the subcommittee and particularly for his courtesy to me when I was testifying, and his courtesy to all of us.

The legislation will be of great assistance to all in our area. We are deeply grateful for the fact that it is here today and I am in strong support of H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972.

With nearly 5½ million Americans out of work across the country, it is incumbent on the Congress to take concrete action to stimulate our stagnant economy and get people back to work. H.R. 16071, by establishing a public works impact program and authorizing up to \$500 million a year through fiscal year 1974 for areas of substantial unemployment or with a concentration of low income persons, will provide a major impetus in this direction.

I was an original cosponsor of public works acceleration legislation in the 91st Congress, and cosponsored similar legislation again in the present Congress. I was very pleased by the overwhelming support given to the bill when it passed the House in April of last year by a vote of 320 to 67. I deplored the President's veto of this needed legislation, and congratulate Chairman BLATNIK and the Public Works Committee for their continued efforts to focus Federal assistance on "special impact areas" suffering from excessive unemployment.

Seattle-King County, the area in Washington State which I represent, has been one of the areas hardest hit by the economic downturn and has suffered an unemployment rate far in excess of the national average. I know that there are a number of job-creating public works projects that could rapidly be implemented in our area as soon as the necessary financial assistance becomes available. Such projects would not only create

jobs where they are needed, but would provide a basis for stimulation of the economy by making the area more attractive to further industrial development.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from the great State of Washington.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska, a very able and distinguished member of the subcommittee.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, I know of no one who is more diligent, able, and persistent in representing the great State of Alaska, where we have so many untapped resources and a great people. I do want to commend the gentleman because he is a very valuable member of our committee.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

It is my pleasure to rise in strong support of this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor. I congratulate the gentleman for the wonderful job he has done in chairing the many meetings we have had.

Most of us probably regret that we must all be here again today to vote on and pass still another public works and economic development act like H.R. 16071. As a cosponsor of this bill, and of the bill which passed earlier only to be vetoed by the President, I can only urge again that this bill be passed and then signed into law.

The time since the earlier veto has not altered the situation, either nationally or in my own State of Alaska. At the time the original accelerated public works act was passed and vetoed, unemployment in Alaska and nationally stood at crisis levels, and was incredibly constant from month to month. Now, that unemployment rate is still the same, but I believe it could have been avoided had the first bill been signed into law. Today, we are giving the President a second chance.

Although this bill is somewhat more modest in its authorizations than the prior bill, its goal is identical—to create jobs in areas which serve the public interest. For Alaska, this legislation is essential.

I would call my colleagues' attention to the section of this bill which is of greatest importance to every economically depressed area, which is the provision for special assistance in "high impact" areas. Under present circumstances, every area in the State of Alaska would qualify for this special assistance, and I can assure you that it is badly needed.

In conclusion, let me say that, should this bill be vetoed again, it is my intention to share in its introduction and passage still another time. The need for jobs is crucial, and I continue to believe that it is at the level of the individual job that economic recovery must begin.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice in support of this excellent legislation which has strong bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle. The State of West Virginia had an unemployment rate of 6.9 percent in June. There are many States throughout the Nation which have areas that will benefit from this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman in the well for his leadership. In addition, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) have along with many others served as the chief architects of this legislation.

I do not think the President can again veto this important and urgently needed legislation. The unemployment situation in our country will not permit it.

Every day I receive letters from men out of work who want to work but the jobs cannot be found. At the same time, constituents write wanting to know why, after years of planning, sewer and water projects cannot be funded. The highly successful accelerated public works program of the 1960's helped solve both these problems throughout West Virginia by putting men to work on jobs that needed to be done. In the early 1960's the local newspapers were full of success stories about public works projects. Streets were paved, water and sewer lines installed, public buildings and hospitals built, and the jobless employed.

I pointed out last year that the accelerated public works program is clearly an alternative to revenue sharing in that it will enable States and municipalities, as well as public service districts in unincorporated rural areas to build badly needed facilities which they do not have the financial capacity to afford.

I urge the committee to give overwhelming approval to this bill today so that we can soon get underway with solving the crucial unemployment problem while proceeding to build needed public facilities.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia because the gentleman from West Virginia knows whereof he speaks. He represents a great section of Appalachia and he is well aware of what the Appalachian program did for the great mountain State of West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his kind remarks.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, my neighbor and friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. DORN), that very few bills have been brought before this body to my way of thinking that are as important as the bill we are presently considering. From whatever viewpoint we

look at this great measure, from the standpoint of the health and welfare of the people of this Nation this bill stands out as one of the greatest. When we think about the thousands of communities throughout the country that do not have local resources to maintain adequate water and sanitation lines to protect the general welfare of the people in those areas, it becomes clear that this is one of the greatest health measures that has passed this Congress for a period of years.

Mr. Chairman, I would regret to see the environmentalists anywhere along the line without approval of projects that are sorely needed in the rural areas of this country, especially in rural Appalachia and in the ghetto sections of this country and in areas where we have as high as 18-, 25-, or 30-percent unemployment. I know there have been holdups in the past which have been unjustifiable along this line, but it behooves everybody to see that this program is carried out in the way intended by Congress that it be carried out in the future.

I certainly want to take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), as well as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) and all the Members who have played a part in bringing this important measure for the benefit of our people before the House, because without it hundreds of thousands of people would not have adequate water or sanitation systems such as those provided for by this legislation.

It is a great bill. I wholeheartedly support it. I am very pleased that the subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works have made the improvements in this legislation they have made. They are certainly to be complimented on a great piece of legislation.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. He is familiar with unemployment and labor conditions throughout the Nation. This is in itself a great recommendation for the overwhelming passage of this legislation.

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS).

Mr. HICKS of Washington. I want to join in the accolades paid to the gentleman in the well and to all members of the Committee on Public Works.

I also want to give an accolade or two to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) who helped to spur this legislation along.

As has been noted, several Members from the State of Washington have appeared here to compliment the gentleman for pushing this legislation along. While it is vitally needed all over the country, it is especially needed in my State of Washington, and that is why so many Members from Washington are so concerned that this legislation be enacted.

I thank the gentleman very much for pushing this legislation and, as a cosponsor of similar legislation, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, last year Congress approved a \$2 billion accelerated public works bill that in my view would have provided an important stimulus to our lagging economy. The money was earmarked for local public works projects—sewers, water purification plants, streets and sidewalks, storm drainage systems, et cetera—in areas of chronically high unemployment, such as the Puget Sound, and could have been used to finance up to 100 percent of the construction costs. In addition to the sorely needed public facilities, the \$2 billion authorized by Congress would have provided immediate, useful jobs for the local work force in these hard-hit communities.

Much to my dismay, however, President Nixon chose to veto this vital legislation. As I understand it, the rationale behind the veto was that the administration was convinced that prosperity was just around the corner. In his veto message, the President argued that local public works projects take a long time to get underway and that the accelerated public works program would lead to "marginal, hurriedly planned" projects with little long-term benefit to the local community. Although he did not say so directly, the President implied that the \$2 billion would create only WPA-type leaf-raking jobs.

However, the city and county officials in my district with whom I discussed the bill advised me that they had numerous key projects languishing on the drawing board just waiting to be funded. Such projects would have created jobs for carpenters, bricklayers, electricians, plumbers, and other skilled and semiskilled laborers. This is not what I consider dead-end leaf-raking jobs.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, a year has passed since that veto and the economic picture has not brightened up much. Nationally, unemployment still hovers around the 5.5-percent mark—nearly twice the amount at the beginning of this administration. In the Puget Sound region, unemployment is at least twice the national figure. In Tacoma, for example, 13.5 percent of the labor force was out of work last year at this time. Today, 12.3 percent are still without jobs.

While prosperity may have arrived in some areas of the country, the administration's claim has struck a hollow ring in others, including Puget Sound. Thus, I was pleased to join with more than 100 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in again sponsoring legislation that would expand the public works program to high-unemployment areas. As reported by the House Public Works Committee, the legislation before us today—H.R. 16071—authorizes \$500 million during this fiscal year and \$500 million in fiscal year 1974 for high-unemployment area public works projects.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the importance of getting men and women back to work. None of the sponsors of this bill, myself included, contend that this legislation will singlehandedly turn the unemployment picture around. How-

ever, it is undoubtedly a step that needs to be taken to achieve a reasonable level of employment in the depressed areas of our country.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, who is familiar with the Ozarks Regional Commission and economic development in that area of our great country.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have cosponsored this legislation and have joined with this very fine committee in its work.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal before us today has the potential for helping this Nation make meaningful inroads in the struggle to eradicate a plague which grows ever more threatening to our people—the peril of joblessness. At the same time, it offers practical solution to the provision of the public service facilities which thousands of our municipalities and counties so desperately need.

The public works program which we would approve here today would benefit labor intensive projects. Those men and women whose minds are skilled in the art of building for the benefit of their fellow men would be provided with useful work to do and from which the whole Nation will gain.

For more than a decade I have been increasingly concerned about the need for expanded economic development designed to bring more of our resources to bear on the problems of joblessness and the need for public services. My concern developed with my involvement in the civic and economic affairs of the small town and underdeveloped region in which I grew up and practiced law. Too often I saw the young, and not so young, drift away to the cities in search of jobs to support themselves and their families. Too often I saw the bright hopes stirred by the prospect of a new business or industry crushed when the decisionmakers chose to locate elsewhere because of the lack of public facilities and services.

While its effects are more dramatic and shocking in heavily urbanized areas, the destructive effect of unemployment is no less serious in small towns and counties. This bill which we consider here today—the bill which I have supported as a sponsor since its earliest days—is written in such a way that all areas may have a fair and equal opportunity to benefit from the funds which it would provide.

Time and again small towns in rural areas have been shortchanged when will-intended Government programs are reduced to administration. A vast majority of the votes are to be found in the cities and metropolitan areas. But are we talking about answering the cries of the American people with an attempt to provide permanent solutions, or are we talking about politics?

Let me read to you excerpts from a few letters that I have recently received, which complain about the manner in which the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 was administered.

Judge Earl Storey, of Stone County, Ark., writes in his letter of September 29, 1971, as follows:

I would like to bring to your attention that Stone County has been overlooked in the \$1,040,800 funds that Arkansas will receive under a recently approved emergency employment law that goes mainly to cities and counties that have been suffering from 6 per cent or more unemployment for three recent consecutive months.

It has been called to my attention that both Searcy and Van Buren Counties were to share in these funds. It is hard for me to understand why these counties were approved and Stone County was not approved.

We have a county population of about 6,800 which is consistent with the above mentioned counties. Presently the unemployment rate in Stone County stands at approximately 8 per cent.

Judge Leon Cooper, of Izard County, Ark., reacts in the following manner:

After calling the responsible administrator and being told to "contact your representative", I decided to do just that. My complaint concerns allotment of work slots for the Emergency Employment Act.

In this area, one Employment Security Division office services five counties. The rural people from the outlying counties seldom sign up at the ESD office both because of the distance involved and because they fear a question and answer situation. As a result, statistics do not accurately reflect the unemployment rates in counties like Izard. I am out here every day and I know that the employment picture is even worse than percentages indicate. The rural areas, as usual, are being neglected and misunderstood.

A neighboring county, where the Employment Security Division is located, received eight times as many work slots as Izard. Granted, their population is more, but they also have most of the employment opportunities of this area on their doorstep. They even had problems filling the slots.

It is disheartening to hear all these accounts of people who won't work, and to know that it isn't so. If a living wage is offered, people are desperate for work.

I realize that this program has been delegated to the State of Arkansas. However, if there is any way that you can help call attention to the constant discrimination being exercised against rural counties, it needs doing . . .

The other rural judges in this area also feel that we have been neglected for too long. We not only need your assistance, we need your advice as to what steps to take.

Mayor B. H. Johnson of College City, Ark., directs his attention to the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration, the State agency responsible for administering the act:

It was good to talk with you by phone this morning and learn that we may be able to obtain assistance under the EEA, Section 6. As you suggested, I talked with the local Employment Security Office and was informed that our current rate of unemployment is 10.7% and the average rate for the past year was 11.8%.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress in passing the Act, to exclude any needy city just because they are small.

It should be made clear here today that we, with this bill, remember America's small towns and low population areas—they need help too. Should we fail to solve the problems which have forced the residents to leave their homes and seek economic survival in the cities, we will not solve the frustrating, festering prob-

lems of overpopulation of our rapidly deteriorating central cities.

The need in areas like Arkansas' First District for aid such as this bill would provide is undeniable. It was clearly outlined in the four hearings on community development needs which I held in the First District between August 1971 and January 1972. The witnesses who appeared identified more than \$35 million worth of public works needs. They were from a 21-county region. Nineteen of those counties have been designated as redevelopment areas. Over the 2-year period of 1969-70, 18 of the counties had annual average unemployment rates which were higher than that for the Nation.

More than half these counties lost population during the last decade. Ten of these lost more than 5.5 percent of the 1960 population. Of the counties with unemployment levels higher than those of the Nation, eight lost between 5.5 and 13 percent population. A ninth, which had unemployment rates of less than 1 percent below the national rate, lost 17 percent of its population between 1960 and 1970.

These figures, Mr. Chairman, provide, I believe, ample proof of the need for insuring that this public works and economic development program operates with strict attention to the needs of the potential for benefit in the nonmetropolitan areas. I favor aid for metropolitan areas, but believe pouring money into these areas is fruitless unless we treat the problems of the nonmetropolitan areas.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this bill which offers hope of future economic development and increased public services to small and large municipalities—metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas—alike.

Mr. DORN. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California, who not only ably represents the people of the country but also is particularly concerned with the unemployed and the underemployed in the distressed areas of our country.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, join with many of my colleagues in applauding the gentleman in the well.

Mr. Chairman, I further rise as a cosponsor of this bill along with my distinguished colleague from the State of California (Mr. McFALL). This legislation is a chance for Congress to regain the support and respect of the working people of the Nation. The administration tells us that unemployment is now at 5.6 percent or 5.8 percent of the work force, and on its way down. But, in fact, there are still many areas—particularly urban centers—where unemployment is at least 10 percent or 15 percent of the work force, perhaps higher. It is imperative that Congress address itself to this problem.

The administration has not been remiss in insuring that certain powerful and rich factions of our society have been protected from the current depression.

What we must do now is provide for those people who are affected by the economy at a much more basic and fundamental level—for those people whose loss of employment has made it difficult, if not impossible, to feed and clothe their children—with the assurance that they will not be made to suffer further consequences of the state of the economy.

It is the working class which has made the major sacrifices which have enabled us to continue our insane involvement in Indochina—and I believe this absurd adventurism is the prime reason for the depressed state of the economy. It would be a most cynical act on the part of Congress to further subject the working class to the economic consequences of war and militarism. It is necessary that we demonstrate our awareness of the problems of the working class. I therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that the House approve this bill.

Mr. DORN. I want to thank the gentleman from California for a very splendid statement.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD).

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I joined with other Members in cosponsoring the legislation to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 in order to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in the eligible areas and to help these areas to become more conducive to industrial and commercial development through the improvement of their public facilities. I strongly urge immediate and positive action on the measure before us.

The accelerated public works program as recommended in this bill would update portions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 by increasing financial assistance to the highest unemployment areas designated as "special impact areas" to \$500 million a year through fiscal year 1974. All of us agree that unemployment in this country must be curbed. We recognize that the problem progressively worsens each year, the unemployment rate having increased from 4.9 percent in 1970 to at least 6 percent in 1971. Needless to say, prosperity is not "just around the corner" if we sit with our arms folded and ignore this dilemma just hoping that it will go away.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleagues who feel that more Government jobs is not the whole answer to the problem of unemployment in 1972; nonetheless, it is still a beginning. The APW impact program legislation is designed to assist communities with 80-percent matching grants to build public facilities such as nursing homes, hospitals, libraries, water and sewer lines. This brings the situation right down to where all of us live. My own congressional district, as that of every other Member present, needs these public facilities—and the people that I represent also need jobs.

Of all the devices in the arsenal of public policy designed to cope with unemployment, a public works program is the only one that directly and immediately opens up employment opportuni-

ties. Such a program draws workers into gainful employment and frees them from the bondage of needing to rely on unemployment compensation and relief. It maintains their self-respect, pride of work, and status in a society that continues to assign to them useful functions. Payments under such a program are for work done, not for being unemployed. This bill provides immediate employment to persons in the building trades, which are among the groups hit hardest and suffering the most by unemployment.

Let us be honest with ourselves and with our constituents, and let us have courage to pass legislation which will meet our national needs by providing jobs, stimulating growth, and making available necessary public facilities. Let us face it: Unemployment is bad. The country needs more public works. Communities do not have resources to build these public works. More Federal funds will put men to work and at the same time provide needed public facilities.

We just cannot afford to wait any longer to pass the accelerated public works legislation. The people in the First Congressional District of the State of Kentucky deserve something better than they have in the way of public works and employment, and I, for one, am willing to fight to see that they get it.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would not do justice to this committee if I did not again thank the distinguished chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) for their leadership and dedication. I could name every single member of this committee who helped make it possible today to have this very important bill come up on the floor—an investment in tomorrow.

I wish you could have heard our distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) yesterday before the Committee on Rules when he so ably pointed out the unemployment and the underemployment which exists and the billions and billions of dollars that we are spending on unemployment compensation and on welfare because so many of our people do not have an opportunity to get jobs or have economic opportunities.

I want to thank my distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT). I attended, I believe, all of the hearings for 15 days, and I do not recall a single time when the able gentleman from Arkansas was not present. He was most cooperative and diligent in pursuing every aspect of this legislation.

I want to thank and commend the gentleman from Arkansas, the members of the staff on both sides of the aisle, and the distinguished minority members, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MIZELL, and all of them. Otherwise we could not have had this bill up on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, also, that we had 125 witnesses appear before the committee in a period of 15 days. We heard from many Governors, some of the most distinguished Governors in this country. We heard from many mayors

and cochairmen of regional commissions.

We had our friends, the Indians from the Four Corners area of the Southwest who appeared. We had many witnesses, as I say, and I do not recall a single one of the 125 witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee who opposed this legislation. We had representatives of the Department of Commerce, great and distinguished witnesses from all through this Nation.

I want to say that this is a timely bill, and I want to repeat it is not just an expenditure of money but an investment in the future welfare of our country.

This bill has many educational features to it—technical education and vocational education. This is also a private enterprise bill. Private enterprise is the positive approach. Government cannot do this job alone. When a business is profitable people are employed. Employees then become consumers and taxpayers. There is no other way. This bill provides for participation of local, State, and Federal governments and yes, free enterprise.

We have amended this bill so that a business can obtain a loan to go into business in an economically undeveloped area where there is unemployment and underemployment. I do not know of any community in this country, the rural communities, especially, that have the money to build the necessary water lines, the sewage treatment facilities, access roads, and those things so necessary for economic development.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor participated in this debate because I want to dwell for a moment on the educational features in the bill, especially of technical education.

In my own district I helped dedicate a technical educational school in the Coastal Plains Regional Commission area. This is an investment in the future of our country, and one that will provide more revenue, local, State and National. Men and women trained for job opportunity under this act is an investment in stability and national security.

I know of one plant that came into the Appalachian region through the Appalachian program which is similar to this program—and I believe that this program will do as the Appalachian program has done, and I think that is one of the greatest programs in the history of our country. But, as I started to say, one plant came into the Appalachian region not far from where I live, and now it is employing 3,000 people today. But, Mr. Chairman, that plant could not have come there if the technical education school, made possible by Appalachian funds, had not agreed to train 1,000 employees to work in this particular plant. The plant came and today 3,000 people are employed there in a previously underemployed and unemployed area.

May I use this by way of illustration for the membership of the committee? When I first came to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs there were some arguments about the GI education bill. Some said it would lead to the Federal Gov-

ernment participating in education, would lead to socialism and other things. We invested \$19 billion in the education of 10 million American men and women, and already these 10 million American men and women have paid into the Federal Treasury over \$100 billion in taxes more than they would have paid had they not been educated. This does not include the local and State taxes, the homeownerships, philanthropy, better schools, hospitals, and those things which create a stable society. And so the educational features of this bill and aid to local communities in the field of economic development will do the same thing.

That GI bill was the greatest investment in the future of this country, or of any other country, ever made in the history of the world. And I want to recommend to you and commend to you this bill as a similar type bill that will provide people with an opportunity to improve themselves in both the ghetto areas of our country and in the rural areas of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have not received one single letter—and I was one of the original supporters of the Appalachian program—I have not received one single letter or one single adverse comment from any citizen on that great program.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend this Congress for passing the EDA bill, and the one we have before you today, with the improvements that have been worked out by my colleagues who are gathered here today, will do the same thing for these economically depressed areas, so that they will become a part of the mainstream of this Nation. This is providing for them an opportunity to help themselves and to bring better schools, hospitals, and better water supplies and sewage treatment facilities, and will improve the environment. This, and I want to repeat this, is an investment in tomorrow that will pay back to the people of this country, all of us, tenfold dividends.

This great legislation not only encompasses specific rural redevelopment and large urban redevelopment areas, it funds and encourages multistate regional commissions to foster the development of economically faltering areas. Mr. Chairman, these commissions are a vital part in the continuous economic and social development of 28 States and untold hundreds of communities. The commissions are in every geographic section of this Nation. These commissions are: Coastal Plains, Four Corners, New England, Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes, Old West, and Pacific Northwest. These commissions are required to develop long-range comprehensive development plans. The majority of the multistate commissions have completed their plans, and the committee believes that they should be funded to solve the problems outlined in their comprehensive plans. Our bill provides \$100 million annually to each commission and \$20 million annually for those commissions still in the planning process. This initial authorization will amount to \$460 million per year. This amount will be revised as more commissions are created. Mr. Chairman, poverty, unemployment, and other pressing prob-

lems know no State boundaries. The multistate approach will greatly aid in reducing unemployment and bolstering the economy. One State will benefit from another State's accomplishments which have been provided by this authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, economic development districts and multistate commissions have fostered new industries, community facilities, educational institutions, and even recreational complexes. These tangible manifestations of this legislation are the backbones of communities. EDA funded districts have aided in curbing outmigration from rural areas to the large deteriorating cities in this country. These districts have become a catalyst for the distribution of other federally funded programs, and greatly assist in the coordinated planning efforts of their member communities.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district, the title V commission, Coastal Plains, has funded a technical education school and an extension of the University of South Carolina. These projects greatly enhance the community and the surrounding area. Through the EDA districts, many important projects in my congressional district have been funded, providing jobs, water, education, and the increased input of private capital in underdeveloped areas. However, my district is not atypical; thousands of projects have been funded throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation concentrates on our greatest resource—our people. The individual citizen benefits both economically and socially, and collectively they improve their communities. This is not utopian legislation, Mr. Chairman; it is solid, good, economic investment in the future of our citizens and in the continued development of our Nation. I urge my colleagues in the House to support and pass the Economic Development Act Amendments today by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California who so ably assisted us in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD), a member of the committee.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in addition to its other features, H.R. 16071 addresses the very important matter of providing assistance for workers who become unemployed because of a Federal environmental standard or order.

In recent years, the Congress has enacted a number of pieces of legislation designed to safeguard the quality of our Nation's environment.

These environmental quality laws,

such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act, have admirable goals. But they may also from time to time have an unfortunate side effect—causing job loss for those individuals who are employed at installations which are closed or curtailed because of environmental orders or standards.

When an individual loses his job because of environmental orders, it is a clear case of the sacrifice of the interests of a few for those of many. Justice demands that those few who suffer job loss be compensated during their period of hardship, and this is exactly what H.R. 16071 would do.

Section 801 of the bill offers several kinds of assistance to workers who lose their jobs because of Federal pollution control measures, including unemployment compensation, temporary mortgage or rental payment assistance, reemployment assistance, and where necessary payment of reasonable moving expenses.

Unemployment compensation payments under this bill are limited to 60 percent of a worker's former weekly wage and are available until the worker is reemployed or for a period of 78 weeks, whichever is lesser. To be eligible for this unemployment compensation, a worker must have been employed for no less than 26 of the 78 preceding weeks in the plant or industry affected; and while receiving compensation under section 801, a worker will not be entitled to regular State unemployment compensation payments. Duplicate benefits are not authorized.

In addition to unemployment compensation payments, section 801 of the bill authorizes rendering of reemployment assistance services under other laws and temporary mortgage or rental assistance payments.

Mortgage or rental assistance would be limited to individuals who, as a result of financial hardship caused by unemployment, have received notice of mortgage foreclosure, lease termination or cancellation of a contract of sale. Assistance would be available for the duration of hardship, but not for more than 1 year.

One of the great tragedies of contemporary American life has been the steady migration in search of work by people from small- and medium-sized communities and from rural America into big cities which are already overcrowded, over-complicated and almost ungovernable.

Availability of the assistance offered under section 801 of this bill—unemployment compensation, reemployment assistance and mortgage or rental payments—will cushion the blow while the worker seeks other employment locally, and thus will help combat this migration trend and will contribute to a more balanced distribution of our population.

Workers who become unemployed will more easily be able to remain in their local communities while awaiting new job opportunities and will not be forced by Federal environmental measures into immediately leaving their local communities to look for work in the already congested urban centers. The smaller communities will be given time in which to work out their economic problems and

the large cities will be spared the influx of yet another wave of unemployed workers who would have preferred not to have been forced to move.

Finally, for those persons who cannot find employment near their homes but who are able to find work elsewhere, H.R. 16071 offers payment of actual reasonable moving expenses. It is only equitable that if Federal policies have caused loss of a person's job, the Federal Government should bear the cost of that individual's moving to a new location where he can find gainful employment.

The assistance made available under section 801 of H.R. 16071 to persons who become unemployed because of Federal environmental quality standards is a reasonable and well-conceived congressional response to a problem which arises directly from implementation of other congressional policies. The provisions of section 801 are an essential part of our efforts to solve environmental problems without undermining our policies of balanced economic growth.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071 and the continuation of the economic development programs administered under the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

These programs are now in their seventh year of operation. They have proven their capability in creating jobs and uplifting the economy of areas in economic distress.

Only the limited funds available for these programs have limited their degree of success in stemming unemployment.

In 1970, extensive evaluations were made on the effectiveness of these programs by the Economic Development Administration through contracts with outside consultants, and our committee conducted its own evaluation. The results of these evaluations were presented to the committee at hearings held in September 1970.

For example, in 1970, a total of 274 public works projects that had been completed for at least 1 year were evaluated by consultants for the Economic Development Administration. These projects generated the equivalent of 33,486 industrial, commercial, and supporting jobs at an average annual salary of \$6,500. The total EDA public works investment in these projects was \$76.5 million. The Federal Government cost per job averaged \$2,290. The Federal Government's share of the total cost of these projects was about 61 percent.

This extension will authorize a continuation of the grant program for public works and development facilities needed for economic growth.

Fifty-two business loan projects approved prior to the fiscal year 1970 were analyzed by consultants for the Economic Development Administration. It was estimated that 25,000 direct and indirect jobs had been located by these business loans, with an annual payroll of over \$130 million and an average wage per job of \$5,300. The findings indicate that the agency's cost per job averaged \$1,248. This money is returned to the Government with interest.

Under this bill the public facility loans and industrial and commercial loan and guarantee programs are extended at the existing annual authorization of \$170 million.

The findings of the evaluations of the technical assistance program indicated that it had helped to initiate a broad range of business activity in distressed areas and has provided coordination between communities in need of aid and organizations that can furnish various forms of support and training.

Compare this to what the Government is paying in welfare and unemployment compensation and ask which is the better investment.

Millions of our fellow citizens are jobless through no fault of their own, and hundreds of our communities are teetering on the brink of economic catastrophe. This bill is not a handout; it is a helping hand to neighbors who have nowhere else to turn. We cannot and we will not let them down, if only because large-scale unemployment and the existence of major pockets of depression threaten the well-being of the entire Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the results of the Economic Development Act have been seen in my own district in New Jersey.

Recently this program provided funds for the city of Asbury Park, a city that is in need, as are many cities throughout this Nation, in need for improvement and renovation of the Asbury Park Convention Hall. The results of this program will be that we in Asbury Park will be able to get more conventions located there.

The benefits of this program are not only the jobs that were created directly through the improvement of the convention hall, but with the income produced by people who come to the area for these conventions there will be an improvement in the economy along the boardwalk and in the hotels, by the employees in the business community and by the restaurants and gasoline stations and a host of other areas and activities.

Mr. Chairman, this is truly a fine piece of legislation. This Economic Development Act, Mr. Chairman, is a profitable investment of money. It is a productive investment in America, and it is, finally, a most humanitarian investment in people. I hope that the legislation is approved.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL).

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate this great committee, on which I had the honor of serving for 7 years of my experience in the Congress, for doing such a tremendous job on this piece of legislation. It truly brought a remarkable bill to the floor, and I congratulate all of the members. Especially am I proud of my fellow Californians on the committee on this side, Mr. JOHNSON, who is managing the bill, and Mr. CLAUSEN on the other side, who is a senior member of the committee, and the other Californians on the committee who have assisted their colleagues in bringing forth this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, today the American people find the country in stormy economic waters and they are working to chart this Nation on a course which will provide a prosperous climate where each person, who is able, can work and earn enough income for him and his family to live decently.

Americans are concerned with improving both the standard and quality of living in the United States. An essential key to bringing this about is to do all that we can to provide for an economy, wherein all who are able and all who wish to work, can do so and earn a livable wage.

This is a basic national goal toward which our efforts must be directed, and it is for this reason that I rise today in wholehearted support of the economic development bill under consideration by the committee.

Of course there are no simple, one-dimensional solutions to curing our Nation's economic woes. Recent history demonstrates that the causes and solutions are complex. But the record also shows that the Congress has led with action to shore up our sagging national economy.

Mr. Chairman, many in this Chamber will recall that it was said that the administration did not want and would not use the tools the Congress provided to meet emergency economic conditions. Ironically, it was 1 year ago this week that the administration did use those very tools to implement the 90-day wage, price, and rent freeze.

The Congress a year ago also readily responded by granting the requested repeal of the automatic excise tax as another economic spur.

The Congress was in the lead again when, in an effort to combat unemployment, it passed a public service jobs bill. This move was rejected by the administration, but the Congress tried again and passed the successful public employment program legislation, which was signed into law.

The Congress, in short, is valiantly doing its share in the economic battle and today's bill would bring up reinforcements to continue the effort to eliminate unemployment.

Today, Mr. Chairman, there are 2 million more people unemployed than when the present administration took office. Five and one-quarter million Americans are unemployed, and the results are staggering—statistically and in very real humanitarian terms. We cannot turn our backs on the fact that combined unemployment and welfare payments have reached extreme and emergency proportions—exceeding \$2 billion every 30 days, not including food stamps.

The time has come once again to take positive action, nationwide and especially for those areas hit hard by high rates of unemployment.

Accelerated public works impact program legislation is one valuable method of stimulating employment and a valuable program for providing local governments with needed permanent public facilities. Accelerated public works impact legislation is providing a program of investing in people—investing in America.

Early in 1970 the handwriting was on the wall. Unemployment was rapidly climbing toward 6 percent; 200 Members of this House joined me in introducing legislation to revive the accelerated public works program, which was successful in the 1960's as one means to fight the high unemployment problem.

Though the bill introduced in the 91st Congress was not passed, the unemployment problem became more serious. In the first days of this Congress, 150 Members joined me in reintroducing accelerated public works legislation. The Public Works Committee, which has a great record for taking responsive action, reported out the bill H.R. 5376, which extended the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Development Act, and incorporated the APW program. The bill was overwhelmingly approved by a 320 to 67 House vote and received a solid majority in the Senate, only to be vetoed by the President.

To the credit of Chairman JOHN BLATNIK and the members of the Public Works Committee, another bill was soon reported which salvaged the APW program in a scaled-down form. This legislation again cleared both Houses and was enacted into law last year.

During the early days of this session, more than 100 colleagues joined with me in cosponsoring legislation to increase the funding for the APW program to \$475 million this year. Significant support for the APW impact program was added with nearly all members of the Public Works Committee cosponsoring H.R. 16071.

When testifying before the Public Works and Economic Development Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, I stated that—

The committee may wish to develop a more comprehensive bill that would increase this amount and extend the program over several years.

The bill under consideration today gives the APW impact program new life for 2 years and authorizes \$500 million each year.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 16071 is principally aimed at assisting areas of high unemployment and areas that will suffer economic problems resulting from new environmental legislation that may put plants out of business, and people out of work in those plants.

The Public Works Committee recognizes that the Economic Development Administration is the agency in the Federal Government which has the best track record in dealing with such problems and the committee has authorized this additional tool and funds in order that the EDA may expand its valuable services to communities suffering from environmental unemployment.

Although there may be questions in the minds of many here today about some provisions, I believe that when the total bill, including the APW impact program, is thoroughly examined, it will merit the overwhelming support of the membership.

The question may also be raised, "Why APW when the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its latest report, shows a

decrease in the unemployment rate to 5.5 percent, seasonally adjusted?" Last year, at this time, we saw a similar situation when the unemployment rate dipped. The people on Pennsylvania Avenue were all smiles when the rate dropped, but heads began to shake when, only weeks later, the jobless rate again headed toward 6 percent.

Of course, it may very well be true that the rate of unemployment has leveled off and will continue to decline. I hope so, and so does everyone in this Chamber and across this land of ours. If the rate continues to fall, however, it will be in part due to efforts such as the APW impact program.

Although the APW impact program does not and cannot totally solve our unemployment problem, it does complement the other programs which form a network of action to improve our economy.

The PEP program is one example. PEP has placed thousands of unemployed and underemployed in public service jobs across the Nation, but PEP does not assist building tradesmen and those in the construction industry, nor the thousands of allied business and working people. The APW impact program and H.R. 16071 serve to fill this need and at the same time assist economically hard-hit communities in building urgently needed public facilities.

I have seen accelerated public works used successfully in the 15th District of California, which I have the privilege of representing. My district lies in the heart of one of the richest agricultural regions in the world, but unemployment is a serious problem.

The Stockton labor market has been known for years as an area of persistent high unemployment and in June had an unemployment rate of 8.8 percent, seasonally adjusted to 8.4 percent. The Modesto-Turlock labor market, though not considered a major labor market, had an astounding unemployment rate of 11.8 percent, nonseasonally adjusted. The national rate was 5.5 percent seasonally adjusted and 6.2 percent, nonseasonally adjusted. The State of California had a seasonally adjusted rate of 6.1 percent and nonseasonally adjusted rate at 6.5 percent.

We in the 15th District of California, therefore, are particularly aware of the problems of high unemployment and the resulting spin-off effects in terms of increased welfare costs and less revenue going into local government than would be if we had full employment.

So it was that when the last APW legislation was enacted, two projects were readily approved by the EDA in the 15th District. One \$73,600 grant provided immediate construction jobs for the unemployed and underemployed in Modesto and assisted the Stanislaus County government in providing needed warehouse space at two locations.

Another \$80,000 grant was put to effective use in Patterson, by helping the city to remodel the city hall and fire station.

We are working with other cities in the 15th District, which are looking to the accelerated public works impact program for needed assistance for similar projects to benefit local citizens and provide jobs.

APW impact is a vital program, Mr. Chairman. APW impact has proven itself and should be expanded, extended, and I urge the passage of H.R. 16071.

I also include at this point in the Record, statistics relating to unemployment compensation and welfare payments which illustrate the impact of these costs:

MONTHLY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS (WELFARE) 1969
1970, 1971 AND JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH 1972

| [In thousands] | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 |
| January..... | 900,848 | 1,062,441 | 1,369,752 | 1,541,447 |
| February..... | 915,444 | 1,086,245 | 1,370,566 | 1,549,253 |
| March..... | 938,609 | 1,119,020 | 1,458,874 | 1,636,903 |
| April..... | 943,113 | 1,142,849 | 1,461,843 | |
| May..... | 938,171 | 1,171,425 | 1,478,321 | |
| June..... | 936,970 | 1,184,955 | 1,469,119 | |
| July..... | 962,966 | 1,219,020 | 1,471,060 | |
| August..... | 954,376 | 1,202,439 | 1,480,518 | |
| September..... | 984,865 | 1,252,721 | 1,466,328 | |
| October..... | 1,039,214 | 1,291,143 | 1,578,895 | |
| November..... | 1,018,608 | 1,294,445 | 1,550,159 | |
| December..... | 1,017,450 | 1,380,110 | 1,553,861 | |

Source: Public Assistance Statistics, National Center for Social Statistics Reports (January 1969 through March 1972). U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—SELECTED DATA ON STATE PROGRAMS

| PERIOD | Average weekly insured unemployment | | Benefits paid (in thousands) |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Number of workers | Percent of covered employment | |
| 1969 | | | |
| January..... | 1,491,090 | 3.0 | 246,117 |
| February..... | 1,459,261 | 2.9 | 234,199 |
| March..... | 1,300,104 | 2.6 | 226,516 |
| April..... | 1,039,708 | 2.2 | 200,052 |
| May..... | 906,317 | 1.8 | 152,966 |
| June..... | 852,155 | 1.7 | 135,004 |
| July..... | 1,020,596 | 2.0 | 159,161 |
| August..... | 947,638 | 1.8 | 156,707 |
| September..... | 839,977 | 1.6 | 136,182 |
| October..... | 863,937 | 1.6 | 139,536 |
| November..... | 1,029,877 | 2.0 | 136,585 |
| December..... | 1,374,659 | 2.7 | 214,260 |
| 1970 | | | |
| January..... | 1,847,486 | 3.6 | 299,352 |
| February..... | 1,873,594 | 3.6 | 310,808 |
| March..... | 1,797,766 | 3.5 | 331,087 |
| April..... | 1,769,603 | 3.4 | 321,476 |
| May..... | 1,666,638 | 3.2 | 293,588 |
| June..... | 1,582,503 | 3.0 | 292,317 |
| July..... | 1,760,947 | 3.3 | 314,201 |
| August..... | 1,710,145 | 3.2 | 311,420 |
| September..... | 1,606,993 | 3.0 | 298,419 |
| October..... | 1,724,435 | 3.2 | 304,201 |
| November..... | 2,016,679 | 3.7 | 342,060 |
| December..... | 2,369,214 | 4.4 | 460,568 |
| 1971 | | | |
| January..... | 2,798,613 | 5.2 | 526,744 |
| February..... | 2,750,665 | 5.2 | 557,928 |
| March..... | 2,577,025 | 4.8 | 634,485 |
| April..... | 2,282,848 | 4.3 | 544,241 |
| May..... | 2,000,737 | 3.8 | 434,196 |
| June..... | 1,892,676 | 3.6 | 451,385 |
| July..... | 1,992,940 | 3.8 | 428,002 |
| August..... | 1,912,248 | 3.6 | 433,636 |
| September..... | 1,739,103 | 3.3 | 400,329 |
| October..... | 1,716,322 | 3.2 | 367,169 |
| November..... | 1,878,625 | 3.5 | 406,905 |
| December..... | 2,221,488 | 4.2 | 466,189 |

Source: Social Security Bulletins.

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

Mr. McFALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I just rise at this point to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well.

I have been very pleased to cosponsor the same legislation in prior instances with the gentleman from California (Mr.

McFALL) and with others. I have been very pleased to associate with them and commend those who work so diligently. This legislation should have been recognized by the present administration some time earlier. I hope he will now do so.

Mr. McFALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman in the well for his diligence in assisting the committee in putting this bill together and bringing it before this body.

I also want to associate myself with all of the accolades that have been made to the membership of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the situation in which the American people find their economy today.

Rising unemployment coupled with inflation has cut the economic heart out of countless communities. More people have been thrown out of work or rendered underemployed than at any time within recent memory.

H.R. 16071, the accelerated public works bill, would raise the level of this year's authorization for special impact area APW assistance to \$500 million. As the Representative of the dynamic and rapidly industrializing Seventh District of Georgia, I must rise in support of the accelerated public works bill.

This bill has a twofold purpose. First, it is a bill to combat unemployment through effective stimulation of the construction, building trades and supporting industries. Second, it will provide public investment for needed community projects.

At the outset, let me say that I know that others will participate in this debate, and go into the specifics of this legislation with regard to its funding and the mechanics of its eventual implementation. But let me outline briefly, for the public's sake, the meaning of this legislation and the effect which we plan for it.

Not long ago, I received a telephone call from an unemployed engineer. He told me that he could understand other people wanting pay raises and additional fringe benefits, but the only pay raise he wanted was from nothing to something, and the only fringe benefit he wanted was a job.

I am well aware that the focus of this bill is on the creation of jobs in the construction industry. I believe we need to recognize as well that the new projects started under this legislation will have what economists call a "multiplier effect" on the economy. That is to say that for every dollar the Government puts into the direct construction of a needed sewer or water line it will create so many dollars more in jobs and purchasing power for the people in the area.

Thus, we will take at least a strong, first, positive step to meet the problems associated with unemployment in the general economy. I might add at this point that whenever legislators, businessmen, or economists gather and talk about that particular economic problem

or another one, invariably all the proposals for an immediate and specific remedy, whether it be job retraining or a tariff, boil down to "we must set all our actions in the context of a more fully employed economy." Mr. Chairman, that is what this bill intends to do.

Through this legislation I anticipate substantial across-the-board relief, which this country has not been able to gain elsewhere, from unemployment and its attendant problems, and I anticipate specific relief for those areas of the country which have been especially hard hit by the slowdown in our economy. In my own district, three counties now stand to put numbers of persons back on the job rolls and to build essential community facilities should this bill become law.

Community facilities to be built under a new Accelerated Public Works Act include water purification plants, sewer lines, and countless other essential items long proven needed, but too long neglected. These items of public investment affect the health, safety and economic well-being of every citizen of the seventh district.

When I say that these projects have a demonstrated need and that the money will not be wasted. I would only ask and remind all of you; How many water purification plants and new sewer systems which both enhance our environment and attract industry have been turned down by the administration?

Is it necessary for the Economic Development Administration to return applications for needed projects to our communities due to lack of adequate funds? How many more of these projects could be built if funds were available? How many jobs have been lost by inaction?

Mr. Chairman, all these are the hard, bedrock reasons why accelerated public works is a sound public investment.

I know that I speak for many in this Chamber today when I convey the feelings of my own constituents. Most distressing to the EDA designated counties has been the knowledge that their plight has been recognized by the Federal Government but that recognition by the Federal Government until now has carried with it no funds to combat the problem. With the passage of this bill, recognition will no longer be a footnote to the eventual economic revival of these and other areas, but will instead be the first step in a meaningful program for building and restoring the economic viability of the economy, its workers, businesses, and communities.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the passage of H.R. 16071, the accelerated public works bill, a necessity. I hope that the overwhelming majority of my colleagues concur.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am in full support of the bill which is before us after the testimony that has been given by those who completed the hearings and held the hearings covering 125 witnesses. I think all of us are very familiar with the context of the bill and the

report that was put out. The bill was out in time. Everyone had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to the House today H.R. 16071 which amends and extends the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. This act provides Federal assistance, in cooperation with the States, to communities, areas, and regions in the United States that have fallen behind our Nation's mainstream of economic growth. The purpose of the act is to assist areas in economic distress. These are areas, both rural and urban, suffering from high unemployment, underemployment, and outmigration. It is both an urban and rural program.

The act stresses the planning process in developing goals for economic growth and provides grants for public facilities, loans and guarantees for business development, and technical assistance.

The Special Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs of the Committee on Public Works held extensive hearings on proposals to revise and extend this act earlier this year. As a result of the testimony received at these hearings, H.R. 16071 was introduced and reported favorably with an amendment by the full committee on August 7.

The bill extends the Public Works and Economic Development Act for 1 additional year, through fiscal 1974. It makes improvements in existing economic development programs and provides new programs of assistance to individuals and businesses which suffer economic hardship from imposition of environmental quality standards.

PURPOSE CLAUSE

Section 2 of the bill adds two new sentences to the purpose clause of the act to recognize that economic distress has brought about substantial migration which is frustrating orderly national growth and aggravating economic and social conditions in both rural areas and central cities, and that orderly growth should recognize economic disorders.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

Section 3 of the bill amends the act to improve the public facility grant program. The annual authorization of \$800 million for the regular public facility grant and supplementary grant program—which provides permanent jobs through long-term development—is extended for an additional year through fiscal year 1974. The maximum Federal share of total project cost is increased from 80 to 90 percent, to help the areas showing the greatest need but unable to raise the local share.

Also, a separate authorization of \$500 million per fiscal year for the fiscal years 1973 and 1974 is provided for the public works impact program enacted into law in August of last year 1971. This program is designed to provide immediate useful work to the unemployed in distressed areas on backlog of public facility projects ready for construction.

One of the principal objections to this program raised last year was that it would take too long to get these projects into the construction stage in order to have an immediate benefit to the un-

employed. Experience has demonstrated the program can get the unemployed to work rapidly. The Economic Development Administration has done an excellent job in responding to the intent of the Congress. The guidelines require that projects are to be under construction within 2½ months from the date of approval.

The initial fiscal 1972 appropriation and a subsequent supplemental appropriation were obligated by the end of January of this year, and more funds are badly needed for this emergency job-creating program.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Section 4 of the bill amends the business loan program to add authority to guarantee up to 90 percent of the outstanding balance of a loan to a private borrower and up to 90 percent of the remaining rental payments under a lease. Under current law, only working capital loans may be guaranteed and only then in connection with direct loan under this program.

The maximum Federal participation in direct loans is increased from 65 percent to 75 percent.

These changes will give the Secretary greater flexibility in assisting businesses in economically lagging areas and will increase the overall supply of capital for such businesses by encouraging participation of private lending institutions.

The bill extends the annual authorization of \$170 million for this program for an additional year, through fiscal 1974.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Section 5 of the bill amends the technical assistance provisions to permit the Secretary to assist applicants who are unable to obtain expertise needed to apply for economic development assistance under the act, and to defray up to 100 percent of economic development planning expenses of Indian tribes.

INITIAL OPERATING COSTS OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING FACILITIES

Also authorized are grants of up to 75 percent of the cost of operation of vocational education facilities constructed with grants under title I of this act. These grants are available for any 2 years during the 5-year period beginning with enactment of this legislation. They are intended to help ease the period during which communities make permanent arrangements for funding new vocational training facilities. Up to \$15 million annually may be used for this purpose.

COORDINATION

In sections 5, 6, and 7 of the bill, provision is made for better coordination of economic activities of local communities, economic development districts, States, and regional economic development commissions. The amendments in the bill establish better communication and assistance at each of these levels to insure continuity in the planning process for economic growth.

AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Section 6 of the bill makes a number of changes in economic development assistance eligibility criteria:

Only one redevelopment area—instead of two—would be necessary for forma-

tion of an economic development district. Assistance to nonredevelopment areas within development districts would be permitted if the benefits accrue to redevelopment areas within the district.

Economic development districts would be assured of a minimum of 5 years' administrative expenses. A new authorization of \$20 million annually for fiscal 1973 and 1974 is provided for district planning and administrative expenses.

The moratorium on redesignation of redevelopment areas is extended until June 1, 1974.

Areas with population up to 500,000—rather than the current limit of 250,000—may be designated as "economic growth centers."

Special impact area criteria designed to reach pockets of economic distress in urban and rural communities or neighborhoods without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries is redefined.

REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

Section 7 amends the regional planning commission provisions of the act.

To date, seven regions have been designated by the Secretary of Commerce. These are Upper Great Lakes, Ozarks, Four Corners, Coastal Plains, New England, Old West, and the Pacific Northwest regions. The Old West Region and the Pacific Northwest region have been designated by the Secretary this year. Except for these new regions, the process of preparing long range economic development plans for each region has been underway since 1967.

A separate annual authorization of \$100 million is provided for each regional commission that has an overall economic development plan completed and approved by the Secretary. Four such commissions have completed their plans. A \$20 million annual authorization is provided for each commission that has not yet an approved economic plan. Three such commissions are in this category.

POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

Section 8 of the bill contains conforming amendments to permit the Secretary to administer the lease and loan guarantee authority made available under this bill in the same manner as he is permitted to administer the loan program under existing law.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 9 of this bill adds a new title VIII to the act. This title contains two sections. The first section provides assistance to individuals who become unemployed because of Federal actions to improve the environment. The second section provides assistance for businesses to finance the cost of pollution control facilities when a Federal or State action to improve the environment would otherwise close the business and result in job loss.

The first section of the title authorizes \$100 million to provide assistance to each individual certified as being unemployed as a result of an environmental standard or order. Such individuals would be eligible for unemployment compensation equal to at least 60 percent of his former weekly wage for a period not longer than 78 weeks. Mortgage and rental payments

up to 1 year would be available to such an individual if he has received notice of foreclosure or eviction from his residence.

Reemployment assistance under existing laws, as well as moving expenses, are provided when such individual is unable to find employment within a reasonable distance of his residence, but does find employment beyond that distance.

The second section of title VIII would authorize \$100 million annually for fiscal 1973 and 1974 for long-term, low-interest loan assistance—30 years, 3 percent—to businesses to finance the cost of pollution control facilities when a Federal or State environmental quality standard or order would otherwise close the business and result in job loss.

The total new authorizations in this bill, designed to assist in the economic growth of this Nation, is \$3,177,500,000. The dreadful impact unemployment has on the Nation's economy and on the lives of our citizens is of concern to all of us regardless of party. This is a small price to pay to assist in developing our economy, create jobs, and restore dignity to many of our unemployed citizens.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as a coauthor of a companion bill, I rise in strong support of H.R. 16071, a bill designed to provide needed jobs in areas of high unemployment.

In the first quarter of 1972, unemployment averaged 5.8 percent. This means that almost six people of every 100, who are actively seeking a job, are unsuccessful. This means that approximately 5 million people in our 81-million-person labor market are still out looking for a job.

Of those millions who are out of work, 1,180,000 have been unsuccessfully seeking a job for almost 4 months—3 months and 3 weeks, to be exact.

What are the results of this high unemployment rate?

First, obviously, the breadwinner is deprived the dignity of bringing home a paycheck.

Second, his family is denied the security of knowing from where the next meal is coming.

Third, society does not gain from the fruits of his labor.

Fourth, rather than adding to the strength of America, the unemployed drain tax dollars which could be funneled into education, health care, law enforcement, or into some other important area. In fact, State unemployment insurance programs paid an estimated \$739.5 million in benefits in March 1972.

Mr. Chairman, we must provide jobs performing useful services for those seeking employment.

The bill before us today would provide funds to those areas, which have been particularly hard hit by unemployment, in order to assist the communities in building necessary public facilities, such as nursing homes, hospitals, libraries, water, and sewer lines.

Our country needs jobs—preferably jobs in the private sector of a growing, expanding economy. But when the economy is not growing or expanding sufficiently, then the Government must as-

sume the obligation of being the employer of last resort.

Mr. Chairman, I endorse the bill, H.R. 16071, and I urge my colleagues to pass this measure overwhelmingly.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, the need is urgent for passage of H.R. 16071. Section 107, which deals with the public works impact program, is of special concern to districts like the Sixth Congressional District which I serve.

Section 107 creates a public works impact program to assist areas of high unemployment, low-income concentration, or substantial outmigration. This provision would authorize \$500 million for the Secretary of Labor to allow payment of up to 100 percent of the cost of public works projects to these hard-pressed areas.

The unemployment situation in Connecticut is far above the national average. In my State, 8.5 percent of the working force is unemployed. The Sixth District includes all or parts of seven labor districts, as determined by the State labor department. In only one area is the unemployment rate below the State average. In three areas entirely within my district, the rate is over 11 percent. Bristol has 17.6 percent, New Britain and Torrington areas each have 1.4 percent.

The situation in these areas remains critical. The people in my district need jobs. They want jobs. Furthermore, preliminary figures in my district opinion poll indicate that a vast majority of those who returned questionnaires favor increased Federal spending on temporary public works projects to provide work opportunity for the unemployed.

As one of the cosponsors of the McFall accelerated public works bill, I commend the action of the committee in providing section 107 in H.R. 16071. Passage of this legislation would meet two pressing needs: the creation of badly needed municipal facilities as well as badly needed jobs.

Mr. Chairman, Federal employment in public works should only be a temporary measure in times of emergency. This emergency situation is and has been a part of the fabric of life in northwest Connecticut far too long. I urge passage of H.R. 16071 so that unemployed people in my district and throughout the Nation may soon begin working on needed public works projects, in anticipation of that time when employment in the private sector may remove the need for such measures.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee along with his committee members who have very diligently put together a bill aimed at the very heart of some of America's most crucial problems. A high percentage of crime, poverty, poor health, urban blight, and welfare problems can be traced directly to one source—lack of jobs.

I am particularly concerned with the portion of this bill referred to as the accelerated public works impact program. Under this program communities across America would receive \$500 million in each of the next 2 fiscal years to com-

bat high unemployment and provide badly needed permanent public facilities.

This bill is not a welfare or "make-work" proposal. It is a program to put skilled workers back to work. One of America's greatest assets is its reservoir of skilled workers. Today too many of these people are sitting idle through no fault of their own. Every day they are unemployed our Nation loses the benefit of their talents. The people I am talking about are the Nation's carpenters, bricklayers, heavy machinery operators, electricians, and other craftsmen.

Not only will these people get back to work to support their families and communities, the communities will have new libraries, police stations, community centers, storm drainage systems, street lights, hospitals, water purification plants, and other similar projects.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the need for such a program. For 3 years now we have been assured that the unemployment problem has been solved and that prosperity is on the way. In July, national unemployment was 5.8 percent, seasonally adjusted to 5.5 percent. There were 5,173,000 persons out of work. In one county in my congressional district, unemployment was at 6.8 percent in June. I hardly consider this "prosperity" and it is difficult to tell these people that there is no unemployment problem. Last year the President vetoed similar legislation after it had been passed by substantial margins by both the House and Senate. In the meantime, such drastic measures as wage-price controls and export embargoes have been instituted.

Meanwhile, the unemployment situation has not substantially improved. I think it is time we ceased pretending that no problem exists. This legislation will make substantial strides toward improving the unemployment situation and it has my wholehearted support. I urge my colleagues to again join with me in telling the President that we do not accept a 5.5 percent unemployment rate and we do not want more than 5 million Americans and their families to continue to suffer the economic hardships and stigma of being unemployed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, legislation to authorize needed funds for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

As we know all too well, the unemployment rate has continued at intolerably high levels in this country for better than 2 years, and has, in fact, been well over 5 percent for the past 24 months. Among many segments of the economy, this rate is even higher. For example, 14.8 percent of teenagers were unemployed according to Department of Labor statistics for July, 10.9 percent of construction workers, and 7.3 percent of Vietnam veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this unemployment situation and the drain it represents on the entire economy, cannot be allowed to continue. Enactment of H.R. 16071 will demonstrate the sincerity of the Congress to take positive measures to reduce substantially the unemployment rate and to offer the dignity of work to many of

the more than 5 million persons who are currently unemployed.

Especially important, in my view, are provisions of H.R. 16071 to increase the authorization for public works programs to \$500 million yearly for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The first year's experience with the public works impact program has indicated highly satisfactory results, both in job creation and in the construction on needed public facilities. In addition, continuation of current authorization levels for accelerated public works for the next 2 years will help to provide needed Federal assistance in employment creation in especially hard-hit areas. It is my hope that the aims of this program may be more fully developed through increased appropriations to meet the authorization amounts which have been specified.

In conclusion, I would like once again to emphasize my belief that support for the measure now before us represents a responsible step toward meeting the essential need of our Nation's unemployed—the need for constructive job opportunities.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 16071. The need for the legislation is readily apparent as has been fully detailed in the committee report and in the explanation by my colleagues.

I was one of the original sponsors of the accelerated public works impact program, an integral part of this bill. As reported, the bill authorizes \$500 million for the current year and another \$500 million for fiscal 1974.

I commend the chairman and members of the Committee on Public Works for bringing forward this comprehensive measure to provide for public works and economic development.

My own area of Buffalo, N.Y., is hard hit by unemployment and we are by no means the exception. There are pockets of serious unemployment throughout the Nation and Federal assistance is essential.

In New York State we now have an unemployment rate of 6 percent, slightly higher than the national average.

In the Buffalo metropolitan area, the unemployment rate is a whopping 8.2 percent and the outlook is not good. Just this week, the banner headline in our evening newspaper was the announcement of another plant closing which will put another 450 people out of work.

The pending bill contains a number of changes and improvements in programs to aid depressed areas. The Committee on Public Works has done an excellent job of blending these varied approaches into a coordinated program.

The accelerated public works impact program provides 80 percent construction grants to local governments in high unemployment "special impact" areas.

This program is important as it provides help on two fronts by assisting local governments in building needed facilities, such as sewage treatment plants, public structures, and so forth. It also provides immediate employment to persons in the building trades, which are among the groups hardest hit by unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16071 and urge its passage.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is much needed. Thirty thousand unemployed persons in Maine can attest to that need. So can the long list of public works projects left undone: Storm drainage systems, libraries, police stations, nursing homes, community centers, airport facilities, hospitals, water purification plants, and water and sewer lines.

This bill, particularly the section authorizing \$500 million a year for the accelerated public works impact program, will effectively pinpoint an attack on joblessness.

The proposal will help create additional employment in the construction industry, including the building trades, which suffers from an unemployment rate of approximately 12 percent. Local governments would be provided with 80 percent construction grants for needed public projects such as storm drainage systems, libraries, police stations, community centers, street lights and traffic signals, airport facilities, hospitals, warehouses, water purification plants, and other similar projects.

There are presently 5 million men and women unemployed in the United States. This proposal will not provide jobs for all these people, but it should help reduce the unemployment count to a level that is healthier for the economy.

This kind of program would not only provide urgently needed jobs, but it would also make our rural communities more attractive to outside industry by furnishing necessary public services.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972.

At a time when unemployment continues to skyrocket, this legislation is critical. Under the public works impact program, \$500 million would be made available for each of the next 2 fiscal years to provide 100-percent Federal matching funds for areas of high unemployment and concentrated low income. Under the environmental effects program, \$100 million would be authorized to aid those workers who have lost their jobs through Federal environmental enforcement. I believe we have a moral obligation to assist those who must sacrifice their jobs to help protect our environment.

Mr. Chairman, each day I receive mail from constituents who are unemployed and, following months of searching, are still unable to find jobs to support their families. This bill, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, will put Congress on record in favor of the creation of new employment opportunities. Grants for public works and development facilities and for vocational training facilities will enable our local governments to help develop long-lasting economic improvements and jobs. Furthermore, it allows us to focus our Federal resources on those special impact areas, rural and urban, which are hardest hit by poverty and unemployment.

The past history of the Public Works and Economic Development Act demonstrates that Congress can effectively as-

sist millions of Americans by funding permanent jobs in economically distressed areas in cooperation with State and local governments.

I urge passage of this vital legislation. Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071 which authorizes a \$4.4 billion package for public works and economic development.

This important legislation contains an accelerated public works impact program which my colleague JOHN MCFALL and I pressed for since March of this year. The bill provides for \$500 million a year through fiscal 1974 for an immediate job creating public works impact effort in areas where unemployment is significantly above the national average, as in the eastern parts of my own district.

The impact program is designed also to assist these communities with 80-percent matching grants to build public facilities such as nursing homes, hospitals, libraries, and water and sewer lines.

When we first introduced our accelerated impact program this year, we had called for an increase of \$475 million for fiscal 1973. I was gratified to see that the House Public Works Committee approved an increase of \$500 million per year for this and the following year.

In evaluating last year's performance the committee concluded that the program had been "successful in creating jobs and constructing needed facilities." Our action today in support of this program would be based not on future promises that it will succeed but on proven success and performance.

Further, the program has been effective on two critical fronts. First, it has helped local governments in building needed facilities, which drain the taxpayer's pocketbook. Second, it has created immediate employment in the building trades, which are among the hardest hit unemployed groups in the country.

Clearly it has been an effective tool in attacking joblessness and relieving the unemployment-inflation crisis which has gripped this country since President Nixon took office some 4 years ago. During that period of time we have seen the bankruptcy of this administration's trickledown theory which offers billions of dollars in tax breaks to business in hopes of creating jobs. This approach has been a dismal failure.

We have consistently urged the President to adopt immediately an accelerated public works-public employment strategy. Last June he responded by vetoing legislation that would have provided \$2 billion for such a program. Instead of creating jobs, he dispatched Secretary of Labor James Hodgson with instructions to camouflage our unemployment crisis and proclaim unemployment as only "the hole in the doughnut." Well, for some 5 million workers across the country, with 600,000 in California alone, unemployment is indeed a tragic hole in their lives.

It is our responsibility today to help overcome that tragedy and create meaningful employment for these workers, and I urge you to support this job creating legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, we have a great opportunity before us today in the form of H.R. 16071, the accelerated public works legislation. The passage of this bill will increase the impact program authorization to \$500 million this fiscal year and extend the program for another year at a \$500 million authorization. I am happy to say I am a cosponsor of the bill.

As I am sure my colleagues are aware, the unadjusted unemployment rate for the United States in June 1972 was 6.2 percent. In my home State of Michigan, the unadjusted unemployment rate for June was a frightening 9.8 percent, and a total of 370,000 people were unemployed in Michigan. In July of 1972, these figures rose to 10.7 percent of the labor force, or 392,000 people in Michigan were unemployed.

The bill we have before us today is a step forward in alleviating this serious problem. New jobs will be created in that local governments will be assisted in the building of badly needed facilities, such as sewage treatment plants, public structures, et cetera. This will provide immediate help to persons in the building trades, some of the most affected by unemployment.

Leaders of organized labor have strongly supported legislation to increase funding of accelerated public works programs to combat unemployment. Included in this group are Frank Bonadio, president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, and Andrew J. Biemiller, director, Department of Legislation for the AFL-CIO.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for passage of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Massive unemployment continues to plague our country. The most recent figures of the Department of Labor show that 5.9 percent of our Nation's workers are without jobs. The problem in my own State of Massachusetts is particularly severe. In January 1970, the unemployment rate of Massachusetts was 4.4 percent. By January of the following year unemployment had risen to 7 percent. Preliminary figures for June of 1972 show that unemployment in Massachusetts has skyrocketed to a shocking level of 8.3 percent.

In the Boston labor area, which comprises 78 cities and towns, including the communities in my district of Waltham, Brookline, and Newton, more than 107,000 workers were unemployed as of June 1972. The Fitchburg-Leominster labor area, also in my district, is burdened with an unemployment rate of 9.9 percent, with 4,100 people out of work in the six cities and towns of this area.

These individuals must have jobs. I am convinced that the legislation before us today, key provisions of which I sponsored months ago, will help meet the needs of the unemployed in my district, in Massachusetts, and throughout our country.

This bill authorizes \$800 million for fiscal 1973 EDA on-going public works

projects, and the same amount for fiscal 1974. The bill authorizes \$500 million for fiscal 1973, and an identical amount for fiscal 1974, for critically needed accelerated public works impact programs. Also authorized is \$920 million through 1974 for seven regional commissions whose work would combat unemployment, and \$100 million for unemployment compensation, rent and mortgage payments for workers whose jobs were lost due to the effects of environmental protection studies.

The bill also provides that 60 percent of eligible workers' former salaries would be paid to them as unemployment compensation for a period of 78 weeks.

Another key provision of this bill authorizes \$100 million through fiscal 1974 for technical assistance to local governments for administering planning and feasibility studies including \$15 million for operation of vocational training facilities.

The bill also redefines special impact areas as areas which have a large concentration of low-income persons, substantial unemployment, or actual or threatened unemployment due to closing or curtailment of a major source of employment.

Finally, the bill provides for 90-percent loan guarantees to aid business firms in redevelopment areas.

Mr. Chairman, I have said many times before that I do not believe in President Nixon's so-called trickle down theory. That discredited theory, which is based on the faulty assumption that tax giveaways to large corporations will result in increased employment, is a proven failure. The unemployment statistics speak for themselves.

I believe that the best way to decrease unemployment quickly is to provide grants for local government projects which will create immediate construction jobs in areas of high unemployment, and thus will have highly desirable spin-off effects in creating new employment throughout such areas in all local goods and services businesses.

The accelerated public works provisions of this bill do just that.

Andrew J. Biemiller, the director of the AFL-CIO Department of Legislation, has summarized the need for this bill in these words:

America's workers know full well that many of our most critical problems stem from inadequate public facilities and could be solved through added public investment programs and full funding of those that are already on the books.

I congratulate the Public Works Committee, its chairman, JOHN BLATNIK, my colleague JOHN McFALL who has worked so hard to effect the enactment of this bill, and our other colleagues who have joined in sponsoring or advocating this necessary measure. America's workers will thank us if we pass this bill today.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of the Public Works Acceleration Act, I want to voice my earnest support of this bill as the Congress must address the economic ills of this country. Unemployment is insidious and is destroying the pride and vigor of millions of Americans. We can now count over 5½ million

Americans on the unemployed rolls. Factories are running at much less than full capacity. And while these millions of unemployed Americans are spending idle and unproductive hours, many of our communities are stagnating for want of public services.

This bill will not solve all of the economic problems of this country, but it will contribute to the resolution of these problems and provide productive employment to hundreds of thousands of people whose talents are being wasted. In my own district public works programs could provide much needed water and sewer systems, improved lighting, and a plethora of other much needed services. The problems of unemployment are cyclical and as the unemployment rolls in a community grow tax revenues decline, and public services are the first area to feel the bite. It is time to stop the emotional rhetoric and the raising of the specter of RPA projects. This legislation is fiscally sound and will contribute to the unemployment-inflation malaise which detracts from the lives of millions of our citizens.

Again this year the committee has spent long and fruitful hours in hammering out a bill that will greatly stimulate the economy and lessen the psychological and physical effects of unemployment. The response to this legislation has been overwhelming as is manifested by the fact that over 100 Members of this House have cosponsored it. Last year's measure, of which I was also a cosponsor, received overwhelming support when it passed the House.

We recognize the great need for this legislation as a substitute for Federal handouts and the dehumanizing aspects of such relief. We hear from the administration that employment levels of 4 percent are not feasible as a guideline for full employment. I am not ready to accept the fact that we must adjust our expectations downward so that we can grandly say that we are at "full employment." The unemployment level in this country is hovering around the 6-percent level and there is no reason to think that relief is in sight unless we take affirmative action. The proposal before us today calls for much needed public services as a vehicle for providing work for our unemployed. Not busy work, as some would suggest, but essential projects utilizing the talents and skills of thousands of Americans who have spent dreary months in enforced idleness. In closing I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from California, JOHN McFALL, for his excellent leadership in this effort and also the committee for the excellent bill that is being considered today, and I urge full support for this essential legislation.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendment of 1972 which I have cosponsored with my colleague, the Honorable JOHN McFALL. This bill has but one general purpose: to provide much needed Federal assistance to the economically distressed areas and regions of our Nation suffering from a high rate of unemployment. Despite the persistent proclamations of the administration and the

satyrical wit of the President's Council of Economic Advisers that this Nation is experiencing an economic upturn, we can hardly overlook the some 5 to 5½ million men and women out of work, unable to support their families. The legislation we consider here today has a direct, real and immediate bearing on these people.

It authorizes the expenditure of \$500 million a year through fiscal 1974, redefining special impact areas as both urban and rural which have a large concentration of low income persons, substantial unemployment, or have an actual or threatened abrupt rise in unemployment due to closing of main source of employment. The legislation allows the Secretary of Commerce more flexibility in the administering of financial assistance for business development. It provides assistance for States in the preparation of their overall economic programs, and to individuals who suffer employment loss because of Federal action to improve the environment. In short, this legislation recognizes that there is high unemployment now and seeks to put these people back to work.

Apparently, the administration is more concerned with matters other than unemployment. In recent weeks, the administration has charged this body being fiscally irresponsible, inflationary and short-sighted—in regard to health, nutrition, education, and unemployment. In fact, the President has used this reasoning to veto several pieces of major domestic legislation: Accelerated public works, Labor-HEW appropriation and Office of Economic Opportunity. But, is it fiscally irresponsible to authorize and appropriate funds for projects and jobs when the economic climate is such that no one is hiring at the blue collar level? Is it inflationary to ask an unemployed individual to work and receive just compensation from the Federal Government so that he can provide for his family? Is it shortsighted of this Congress to seek to provide funds to put people to work? Or do we sit by and let long range planning forget the unemployed? Do we act as if the economy cannot operate beyond 75 percent of its capacity without intolerable inflation? Do we resign ourselves to 5-percent unemployment? My constituents and I think not.

Last month I received an announcement from the Department of Labor for release on July 31, 1972, which defined how the administration's economic upswing was affecting Massachusetts and the country. The city of Boston, Mass. which includes Suffolk County, parts of Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk, and Plymouth Counties, which had been hovering and plagued by a rate of 6 percent unemployment must now contend with 7 percent or more unemployment. Two of the nine areas designated by the Department of Labor as "major areas of substantial or persistent unemployment"—12 percent unemployment or higher—are located in my home State.

Further, according to the Department of Labor, there are now 883 areas classified as areas of substantial or persistent unemployment. Parts of all of 421 cities, 650 counties in all States, 31 Indian reservations and the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico are classified as sections of concentrated unemployment or underemployment. Every State in this Union has felt the effect of the present 5.5-percent unemployment rate. The time has come for solutions. We have seen the effect of vetoes. Inaction is no longer tolerable.

Mr. Chairman, the House must act favorably on this measure which is so important to unemployed Americans. I ask my colleagues to direct their attention to the unemployed people of our Nation who have been forgotten. These people are tired of listening to hollow excuses about the inflationary risk of legislation of this kind.

We have a mandate from the people. As a coequal branch of Government, Congress can and must act to assist the unemployed. If we are to be recorded as a Congress that cares, we must meet the task before us and give our unequivocal support to this desperately needed legislation.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support H.R. 16071, the accelerated public works impact program. At a time when more than 5 million Americans are out of work, when countless others have given up looking for jobs, this program makes sense. At a time when everyone feels the impact of an economy in disarray, when inflation and interest rates are too high, this program can generate stability and help bring prices back to earth. The gentleman from California, Congressman McFALL, and the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, Congressman BLATNIK, are to be commended for their vigorous support of this legislation.

Simply put, this program will create jobs: The one thing the American economy so desperately needs. For the last few years, the administration has been struggling with a variety of approaches to inflation and a faltering economy. There have been wage and price controls, stern warnings, and a variety of gimmicks all designed to help the economy by helping the top of the heap first. Some people have called it the "trickle down" theory of economics, and, it has not worked very well. Take the investment tax credit, for example. It was supposed to encourage industry to expand, creating more jobs in the process. The tax credit failed at generating employment, but it succeeded at generating additional tax deductions and larger loopholes.

A year ago, the President vetoed legislation similar to the bill before us today. It was a tragic mistake. The unemployment rate still is intolerably high—too many Americans still are out of work, unable to support their families. This program would help, creating new jobs—not through a series of intricate maneuvers—but directly, giving communities the financial help they need to improve and creating new jobs in the process.

By approving this legislation, however, we will be doing more than just generating employment. We will be helping communities across the country improve themselves and the equality of life for their residents. With this legislation,

communities will be able to build hospitals, libraries, sewage treatment facilities—any number of projects that they have had to postpone because they have not had the money. In so many communities, those kinds of projects are desperately needed and long overdue.

The accelerated public works impact program will provide special help in protecting the environment. It would help workers who have lost their jobs because of Federal antipollution orders, but more importantly, it will give communities the incentive and the financial ability to attack pollution through public works. Chairman BLATNIK is familiar with the pollution of Lake Michigan, much of it caused by inadequate municipal sewage treatment facilities. In too many areas, virtually untreated sewage is being dumped into lakes and rivers, and they are choking to death on it. With the money provided in this legislation, local communities will be able to build new sewage treatment facilities and systems—systems that do not overflow into lakes and rivers every time there is a storm, systems that protect the environment instead of destroying it.

Local communities need the kind of public works this bill provides. Their residents need the employment this bill provides. The environment needs the protection this bill provides. With one program, we are helping local communities find the answers to three very serious problems; not the whole answer, but part of it. And, given the history of the last 2 years, it is an answer that we must not reject.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972. Earlier this year I cosponsored H.R. 13702 with Congressman McFALL to establish a job-creating accelerated public works program.

The recorded rates of unemployment throughout the country and, in particular in the State of Connecticut, are at an unacceptable level. The average national rate of unemployment for 1971 was 5.9 percent, the highest it has been since the 1961 recession. In the State of Connecticut the rate of unemployment is 9.4 percent—which is higher than average for that State last year. These figures only reflect recorded unemployment—certainly hidden or unrecorded unemployment, the existence of which we recognize, would raise these figures to higher levels if recorded.

The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1971, which Congress passed during the first session of the 92d Congress to help alleviate the escalating national unemployment, was unwisely vetoed by the President. Once again over 5 million unemployed are looking to us for action that will help put them back to work and this bill, providing a 2-year \$1 billion public works construction program, will do much to accomplish that objective in areas of greatest need.

I can speak from personal experience about the value of this proposal. I supported President Kennedy's Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 which succeeded by this popular and effective mechanism in hastening economic re-

covery in areas heavily affected by the recession of that time. Several communities of Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, benefited greatly from that program. I am confident that the \$1 billion authorized by this bill for worthwhile and permanent public works projects will also be spent in providing jobs and programs for economically depressed areas.

The legislation is designed in part to increase the financial assistance to the areas of highest unemployment which have been designated as "special impact areas." As was the case in 1962, expansion of authorizations and providing 90-percent public works construction grants develop immediate useful work in hard-hit communities. Those municipalities and counties with high rates of unemployment will be provided funds to facilitate the construction of libraries, schools, sewers, water purification facilities, sidewalks, and similar public improvements, to enhance their attractiveness to new industry without a resultant drain upon their tax resources. Most importantly, these activities will reduce the unemployment afflicting that area.

This legislation also provides guarantees by the Secretary of Commerce of up to 90 percent of the outstanding unpaid balance of a loan or 90 percent of the remaining rental payments under a lease for loans or leases made by private lending institutions to businesses in "redevelopment areas" or "economic growth centers." These guarantees will help to encourage the investment of private funds to augment the public funds provided by this legislation resulting in the development of new industry and increased permanent employment in these economically stricken areas.

Assistance for the establishment and operation of vocational training facilities is also provided by this legislation. Providing workers with new skills to meet today's industrial needs would enable them to reenter the labor market and once again become contributing members of their communities.

This bill responds to the unemployment problem; it will help put people back to work; and it will provide permanent and needed capital improvements.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this necessary legislation.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Amendments of 1972.

Because of the great and varied needs of my district, I have long been a supporter of economic development programs which, while seeking to provide immediate relief for depressed areas, concurrently draw upon the resources of their people to assure them long-range productivity and self-supportiveness.

All of us are aware of the difficulties we experienced with similar legislation last year. Congress, last June, enacted S. 575, the Appalachian and Regional Development Amendments of 1971. Title I of that legislation contained emergency provisions for rapid job creation and allocated \$2 billion for the construction of a portion of our great backlog of needed

public facilities. When the President vetoed the measure, he shattered the hopes of approximately 420,000 unemployed Americans who would have found jobs through the accelerated public works program.

Later efforts to deal with this situation were largely unsuccessful—in fact, the level of appropriations last August as compared with authorizations was the lowest for public works projects in 7 years. More problems were encountered toward the end of the year when it became apparent that the language of the Economic Development Act, stating that between 25 and 35 percent of moneys appropriated for title I programs be expended under the accelerated public works criteria, was inhibiting the development of public works impact projects throughout the country, while the low level of funding for accelerated public works projects was destroying the hopes of those who had expected to secure employment under the program.

I am, therefore, very pleased to note that this legislation has separate authorizations for sections 105 and 107, thereby permitting the orderly carrying out and planning of both long range and accelerated public works projects. I am also extremely pleased that the Secretary's authority in the area of financial assistance for business development has been modified to allow him to guarantee up to 90 percent of the outstanding unpaid balance of loans and up to 90 percent of remaining rental payments under leases and loans made by private institutions to lessees and borrowers in redevelopment areas. This change, I know, will greatly enhance the level of private investment in these areas of need.

In New York City and similar urban areas the lease guarantee authority could be crucial in the development of vertical industrial parks in core city areas. That type of development would bring jobs into locations where many of the unemployed live, could assist in eliminating our transportation problems, and could well reverse the trend for the abandonment and disintegration of our cities.

The authority granted under this measure for operational grants to vocational training facilities was long needed.

So much for the highlights. My problems with this measure are largely restricted to title VIII, pollution control facilities, which in my opinion needs changes to insure workers' rights. I shall give my support to clarifying and strengthening amendments designed to safeguard the interests of those who lose their jobs because of the implementation of Federal environmental quality laws, whether such rights and interests be in the area of unemployment compensation or pension rights. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support such moves.

However, on the whole, I believe that the committee has reported out a measure worthy of support and needed by the Nation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this Nation today faces an unemployment problem of nagging persistence. The administration may take pride in the recent downturn of unemployment to 5.5

percent, but the fact remains that this is an unacceptably high rate.

There are more than 2 million more Americans unemployed than when the present administration took over 4 years ago. As many Members of this House are well aware, there are a large number of areas in this country where the problem is far graver than the national picture indicates. In some areas, in fact, the problem has assumed depression-like characteristics. In my own district, the 24th of Illinois, the latest available unemployment rate for Madison County is 7.1 percent. For St. Clair County it is even higher at 9.2 percent. The rate for St. Clair County, high though it is, is deceptive since this county contains the city of East St. Louis where the unemployment rate is far worse than the country as a whole. Furthermore, there is evidence that the statistics that we so trustingly use are understated in that they do not include the underemployed or those who have left that job market out of discouragement.

An attempt was made in 1965 to provide a program of public works to help areas of serious unemployment. This program, embodied in the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, has produced many good results. However, over the last few years it has become evident that not enough was being done to provide immediate job opportunities for seriously depressed areas. An attempt was made last year by the House Committee on Public Works to provide such help with a \$2 billion accelerated public works program. The President, however, saw this program as leading to "wasteful, hurriedly planned projects" and gave it an ill-advised veto. Fortunately, the committee salvaged a portion of this program by amending the act of 1965. However, only \$45 million was made available in fiscal 1972 for this program, now called the public works impact program, out of an authorization of \$280 million.

The bill before us today would amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act, extending it through fiscal year 1974, liberalizing certain conditions, and making numerous other improvements. The most important provisions of this bill, however, are those affecting the public works impact program. The bill recognizes the importance of this program by setting it up as a separate program with its own \$500 million-per-year authorization rather than leaving it as part of the regular grant program. Thus the act now has two categories of public works grants; those designed for long-term improvement in economic conditions and the impact program, designed to provide immediate employment.

It should be emphasized that the grants under the impact program are not for "make work" or "boondoggle" projects but are for projects which fulfill a pressing need in the areas in which they are to be located as well as providing "immediate useful work to the unemployed and underemployed persons in these areas." There is also no lack of worthwhile projects for which to utilize funds under this program. The National League of Cities has estimated, for example, that from \$33 to \$37 billion will be

needed for sewage treatment facilities alone in communities throughout the United States during the period 1971-76. The 24th district alone has at this time no less than 42 applications for sewer and water grants before the Department of Housing and Urban Development. These and other types of public works not only create immediate job opportunities but provide the facilities which are essential to attract industry and business vital to the long-term economic growth of such areas as the 24th district.

As the representative of a district which is afflicted with high unemployment, I strongly urge the passage of this bill. I feel that the concept of the public works impact program has been adequately tested and that it does create sorely needed jobs not only in the construction industry but in other sectors of the economy as well. This bill, if it becomes law and is adequately funded, will go a long way toward relieving the chronic unemployment which plagues many areas of our Nation.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972. This legislation has been formulated with the laudable purpose of concentrating our Nation's energies toward a solution to our present economic troubles, particularly with regard to the continued high level of unemployment.

As a cosponsor of the public works impact section of this bill, I am pleased that we will have this opportunity to put the House of Representatives on record once again in support of America's millions of jobless citizens.

Unemployment continues at an unacceptably high level. In my own State of New Jersey, approximately 7 percent of the work force was unemployed in June. Nationwide the jobless rate is now 5.5 percent.

The public works program is a proven method of providing assistance to areas of high unemployment to create meaningful work for the jobless. Under the measure before the House today, we will, overall, authorize \$3.18 billion in additional funds over the next 2 years for a variety of much needed public works programs.

Programs authorized by H.R. 16071 include the public works impact program under which areas of high unemployment, concentrated low income, or substantial outmigration would receive \$500 million in each of the next 2 fiscal years to create new jobs. The program will assist local communities with 80-percent matching grants to build public facilities such as hospitals, libraries, water and sewer lines, municipal buildings, police stations, and storm drainage systems.

Therefore, the program will have the dual result of reducing unemployment, particularly in the hard-hit construction industry, and providing needed local facilities without overburdening the local tax rate.

Another important section of this legislation would establish the environmental effects program which would provide assistance to individuals who have lost their jobs as a result of Federal environ-

mental orders. For those persons who find themselves threatened with foreclosure or eviction, temporary mortgage and rental payments will also be provided.

Mr. Chairman, an expanded public works program is necessary in order to break the back of our chronically high rate of unemployment. There is no such thing as an "acceptable level of unemployment." We in the Congress must continue to seize the initiative to achieve a truly full employment economy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, this legislation has the bipartisan support of the Committee on Public Works and it merits the same bipartisan endorsement of the House because it can help us correct terrible economic injustices that are rampant in many parts of our country today.

Through no fault of their own, nearly 5 million of our fellow citizens are jobless today and literally hundreds of communities are in danger of becoming ghost towns for lack of the commerce, industry, jobs, and payrolls they need to stay alive.

These men and women, and their communities, have exhausted their own resources; they are looking to us, their elected Representatives in Congress, not for a handout, but for a helping hand to bring them back into the mainstream of our national prosperity.

This legislation offers them that helping hand. Conscience dictates that we must offer our hand because they are our neighbors, our fellow Americans. Self-interest demands that we offer it because the massive unemployment and the major pockets of depression that exist in our country today threaten the well-being of the entire Nation.

We have heard it said that this wealthiest Nation on earth cannot afford the cost of this legislation, on top of all the other burdens the American taxpayer has assumed.

But I submit that the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, clearly disposed of that fallacy when he presented this bill to the Rules Committee yesterday.

Chairman BLATNIK pointed out that this measure will not add 1 penny to the taxpayers' burden; rather, it will lighten that burden because it will take workers off the welfare rolls, off the unemployment compensation lists, and place them in productive, revenue-producing jobs.

Today, we are pouring \$1½ billion of the American taxpayers' money into welfare and almost one-half billion dollars into unemployment compensation every month—a staggering total of \$24 billion a year to support millions of our fellow citizens in unfortunate idleness.

Every job that this legislation creates—and it will create many thousands of jobs—takes a family off the welfare rolls or a family breadwinner off the unemployment compensation roster, restores one more American's dignity, and strengthens the economic fabric of the community and the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, commonsense and our common interest demand the passage of this legislation by a margin that will make clear to millions of our less fortunate countrymen our determination to restore them to the mainstream of America.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this essential legislation and to endorse its objectives, which are stated so clearly in the report of the House Public Works Committee:

To provide Federal assistance, in cooperation with the States, to the economically distressed areas and regions of our Nation suffering from a high rate of unemployment and underemployment, to enable those areas and regions to help themselves in developing long lasting economic improvement.

We have had 7 years of experience with this legislation, going back to the passage of the original Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the programs it has made possible have been effective; they have generated jobs and payrolls in communities all across the country where jobs and payrolls were most urgently needed; they have restored economic stability and strength to many depressed areas that had been left behind the general prosperity.

I have seen these programs operate in my own Fifth District of West Virginia where, since 1968, we have undertaken 27 self-help projects combining local funds and local initiative with Federal funds and the technical assistance of Federal experts. We have not yet been brought back into the mainstream of our Nation's economic growth, but we are moving in that direction, and the despair that gripped so many of our communities not long ago is giving way to hope and confidence.

Our small communities in West Virginia and elsewhere across the Nation have much to offer toward the solution of the problems of congestion and pollution that plague our major urban centers today. These communities can offer many thousands of acres of uncrowded, unpolluted land, an abundance of human resources, untapped natural resources, and the will to work for the common good.

We have an opportunity in this legislation to marshal the strengths of these long-neglected communities, to stem the outmigration of their young people, and to train them for productive futures in their hometowns.

We have an opportunity to turn these communities around, to enable them to plan and build for a brighter tomorrow, not only for themselves but for all America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this constructive legislation so that we can build on the progress already achieved and keep alive the hope that has been inspired in so many distressed communities of our land.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, legislation to extend and expand the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. As an original sponsor of this measure, I strongly support its objective of helping people in areas of high unemployment develop long lasting economic improvement.

The State of Hawaii and other States will benefit from the provisions of this legislation designed to stimulate employment opportunities and improve the economic base of poor neighborhoods.

A total of \$4.4 billion in economic development funds is authorized by the

bill. The impact of these funds, being utilized in distressed areas having the greatest need for the influx of new capital, will be a tremendous lift for the national economy. It will also provide thousands of new jobs for those in areas which have been hit hardest by lagging growth and other economic adversity.

One of the major features of the bill is the authorization of \$500 million a year through fiscal year 1974 for the immediate job of creating accelerated public works impact program in places where unemployment is significantly above the national average. We have several areas in Hawaii which could benefit from the enactment of this bill.

This impact program is designed to assist communities with 80 percent matching grants to build public facilities such as nursing homes, hospitals, libraries, and water and sewer lines.

In addition, the legislation authorizes \$800 million for each of fiscal years 1973 and 1974 in direct and supplementary grants through the Economic Development Administration for long-term development and permanent employment projects in depressed areas; authorizes \$920 million through fiscal year 1974 for regional development commissions; authorizes \$100 million a year for the 2-year period for long-term, low-interest rate loans to help industries install pollution control equipment; authorizes \$100 million through fiscal year 1974 for unemployment compensation and rent and mortgage assistance for workers who lose jobs because of environmental protection orders; and authorizes \$100 million through fiscal year 1974 in technical aid to local governments which lack the expertise to conduct their own administration and planning studies.

This important legislation is designed to help this Nation surmount the economic doldrums of the past several years, and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues today in expressing strong support for the passage of H.R. 16071, the bill to approve and expand the accelerated public works impact program.

If passed into law, this bill will authorize \$500 million—through fiscal year 1974—for the creation of urgently needed public service jobs in local communities which are suffering from excessive levels of unemployment. Eligible cities and counties will benefit from participation in these programs in two ways. First of all, the legislation will help high-unemployment areas to relieve their unemployment problems by creating jobs that local communities can no longer afford to provide. And second, jobs will be created which will help these localities to attack some of their most pressing problems. Projects which could be initiated as a result of the passage of this legislation include the establishment of badly needed facilities such as hospitals, police stations, libraries, community centers, as well as the expansion of programs to improve water and storm drainage systems, sewers, and water purification projects.

Two other important features of this legislation include an authorization of \$100 million, during the next 2 years, for

unemployment compensation to workers who have lost their jobs as a result of environmental protection orders, and an authorization of \$15 million to aid local governments in their operation of vocational training programs.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the last 3 years, this country has been plagued with persistently high levels of unemployment. While the Nixon administration has held firm in its belief that unemployment is a necessary evil in the battle to combat inflation, millions of American men and women have continued to suffer from the impact of long-term unemployment. We have seen the level of unemployment rise sharply from 2.7 million in January 1969, to over 5.1 million as of July 1972.

Congress, in response to this continuing crisis, has been required to assume the mantle of leadership which has been so seriously neglected by the present administration. We have put forth a variety of programs in an effort to stimulate the economy and to provide jobs in areas of critical importance to communities across the country.

A little over a year ago, the House and Senate overwhelmingly approved accelerated public works legislation only to have it vetoed by President Nixon, who called it a "deficient approach" to the unemployment problem. Now, a year later, the unemployment situation remains at the depressing figure of 5.5 percent and the Nixon administration has still failed to offer any substantive programs to deal with the problem.

In his June 29 press conference, President Nixon confessed that he was "not a bit satisfied" with the unemployment situation and he stated his intention to "explore other means to bring the rate of unemployment down."

Mr. Chairman, I share President Nixon's dissatisfaction. While I am aware that the problem of reducing the rate of unemployment is a very difficult one, I disagree completely with the President's premise that it is a problem that will disappear if we just ignore it long enough. The past 3½ years demonstrate that this will not work.

Obviously, the accelerated public works program will not provide a panacea for all of the problems of our depressed economy. However, I believe it is a responsible and progressive approach to a problem that desperately calls for action, not inaction.

I strongly urge my colleagues to give this bill the strong support which it deserves and I hope that this year the President will choose to reconsider his position and approve this critically important piece of legislation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, with some reluctance, I think I must vote against passage of the pending bill, H.R. 16071. Congress should take appropriate steps to assist people who suffer economic dislocation as a result of being thrown out of work because of the application of Federal environmental impact orders.

However, as I understand it, no committee hearings were held on this matter, which involves not only unemployment compensation payments, but also temporary assistance in the form of mortgage and rental payments and moving ex-

penses. I am advised that the types and conditions of assistance under this particular bill have not been coordinated and dovetailed with similar types of assistance available under other programs such as those involved in trade adjustment economic dislocation assistance.

I just do not believe adequate consideration has been given to this open-ended, uncoordinated feature of the bill.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, because our colleague, Congressman LAMAR BAKER, is on an official leave of absence as a delegate from Tennessee on the resolutions committee of the Republican Party meeting in Miami this week, he is unable to be here this afternoon.

However, he worked with us in developing this legislation and shares our reservations on certain aspects. Thus, at this point, I would like to insert his remarks on this economic development legislation:

STATEMENT OF HON. LAMAR BAKER ON PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. Chairman, by and large, I strongly support these Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments. The Economic Development Administration is carrying out its mandate and administering its programs in a highly commendable manner, and this legislation to continue and improve their programs deserves the support of all of us.

Nevertheless, I must stress my serious reservations, which we also noted in filing our minority views, regarding section 9 of this bill which would add a new Title VIII "Environmental Effects" to the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Section 801 would provide for assistance to working people whose jobs are lost due to the issuance of a federal environmental quality standard or order. Subsection 801(c) would provide a federally-paid unemployment compensation benefit based upon 60% of the worker's former weekly wage without a dollar limit, and would provide for the payment of rent or purchase contract or mortgage payments upon written notice of eviction from or foreclosure of his principal place of residence, for up to one year.

The examples cited in our minority views clearly show what a windfall this would be. Just imagine, a wage earner with two dependents earning four dollars an hour could receive about \$8,000 per year without working a day. A wage earner earning \$20,000 per year with two dependents would receive benefits equivalent to \$17,000—making his effective income after taxes higher by \$640 a year when he is not working than when he is working.

I can hardly believe, Mr. Chairman, that Congress wants to encourage industry to fold up because their employees and officials can be amply taken care of under this provision rather than making the necessary adjustments to accommodate the environmental needs.

Further, I have very real doubts about the propriety of using the EDA program to get into such a major unemployment compensation business. This legislation is just not the proper place for this type of language.

I agree that EDA funds should be available to help salvage any business which finds itself in dire straits because of anti-pollution activities. However, I firmly believe that if anyone in any industry, knowingly or otherwise, contributes to unsafe air and water, then it is their obligation to clean it up—American taxpayers across the Nation ought not to be burdened with problems in one area.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my strong support for H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1972.

The concept behind this legislation has proved to be effective since its inception but its efficacy is matched by the competent handling of the programs by the officials at the Economic Development Administration.

These men and women continue to adopt a constructive and helpful attitude that has resulted in our north coast of California area being able to make good strides toward meeting our full economic potential and diversifying our economy in a planned, disciplined way.

The First Congressional District I am privileged to represent in the Congress has historically been an area of high unemployment and its reliance on one major industry has limited its ability to fulfill the needs and aspirations of its residents. Our area marks a true proving ground for the programs of the Economic Development Administration. I am pleased that a good working relationship has developed between the local people and the EDA officials. I know it will continue and work for the benefit of the Redwood Empire.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972. This bill would continue and expand one of the truly successful and effective programs we have in helping economically distressed areas to help themselves. It is not a one-shot program having only temporary benefit, but a long-term endeavor to make permanent, tangible economic improvement possible in those parts of the country which have lagged behind the mainstream of national economic development. Through long-range planning, community facility grants and loans, business grants and loans, and technical assistance, EDA works with States, area-wide development districts, and local communities to create more viable and diversified local economies and expanded job opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed.

During the nearly 2 weeks of hearings on the 1965 act, as amended, the subcommittee received considerable testimony reflecting the wide support and general effectiveness of EDA programs and suggesting where we might improve program criteria, guidelines, administration, and delivery. The refinements and revisions contained in H.R. 16071 recognize the nature of current economic conditions and the need to maximize the efficient utilization of program resources.

The bill extends the economic development programs to June 30, 1974, and authorizes \$3.18 billion in new funds. Because of the severe financial problems facing disadvantaged communities, the bill allows supplemental grants to work to reduce the local share of project costs and decrease their share in the case of combined grants from 20 to 10 percent.

Under the 1971 amendments to the act, the public works impact program—PWIP—was created to provide immediate useful employment in areas of threatened or actual unemployment, a concentration of low income families, or

substantial outmigration through supplemental grants to 100 percent of a public facility project costs.

PWIP has been quite successful in creating jobs and building badly needed community facilities. This is true in our own 10th Congressional District where three projects were approved in fiscal year 1972 with 80 percent EDA fundings. The bill continues PWIP in its special role and authorizes \$1 billion in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974. In addition the bill provides for guaranteed loans and leases for business development, technical assistance to local sponsors in filing applications, upstart grants for the operation of vocational training facilities, stronger program coordination at the Federal, State, and local level, redefinition of special impact areas, continuation of economic development districts under certain circumstances, and a moratorium of area designation. These revisions are important and make for a better and more responsive program.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to associate myself fully with the comments of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN).

At the same time, I want to express my admiration and appreciation for his effective leadership in advancing the legislation we are considering today.

His helpful, cooperative, and constructive attitude while serving as chairman of our Subcommittee on Economic Development Programs makes it a privilege to be associated with him in our work on the Public Works Committee.

The gentleman from South Carolina is truly a southern gentleman in the most complimentary sense of the word. Both the general public and the direct beneficiaries of EDA programs are deeply in his debt.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I have cosponsored accelerated public works bills in both sessions of this Congress. I have done so for a variety of reasons.

First, I believe it is inexcusable to permit widespread unemployment when we have available the tools to correct the problem. I need not describe here the despair that grips a man who wants to work but cannot. Nor need I dwell on the effects of unemployment on his family. Some of us here today—and I am one—have been through this agony and most of us promised in the 1970 election to use our best efforts to combat unemployment.

Second, the use of an accelerated public works process is a tested and valid method for dealing with unemployment. We observed its success in the thirties and we have seen it work in the sixties under President Kennedy.

Third, the benefits of the work to be done will, in the future, forestall unemployment by creating circumstances in which private enterprise can prosper and thrive.

Fourth, this particular bill makes good use of the efforts we have already made to identify the areas where unemployment is severe. The bill compliments existing programs.

Fifth, the bill is fiscally responsible. The amount of money authorized is reasonable. Moreover, it makes good fiscal sense for the Government to promote its construction programs when the productive capacity of private enterprise is not being fully used.

All projects to be funded by the bill would be built sooner or later anyway. How much better it is to build them now at lower costs and at a time when the work generated will be most welcome.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to avoid welfare handouts if we can. But the only alternative for a humane society is to assure the opportunity to work for all our citizens. The bill before the House provides this opportunity and, at the same time, it provides needed capital improvements throughout our Nation. The bill makes good sense and deserves our support.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my full support for H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments. I cosponsored accelerated public works legislation both last year and this year. The bill now before us provides authorization for vitally needed public works projects. It would have the additional benefit of substantially reducing the very serious unemployment which has persisted so long.

President Nixon has consistently obstructed all efforts to reduce unemployment. He talks of reducing welfare rolls but his policies keep millions on unemployment rolls. Programs which would have provided substantial numbers of jobs have had their funds impounded by the Office of Management and Budget. A prime example is the \$500 million appropriated for water and sewer grants last year. One justification given at that time was that public works projects take too long to make an impact on the unemployment situation. That was one full year ago. Unemployment is still hovering around six percent nationally and is far above that in our central cities and poor rural communities. If the President had approved the legislation last year, we could have made some real progress by now. We must give him that opportunity again.

Two provisions of this bill are deserving of special attention. The first is the authorization of \$500 million in fiscal year 1973 and \$500 million in fiscal year 1974 for the public works impact program. The entire amount available for this program—nearly \$48 million—was obligated last year. Grants of up to 100 percent of project cost are available under this program to areas having threatened or actual high unemployment, a concentration of low income residents, or substantial out migration. The authorization of \$500 million is fully justified, and I am hopeful that the full amount will be appropriated.

Finally, the bill deals with the problem of loss of employment as a result of environmental protection orders.

It provides for low interest loans to enterprises which would otherwise have to close down because of environmental regulations. It also provides unemploy-

ment compensation payments to employees who lose jobs because of such orders.

The administration's failure to confront the unemployment crisis cannot be tolerated. We must act to provide jobs for the more than 5 million jobless people. I think this bill is an effective approach. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting both the bill and the necessary appropriations.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the high unemployment rate in this country is creating a desperate situation for many Americans. Families that once proudly provided for their own means now find themselves without employment and no income. I have strongly urged for many years some concerted effort on the part of Congress to find a way to alleviate this problem.

One substantial effort toward this goal is H.R. 16071, introduced by my distinguished colleague JOHN McFALL and of which I am a cosponsor.

H.R. 16071 will increase assistance to high unemployment "special impact" areas. The bill will help to create additional employment in the construction industry including building trades, which suffer from an unemployment level far above the national average. Eight hundred million dollars would be authorized for the EDA on-going public works program, a necessary step to lower unemployment. Funds would also be allocated to regional and local authorities in order to insure that the most pressing needs of any area would receive attention first. H.R. 16071 would authorize \$100 million through 1974 for unemployment compensation for those workers whose jobs are lost due to environmental protection studies. This is a major area of concern, because although it is very important to safeguard our environment we must also make certain that no hardships are created in this effort.

This bill also provides for a 90-percent loan guarantee to aid business firms in redevelopment areas. We must insure that business will have an incentive to develop in other areas.

I do not contend that more Government jobs is the whole answer to the problem of unemployment, but it would appear to be at least a part of it. We must now pinpoint the attack on joblessness in this country. Unemployment has reached an intolerable level. We can no longer sit by and watch severe hardship overtake decent Americans. These are the same Americans who worked all their lives, as long as they had a job. They worked for the benefit of their families. They worked because they felt that as long as they were able to, it was their duty.

H.R. 16071 will help to eliminate some of this problem. It will provide jobs that do not now exist, for the many Americans who are desperately searching for work. We must not let these people down. We must begin the battle against unemployment. It is for these reasons that I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 16071.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged with our positive action in regard to H.R. 16071, the Public Works

and Economic Development Amendments of 1972. Administrative attempts to cope with the current economic crisis have been basically ineffective to date. The President's efforts to check inflation have resulted in massive unemployment.

This bill, which authorizes specified appropriations for fiscal years 1973 and 1974, not only extends aid to already existing public works programs, but also provides funds for new public works programs in economically depressed areas. The benefits from such legislation are twofold. H.R. 16071 will provide jobs for scores of unemployed who would otherwise remain faceless statistics on our unemployment lists. In addition, a multitude of public necessities will be satisfied. Public works projects will include the construction of police stations, libraries, airport facilities, street lighting and so on.

Since World War II we have spent \$1,300 billion on our military and defense programs. In the same period an additional \$100 billion has been authorized for foreign aid. The time has long been due for us to turn our attention to the critical domestic needs of our Nation. The public works bill on which we have just acted is a step in that direction.

While favoring the overall nature of H.R. 16071 I must stand in disagreement with title VIII, sections 801 and 802. This amendment provides novel benefits for those affected by Government measures geared to the improvement of environmental quality. I have always condoned those actions which improve the environment when conducted in a responsible manner. It is inevitable that industries which cannot adjust to essential standards will suffer adverse consequences. Compensation of some sort must be available but this compensation must be prudently controlled within functional guidelines.

Section 801 would insure that up to 60 percent—but not to exceed \$129 per week—of one's salary would be guaranteed for 78 weeks if that person finds himself unemployed because of Government enforced environmental action. Other benefits include temporary mortgage and rental payments and relocation assistance. There are problems with this provision. An employee covered by this section is given the advantage of 26 additional weeks of unemployment compensation over the standard 52 weeks with which others in the same predicament must be satisfied. There is no requirement that the recipient be available and actively seeking employment. There is a dearth of incentive to find a job which runs contra to the desired goals of H.R. 16071. There is a strong possibility that this section will cause duplication of already existing programs such as trade adjustment dislocation assistance.

Section 802 provides 30-year, 3-percent interest loans to enterprises which may otherwise be forced to close or reduce the number of their employees as a result of environmental orders unless they adjust their pollution generating operations. This smacks of the same preferen-

tial treatment given to Lockheed which so many of us actively opposed. It is feasible that an industry could use this assistance to their advantage and find themselves in a substantially improved situation requiring fewer employees with little or no effort. Many industries should have taken it upon themselves to adjust their environmentally damaging procedures long ago rather than wait for massive Federal assistance.

There is much good to be gained from programs which offer aid to those who are affected by environmental directives. But such programs must be given our closest attention if they are to be truly meaningful.

H.R. 16071 is a landmark in domestic legislation. If and when it becomes public law it will be a boon to the unemployed. Public oriented projects will be expanded in a forward attempt to meet our society's demands. With direction, perseverance and responsible administration the public works and economic development amendments which we have passed will, for the most part, promote our country's prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported 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 this Act may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: Congress further declares that the aforesaid conditions have caused substantial outmigration from rural to urban areas frustrating orderly national growth and aggravating the economic and social conditions of areas of outmigration as well as central cities. Orderly development of the Nation's economy should anticipate and account for dislocation of jobs due to technological change, shifting trade patterns, environmental adjustments, and the continuing need to make geographical adaptations to economic problems."

SEC. 3. Title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) By striking in subsection (a) (1) (D) of section 101 "a redevelopment" and inserting in lieu thereof "an"; and by striking "401(a) (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "107".

(2) By striking in subsection (c) of section 101 the number "20" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "10".

(3) By striking in subsection (c) of section 101 "a redevelopment area designated as such under section 401(a) (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "an area designated as such under section 107".

(4) By striking in subsection (c) of section 101 the entire sentence beginning with "Notwithstanding" and ending with "the applicable law".

(5) By striking in subsection (c) of section 101 the words "the nature of the project to be assisted" and all that follows down through and including the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and the nature of the project to be assisted."

(6) By striking in subsection (a) of section 102 "In addition to the assistance otherwise authorized," and by capitalizing the word "the" immediately following.

(7) By inserting in section 104 after the words "pursuant to" the words "section 105 of".

(8) By inserting in section 105 after the word "title" the words "(except as provided in section 107)"; by striking in the first sentence the words "and June 30, 1973.", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974."; by striking in the third sentence the words "years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "year ending June 30, 1972."; by striking in the third sentence the words "redevelopment" and "as such"; and by striking in the third sentence "401(a) (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "107".

(9) By adding at the end of such title the following new section:

"PUBLIC WORKS IMPACT PROGRAM"

"SEC. 107. (a) The Secretary is authorized to designate those communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which he determines have one of the following conditions:

"(1) a large concentration of low-income persons;

"(2) rural areas having substantial outmigration;

"(3) substantial unemployment; or

"(4) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment.

No area designated under this section shall be subject to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 101 of this title. No area designated under this section shall be eligible to meet the requirements of section 403(a) (1) (B) of this Act. Each area designated under this section shall be known as a public works impact area.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants, in accordance with the provisions of this title, to areas designated under this section.

"(c) Areas designated under this section shall be subject to a periodic review of eligibility (but at least annually) and the Secretary shall terminate the designation of any such area whenever it no longer satisfies the requirements of this section.

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not to exceed \$500,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974."

SEC. 4. Title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting in subsection (c) of section 201 after the words "and guaranteeing loans" the words "and lease rentals"; and by striking "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

(2) The catchline for section 202 is amended by striking the words "LOANS AND GUARANTEES" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT".

(3) By striking all of subsection (a) of section 202 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"SEC. 202. (a) (1) The Secretary is authorized to aid in financing, within a redevelopment area, the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing build-

ings by (A) purchasing evidences of indebtedness, (B) making loans (which for purposes of this section shall include participation in loans), (C) guaranteeing loans made to private borrowers by private lending institutions, for any of the purposes referred to in this paragraph upon application of such institution and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that no such guarantee shall at any time exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to aid in financing any industrial or commercial activity within a redevelopment area by (A) making working capital loans, (B) guaranteeing working capital loans made to private borrowers by private lending institutions upon application of such institution and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that no such guarantee shall at any time exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan, (C) guaranteeing rental payments of leases, except that no such guarantee shall exceed 90 per centum of the remaining rental payments required by the lease."

(4) By inserting in subsection (b) (6) of section 202 after the word "repayment," the following sentence: "No lease guarantee shall be made unless the Secretary determines that there is a reasonable assurance of payment of the rentals required by the lease."

(5) By striking in subsection (b) (7) of section 202 the comma after the words "no loan" and inserting immediately thereafter the words "or guarantee."

(6) By striking in subsection (b) (9) of section 202 the number "65" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "75".

Sec. 5. Title III of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

(1) By inserting after the second sentence in subsection (a) of section 301 the following: "Such assistance shall include aiding an applicant in applying for assistance under this Act if such applicant does not possess the expertise and does not possess the ability to obtain the expertise necessary to perform the technical aspects of application."

(2) By inserting in subsection (b) of section 301 immediately after the word "thereof" the following: ", except that in the case of a grant under this subsection to an Indian tribe the Secretary is authorized to defray up to 100 per centum of such expenses".

(3) By striking out in subsection (b) of section 301 the following: "the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962," and inserting in lieu thereof "title 23, United States Code."

(4) By adding new subsections (g) and (h) to section 301 as follows:

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under subsection (a) of this section to any State for the purpose of such State—

"(1) preparing an overall State economic development program;

"(2) providing technical assistance by use of State employees to economic development districts and proposed districts;

"(3) reviewing overall economic development programs prepared by an economic development district or a proposed economic development district.

"(h) The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance under subsection (a) of this section to economic development districts for the purpose of such district:

"(1) providing technical assistance (other than by grant) to local governments within the district;

"(2) carrying out any review procedure required pursuant to title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 if such

district has been designated as the agency to conduct such review."

(5) Section 302 is redesignated as section 303 and immediately following section 301 a new section 302 is inserted as follows:

"Sec. 302. In the case of a vocational training facility constructed with a direct grant under title I of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make grants for the operation of such facility. Such grants may be made for up to 75 per centum of the operating costs of such facility for any two-year period during the five-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 per fiscal year of the funds authorized in section 303 of this title shall be available to carry out this section."

(6) By striking in redesignated section 303 "and June 30, 1973," and inserting in lieu thereof: "June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974."

Sec. 6. Title IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) By amending section 401(a) (6) to read as follows:

"(6) those urban and rural communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which the Secretary determines have one of the following conditions:

"(A) a large concentration of low-income persons;

"(B) substantial unemployment; or

"(C) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment.

No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be eligible to meet the requirements of section 403(a) (1) (B) of this Act."

(2) By striking in section 403(a) (1) (B) the words "two or more redevelopment areas" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least one redevelopment area."

(3) By amending section 403(a) (1) (D) to read as follows:

"(D) the proposed district has a district overall economic development program which—

"(i) includes adequate land use and transportation planning;

"(ii) contains a specific program for district cooperation, self-help, and public investment;

"(iii) is approved by each affected State as consistent with the goals and objectives of each applicable State plan and any overall State economic development program;

"(iv) is approved by the Secretary; and

"(v) provides that a copy be furnished to the appropriate regional commission established under title V of this Act if any part of such proposed district is within such a region, or to the Appalachian Regional Commission established under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 if any part of such proposed district is within the Appalachian region;"

(4) By striking out in section 403(a) (2) (C) "two hundred and fifty thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "five hundred thousand".

(5) By amending subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 403 to read as follows:

"(d) As used in this Act the term—

"(1) 'economic development district' refers to any area within the United States composed of a cooperating redevelopment area or areas and, where appropriate, designated economic growth centers and neighboring counties or communities, which has been designated by the Secretary as an economic development district;

"(2) 'economic growth center' refers to any area within the United States which has been identified as an economic growth

center in an approved district overall economic development program and which has been designated by the Secretary as eligible for financial assistance under sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section; and

"(3) 'local government' means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to provide, in accordance with the applicable requirements of this Act, financial assistance to those parts of an economic development district which are not within a redevelopment area when such assistance will be of significant direct benefit to a redevelopment area within such district. Such financial assistance shall be provided in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in this Act for a redevelopment area, except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to permit such parts to receive the increase in the amount of grant assistance authorized in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(f) In addition to technical assistance under section 301(a) of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to an economic development district to pay not to exceed 75 per centum of the administrative expenses, and not to exceed 100 per centum of planning expenses, of such district. In any case where the designation of an economic development district is terminated under subsection (c) of this section before the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the date of designation of such district, grants may be made under this subsection for such additional time as may be necessary to insure that such former district will receive administrative and planning grants during such five-year period. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration of all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services. Where practicable, planning grants authorized by this subsection shall be used in conjunction with other available planning grants, such as urban planning grants, authorized under the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and highway planning and research grants authorized by title 23, United States Code, to assure adequate and effective planning and economical use of funds. For the purposes of this subsection there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$20,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974."

(6) By striking in subsection (g) of section 403 "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

Sec. 7. (a) Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting in clause (7) of subsection 503(a) after the words "other Federal, State," the following: "district."

(2) By amending section 503 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Each Commission shall provide for public participation in the development and revision of any plan or program developed or prepared by such Commission."

(3) By striking out in the first sentence of section 505(a) (2) the phrase "and training programs" and inserting in lieu thereof: "training programs, and the payment of administrative expenses".

(4) By amending section 505(c) to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out subsection (a) (1) and subsection (b) of this section there may be expended in any fiscal year out of funds appropriated under authority of section 509(d) of this title, such sums as are necessary up

to a maximum of 10 per centum of the funds appropriated for each regional commission."

(5) By inserting in section 509(d) "(1)" immediately after "(d)".

(6) By striking out in the first sentence of section 509(d) "two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$305,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, to remain available until expended, \$152,500,000."

(7) By striking out in the third sentence of section 509 (d) "authorization" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph".

(8) By adding in section 509(d) at the end thereof the following:

"(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, not to exceed \$100,000,000 per fiscal year for each regional commission which has a comprehensive long-range economic plan approved under section 503(a) (2) of this Act, and not to exceed \$20,000,000 per fiscal year for each regional commission which does not have such an approved plan."

(9) Section 511 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 511. (a) The Secretary shall coordinate his activities in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act and in providing technical assistance under title III of this Act, with those of each of the Federal Cochairmen under this title, and each Federal Cochairman shall coordinate his activities under this title with those of the Secretary in making grants and loans under titles I and II of this Act and in providing technical assistance under title III of this Act.

"(b) Each regional commission shall coordinate its activities under paragraphs (2) and (7) of subsection (a) of section 503 of this Act with the economic development districts in such region."

"(b) The amendment made by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall not be construed as affecting the validity of any plan or program which has been developed or revised prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 8. Title VII of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 701 (4) is amended by inserting immediately after "with loans" the following: "or guarantees"; and by inserting after "such loans" the following: "or guarantees".

(2) Section 701(5) is amended by inserting after "maturity" the following: "or term"; and by inserting after "any loan" the following: "or guarantee"; by inserting after "in such loan" the following: "or guarantee"; and by inserting after "of such loan" the following: "or guaranteed obligation."

(3) Section 701(6) is amended by inserting after "loans" the following: "or guarantees".

(4) Section 701(7) is amended by inserting after "loans" each of the two places it appears the following: "or guarantees".

(5) Section 701(9) is amended by inserting after "loans" the following: "or guarantees".

Sec. 9. The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VIII—ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

"Sec. 801. (a) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall on his own motion or not later than thirty days from the date he receives a written request of an employee of an affected plant or industry, or his representative, initiate an inves-

tigation of any employment loss which results or may result from the issuance of a standard or order under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, or any other Federal law having for its primary purpose the improvement of environmental quality. Such investigation shall be completed and a report of employment loss submitted to the Secretary of Labor not later than the sixtieth day after the date of initiation of investigation. The Secretary of Labor, upon receipt of such report, shall certify as unemployed as a result of such standard or order all employees who are unemployed as a result of such standard or order with respect to which the Administrator has conducted an investigation under this subsection. An individual to be eligible for certification for assistance under this section shall have had in the seventy-eight weeks immediately preceding his unemployment at least twenty-six weeks of employment in the plant or industry affected.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to provide to any individual certified as unemployed under subsection (a) unemployment compensation. Such unemployment compensation shall equal at least 60 per centum of the individual's former weekly wage and shall be paid so long as such person is unemployed, or until he retires from the labor force, whichever period is the lesser, except that no unemployment compensation shall be paid to any individual under this subsection for a period of more than seventy-eight weeks.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide assistance on a temporary basis in the form of mortgage or rental payments to or on behalf of an individual certified under this section as unemployed who, as a result of financial hardship caused by such unemployment has received written notice of dispossession or eviction from his principal place of residence by reason of foreclosure of any mortgage or lien, cancellation of any contract or sale, or termination of any lease, entered into prior to such unemployment. Such assistance shall be provided for a period not to exceed one year or for the duration of the period of financial hardship, whichever is lesser.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to provide reemployment assistance services under other laws to individuals who are certified under this section as unemployed.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to pay the actual reasonable moving expenses of any individual (including his family and his household effects) certified under this section as unemployed who is unable to find employment a reasonable distance from his principal place of residence at the time of such unemployment and who finds employment beyond such distance.

"(f) There is authorized to be appropriated, not to exceed \$100,000,000 for carrying out this section.

"POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES LOANS

"Sec. 802. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans (which for purposes of this section shall include participation in loans) to aid in financing any project in the United States for the acquisition, construction, or alteration of pollution control facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one part of the United States to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest, or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting, other contractors or subcontractors of contracts there-

tofore customarily performed by them; except that such limitations shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary finds that the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment of the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless the Secretary has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

"(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision, and which have been certified by such agency or instrumentality as requiring the loan successfully to remain in operation.

"(3) No loan shall be made unless it is determined that there is reasonable assurance of repayment.

"(4) Subject to section 701(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years.

"(5) Loans made shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury but not more than 3 per centum per annum.

"(6) Loans shall not exceed the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with such pollution control facilities) of acquiring, constructing, or altering the pollution control facility.

"(7) The pollution control facility for which a loan is requested must be—

"(A) a facility or equipment used, or
"(B) a modification of methods, processes, or operations where the primary purpose of such modification is to abate or control water or atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, recycling, disposing, or storing of pollutants, contaminants, wastes, or heat and which—

"(i) the State certifying authority having jurisdiction with respect to such facility has certified to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency as having been acquired, constructed, or altered in conformity with State requirements for abatement or control of water or atmospheric pollution or contamination; or

"(ii) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has certified to the Secretary—

"(aa) as being in compliance with the applicable regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency and of all other Federal agencies, and

"(bb) as being in furtherance of the general policy of the United States of cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of water pollution under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, or in the prevention and abatement of atmospheric pollution and contamination under the Clean Air Act.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'State certifying authority' means, in the case of water pollution, the State water pollution control agency as defined in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and, in the case of air pollution, the air pollution control agency as defined in the Clean Air Act. The term 'State certifying authority' includes any

interstate agency authorized to act in place of a certifying authority of the State.

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$100,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, to carry out this section."

SEC. 10. Section 2 of the Act of July 6, 1970 (Public Law 91-304) as amended, is amended by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

SEC. 11. The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, is amended by striking the words "economic development center" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "economic growth center"; and by striking the words "economic development centers" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "economic growth centers".

Mr. JOHNSON of California (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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WRIGHT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: Page 38, strike out lines 23 and 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall equal 60 per centum of the individual's former weekly wage or the maximum payable to him under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which his employment loss occurs, whichever is the greater amount, except that no such individual shall be paid more than the highest amount of unemployment compensation payable to any individual by any State under any unemployment compensation law other than this section. Such unemployment compensation shall be paid so long as such individual is."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in an effort to redress what may have been an oversight in the original drafting of the bill. Some of the Members have brought to the attention of the committee the fact that, in our zeal to protect the displaced worker thrown out of a job because of an environmental protection standard or order, we placed no absolute top maximum on the amount that he could thus receive. Under the bill as presently drafted, such a dislocated worker would be entitled, in addition to certain help in finding another job and help if it is needed on his mortgage payments or his rental payments, to an amount equal to 60 percent of the wage that he had been receiving.

It has been pointed out to the committee that under certain circumstances it is conceivable that an employee making \$100,000 a year might be displaced or thrown out of work and thus under the terms of the bill be entitled to as high a payment as 60 percent of \$100,000, or \$60,000. This of course was not the intent of the committee. So in order to redress that apparent inequity, we offer this

amendment which I think is eminently fair.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the amount of unemployment compensation available to such a displaced person to 60 percent of his former weekly wage or the maximum payable to him under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which his unemployment occurs, whichever of the two is greater, except that no individual would be permitted to be paid more than the highest amount of unemployment compensation payable to any individual by any State under any unemployment compensation law. So we would by the adoption of this amendment avoid any question of duplicate payments. We would avoid enriching someone unduly. We would place a reasonable limitation at the highest level payable by any State under its own unemployment compensation laws, and in no event could it be more than 60 percent of the wage that the employee was receiving.

The imperatives of environmental protection, which all of us recognize, will inevitably dislocate and disaccommodate some unfortunate Americans. That seems a necessity in order to accommodate the needs of the few to the needs of the many. But society does, it seems to me, have the overriding responsibility then to make those workers as whole as we reasonably can, so that the workers do not bear alone the burden of our Nation's environmental effort.

I think this is a humane approach and I think it is a reasonable approach and I think it is a responsible approach. I urge that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the wording of the gentleman's amendment, there is the limitation:

Except that no such individual shall be paid more than the highest amount of unemployment compensation payable to any individual by any State under any unemployment compensation law other than this section.

Is the gentleman intending by that wording to mean any State or by the State where the unemployed man is losing his job?

Mr. WRIGHT. He would receive the highest amount paid by the State in which he was employed or 60 percent of his former earnings, whichever was greater, except that in no case could it exceed the amount paid by the highest and most generous payment made among the States.

I am advised that top figure presently amounts to \$129 weekly. That would be imposed as an absolute top ceiling.

Mr. SNYDER. So if a fellow was in a State where the normal unemployment payment would be \$65 or \$70, something like that, he could then get 60 percent of his pay, or up to \$129, which I understand is the highest in some other State many miles away?

Mr. WRIGHT. If I am correctly ad-

vised, the highest presently extant amounts to \$129 a week. He could receive up to that amount, but in no instance could he receive more than 60 percent of his former income.

Mr. SNYDER. So the limitation is the highest of any of the 50 States, whatever it might be at the time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Exactly so.

Mr. SNYDER. I have one other question. The gentleman says the wording of this prohibits the "double dip," both compensation here and from the regular unemployment compensation law. I do not read it that way. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has said it. However, it looks to me like the wording here is only a limitation.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WRIGHT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. If I correctly read the act and correctly understand the intent of the Congress, and I believe I do, duplicate payments would not be permitted. He could not receive one payment from his own State in unemployment compensation plus an additional payment in the amount herein authorized. The top total amount authorized to be available to him would be the top amount payable by this statute.

Mr. SNYDER. That is the gentleman's interpretation?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is my interpretation.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. My understanding of the purpose of the amendment is that it is offered to answer some of the questions presented to us, by Members, during the presentation of the bill to the Rules Committee, because of a concern over the lack of a limitation in this provision.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct. I believe it was a proper concern.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask if an amendment to strike the entire section is in order as a substitute to this kind of amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that it is not.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16071, and especially as an advocate of the accelerated public works section of this legislation. The rationale underlying this much needed measure and its mechanics

have already been explained to you, and I will not repeat what was said earlier in this debate. But I do want to emphasize that my district in Cleveland, Ohio, needs—desperately—the economic shot in the arm that this legislation would provide. The average annual unemployment rate for the city of Cleveland in 1971 was 11.8 percent—far above the national average. Especially hard hit have been workers in the construction industry who, as you already know, suffer from an unemployment rate that, across the Nation, is twice the national average. In July of this year, the unemployment rate for carpenters, bricklayers, and others in that industry, taken as a whole, was 10.9 percent nationally, compared with an overall unemployment rate of 5.5 percent for the United States in that same month. The accelerated public works program not only offers a very direct solution to this problem, but at the same time it will produce public improvements that are greatly needed—water and sewer plants, airports, hospitals, and other public health facilities, to mention some examples.

Now, as you know, Congress passed an accelerated public works program last year which was promptly vetoed by President Nixon. In view of this fact, some of us here might hesitate to vote again for this program—not because we disagree with it on its merits but out of fear that the President might veto it a second time.

However, I for one do not share this fear, and I shall vote yes on this proposition with full confidence that President Nixon will come around to signing this bill. In the first place, of course, this particular bill is not likely to be as offensive to Mr. Nixon since we are authorizing less money to aid the unemployed—\$500 million a year for 2 years as opposed to the \$2 billion in last year's bill. This alone ought to make it more palatable to the President.

But, Mr. Chairman, the President is very likely to find other reasons—positive reasons—to sign this bill. He is, after all, a pragmatist, and he has shown an admirable capacity to tacitly admit his mistakes and to reverse himself, no matter how embarrassing this might be politically. There are any number of examples of reappraisals of this kind by the President that I could cite. For example, he rejected a bill for public service employment in 1970 but accepted it when we submitted it to him again in 1971. He made a point of renouncing the authority we gave him to impose wage and price controls, only to seize it last year when he finally concluded that his own prescription for the economy had been a failure. He has been a strong critic of deficit spending by Government during the greater part of his public career, but now he has submitted to us a series of deficit budgets, with the definite prospect of more to come. He was one of this country's most outspoken and irreconcilable foes of Communist China, but in an act of high statesmanship, he jettisoned a great deal of past rhetoric and made an

historic trip to that country in a quest for peace.

I submit too, Mr. Chairman, that in this election year the President has additional positive and pragmatic reasons to approve, rather than again to disapprove, an accelerated public works program. As Hobart Rowen has written in the Washington Post:

The administration cannot merely point out that reducing the rate of unemployment in today's society is difficult. It must do something about it. It must consider public works—

And as Alice Rivlin, the distinguished economist, has written:

(The administration was) consciously holding down total government spending in order to create slack in the economy and reduce the inflation. It was not an implausible policy, although the human costs were bound to be high. Many economists thought at the time that it would be worth creating some unemployment in order to lower the rate at which prices were rising. However, the policy did not work. Unemployment rose all right, but the inflation stubbornly refused to subside.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I truly would be astounded if President Nixon were to veto this bill in 1972. If any of us have any uncertainties on this score, I think we can shed them and proceed, as we are doing here, to consider this bill on its merits alone.

At this time, I would like to call attention also to certain other provisions of this bill, which are equally commendable. It provides \$100 million a year for 2 years for long-term, low-interest loans to help industries to finance pollution control equipment. And it provides \$100 million through fiscal 1974 for unemployment compensation and rent or mortgage payment grants to workers who lose their jobs because of environmental protection orders.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily recommend adoption of this bill.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WRIGHT

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT for the amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: Page 38, strike out lines 23 and 24 and insert "shall equal 60 per centum of the individual's former weekly wage or the maximum payable to him under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which his employment loss occurs, whichever is the greater amount, except that no such individual shall be paid more than the highest amount of unemployment compensation payable to any individual in his State under any unemployment compensation law other than this section. Such unemployment compensation shall be paid so long as such individual is".

And on page 39, strike out line 3 and insert "subsection for a period of more than 52 weeks. Unemployment compensation paid under this section shall be in lieu of, and not in addition to, any unemployment compensation payable by reason of such employment loss under any other provision of law."

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) does not differ a great deal from his except in one major area, or perhaps two. It does restrict the amount of unemployment compensation payable to any individual to the highest amount that can be drawn in the State where he resides, whereas the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, as I understand it, restricts it only to the highest amount paid by any State, which is about \$129.

This amendment would further correct some of the more severe defects in the reported section of 801 as it now stands.

The bill provides no dollar limits of payments that can be made, as the gentleman from Texas agreed. His and my amendment would eliminate that, and tie payments into the maximum paid in the individual States. They differ as to an overall maximum of \$129 as set by Mr. WRIGHT's suggestion and the maximum.

Another major difference between my amendment and that of Mr. WRIGHT's is that my amendment overcomes the provision of benefits for 78 weeks, and it does reduce the time to 52 weeks. This is done because I see no reason to break new ground by providing an extra long period of benefits.

The amendment corrects a defect in the language by eliminating the words "at least" from line 23 of page 38, thus setting the payment at 60 percent. It is now undefined in the amendment. And the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas also speaks to that section.

It further insures the fact, too, that you cannot get a double dip, which is also the intent of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas; the language in here just further spells it out.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. As I understand the two changes the gentleman would make in the amendment as I have offered would be, first, that he would limit the total amount that an individual might draw to that amount which he would already be entitled otherwise under the unemployment laws in his State and, second, that it would limit the length—

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, it limits it to the highest amount any individual may draw in his State.

Mr. WRIGHT. So that it would give him some additional benefits, possibly, over those he has now, but additionally the gentleman's amendment would limit the payments to 52 weeks rather than 78 weeks, and thus bring it back in conformity with the unemployment compensation laws as they presently exist; is that correct?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. That is correct.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman from Arkansas not feel that those who are displaced by reason of Federal action may be entitled to something a little

more than the ordinary unemployment compensation?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I would point out to the gentleman that this body has been asked to consider a new concept in compensation laws without the benefit of hearings, and there is questionable jurisdiction in this matter in my opinion.

The existing unemployment compensation law generally provides a standard of 26 weeks and, as the gentleman knows, these two have been extended up to two 13-week extensions. In other words, to 52 weeks, and this would be sufficient, one would think, for a qualified individual to find some type of gainful employment.

Much has been made of the fact that the Trade Expansion Act provides 78 weeks. However, not enough has been made of the fact it requires, as a condition of those benefits, attendance at a retraining program.

Without some sort of limitation as to how an individual spends his time, it is unreasonable for us to provide for a year and a half of benefits, benefits which are exceedingly generous in nature, without at the same time assuring that the individual is properly utilizing his time.

Again, I would point out that even the 78 weeks provided for in this section are not the result of deliberated hearings, or the result of the expertise of witnesses, but seem to have been plucked from the air. The proposed extension seems to have been plucked from the stratosphere. And there are additional benefits in here for moving benefits and for rental and mortgage payments to the individual affected.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment and certainly to the substitute amendment.

I think there is a lot of confusion in both of the proposals being presented here. The fact is that we are dealing with a very important concept: The burdens and sacrifices required by an action of the government taken for the benefit of all the people should be taken as the responsibility of all interests in society and should be shared equitably by all people in the society. It is wrong for an action of government, which in the end seeks to benefit all of us, to fall disproportionately upon some who are innocent victims of it.

The purification of the environment is in the interest of all citizens. Ultimately all of us will pay for it at some time in terms of taxes and higher prices. It seems to me unconscionable to expect that the working people in this country who stand to lose the most in the event of a Federal environmental order, who stand to lose their jobs permanently—not temporarily, as happens in the usual circumstances in which unemployment compensation is paid—as a result of plant shutdowns resulting from environmental orders should bear the entire burden themselves.

It seems to me unconscionable that anybody here, be he Democrat or Republican, should request families to make the kind of sacrifices that are here being asked.

Many of us in committee, or at least a good number of us, felt that not only should there be a provision for 66½ percent of income given to the workers under the circumstances and some repayment for relocation and rent or mortgage assistance, but that there should also be some way of repaying the worker for his fringe benefits, such as the money that he has paid into his pension fund which he may also lose in the event of a plant shutdown due to a governmental order respecting the environment.

There is a misconception here among the Members of this body who are by comparing the environmental allowances for workers being proposed in this bill with regular unemployment compensation benefits.

They are two entirely different things; in the present instance, you are talking about a man possibly losing his livelihood for an extended period of time which may go way beyond the 78 weeks provided here.

I think the Committee on Public Works showed a great deal of intelligent conservatism in recognizing that if we were to clean up our environment, we would have to find not only a way to recompense the workers, but also a way to help business secure the money, at low interest rates, to put in antipollution equipment. We provide in the very next section, I might add, for loans to business which come out of everybody's pockets, including the workers; at a very low rate, 3 percent, to permit them to get the kind of equipment that they need to continue their business.

It is very interesting that some Members of this House are prepared to secure and back up business but are seeking to take away from the workers who have no other remedy, no other means with which to feed and clothe their families.

It would be inexcusable for this Congress not to give the kind of compensation that is required for working people to continue their livelihood and to thereby make them allies with us in efforts to clean up pollution. Otherwise, we may lead the working people of this country to feel that it is against their interest to work with us in cleaning up pollution. Perhaps that is what the authors of these amendments seek to do. But if that is so, it is certainly an anti-social act, and I would call upon the Members of this body to vote down these amendments and to go along with the committee bill, which is really a very minimal approach toward recognizing our responsibility to the workers in this country.

We recognize our responsibility to business. Let us be equitable in our recognition of our responsibility to labor.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, somehow the last few speakers, including the gentlewoman from New York, have been trying to create the impression that this is the first time public policy has ever resulted in

unemployment, and that this new policy gives us a brand new game to which we must apply brand new rules.

I think all of us can think of urban renewal public policy considerations, and of reconversion public policy considerations. Certainly in this Congress we have labored through the Lockheed problem. We can think of many other considerations where certain programs created certain types of unemployment.

Many highway condemnation programs have put businesses out of commission forever.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a new thing to have public policy create unemployment. The committee has done a good thing in attempting to be honest with the people of the country by saying we do have a policy which may create unemployment. That is a plus. That is a first.

Where the committee made its mistake, and why we must have this amendment, is because they attempted to superimpose a new unemployment program administered by a totally separate agency rather than an existing agency. Had they had the foresight to suggest a program that could fit into the existing one, carried out by the Secretary of Labor, we would not have these awful problems of no limits, no extension, and all the other rules that we need to properly administer a program.

The amendments suggested by the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Arkansas are illustrative of the fact that this bill is not ready for passage in terms of this unemployment section.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is essential that the amendment be adopted and it is essential that the substitute be approved by this House. It would be far better, I think, if we turned the administration of this unemployment provision over to the Secretary of Labor and that it become a part of our regular unemployment compensation program.

I must say again that I commend the committee for admitting that unemployment may result, and for their efforts in pointing this out, and for attempting to finance the unemployment in their own bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we address ourselves to what is certain to become one of the most difficult challenges of our particular time. That is the challenge to reconcile the demands of a sound ecology with the demands of a sound economy. I think it is clearly foreseeable that some of the things we are demanding in the interest of environmental protection and purity will result in some job dislocations through no fault of the people thrown into unemployment.

We have before a conference committee at the present time the House and Senate versions of the water pollution control bill. This will be landmark legislation. Most of us supported it in the House. All Members in the Senate supported it. Either version that is adopted, or whatever compromise we jointly agree

upon, is going to require that within a very few years every new source that discharges into the streams of this country will be required to secure a permit from the EPA, and that within a very few years every old source that has been discharging must meet the latest best available technology, with the express purpose ultimately of achieving the goal of no discharge.

Witnesses appearing before our committee called attention to the probability that this may cost hundreds of billions of dollars. It is inevitable—painful, but inevitable—that in our zeal to protect the natural environment of the country some workers are going to lose their jobs. Does not the Government owe to those people a little more than just unemployment compensation to which they would be entitled under their States? They lose their jobs as a result of governmental decree.

They forfeit and sacrifice their livelihoods for the benefit of all of us, and it seems to me we ought to bend over backward to be particularly generous on those occasions where society itself has ordered and mandated a situation which has put these people out of work.

Additionally, we are considering here another really critical facet of America's problem, and that is the massive migration of people from the small towns, which this bill addresses itself to help, into the bigger cities already glutted, crowded, contaminated, and congested with overpopulation. If we can be just a little bit generous to give displaced people some time to relocate in that same small community, maybe we can help by some small degree to reverse this tide. If not checked, it will result by 1990 in 80 percent of the American population living in only four congested megalopolitan areas, one along each of our coasts on the east and west, one concentrated around the Great Lakes, and one huddled along the gulf coast. The entirety of the remainder of the country, constituting 97 percent of the real estate and some 2,900 communities, will provide homes and jobs for only 20 percent of the American public.

So I say to the Members that we ought to resolve this question, not with a total lack of limitation, but with a reasonable limit sufficient to give the fellow the benefit of the doubt so that he can look for another job locally. Let us provide a cushion so that he will not have to move in desperation into one of the already overcrowded cities, thereby accentuating every problem from pollution to crime to psychosomatic illness. It seems fair to me that a humane society, in asking of these people this sacrifice for the good of society, should extend this measure of help to them.

So I urge the Members to vote down the amendment offered by my dear and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, and vote instead for my amendment. I think it is a reasonable approach, a humane approach, and a fair approach.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I

rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT). I also support Mr. WRIGHT's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the remarks of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) were eloquent. I think they are also deserving of an answer. The gentleman from Texas said that if we or if the Government deliberately by a policy put somebody out of work, do we not owe him just a little bit more than the existing programs? As the gentleman knows, but I do not think he made enough of it, in this legislation which our committee brought before the House there is a little bit more. As the Members know there is a little bit more, and for the first time—at least for the first time in my memory and my committee experience—we have offered this little bit more. We have added help with their rental or mortgage payments during their unemployment.

The Members know as well as I that the Committee on Public Works has no special competence in the area of unemployment compensation. I think while we have recognized the problem of unemployment by virtue of these pollution orders, I do not think we should act as final arbiters in this area. I think we have done a good job by calling it to the attention of the House.

There is more to be done. The gentleman from Texas is the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. I want to remind the gentleman that if we perform our oversight properly, some of these orders that will cause these people to be unemployed will never be issued or will be issued more carefully. If the Environmental Protection Agency acts with a little bit of brains and commonsense, much of what we are talking about here may never come to pass. Before any one of us becomes too exercised about whether this section is a be-all or an end-all, or whether we owe more or less to the workingman, I think we should remind ourselves that if we pursue our oversight diligently many of these orders we fear may not be issued.

Companies should be given time to meet the new technology and to meet these pollution problems. In this connection it should be noted section 802 of this bill, as the gentleman from Texas knows, also gives financial assistance to companies so that they can meet these orders when and as they are delivered.

I would urge the committee not to become too concerned about the immediate details of this section. First, if we exercise our oversight properly, these orders will not come falling down on us like rain from heaven. They will come when needed, with some restraint. Second, if section 802 is properly administered, to do its job, people will not be put out of work because we in our wisdom have provided money for companies affected, additional assistance so that they can change their production systems and meet these pollution orders.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is making the point that there may not be so many of these orders, and if there are not the money will not be spent anyway. Is not what the gentleman really is saying, "We do not think it is going to rain as much as you think it is going to rain; therefore, let us not build the roof until it rains some more."

Mr. CLEVELAND. I believe the gentleman would admit that we have not had too much experience in the unemployment compensation law field. I believe before we go into that too far and too heavily we should remember that there will be other people being put out of work by Government decree or action and general legislation may be the best answer. For example quite a few people have been put out of work by the peace policies of this administration. We are winding down the war, reducing troop levels, and cutting down on some defense contracts. Should we not treat workers thus affected the same?

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

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

Mr. KYL. Were the people who were put out of work because of the stoppage of work on the SST put out of work because of environmental considerations or because of economic considerations?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Well, that is an interesting question. It was a combination of both, with the stamp of approval of this Congress, as I understand it.

Mr. KYL. In other words, there is some question even as to how this law would apply with special emphasis on the environment. As the gentleman indicated, the policies on foreign trade might result in unemployment of American citizens.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Wright amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, there is no doubt in my mind but that we in the Congress are responsible for the controversy which exists here today with regard to whether or not there should be some limitation placed on section 801 of this proposed bill.

In my personal opinion, we are more responsible than anyone else, because we have with too much haste in times gone by passed supposedly environmental protective legislation without giving due consideration to what the end result of some of this legislation might be.

Now we find that certain agencies in the Federal Government, or at least we lay claim to the fact that certain agencies in the Federal Government—in this instance specifically the Environmental Protection Agency—are not administering the legislation which we passed according to congressional intent. This may or may not be the case.

Certainly we can all agree that people are being displaced from their regular

employment because of the administration of such legislation by the Environmental Protection Agency.

I am not one of those people who get as excited as some others do about protecting the environment. I admit we have to do something about it, we must do everything we can, but we have to do it with common sense. I do not share the attitude that some have, that everything is emotional and we can correct all these things today. I stand before this House laying claim to a belief that says we will never eliminate totally, as some would say, pollution in this country. We must however reduce it to a minimum. Some of those people who speak emotionally over that subject have not found out yet that if one takes a bath one pollutes the water, and if one does not, one pollutes the air. Sincerely, however, the vast majority of all Americans want to do all that can possibly be done to protect the environment. I share that desire with them.

However, I will tell you this: We are in the process going to displace some people and cause them to lose their jobs because of the legislation that we already have passed or in the future do pass. Now, listen to me, because there is a parallel to be drawn here.

I have never in my own mind been able to justify, for example, compensation by payments to farmers for letting land lie idle except because of the fact that here, for example, was a farmer who owned land and who owned equipment and who had been farming that land which he owned with the equipment which he owned and who was suddenly told by the Federal Government, "You can no longer farm your land; you have to do something else." That farmer is due compensation by the Federal Government.

People are going to lose their jobs because of acts of the Federal Government, of the EPA. I think just as farmers are due some compensation, so are these workers who are displaced because of Federal legislative action and in turn then the action of an executive agency of the U.S. Government. This being the case, I think they ought to be compensated.

But the question comes up, how much are they going to be compensated? We have a national standard for compensating farmers through the system of payment for land which cannot by Federal law be farmed and which lies idle. I see nothing wrong under these circumstances with a uniform standard. Certainly we have to have some limit. It could be nothing but an oversight on the part of the committee that a limitation was not placed on this section and the compensation provided by this section in committee. So the committee comes along now and wants to limit and limit severely what an individual is eligible for in the way of compensation.

I think in this instance the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) makes a point and makes it well that maybe they are entitled to just a little bit more than they would be as insured employees under workmen's compensation because they are losing their jobs purely and solely

because of the actions of the Federal Government.

I believe, as we do in urban renewal and in the uniform Relocation Act for others who are displaced, that we ought to compensate them.

I think the formula that Mr. WRIGHT suggests is fair and equitable. It may be lenient, but it is because of our inattention, our not passing good legislation that the situation exists.

Let us limit it, because limit it we must. We must not pass section 801 as it is in this bill now.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Would the gentleman subject the farmers of America to the workmen's compensation laws in the individual States by virtue of Government action?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No. The gentleman said he would not.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. No. I asked would you subject the farmers of America to the workmen's compensation laws?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No, I would not, because there is no relationship between a farmer's investment in land and equipment and what as an employee without an investment he might be eligible to draw in the form of compensation.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Why would you subject the workers displaced by actions of the Federal Government, the EPA, to the laws of workmen's compensation when you will not subject the farmers to them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman from Louisiana would not do this any more than he would limit an investor who loses his property because of the construction of a Federal project—a highway, for example, let us say—to whatever unemployment compensation would provide, because the employee has no investment as compared to the employer. A farmer is both an employer and an employee. He has an investment in land and equipment. The owner of a business, for example, displaced by the construction of a Federal highway, owns the building. Would you ignore the money that he has invested in that particular building and not have a uniform relocation act or assistance program to compensate him for his loss of that building?

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. No.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Would you only compensate him for a weekly wage?

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. No. We are compensating him in this bill for his loss, but what we are not compensating is the worker who is losing a job and who has to be retrained. The reason why the amendment as offered and the substitute are wrong is because they are following a pattern of compensation according to the workmen's compensation laws, and that ought not to be the standard. The standard was established under the Trade Act of 1962, which established

that they should be compensated at a rate of 66 percent.

Further, the bill originally was in the committee at 66 percent. It has been reduced in committee to 60 percent. It is now being reduced further here in the House by action of the substitute, and if the substitute fails the attempt will be to pass the Wright amendment by reducing the rights of the American workman further.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But the compensation provided for under the Wright amendment is more lenient than is provided for under present unemployment compensation laws, and it does provide for a maximum standard because of his displacement from his employment as a result of national legislation.

Mr. ERLÉNBERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not serve on the committee that reported this bill, and I am not too familiar with the genesis of this bill, but I do understand from the debate that apparently there were no hearings held, and it seems apparent from reading section 801 that very little consideration was given to the drafting of this legislation before it was included in the bill.

It appears that the bill before us, section 801, as well as the Wright amendment, and as well the Hammerschmidt amendment, that none of them have any requirement that a person to be eligible to receive these benefits be available and actively seeking employment.

So this is an unheard of provision for unemployment compensation.

I think that it is obvious that anyone who receives benefits for being unemployed certainly ought to be available for employment and actively seeking employment.

None of the provisions that are now pending before us in the bill or in the two amendments so provide.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLÉNBERN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and when the parliamentary situation adjusts itself I intend to offer a motion to strike the section.

In addition, there is no authority in this bill delegated to the Secretary of Commerce to promulgate regulations that have to do with who is going to get these benefits and who cannot.

The gentleman is eminently correct when he said, as others have said, there were 125 witnesses and 15 days of hearings, but not one directed at or dealing with that work of art that we see in this section. It is something we need to deal with on some committee that has to deal with benefits, or some committee that has some expertise in this particular area.

I think the gentleman has made a great contribution by his remarks.

Mr. ERLÉNBERN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with the gentleman that the committee of jurisdiction that might know a little better how to draft such legislation ought to be given the job if it

is going to be done properly, and that is the Committee on Ways and Means.

It appears to me the bill before us is completely deficient. The Wright amendment improves it somewhat, and the Hammerschmidt amendment is a great improvement over the Wright amendment. I hope, however, that the Snyder amendment striking the whole section will be adopted, so that some proper consideration to this subject may be given. If we should act on this without giving the proper consideration then I think we are not doing the job we are elected to do.

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

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) says that he has no knowledge or not much knowledge about the provisions of section 801, but it would not surprise me if the gentleman does not have a greater knowledge about what is in section 801 than many members of the committee from whence this bill emanates, because in the Committee on Education and Labor on which the gentleman serves at least they do deal with unemployment compensation legislation, as of course also does the Committee on Ways and Means.

I am sure he has heard many references and witnesses that speak to this subject matter in his committee activities. I have heard none.

Actually, we have had no hearings on the subject, and I would agree with the gentleman that the eligibility requirements need to be more stringent and improved, as does this entire section. I only offered my amendment as an improvement to the existing legislation as now drafted.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLBORN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I think it would add to the discussion and to the legislative history if I were to read from the act to revise and expand the Federal program for relief from the effects of major disasters that are affecting many of the areas of the country—the specific section relating to unemployment assistance; namely, section 240.

This section reads as follows:

Sec. 240. The President is authorized to provide to any individual unemployed as a result of a major disaster, such assistance as he deems appropriate while such individual is unemployed. Such assistance as the President shall provide shall not exceed the maximum amount and the maximum duration of payment under the unemployment compensation program of the State in which the disaster occurred, and the amount of assistance under this section to any such individual shall be reduced by any amount of unemployment compensation or of private income protection insurance compensation available to such individual for such period of unemployment.

I believe it is to this point that the amendments have been offered, and it is for this reason that I support the Hammerschmidt amendment.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time because it seems there has been an impression left before the committee that, under the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, we are not offering any help to the workingman who might be put out of work because of some action by the Government.

I would like for the committee to understand that, under the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, he guarantees a man who has been put out of a job at least the maximum unemployment compensation for 52 weeks within the State in which he resides—at least the maximum unemployment benefits.

In addition to that, there is the provision of rent supplement or housing allotment that is in the bill which is estimated to be about 25 percent of a man's income.

In addition to this, we have the 3-percent loan in the legislation for industry that might be confronted with the problem of either having to renovate or remodel its plant, or else go out of business.

This 3-percent loan is specifically to provide jobs for the people in the area. So again the workingman would be the one to benefit the most under this legislation. So I support the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, because of these specific helps that we have for the workingman. If the substitute of the gentleman from Arkansas is not adopted, or the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, then I intend to support the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky to strike section 801. It is new ground, and I think under the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas, or the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, it is about as far as we should proceed at this time without holding hearings before our committee on this subject.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would say to my colleagues who serve on the Committee on Public Works that I think they are to be commended for tackling this subject and doing something to ameliorate the economic impact on workers who are affected by an environmental order.

I think we have been tardy, Mr. Chairman, in looking at many of the economic impacts of our environmental program.

I think from the reports that many of us have examined, reports made by some of the great consulting firms in the country for the Department of Commerce and for EPA, and considering what the economic impact is going to be and the closing of industries—we know from that that many industries in this country are going to be forced to close because of their inability to meet environmental standards.

What concerns me, Mr. Chairman, and on this I would like to direct a question if I may to my colleague and dear friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT)—I sense in the argument for this particular formula of compensation both in your amendment and in the argument advanced against the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) that in all these arguments there runs the thread of the argument that because this is resulting from governmental action, there is some need to go beyond the social philosophy and concept of unemployment insurance, and that there should be some additional compensation.

For instance, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN) pointed out, there is no requirement to be actively seeking employment and be available for employment under this provision.

The argument, as I understood it, advanced by the gentleman from Texas, and the others, is that we owe a special obligation because this results from a governmental decision or policy.

My question to the gentleman is this: Does the gentleman apply this to any area where unemployment may result from the action of Government? For example, in this House we debated the question of the supersonic transport. Involved in the arguments on the SST was the question of a possible environmental impact by the SST. Should we, therefore, to the employees of Boeing provide a new form, such as this calls for, of compensation for unemployment resulting from that?

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman would recognize that there is a clear distinction and a discernible difference between the Congress decision on the one hand simply not to continue production of a given type of aircraft, and on the other hand an order specifically directed to a given industry by a governmental agency which puts people out of work. I think they are two different kinds of problems. From the standpoint of equity I would be inclined to say to the gentleman that perhaps people are entitled to some additional consideration wherever they may be affected; but I do believe the gentleman will recognize that a congressional decision which is based upon a broad question of procurement contracts, and things of that kind, is different in character from a specific order emanating from a governmental agency to close down a plant.

It seems to me that in this latter category we do have a somewhat more direct responsibility and obligation to those who are inadvertently displaced and thrown out of jobs and put into positions of extreme hardship.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I say further to the gentleman from Texas that I appreciate the distinction he is endeavoring to make, but I do not think it was clear in the debate. I think in the matter of water quality standards, for example, we have had changes, both by Federal and by State action, on the classification of streams where an employee, and the industry that he works for, might well think they could continue. Then there was a further legislative or admin-

istrative decision to change that stream classification, resulting in the loss of jobs.

So I say to the gentleman from Texas I did not in the debate earlier today, and I do not now, get the distinction between the various categories of Government action and when and where we should apply the rule that the Government owes them additional compensation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) there were—ayes 44, noes 56.

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. ABZUG, and Messrs. WRIGHT and CLEVELAND.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, noes 209, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—161

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbott | Ford, Gerald R. | Pettis |
| Anderson, Ill. | Forsythe | Pirnie |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Fountain | Poage |
| Archer | Frenzel | Poff |
| Arends | Frey | Powell |
| Ashbrook | Galifianakis | Price, Tex. |
| Baring | Gettys | Purcell |
| Belcher | Goodling | Quile |
| Bell | Gross | Quillen |
| Blackburn | Grover | Robinson, Va. |
| Bow | Gubser | Robison, N.Y. |
| Bray | Haley | Rogers |
| Brinkley | Hall | Ruppe |
| Broomfield | Hammer- | Ruth |
| Brotzman | schmidt | Sandman |
| Brown, Mich. | Hansen, Idaho | Satterfield |
| Brown, Ohio | Harsha | Scherle |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Hastings | Schneebell |
| Broyhill, Va. | Helms | Scott |
| Buchanan | Hogan | Sebelius |
| Burke, Fla. | Hosmer | Shoup |
| Burleson, Tex. | Hunt | Shriver |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hutchinson | Skubitz |
| Byron | Jarman | Smith, Calif. |
| Camp | Johnson, Pa. | Smith, N.Y. |
| Carlson | Jonas | Snyder |
| Casey, Tex. | Keating | Spence |
| Cederberg | King | Stanton |
| Clausen | Kuykendall | J. William |
| Don H. | Kyl | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Clawson, Del. | Landrum | Steiger, Wis. |
| Cleveland | Latta | Stephens |
| Collier | Lloyd | Talcott |
| Colmer | Lujan | Taylor |
| Conable | McClory | Teague, Calif. |
| Conover | McClure | Terry |
| Coughlin | McCullister | Thompson, Ga. |
| Crane | McCulloch | Thomson, Wis. |
| Curlin | McEwen | Thone |
| Davis, Ga. | McKevitt | Ullman |
| Dellenback | Mahon | Vander Jagt |
| Dennis | Maillard | Ware |
| Derwinski | Mallory | Whalley |
| Devine | Mann | Whitehurst |
| Dickinson | Martin | Whitten |
| Duncan | Mathias, Calif. | Widnall |
| du Pont | Matsunaga | Wiggins |
| Erlenborn | Mayne | Williams |
| Esch | Miller, Ohio | Wilson, Bob |
| Eshleman | Mills, Ark. | Winn |
| Findley | Mizell | Wylder |
| Fisher | Montgomery | Wyllie |
| Flowers | Myers | Wyman |
| Flynt | Nelsen | Young, Fla. |
| | | Zion |

NOES—209

| | | |
|---------|-----------|---------------|
| Abzug | Alexander | Andrews, Ala. |
| Adams | Anderson, | Annunzio |
| Addabbo | Calif. | Ashley |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Aspin | Gonzalez | Obey |
| Aspinall | Grasso | O'Hara |
| Badillo | Gray | O'Konski |
| Barrett | Green, Oreg. | Patman |
| Begich | Green, Pa. | Patten |
| Bennett | Griffin | Pepper |
| Bergland | Griffiths | Perkins |
| Bevill | Halpern | Peyser |
| Biaggi | Hamilton | Pickle |
| Biester | Hanley | Pike |
| Bingham | Hanna | Fodell |
| Blatnik | Hathaway | Preyer, N.C. |
| Boggs | Hawkins | Price, Ill. |
| Boland | Hays | Pryor, Ark. |
| Boiling | Hechler, W. Va. | Pucinski |
| Brademas | Helstoski | Randall |
| Brasco | Henderson | Rangel |
| Brooks | Hicks, Mass. | Rees |
| Burke, Mass. | Hicks, Wash. | Reid |
| Burlison, Mo. | Hollifield | Reuss |
| Burton | Horton | Roberts |
| Byrne, Pa. | Howard | Rodino |
| Cabell | Hungate | Roe |
| Caffery | Ichord | Roncalio |
| Carey, N.Y. | Jacobs | Rooney, Pa. |
| Celler | Johnson, Calif. | Rosenthal |
| Chappell | Jones, Ala. | Rostenkowski |
| Chisholm | Jones, N.C. | Roush |
| Clark | Jones, Tenn. | Roy |
| Collins, Ill. | Karath | Roybal |
| Conyers | Kastenmeier | Runnels |
| Corman | Kazen | St Germain |
| Cotter | Kee | Sarbanes |
| Culver | Kemp | Saylor |
| Daniels, N.J. | Kluczyński | Scheuer |
| Danielson | Koch | Schwengel |
| Davis, S.C. | Kyros | Seiberling |
| de la Garza | Link | Shipley |
| Delaney | Long, Md. | Sikes |
| Dellums | McCormack | Sisk |
| Denholm | McDade | Slack |
| Dent | McFall | Smith, Iowa |
| Diggs | McKay | Staggers |
| Dingell | McKinney | Steed |
| Donohue | Macdonald, | Steele |
| Dorn | Mass. | Stratton |
| Dow | Madden | Stubblefield |
| Downing | Mathis, Ga. | Stuckey |
| Drinan | Mazzoli | Sullivan |
| Dulski | Meeds | Symington |
| Eckhardt | Melcher | Tierman |
| Edwards, Calif. | Metcalfe | Udall |
| Ellberg | Mikva | Van Deerlin |
| Evans, Colo. | Miller, Calif. | Vanik |
| Evins, Tenn. | Minish | Vigorito |
| Fascell | Mink | Waggoner |
| Fish | Mitchell | Wampler |
| Flood | Mollohan | Whalen |
| Foley | Monagan | White |
| Ford | Moorhead | Wilson, |
| William D. | Morgan | Charles H. |
| Fraser | Mosher | Wolf |
| Fulton | Moss | Wright |
| Fuqua | Murphy, Ill. | Wyatt |
| Garmatz | Murphy, N.Y. | Yates |
| Gaydos | Natcher | Yatron |
| Gialmo | Nedzi | Young, Tex. |
| Gibbons | Nix | Zablocki |

NOT VOTING—62

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Goldwater | Nichols |
| Abourezk | Hagan | O'Neill |
| Anderson, | Hansen, Wash. | Passman |
| Tenn. | Harrington | Pelly |
| Baker | Harvey | Railsback |
| Betts | Hébert | Rarick |
| Blanton | Heckler, Mass. | Rhodes |
| Carney | Hillis | Riegle |
| Carter | Hull | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Chamberlain | Keith | Roussot |
| Clancy | Landgrebe | Ryan |
| Clay | Leggett | Schmitz |
| Collins, Tex. | Lennon | Springer |
| Conte | Lent | Stanton |
| Daniel, Va. | Long, La. | James V. |
| Davis, Wis. | McCloskey | Stokes |
| Dowdy | McDonald, | Teague, Tex. |
| Dwyer | Mich. | Thompson, N.J. |
| Edmondson | McMillan | Veysey |
| Edwards, Ala. | Michel | Waldie |
| Frelinghuysen | Mills, Md. | Zwack |
| Gallagher | Minshall | |

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOW FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WRIGHT

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. Dow for the amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: On page 39, line 3, immediately after the word "weeks", insert the following: ", and no unemployment compensation paid to any individual under this subsection shall be in excess of \$231 per week".

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that too many of us are interested in the fine points of whether a person who is unemployed under a situation presented by this bill gets a penny more or less than the unemployment compensation that he would normally get. I myself am not interested in these details. I do not believe we are going to be penny-pinchers. I do not think we want to be niggardly with these people in distress due to unemployment situations brought on by environmental causes, but, Mr. Chairman, I am astounded to find out that there is a provision in the bill, in the way this section reads, that anyone, no matter what their income or their earnings, may receive up to 60 percent. Let us consider a person who earns \$52,000 a year—and that is mentioned in one of the minority reports here—that person would be entitled to income from the Government of about \$30,000 a year under this plan, and it would be tax free.

Now, for goodness' sake, I think it is a rank injustice, when we know that income taxes are being paid by widow women and people who earn income as low as \$2,050.

According to the income tax scale, these people would have to subsidize some of our citizens to the tune of \$30,000 or better. I must say I think this is atrocious.

I always understood that unemployment compensation was intended to keep the wolf from the door, and I would be even a little more generous than that. But to provide unemployment compensation, tax-free, from the Federal Government to anybody to the tune of \$30,000 a year or better is unconscionable. It is really unthinkable, and I must say I strongly object to that loophole in the bill.

My amendment is intended only to eliminate such largesse. It is a proviso that anybody who earns more than \$20,000 a year would not receive more than a person who has been earning \$20,000. At 60 percent under the bill, it would give him \$12,000. That is what my amendment would do. That would be the maximum. I do not think it cuts back anybody below the level of the maximum unemployment compensation that he could receive.

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

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

Mr. ERLBORN. When the Clerk read your amendment, I understood it to say that the maximum benefit would be \$231 per week; is that correct?

Mr. DOW. That is correct.

Mr. ERLBORN. That would be approximately \$12,000 per year?

Mr. DOW. Yes, it would be.

Mr. ERLBORN. Tax free?

Mr. DOW. Yes.

Mr. ERLBORN. And a person receiving that benefit under this amendment—is it clear that he would not be

able to get State unemployment compensation at the same time—or might that be an additional benefit?

Mr. DOW. On that point I would have to refer to the committee, because I am merely assuming that the same dollars that they wrote into the bill would be available for the purpose of my allowance.

I do not know all the limitations that exist in the bill, but I do favor limiting to something like \$12,000 which is far above the average median income in this country.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ERLBORN. Well, if your amendment is patterned after the committee bill, there is no prohibition against receiving State unemployment compensation at the same time you get this \$12,000 per year, and there is no requirement that a person getting compensation be even available for employment, much less be seeking employment.

I think this ought to be called the "year and a half paid vacation bill"—and it is a pretty good paid vacation—\$12,000 a year.

Mr. DOW. I believe the gentleman has made a good point there. I think he ought to offer an amendment as to that duplication. But would not the gentleman agree with me; it is better if anyone is to receive State compensation in addition to this compensation, to limit this compensation to \$12,000 instead of \$30,000?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

As I understand the amendment, it is a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, which would raise the possible payment to someone who became unemployed under the provisions set forth in the bill to \$102 a week.

The amendment that was accepted by the committee, as offered by the gentleman from Texas, has a ceiling on it of the highest benefits now paid in any State, which is \$129 a week. This would just further liberalize the provisions of the bill, and I strongly oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Dow) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright).

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SNYDER

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Page 37, line 24, strike out all of section 801 beginning on line 24 of page 37 down through and including line 2 on page 40.

Renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the House to delete section 801 of title III from this bill.

Section 801 would create a new form of "unemployment compensation" and related benefits for one special class of unemployed, those whose unemployment is caused by Federal environmental legislation.

The House should know that, although a total of 125 witnesses appeared during 15 days of hearings on this bill, there were no hearings on this section 801 which was developed in executive session. The House is aware that the Committee on Public Works is not the committee which handles unemployment compensation, nor do its members claim expertise in this area. It would be unprecedented for the House to pass new "unemployment compensation" legislation as part of a public works bill, particularly without the benefit of public hearings and the expert testimony of those knowledgeable in this area.

Our Federal-State unemployment compensation system has been successfully operating since the 1930's. Billions of dollars in taxes are collected yearly from employers, and billions of dollars yearly are paid in benefits to jobless workers. Every State has its own program operating daily. On the whole, this Federal-State system has enjoyed public confidence and acceptance.

Basic unemployment compensation normally provides for 26 weeks of unemployment compensation for those eligible for such benefits. Under the guidance of the Ways and Means Committee, recent changes have been made to extend benefits up to 52 weeks. The Employment Security Amendments of 1970—Public Law 91-373—provide for a 13-week extension of the basic 26 weeks when the national unemployment rate is 4.5 percent or more for 3 consecutive months or when the unemployment level in a State averages 4 percent for 13 consecutive weeks and 120 percent of the average rate for the same period in each of the 2 preceding years. The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971—Public Law 92-224—recently extended by Public Law 92-329, provides for another 13 weeks extension whenever a State's unemployment reaches 6.5 percent. It is obvious that, after due deliberation, our unemployment compensation laws have been adjusted to meet current needs. But section 801 of title VIII, if passed, could undermine this system, and undermine public confidence in its fairness.

Section 801 would provide a special form of so-called Federal unemployment compensation which would pay workers, who are found to be unemployed because of Federal environmental quality laws or standards, 60 per centum of their former weekly wages for a year and a half without any dollar limit.

I urge the House to strike section 801 from this bill for the following reasons:

First, it would provide tax-free "unemployment compensation" benefits of \$90,000 in a year and a half to a \$100,000-a-year executive employee. There is no dollar limit, and the period of payment is at least 50 percent longer than under our regular Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

Second, there is no offset. This section contains no provision preventing an individual from collecting both regular un-

employment compensation and this new special "unemployment compensation." I would point out that the committee report, on page 10, gives assurances that "duplication unemployment compensation payments are not authorized by this section." The text of the bill, however, does not contain any such safeguard—and I submit that this means we are treading on pretty treacherous ground.

Third, this section is unfairly discriminatory. A worker unemployed because of an environmental standard or order is no more disadvantaged than a worker unemployed for some other reason. If this section were passed, then any two constituents of any Member of the House—unemployed constituents with the same skills living side-by-side in any city or town—could end up getting vastly different amounts of unemployment compensation.

Fourth, this section lacks the most fundamental safeguards, which could lead to widespread abuses. There is no definition of what an "affected plant or industry" is, nor are there sound and equitable criteria to determine which individuals would be eligible for benefits. For example, the manner in which this section is drafted would permit an employer, knowing he would be forced into curtailing or completely closing his operations due to an environmental order or standard, to temporarily raise the wages of his employees for the express purpose of creating increased benefits for those who would be eligible under this section.

Fifth, section 801 completely ignores the existence of the Manpower Development and Training Act, a law we put on the books in 1962. One of the principal purposes of the Manpower Development and Training Act is to provide assistance to those persons whose job skills have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from a variety of factors such as automation or other technical developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other structural changes in the economy.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide a program of testing, counseling, occupational training, payment of training allowances and transportation expenses for unemployed persons who cannot find jobs.

Generally speaking, the training allowances are equal to the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment provided under State programs. Trainees with dependents can receive up to \$20 extra per week. Those participating in training programs can receive payments for up to 104 weeks.

Sixth, as previously noted, the House is being asked to pass this section although there have been no public hearings which would have brought out the extraordinary problems that will be created by such an unwise program of special unemployment compensation benefits.

I generally support the extension and improvement of the programs administered by the Public Works and Economic Development Act, but section 801 should be deleted from the bill. We are all deeply concerned with unemployment. Sec-

tion 801, however, is the wrong approach, at the wrong time, in the wrong bill, by the wrong committee. The provisions of 801 are unwise, unwarranted, and unsound. We cannot afford to undermine public confidence in the fairness and equity of our unemployment compensation laws by hastily passing special benefits for a few, and discriminating unfairly against the majority of our unemployed workers.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I think we would be wise to stop now and take a look at the bill. We have had amendments and substitute amendments. The committee has labored long and hard to bring out a piece of legislation that authorizes \$3.5 billion to raise up the social and economic well being of the people of this country, particularly those that are unemployed now.

Someone has said that to be poor and unemployed is to die a little each day. If one has never had the experience of representing a district where there are coal miners who have to go 300 or 400 or 500 miles from home, commuting back and forth to see their loved ones on the weekends, he does not know what it means to be unemployed.

If this Government and this Congress through its actions force someone out of work and forces him to drive hundreds of miles to find work, surely we are willing to pay him less than \$100 per week for a maximum of 18 months while he looks for other employment. That is all section 801 does. It says for a maximum of 1½ years or 18 months we will pay this unemployed person 60 percent of his wages and in no event it will exceed—get this—\$129 a week as the maximum paid in the State of Connecticut.

Under section 801 that the gentleman from Kentucky would strike, the man can only draw up to 60 percent of his wages or in no event more than \$129 per week. Is this too much to expect of a Government that forces an employee out of work? Is it too much to give him up to 18 months to go someplace else and find a job?

Furthermore, we only authorize for a 2-year period a maximum of \$100 million in this section.

During the entire history of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, since 1965 the Congress has only seen fit to appropriate some 34 percent of the amount authorized. On that basis, if hindsight is any criterion, this section would allow only \$34 million for all the displaced workers from the entire 50 States over the next 2 years.

I do not believe that is extravagant. I do not believe it is even realistic. But my friend from Kentucky would say—"No, close the gate on that plant, which may be producing chemicals, because that is closed down by reason of EPA regulations. Close down that unemployment office and give no hope to that unemployed person who is coming here wanting help from the Congress to find other work."

There has been a lot of talk about the fact that there have been no hearings.

We do not need hearings to find out that the unemployed workers are in distress. We do not need hearings to find out that this Government has been forcing people out of work because of the stringent requirements of the EPA.

Go out and talk to the 5 million unemployed persons. They will tell you that they want jobs, not relief checks. They do not want to hold hearings, but they do want action by the same Government that forced them out of work.

That is all we would do under section 801.

So I hope we vote down the amendment and vote up the little pittance of \$80 to \$125 per week as a maximum in the 50 States and give that man an opportunity to find another job somewhere. That is all we ask.

I hope the Members will vote "no" on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. GRAY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. As my friend from Illinois knows, under the existing provisions of the trade law, when jobs have been exported—in other words, when in an industry employers and employees have been put out of work by reason of imports, by reason again of Government action in its trade policies—we have written in relief provisions not alone for the unemployed who are involved but indeed for the industries that have been hurt.

My question to my friend is this: What basic difference is there between the man who is out of a job because of Government trade policies and the man who is put out of work because of the EPA or because of ecological laws?

Mr. GRAY. Well, there is a major difference. Trade, as the gentleman knows, is a two-way street. I would remind the gentleman, as an example, that our great State of Illinois exports far more agricultural commodities than it imports. So we have to have checks and balances on our trade policy.

But it is a 100-percent deception of the American worker when we sit here and approve legislation which takes his job away and then we are unwilling to help him out until he can find a new job. God only knows where. We are not dealing with a foreign country. We are not dealing with reciprocal trade. We are dealing with the actions of this Congress. That is the major difference.

Mr. Chairman, the EPA act has brought thousands of new jobs to southern Illinois. It will help other areas of our country if you will stick with the committee bill. Thank you.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about this "pittance" which my good friend from Illinois has talked about.

Let us say, for example, that up in Baraboo, Wis., a man has a pea cannery, and he pays himself \$60,000 a year. He has a brother who works at \$50,000 a year. He has a brother-in-law, at \$40,000, and a few other relatives and friends at \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year. Then the EPA

comes down and says, "We are going to require you to spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars to keep you from polluting the creek out here." Then the guy says, "That seems like an awful lot of trouble. I will just go out of business. They will pay 60 percent of my salary. They are going to pay my rent and going to pay my mortgage on the homes of all my relatives and employees. With the tax bracket I am in, I can make a lot more money not working than I could if I stayed here to pick peas for a living."

We are talking about a "pittance." This peapicker will be living pretty high for not picking peas. The bill as reported provides for an automatic draw from the Federal Treasury for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits.

Mr. GRAY. I know my distinguished friend is sincere in his remarks, but if you will read the bill, you will see the Secretary of Labor is the one to determine whether or not the jobless worker has been forced out because of Government action and not the owner of the plant that might feel he could get a big windfall for his employees. It has to be determined in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor and the EPA. I doubt very seriously that the Secretary of Labor will certify that plant if the person in charge decides to close it on his own volition.

Mr. ZION. I say you are talking about \$100 million here to be authorized and appropriated to carry out section 801. That figure is absolutely meaningless, because it says any individual who has lost his job because of the issuance of a standard order under Federal environmental laws has a right to such benefits. There is no way in the bill to limit Federal expenditures.

I would like to ask the gentlemen who favor section 801 if they can tell me within 1 million workers how many will be put out of work? Within 2 million.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZION. I am glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. BLATNIK. I will respond to the question.

We called the Council on Environmental Quality. They are the ones who advise the President, and they released a report just last week. Their estimate of total cost for abatement of all pollution and physical degradation in every form would be in the area of about \$287 billion. We asked them, "How many plants would you estimate would be closed," and they said in response about 300 plants—about six plants per State. This is an impossibly low figure. We asked them how many workers would be put out of jobs. There was no estimate.

I am in sympathy with section 801. We thought that, for people who are long-time employees with definite skills, who are far different from those who are thrown out of work for seasonal reasons, we should have different treatment.

When we have a man 40 years of age, who is a trained chemist and who has experience in the aerospace industry, but who is out on the street because of Federal environmental laws, why should the brunt of this be placed on him?

Mr. ZION. Would the gentleman like to get his own time to make a speech?

Mr. BLATNIK. You asked a question.

Mr. ZION. I ask the chairman how many industries came before our committee and testified. I would say there was only one industry that was permitted to testify. The paper industry came before us. They said under the provisions of this bill there was no way they could continue. We asked, "How much would you have to raise your prices in order to comply," and they said 40 or 50 percent. We asked them, "How high can you go," and they said 5 or 6 percent and they would lose their whole industry to Canada and Sweden.

I would say of the companies permitted to testify that 100 percent of them will be out of work. It is not just people trying to earn a living in the paper industry but the fellow who is involved in cutting the logs and hauling them to the mill. I would say that we do not know within \$10 billion how much this will cost. For that reason I say we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BLATNIK) Mr. ZION was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ZION. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. I do not want to dwell on the fairness of this provision to skilled workers. I want to say that we approached this matter with great care and much thought.

Mr. ZION. How many industries came before our committee and testified?

Mr. BLATNIK. We gave them great emphasis. We stressed in this bill preventive action to minimize unemployment by giving commercial loans at a low rate of interest to all industries to enable them to buy this expensive new pollution control equipment so that they will be able to comply with environmental standards.

Our first priority is to keep an industry in business, to keep a company going. We have provided \$200 million in loans to business at a 3-percent rate of interest in our bill to accomplish this purpose. But, when we cannot keep an industry in business, the employer and his employees should get some help.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, let us take the case of the SST, where the Congress decided that we should not put any more money into that program, and say that there was a metal worker or a metallurgist, and he is unemployed because the Government stopped the program, the Labor Secretary determines that he is either out of a job because of environmental factors or other factors, but it makes no difference to that man because he is out of a job, it just makes no difference to him. I do not know how you can make it a special kind of case just because the Secretary of Labor might make a decision that he was dispossessed

of his job by the environmental need, or economics, or trade, or any other factor. It is completely illogical.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

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

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

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, there is something fundamentally wrong with this legislation. Let me illustrate.

If a man loses his job because of the closing of a military facility, he is not covered.

If a man loses his job because he was working on a project which Congress has cancelled—such as the SST—he is not covered.

If a man loses his job because of a condemnation proceeding in connection with a public works project, he is not covered.

But if a man loses his job because of an order of the EPA, he receives special benefits under this bill.

Why should those in the last category be treated specially? Unemployment is a personal tragedy. It matters very little to the man who is broke and out of a job, why he finds himself in that unfortunate status. It is the fact of unemployment that is the problem which requires solution.

This legislation divides citizens similarly situated into classes for different treatment without a logical reason for doing so. Unless amended to correct this fundamental flaw, it should be defeated.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this bill comes to the floor in this manner, because very seldom will you find a bill from the Committee on Public Works coming to the floor with this much controversy. But there is a reason for it, and that is because we hooked a section onto this bill on which we have no expertise, and on which we have had no hearings. This section should be opposed for the following reasons, and that is the inclusion of section 801, which the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) has offered, an amendment to strike. But, first, to clarify the impression of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) who said that there is only \$100 million authorization in this bill. Even so there is no protection for the Federal Treasury because the level of expenditures would be completely uncontrolled as to benefits. Once this was enacted into law, they would become a matter of right. We really would be sort of back-door appropriating through the authorization of this particular section.

To further clarify the remarks of my good friend from Illinois, if I may—

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois in just one moment, but I want to mention one other thing on which the gentleman may have the wrong impression, or that was my understanding from his remarks. That was where the gentleman indicated that

\$60 or 60 percent of \$129—I believe the gentleman might have stated it both ways—was the maximum amount a person might draw under the Wright amendment, as added to this bill. Actually, the maximum amount that could be drawn under the existing provision is \$129 per week—not \$60—plus the fringe benefits of mortgage payments, rent payments, and moving costs.

Also, without a maximum level of benefits the law could act as a disincentive to the individual's seeking and obtaining alternative employment.

Another point. These provisions have not been subjected to open testimony and scrutiny. The opinions of labor, the opinions of management, the opinions of the public and Federal officials have not been heard.

This section does not take into account existing programs such as the Manpower Development Training Act, which also provides relief and assistance to unemployed workers.

I say that it is a dangerous precedent to establish because the effects on other Federal programs and legislation have not been considered. The same rationale could be extended to workers suffering unemployment from defense expenditure cutbacks, or from foreign or domestic competition.

There is nothing in the bill requiring a claimant to be available and actively seeking employment as a requirement for receiving benefits.

Unemployment compensation and insurance should be a form of social insurance. That is not the philosophy of section 801.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me ask a question or two of the gentleman from Arkansas. Since this is an open-ended obligation of the Federal Government, if a decision is made to close a plant because of environmental problems, this financial open-end obligation of the Federal Government might be a deterrent to affirmative pollution control. It might be a deterrent to any Federal agency to act as they might otherwise act in closing a facility because of the pollution problem; is that a fair observation?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I think that is a fair evaluation.

I would agree with the gentleman and we would never really know that for sure unless we hear witnesses and have proper hearings and heard testimony.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me ask the gentleman another question.

The existing law, which this legislation proposes to extend, is on the books at the present time. What is the expiration date of the existing law?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I think there is one more year of authorization time to go.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, this is not critical or essential legislation at this point because the existing law is on the statute books.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. It is not critical. However, we did sit for 15 days and hear 125 witnesses who testified to

the need of revising the existing legislation, but not to section 801. I would say to the distinguished minority leader, I think there is a need for expanding existing EDA authorization. But it is not critical.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If I may ask the gentleman one other question.

Has the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives ever dealt with unemployment compensation legislation heretofore to your knowledge?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. To my knowledge, they have never dealt with this subject matter. We did in the Disaster Assistance Act get into this matter of unemployment compensation, but it is far more restrictive in nature. It considers the States and uses their criteria. This is far different from what we have in this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For these various reasons, I hope and trust that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky prevails.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Gentlemen, I think this provision in this bill is a perfect example of another step toward the erosion of the orderly legislative process which I have seen happen in recent years and the invasion of the proper jurisdiction of committees.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statement of my distinguished colleague on the committee and the distinguished minority leader. But I want to make one thing perfectly clear to my colleagues here.

This is not an open-end authorization. You cannot read something into the law that is not here.

I refer you to page 40 of the bill. It says:

There is authorized to be appropriated, not to exceed \$100 million for carrying out this section.

Now, how can the gentleman tell the House or the committee that this is an open-end authorization when the bill itself—and I am holding it before you—shows "not to exceed \$100 million." That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2—

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. If I may interrupt at this point in order to reply to the gentleman, I would ask the gentleman, should his district have people who have been put out of work by an adverse environmental impact matter and they were subject to this law, and there was no money legislated in their behalf, and then there was no money in the Federal Treasury—do you suppose that we would not appropriate money as a matter of right for those individuals?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. In that unlikely event, if the Congress appropriated every dime in this bill for the full 2-year period that at the close of the 2-year period, when the \$100 million was spent, that that would be the end of the program—period, unless the Congress came back and reauthorized it.

But what is being said here on this side of the aisle is that this is an open-end bill before you—this is not so—it is a closed-end bill.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I agree that the gentleman is technically correct.

Mr. GRAY. Technically? The bill speaks for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me plead with this House: First, to try to be consistent; and second, to try to treat people who are equally situated equally under the law.

I agree that there is a real justification for giving special consideration to the plight of those people who are put out of work specifically by Government action.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we will face situations where as a result of the Environmental Protection Act people are put out of work, and I think we have to address ourselves to that. I think the committee is to be complimented for at least trying to address itself to the fact that these people have a special problem.

I would point out, though, that we have people also put out of work because of the closing of a defense plant, and we do not yet have any special provision for them. I think we probably should.

Let me point out to the members of the committee that reported this bill, and to the Members of this House, that we as a Congress have faced up to developing a program to give special attention to the problems of the people who are put out of work because of Government action. We have done it in conjunction with the Trade Agreements Act. We started it when we entered into an agreement with Canada on automobiles, and we said there may be some people put out of work as a result of that, and, therefore, we will make a special provision. We extended it to the General Trade Agreements Act so that if somebody is put out of work because of the act of our Government in changing the duties or the protection that various items have, he can get special benefits. It seems to me that is on all fours with what you are trying to do here, but you are designing a program where the eligibility is entirely different, where the benefits are entirely different, where the duration of benefits is entirely different.

You provide no coordination, as does the Adjustment Assistance Act under the Trade Agreements Act, to coordinate to program with the present unemployment compensation system. Why should this be entirely separate? If you want to do a little more, why not do it on top of the unemployment compensation system you have? These people are entitled to unemployment compensation, and

they are supposed to be paid out of the fund that has been developed. Why have something entirely different and not coordinate it? We have programs for the training of these workers and the adjustment assistance under the Trade Adjustment Act is coordinated with that, and the benefits that you pay under the Work Training Act are coordinated to be consistent with what may be paid as a result of unemployment.

I do not know, frankly, whether a person who goes into training can get double benefits, whether he can get benefits under this special compensation, and then also get benefits under work training.

What I suggest to the committee—and I would suggest it to this House—is not that we ignore the problem of these people, but that you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, that the committee go back and take a further look at this matter, hold hearings, and try to coordinate it with what is already being done. If the committee could find that it also has jurisdiction over other kinds of unemployment created by Government action, then those people could be included. Let us not get just a complete mess of topsy-turvy programs where one person, because he is put out of work by foreign imports gets one kind of benefit under one kind of an eligibility system, and then if he is put out of work by ecology, he gets a different one, and another one who is put out of work by the closing of a defense plant gets something different, whereas their problem is all the same. The cause of it is the same.

I plead with you: Let us not make a mess out of our laws. Let us have some consistency. Let us be fair. The committee has time, I am sure, to take this up separately, and come out with a bill on that matter.

I assure the gentleman that I will support the legislation if it has the consistency which I think is required. However, all you are doing here is adding confusion to our laws, and where we will end up, nobody will know.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to point out to the distinguished senior minority member of the Ways and Means Committee that when the committee did consider the original version of the bill they tried to follow the Trade Expansion Act at 66½ percent of compensation, and that position was rejected in the committee and in the bill brought to the floor.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is in error if he contends that is the level in the Trade Adjustment Act. It is not. I suggest he read section 1942 of title XIX—or I will be glad to read it to the gentleman, but it is not 63 percent. It is not even 60 percent. It provides an entirely different formula than he suggests. I will admit it is a complex formula, but it is not the benefit the gentleman is providing here or the suggestion that was turned down by the committee. The eligibility is different. Everything is different.

There is not one item in this bill that is comparable to the adjustment assistance under the Trade Act.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. First of all I would like to point out that there is no duplication of benefits under this bill, as was suggested. There is no duplication anywhere. That has not been established but it has been a repeated statement made by the other side.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I am puzzled as to how to vote. It seems to me there is an ethical question here and a practical question. The ethical question is can we justify a very substantial handout to industry, and incidentally a great many of these industries have been making quite a great thing out of dumping their poison into the waters for decades and longer and making their profits and nobody is going to ask them to pay for past damage to the environment. We are proposing a handout to industry, and yet at the same time we are taking a very businesslike attitude toward the workers who will be displaced by these cleanup orders.

Now there is also a practical question. In my district we have a great deal of pollution in a great many industries that ought to be given cleanup orders. There are 1,200 firms pouring poison every day into Baltimore Harbor. If we give an order to close down a firm, or put in an order which they regard as threatening the firm's ability to continue, I am concerned that we will have the labor force of that firm marching on the Congressmen and protesting to get these antipollution orders stopped. Can we enforce real antipollution programs unless we do have something in here that is acceptable to the workers?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had considerable debate on this particular amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 6:10.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to discuss the merits or demerits of the proposal. I do congratulate the committee for recognizing a serious problem and trying to deal with it. I fear that the committee has given inadequate consideration to the unemployment section, but I am happy that the committee has recognized the obligation of society to pay for losses incurred in behalf of society.

I do want to know on the record, from the chairman or whoever is acting as chairman, whether the gentleman considers that this bill includes those who are put out of employment as a result of the Federal orders prohibiting the use of all practical means of destroying predators in the livestock industry. Will anybody answer?

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not sure that the situation the gentleman describes is expressly covered under the terms of this bill, but it certainly is possible that such a situation could be covered. The test of eligibility set forth in subsection (a) of this section refers to "any employment loss" resulting from a standard or order issued pursuant to certain cited laws "or any other Federal law having for its primary purpose the improvement of environmental quality." If the situation described by the gentleman meets that test, it would be eligible for payments.

Mr. POAGE. Why should it not be?

Mr. WRIGHT. I know of no reason whatever why it should not be. It is my general impression that the general announced purpose of the predator protection legislation is founded upon environmental considerations.

Mr. POAGE. It is intended to conform the environment to what some people think it should be; is it not?

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. And it is a Federal order. I am glad that the gentleman agrees with me that these livestock should receive as favorable treatment as should other industries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. COLLIER and SNYDER yielded their time to Mr. DENT.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time I wanted to take awhile ago to tell the Members about some of the things we may not be thinking about.

We are not talking about unemployment compensation. I was in on the first Unemployment Compensation Act which was passed in this country. Unemployment compensation was designed to pick up between the transitional period when a person lost his job and went to another job. It was never intended to be a payment in lieu of work for jobs which were not ever to be recreated.

The first breakthrough was in the Trade Expansion Act, which set aside all unemployment compensation, when they knew what was causing the unemployment. They said in that act, "If you are out of work because imports have taken your job, we are going to pay you so much as a sort of a bonus not to complain. We will pay you so much a month or a week, for so many months, in order that you will have money to live on."

However, unemployment compensation is entirely different from the situation where jobs have been taken away and will not ever again be recreated.

Why do not we call it what it is? Let us give it a name other than unemployment compensation.

Every State has an unemployment compensation act. If a person is out of work for any reason—for trade reasons, for environmental reasons, for any reason anyone can think of—he can collect unemployment compensation, the same as anybody else, for the period of time which is considered to be correct for the transitional period required between jobs.

What we are doing now is that we are setting up in this country a permanent series of payments for jobs that have gone and will never come back. This is not unemployment compensation. This has nothing to do with what we should be doing to recognize the injury of job losses. It is good, and it is needed, but it is not needed any more for the one group of workers who are out of work because of a trade proposition being out of kilter, or because of an environmental situation.

Environmental expenses should be paid for by the Government, and they should be paid for with money that does not pay interest. They are in the public domain. They ought to be paid for with money which is put out and issued against the project, and returned to the Government when it is collected in taxes on a 5- to 10-percent discount, paid back to the Treasury with no added debt created.

This was suggested by Henry Ford when the Muscle Shoals plan was before the Congress. It was laughed at when he suggested it, yet if it had been approved Muscle Shoals would have cost exactly \$33 million instead of the uncounted millions of dollars when we finally pay for Muscle Shoals, because we have never yet paid the interest on the bonds that we created.

So if we are going to make a law in this country that makes an effort to do something about cleaning up the environment, ecology, and all of that, that is in the public domain, it ought to be paid for without paying interest of any kind as a reward, because of the fact that we pass a law that puts them out of business.

We have no right to put industry out of business, and persons out of work, without considering the real loss to them both and the added burden to everyone in the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment must be supported.

In creating a separate competitive program to that which we operate through the Department of Labor, this committee has contributed to the proliferation of competing agencies in our Government.

Last week we voted down a bill, or amended it substantially, because we did not want to lay on another level of government activity. Here today, because a committee that does not have jurisdiction over this unemployment program gave it to a separate agency, we are about to create another agency level unless we pass this amendment.

What about the workers? If it is true, as the gentleman from Illinois says, that we have only a \$100 million liability, what do we do for the unemployed person who comes up for compensation after the \$100 million are gone? All we have given him is a false hope.

What do we do now that we have given this program to an agency that has no authority to establish rules? What do we do if the Secretary of Labor judges that a man is not unemployed because of environmental reasons? There is no appeal or judicial review because we have not provided for coordination, or for rule-making authority.

Not only are we promising to potential unemployed persons more than that which this bill can deliver, but we have also provided an excellent vehicle for abuse of benefits. There is no rule requiring an active search for work, or even that a person be available for work. There is no definition of suitable work.

The committee's incursion into the jurisdictional area of unemployed compensation is a disaster. It is a little like a blacksmith performing brain surgery. Only by passing the Snyder amendment can we protect our well-administered unemployment compensation program. I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT).

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. In further response to the earlier colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) let me say that we cannot deceive the people of America by leading them to believe they would be entitled to more benefits under this section, because once this program becomes law the Congress would be obliged to have all of those who are put out of work for environmental reasons collect benefits. Once this program is started it cannot be stopped, and therefore I say it is open-ended legislation, and Congress will have to legislate the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, there is considerable merit to this section. I am sure we all want to see unemployment insurance of a certain amount given to a man thrown out of work through no fault of his own. That is the basis of our State unemployment insurance program, and I think from my experience that the program works well. It is a good Federal-State relationship.

But we are setting up here a new category and piling one type of unemployment on top of another. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) may be exactly correct, because this is a little bit different because it may be referring to jobs that are gone.

However, this section is full and complete in section 801 with inferences to "unemployment compensation." We ought to give further study to this and try to find an equitable solution but perhaps not in the form before us at this point although it has a great deal of merit and equity to it. I think we can approach it in a better manner with fur-

ther study and come out with what would be considered fair for the unemployed workers.

I do want to add my support, however, of the EDA program. We have an excellent program in my State, and are beginning to add some most worthwhile projects in my district. I commend the administrators of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make two short points in closing.

This bill does not allow any unemployed person to draw both unemployment compensation and the benefits provided by section 801. So let us say this section should be stricken. These same people we would give a remedy to in this legislation will go into an unemployment compensation office and file for benefits and get paid benefits. This is not going to cost the taxpayers an additional \$100 million. I want to make it very clear.

Second, we are paying out right now \$1.5 billion a month in welfare. We are paying out \$500 million a month, and not a year in unemployment compensation. So this is infinitesimal in cost compared to what we are already paying.

What we are trying to do is give this fellow a little hope in going some place and finding a new job. It will not be an additional \$100 million cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is significant that most of those who have argued to strike this entire section have come up and said to you that there is merit in this idea. They have said that we do owe these people some consideration, that we ought to do something about it, but they just do not believe we have quite got it exactly right yet. Therefore, they argue, let us not do anything. That is what they are saying.

That argument, on its face, is illogical. I cannot swear to you that this is a consummate, perfect approach, but it is the best that the committee could devise. We have placed a realistic limit on the amount an individual may receive. We have properly circumscribed the entitlement and the eligibility. We think it is the best we can do. We think it is a fair approach. Perhaps it could be perfected further. Few laws could meet the test of immaculate perfection.

But in heaven's name let us not simply for fear that it may contain imperfection cut it out entirely and do nothing. And that is what you would do if you vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER). You would strike the entire section. If you think we owe these displaced people something, then vote "no" on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) to close the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: The committee worked its will on the new title providing for sections 801 and 802. In doing that we gave consider-

ation to the employee who is going to be affected by the environmental policy acts, water pollution, air pollution, and noise pollution. We provided for industry in section 802 for them to cope with the mandates of the environmental agency as it relates to the industrial establishments.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) pointed out to you that no employee can collect double compensation.

There is an amount of \$100 million to cover the compensation of the employees provided for in section 801, and there is \$200 million that is available to industry on 30-year loans, and at 3-percent interest.

I think sections 801 and 802 are fully justified, and I therefore ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER).

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

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Messrs. SNYDER, GRAY, BLATNIK, and ZION.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, yeas 201, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—161

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abbott | Duncan | McEwen |
| Alexander | Erlenborn | McKay |
| Anderson, Ill. | Esch | McKevitt |
| Andrews, | Eshleman | Mallory |
| N. Dak. | Evans, Colo. | Mann |
| Archer | Findley | Martin |
| Arends | Fisher | Mathias, Calif. |
| Ashbrook | Flynt | Mayne |
| Baring | Ford, Gerald R. | Miller, Ohio |
| Belcher | Forsythe | Mills, Ark. |
| Bell | Fountain | Montgomery |
| Blackburn | Frenzel | Myers |
| Bow | Frey | Nelsen |
| Brinkley | Goldwater | Patten |
| Broomfield | Goodling | Pettis |
| Brotzman | Gross | Pickle |
| Brown, Mich. | Grover | Pirnie |
| Brown, Ohio | Gubser | Poage |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Gude | Poff |
| Broyhill, Va. | Haley | Powell |
| Buchanan | Hall | Price, Tex. |
| Burke, Fla. | Hammer- | Quile |
| Burleson, Tex. | schmidt | Quillen |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hanna | Robinson, Va. |
| Cabell | Hansen, Idaho | Robison, N.Y. |
| Camp | Hastings | Rogers |
| Carlson | Heinz | Roncallo |
| Casey, Tex. | Hosmer | Runnels |
| Cederberg | Hunt | Ruppe |
| Chappell | Hutchinson | Ruth |
| Clawson, Del. | Jarman | Sandman |
| Collier | Johnson, Pa. | Satterfield |
| Collins, Tex. | Jonas | Saylor |
| Colmer | Jones, N.C. | Scherle |
| Conable | Keating | Schneebell |
| Conover | King | Scott |
| Crane | Kuykendall | Sebellus |
| Curlin | Kyl | Shoup |
| Davis, Ga. | Landgrebe | Shriver |
| Dellenback | Landrum | Sikes |
| Denholm | Latta | Skubitz |
| Dennis | Lloyd | Smith, Calif. |
| Dent | Lujan | Smith, N.Y. |
| Derwinski | McClary | Snyder |
| Devine | McClure | Spence |
| Dickinson | McCollister | Stanton, |
| Downing | McCulloch | J. William |

| | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Steed | Ullman | Wilson, Bob |
| Steiger, Ariz. | Vander Jagt | Winn |
| Steiger, Wis. | Ware | Wydler |
| Stephens | Whalley | Wyllie |
| Talcott | Whitehurst | Young, Fla. |
| Teague, Calif. | Widnall | Zion |
| Thompson, Ga. | Wiggins | Zwach |
| Thomson, Wis. | Williams | |

NOES—201

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Abzug | Gettys | Nedzi |
| Adams | Gibbons | Nix |
| Addabbo | Gonzalez | Obey |
| Albert | Grasso | O'Hara |
| Anderson, | Gray | O'Konski |
| Calif. | Green, Oreg. | Patman |
| Andrews, Ala. | Green, Pa. | Pepper |
| Anunzio | Griffin | Perkins |
| Ashley | Griffiths | Feysner |
| Aspin | Halpern | Pike |
| Aspinall | Hamilton | Podell |
| Badillo | Hanley | Preyer, N.C. |
| Barrett | Harsha | Price, Ill. |
| Begich | Hathaway | Pryor, Ark. |
| Bennett | Hawkins | Pucinski |
| Bergland | Hays | Purcell |
| Bevill | Hechler, W. Va. | Randall |
| Biaggi | Helstoski | Rangel |
| Blester | Henderson | Rees |
| Bingham | Hicks, Mass. | Reid |
| Blatnik | Hicks, Wash. | Reuss |
| Boggs | Hogan | Roberts |
| Boland | Hollifield | Rodino |
| Bolling | Horton | Roe |
| Brademas | Howard | Rooney, Pa. |
| Brasco | Hungate | Rosenthal |
| Brooks | Ichord | Rostenkowski |
| Burke, Mass. | Jacobs | Roush |
| Burlinson, Mo. | Johnson, Calif. | Roy |
| Burton | Jones, Ala. | Roybal |
| Byron | Jones, Tenn. | St Germain |
| Celler | Karh | Sarbanes |
| Chisholm | Kastenmeier | Scheuer |
| Clausen, | Kazen | Schwengel |
| Don H. | Kee | Seiberling |
| Cleveland | Kemp | Shipley |
| Collins, Ill. | Kluczynski | Sisk |
| Conyers | Koch | Slack |
| Corman | Kyros | Smith, Iowa |
| Cotter | Link | Staggers |
| Coughlin | Long, Md. | Stanton |
| Culver | McCormack | James V. |
| Daniels, N.J. | McDade | Steele |
| Danielson | McFall | Stokes |
| Davis, S.C. | McKinney | Stratton |
| Delaney | Macdonald, | Stubblefield |
| Dellums | Mass. | Stuckey |
| Diggs | Madden | Symington |
| Dingell | Maillard | Taylor |
| Donohue | Mathis, Ga. | Thone |
| Dorn | Matsunaga | Tiernan |
| Dow | Mazzoli | Udall |
| Dinran | Meeds | Van Deerlin |
| Dulski | Meicher | Vanik |
| du Pont | Metcalfe | Vigorito |
| Eckhardt | Mikva | Waggonner |
| Edwards, Calif. | Miller, Calif. | Wampler |
| Ellberg | Minish | Whalen |
| Evins, Tenn. | Mink | White |
| Fascell | Mitchell | Wolf |
| Fish | Mizell | Wright |
| Flood | Mollohan | Wyatt |
| Flowers | Monagan | Wyman |
| Foley | Moorhead | Yates |
| Fraser | Morgan | Yatron |
| Fulton | Moss | Young, Tex. |
| Fuqua | Murphy, Ill. | Zablocki |
| Galifianakis | Murphy, N.Y. | |
| Gaydos | Natcher | |

NOT VOTING—71

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Ford, | Mills, Md. |
| Abouzeck | William D. | Minshall |
| Anderson, | Frelinghuysen | Mosher |
| Tenn. | Gallagher | Nichols |
| Baker | Garmatz | O'Neill |
| Betts | Gialmo | Passman |
| Blanton | Hagan | Pelly |
| Bray | Hansen, Wash. | Railsback |
| Byrne, Pa. | Harrington | Rarick |
| Caffery | Harvey | Rhodes |
| Carey, N.Y. | Hébert | Riegle |
| Carney | Heckler, Mass. | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Carter | Hillis | Roussellot |
| Chamberlain | Hull | Ryan |
| Clancy | Keith | Schmitz |
| Clark | Leggett | Springer |
| Clay | Lennon | Sullivan |
| Conte | Lent | Teague, Tex. |
| Daniel, Va. | Long, La. | Terry |
| Davis, Wis. | McCloskey | Thompson, N.J. |
| de la Garza | McDonald, | Veysey |
| Dowdy | Mich. | Waldie |
| Dwyer | McMillan | Whitten |
| Edmondson | Mahon | Wilson, |
| Edwards, Ala. | Michel | Charles H. |

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join my colleagues in urging passage of the accelerated public works impact bill, and I commend the Committee on Public Works for reporting out this bill. This bill recognizes the dual need of local communities for waste and sewage treatment facilities, sidewalks, and other needed permanent public facilities, and the national need to reduce unemployment and relieve the unemployment/inflation cycle.

Before the recent devastation wrought by Hurricane Agnes was visited upon the Wyoming Valley, the accelerated public works impact bill was desperately needed—unemployment hovered at the 6-percent level with pockets of substantial unemployment in many areas of my district. The needs of the communities—sewers, firehouses, and other municipal buildings, waste treatment plants, and the scores of other projects which we all know so well, all of these were needed before the flood waters rose. And then came Agnes. Agnes, the greatest civic disaster in the history of the Republic. They talk of sudden rises in unemployment rates to qualify for public works projects—they talk of substantial unemployment. On June 22, 1972, the unemployment rate in Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, Pa. was 5.8 percent. On June 23, 1972, a Friday morning after everyone had been to work the day before, the rate was 33 percent; 33 percent. This is not a short-term problem either—grossly substantial unemployment will remain in Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding disaster area unless all aid possible is brought to bear to relieve these suffering communities.

Mr. Chairman, if I may give a brief rundown of what has happened to public facilities in my district:

Borough buildings and city halls damaged or lost in Wilkes-Barre, Kingston, Plymouth, Forty Fort, Soversville.

Firehouses damaged by the scores, police stations wiped out, sidewalks ripped out in every community in my district, and bridges and highways destroyed completely by the hundreds.

In one community alone, Kingston, 70 percent of the sewage treatment facilities and pipelines were rendered inoperable, with a huge amount still damaged at this time. I could go on like Tennyson's brook, but let it suffice to say that this legislation is needed, it was needed yesterday, and if the future of the disaster areas is to be secured, legislation of this type is a must.

Mr. Chairman, I will not seek to burden you with statistics and data, which in themselves reflect the critical need for the accelerated public works program. However, I would wish to underscore a few points. With relation to the domestic economy: The balanced budget of 1969 has become the expansionary, unbalanced budget of 1973; the complete rejection of Federal involvement in setting wage and price ceilings matured into the implementation of such controls last August, at a time that some economists say may have been too late. And finally, the abhorrence of public works projects as political "boondoggles" has come to be

an approximately \$50 million program for public works concentrated in high unemployment impact areas.

Even the administration realizes that while not a permanent solution to the problem of unemployment, that public works programs of this type involves a human investment as relates to skills and the reducing of State and Federal expenses in the form of reduced welfare rolls and shorter lines at the unemployment offices. The program which has now been placed before us would accelerate public works spending and would have the attendant benefits by providing badly needed services to areas of high unemployment, of training idle manpower, and reducing spiraling public assistance costs which represent nonproductive Government expenditures.

The argument with relation to the reduction of welfare costs is one of the most telling in this respect. Since January 1969, welfare costs have almost doubled as the unemployment rate for the same period went from 3.5 percent to 6 percent. In the year 1969, payments of unemployment compensation totaled \$2.1 billion, while in 1971, the last year for which figures are available, that figure soared to \$5.7 billion.

The reduction in the unemployment rate to 5.5 percent last month has been hailed as the harbinger of good news concerning the state of the economy and has led to predictions that the rate will be reduced to 5 percent by the end of the year. Assuming that this is an accomplishment to be proud of, which I do not contend it is, such figures which express a national average of unemployment do not speak directly to areas which may be suffering unemployment rates twice or three times the national average. These areas are the locus of emphasis in the legislation before us.

However, I do not agree that a figure of 5-percent unemployment is a fact of sound economic policy to be admirably applauded. Taken in the context of the net accomplishment regarding the unemployment figure we still discover that since January 1969 there has been, as it stands now, a net increase of 2 percent unemployed.

We need not belabor the need for taking up the employment slack in this country, yet we can neither stress the need too strongly. Persistent unemployment has a reverberating effect on every sector of the economy, on the cost of living, and even on our Nation's ability to maintain a sound international fiscal policy. The APW impact bill is only the first step in providing a part of the solution to this complex problem—but it is a necessary step.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: Page 28, line 11, strike out the quotation marks and the period following such quotation marks and insert the following: "The Secretary shall not establish any system of priorities for the kinds of assistance authorized by this section."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I might say that this is the amendment alluded to in general debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The committee members on this side of the aisle have reviewed the amendment and we see no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, this side of the aisle also accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman as a constructive amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an explanation of the amendment even though it has been accepted by both sides.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment further clarifies the meaning of section 301 of this bill. It is apparent the intention of the Congress in this section has been misconstrued by the Department. The meaning of section 301 is to give equal emphasis to the technical assistance, planning grants, et cetera, mentioned in it. The Department has been using its own priorities in making these grants, contrary to the intent of this committee and of Congress when it passed the original act.

This amendment simply stipulates the Secretary shall not make such priorities. This amendment was fully discussed during general debate.

Does the gentleman from Missouri have any further questions?

Mr. HALL. No. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. I heard the general debate. I now know to what the gentleman refers. But I believe there is unanimous agreement that a Member cannot act intelligently without an explanation.

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, 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. 16071) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, pursuant to House Resolution 1098, 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.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute? If

not, 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, and was read the third time.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 92, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

YEAS—285

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abzug | Flowers | Macdonald, |
| Adams | Foley | Mass. |
| Addabbo | Ford | Madden |
| Alexander | William D. | Mailliard |
| Anderson, | Forsythe | Mann |
| Calif. | Fountain | Mathias, Calif. |
| Andrews, Ala. | Fraser | Mathis, Ga. |
| N. Dak. | Frenzel | Matsunaga |
| Annunzio | Frey | Mazzoli |
| Ashley | Fulton | Meeds |
| Aspin | Fuqua | Melcher |
| Aspinall | Galifianakis | Metcalfe |
| Badillo | Garmatz | Mikva |
| Baring | Gaydos | Miller, Calif. |
| Barrett | Gettys | Miller, Ohio |
| Begich | Glaimo | Minish |
| Bennett | Gibbons | Mink |
| Bergland | Gonzalez | Minshall |
| Bevill | Grasso | Mitchell |
| Biaggi | Gray | Mizell |
| Blester | Green, Oreg. | Molohan |
| Bingham | Green, Pa. | Monagan |
| Blatnik | Griffin | Moorhead |
| Boggs | Griffiths | Morgan |
| Boland | Grover | Mosher |
| Bolling | Gubser | Moss |
| Brademas | Gude | Murphy, Ill. |
| Brasco | Halpern | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Brooks | Hamilton | Myers |
| Brotzman | Hammer- | Natcher |
| Brown, Mich. | schmidt | Nedzi |
| Burke, Mass. | Hanley | Nelsen |
| Burlison, Mo. | Hanna | Nix |
| Burton | Hansen, Idaho | Obey |
| Byrne, Pa. | Harsha | O'Hara |
| Byron | Hastings | O'Konski |
| Carey, N.Y. | Hathaway | Patman |
| Celler | Hawkins | Patten |
| Chappell | Hays | Pepper |
| Chisholm | Hechler, W. Va. | Perkins |
| Clark | Heinz | Pettis |
| Clausen, | Helstoski | Peyser |
| Don H. | Henderson | Pickle |
| Cleveland | Hicks, Mass. | Pike |
| Collins, Ill. | Hicks, Wash. | Pirnie |
| Conover | Hogan | Podell |
| Conyers | Holifield | Powell |
| Corman | Horton | Preyer, N.C. |
| Cotter | Howard | Price, Ill. |
| Coughlin | Hungate | Pryor, Ark. |
| Culver | Hunt | Pucinski |
| Curlin | Ichord | Quie |
| Daniels, N.J. | Jacobs | Quillen |
| Danielson | Johnson, Calif. | Randall |
| Davis, Ga. | Jones, Ala. | Rangel |
| Davis, S.C. | Jones, N.C. | Rees |
| de la Garza | Jones, Tenn. | Reid |
| Delaney | Karth | Reuss |
| Dellums | Kastenmeier | Roberts |
| Denholm | Kazen | Rodino |
| Dent | Keating | Roe |
| Diggs | Kee | Roncallo |
| Dingell | Kemp | Rooney, Pa. |
| Donohue | King | Rosenthal |
| Dorn | Kluczynski | Rostenkowski |
| Dow | Koch | Roush |
| Drinan | Kyros | Roy |
| Dulski | Landrum | Roybal |
| Duncan | Latta | Runnels |
| du Pont | Link | Ruppe |
| Eckhardt | Lujan | St Germain |
| Edwards, Calif. | McCollister | Sarbanes |
| Ellberg | McCormack | Saylor |
| Esch | McCulloch | Scheuer |
| Evans, Colo. | McDade | Schwengel |
| Evins, Tenn. | McEwen | Seiberling |
| Fascell | McFall | Shipley |
| Fish | McKay | Shoup |
| Flood | McKevitt | Shriver |
| | McKinney | Sikes |

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| Sisk | Sullivan | Wampler |
| Skubitz | Symington | Whalen |
| Slack | Talcott | White |
| Smith, Iowa | Taylor | Whitten |
| Smith, N.Y. | Teague, Calif. | Widnall |
| Spence | Terry | Wilson, |
| Staggers | Thompson, Ga. | Charles H. |
| Stanton, | Thompson, N.J. | Winn |
| J. William | Thomson, Wis. | Wolff |
| Stanton, | Thone | Wright |
| James V. | Tiernan | Wyatt |
| Steed | Udall | Wyman |
| Steele | Ullman | Yates |
| Stephens | Van Deerlin | Yatron |
| Stokes | Waggonner | Young, Tex. |
| Stratton | Vander Jagt | Zablocki |
| Stubblefield | Vanik | Zion |
| Stuckey | Vigorito | Zwack |

NAYS—92

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbitt | Dennis | Mayne |
| Anderson, Ill. | Derwinski | Mills, Ark. |
| Archer | Devine | Montgomery |
| Arends | Dickinson | Poage |
| Ashbrook | Downing | Poff |
| Belcher | Erlenborn | Price, Tex. |
| Bell | Eshleman | Purcell |
| Blackburn | Findley | Robinson, Va. |
| Bow | Fisher | Robison, N.Y. |
| Bray | Flynt | Rogers |
| Brinkley | Ford, Gerald R. | Ruth |
| Broomfield | Goldwater | Sandman |
| Brown, Ohio | Goodling | Satterfield |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Gross | Scherle |
| Broyhill, Va. | Haley | Schneebell |
| Buchanan | Hall | Scott |
| Burke, Fla. | Hosmer | Sebelius |
| Burleson, Tex. | Hutchinson | Smith, Calif. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jarman | Snyder |
| Cabell | Johnson, Pa. | Stelger, Ariz. |
| Camp | Jonas | Stelger, Wis. |
| Carlson | Kuykendall | Ware |
| Casey, Tex. | Kyl | Whalley |
| Cederberg | Landgrebe | Whitehurst |
| Clawson, Del. | Lloyd | Wiggins |
| Collier | Long, Md. | Williams |
| Collins, Tex. | McClory | Willson, Bob |
| Colmer | McClure | Wylder |
| Conable | Mahon | Wylie |
| Crane | Mallory | Young, Fla. |
| Dellenback | Martin | |

NOT VOTING—55

| | | |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| Abernethy | Edwards, Ala. | McMillan |
| Abourezk | Frelinghuysen | Michel |
| Anderson, | Gallagher | Mills, Md. |
| Tenn. | Hagan | Nichols |
| Baker | Hansen, Wash. | O'Neill |
| Betts | Harrington | Passman |
| Blanton | Harvey | Pelly |
| Caffery | Hébert | Rallsback |
| Carney | Heckler, Mass. | Rarick |
| Carter | Hillis | Rhodes |
| Chamberlain | Hull | Riegle |
| Clancy | Keith | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Clay | Leggett | Rousselot |
| Conte | Lennon | Ryan |
| Daniel, Va. | Lent | Schmitz |
| Davis, Wis. | Long, La. | Springer |
| Dowdy | McCloskey | Teague, Tex. |
| Dwyer | McDonald, | Vesey |
| Edmondson | Mich. | Waldie |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Conte.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Betts.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Chamberlain.
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Lent.
 Mr. Harrington with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Carney with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Hillis.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Mills of Maryland.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Clay with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Roussetot.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Daniel of Virginia with Mr. Springer.

Mr. DOWNING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Further messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to delay the effectiveness of certain amendments to the interest subsidy provisions of the guaranteed student loan program in the case of certain students.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 16071 and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL S. 3726, EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1102, Rept. No. 92-1361) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1102

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report 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, the provisions of clause 2, Rule XXVIII notwithstanding.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1973—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-343)

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

CXVIII—1790—Part 22

To the House of Representatives:

Today, I must return without my approval H.R. 15417, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and certain related agencies. Exceeding my budget recommendations by \$1.8 billion, this bill is a perfect example of that kind of reckless Federal spending that just cannot be done without more taxes or more inflation, both of which I am determined to avoid.

Moreover, the bill fails to include a limitation on Federal matching payments for social services for public assistance recipients, although such a limitation was passed by the Senate. Because this is currently an open-ended program, this Congressional inaction could require a later supplemental reaching as high as \$3.5 billion. By increasing the face amount of the bill on the one hand and failing to place a limitation on payments for social services on the other, the Congress has produced a budget overrun that could exceed \$5 billion.

Inherent in this kind of spending, but not publicly specified by its sponsors, is a cut in purchasing power for every American family. *No program has a higher priority than continued expansion of the purchasing power of all the people.*

As I said in my special message of July 26: "I do not propose to sit by and silently watch individual family budgets destroyed by rising prices and rising taxes—the inevitable end to spending of this magnitude." Our mounting economic resurgence is at stake and I mean to protect it.

We have cut inflation in half, but spending such as this bill would require would clearly undermine that progress.

We have reduced Federal income taxes by 26 percent for a family of four making \$10,000 a year but spending such as this would undermine that progress.

We have achieved conditions in which the purchasing power of the average production worker with three dependents has gained four percent in one year, the best increase since 1964, but spending such as this would undermine that progress.

What the Congress has done is to take my ample and carefully considered 1973 budget proposals and balloon them to fiscally dangerous dimensions.

This Administration is second to none in its concern for America's health, education and manpower program needs. From the very beginning we have consistently proposed and supported desirable programs in both the health research and health service areas, and we will continue to do so. For example, we proposed—and in November of 1971 I signed into law—the most comprehensive health manpower legislation in the Nation's history. This Administration launched the first separate Federal effort to combat sickle cell anemia. We have nearly doubled the Federal commitment to finding a cure for cancer. We have also proposed fundamental reform of education and manpower training programs coupled with recommendations for major fund allocations for education

revenue sharing, emergency school assistance and public service jobs.

The failure of the Congress to use balance and restraint in the framing of H.R. 15417 has turned it into a big-spending measure that impairs the Nation's economic health.

The budget request that I submitted to the Congress proposed an increase of \$2.1 billion for the HEW programs contained in this bill. That addition permits substantial expansion over the fiscal year 1972 level while recognizing competing priorities in other areas and the necessary discipline of keeping total Federal spending within the limit of full employment revenues.

The Congress would add to my proposals \$1.8 billion in new spending authority. Increases of this magnitude are clearly excessive and must be revised.

Aside from increasing the face amount of this bill to unacceptable levels, the Congress, as I have previously noted, threatens to bring on a separate fiscal crisis of a dimension involving billions of dollars by its continuing inaction with regard to the social services program of HEW. Under this program the Federal Government provides matching funds, on a three-to-one basis, for social services provided by the States for past, current and potential public assistance recipients.

As I have previously proposed on several occasions, the Congress should place a ceiling on spending for this program which is now open-ended and not subject to any effective control by the Federal Government. But H.R. 15417 does not contain such a cutoff.

We now provide matching money for whatever amounts of services the States choose to provide. Since the authorizing legislation for the social services programs is vaguely written, the States have been able to include services far beyond what the Congress must have originally intended.

The result amounts to opening up a trap-door in the Federal Treasury through which billions are now flowing and through which more billions will pour unless the Congress enacts a specific limitation.

The rate of increase has been quickening. From 1970 to 1971, expenditures rose 37 percent. In 1972, they more than doubled—shooting up to more than \$1.9 billion. In 1973, they threaten to more than double again as State claims approach \$5 billion.

Elementary fiscal responsibility demands that this loophole for unlimited Federal funds for undefined services must be closed now. The Congress must harness this multi-billion-dollar runaway program by enacting a social services spending ceiling.

I also urge that the Congress, in drawing up a new measure, provide that the line items in the bill should not, in the aggregate, exceed my budget request. This could be accomplished either by revising the recommendations for each of the items, or by including a general provision in the bill which would limit spending to this overall aggregate amount.

I know the usual practice is to repass such a bill with a slight reduction and

assume that the second bill will have to be signed.

Such action would obviously not satisfy the objections to this measure I have set forth here.

In returning this measure without my approval, I again urge the Congress to join with me to avoid higher taxes, higher prices and a resulting cut in purchasing power for the American people by enacting a general spending ceiling of \$250 billion. That action would get us away from this Congressional credit-card approach to Government finances—an approach that will add up to bad news for everybody when the eventual and inevitable bills must be paid.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 16, 1972.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be printed as a House document.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall say only a few words and then move the previous question.

It is my understanding that the so-called open-end provision is a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, not the Committee on Appropriations, and that the Ways and Means Committee has already acted on this matter in H.R. 1, now pending in the Senate. In addition, the chairman of the committee informs me that the Secretary of HEW already has full authority now to approve or disapprove these plans.

It seems to me that the President has developed a habit of vetoing bills dealing with health and education. To my knowledge, this is the second veto of such a bill, the third veto of a bill dealing with education. Education and health are two of the great problems before this Nation.

I am sorry the President does not recognize that in his list of priorities. The issue is quite clear. The Members understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 171, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—203

| | | |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abzug | Begich | Byrne, Pa. |
| Adams | Bell | Carey, N.Y. |
| Addabbo | Bergland | Casey, Tex. |
| Alexander | Bevill | Celler |
| Anderson, Calif. | Blaggi | Chamberlain |
| | Biester | Chisholm |
| Andrews, Ala. | Bingham | Clark |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Blatnik | Collins, Ill. |
| Annunzio | Boggs | Corman |
| | Boland | Cotter |
| Ashley | Bolling | Culver |
| Aspin | Brademas | Curlin |
| Aspinall | Brasco | Daniels, N.J. |
| Badillo | Brooks | Danielson |
| Baring | Burke, Mass. | Davis, S.C. |
| Barrett | Burton | de la Garza |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Delaney | Jones, Ala. | Rangel |
| Dellums | Jones, N.C. | Rees |
| Denholm | Karth | Reid |
| Dent | Kastenmeier | Reuss |
| Diggs | Kazen | Rodino |
| Diagell | Kee | Roe |
| Donohue | Kluczynski | Roncallo |
| Dow | Koch | Rooney, Pa. |
| Drinan | Kyros | Rosenthal |
| Dulski | Link | Rostenkowski |
| Eckhardt | McCormack | Roush |
| Edwards, Calif. | McCulloch | Roy |
| Ellberg | McDade | Roybal |
| Esch | McFall | St Germain |
| Evans, Colo. | McKay | Sarbanes |
| Evins, Tenn. | Macdonald, | Scheuer |
| Fascell | Mass. | Schwengel |
| Flood | Madden | Seiberling |
| Flowers | Mailliard | Shipley |
| Foley | Matsunaga | Shriver |
| Ford, | Mazzoli | Sisk |
| William D. | Meeds | Slack |
| Fraser | Melcher | Smith, Iowa |
| Fulton | Metcalfe | Staggers |
| Fuqua | Mikva | Stanton, |
| Gallfanakis | Miller, Calif. | James V. |
| Garmatz | Mills, Ark. | Steed |
| Gaydos | Minish | Steele |
| Gibbons | Mink | Stokes |
| Gonzalez | Mitchell | Stratton |
| Grasso | Mollohan | Stubblefield |
| Gray | Monagan | Sullivan |
| Green, Pa. | Moorhead | Symington |
| Griffiths | Morgan | Taylor |
| Gude | Moss | Thompson, N.J. |
| Halpern | Murphy, Ill. | Thomson, Wis. |
| Hamilton | Murphy, N.Y. | Tiernen |
| Hanley | Myers | Udall |
| Hanna | Natcher | Van Deerlin |
| Hathaway | Nedzi | Vanik |
| Hawkins | Nix | Vigorito |
| Hays | Obey | Whalen |
| Hechler, W. Va. | O'Hara | White |
| Heinz | O'Konski | Wilson, |
| Helstoski | Patman | Charles H. |
| Henderson | Patten | Wolf |
| Hicks, Mass. | Pepper | Wright |
| Hicks, Wash. | Perkins | Wyatt |
| Hollifield | Peyser | Yates |
| Horton | Pike | Yatron |
| Howard | Podell | Young, Tex. |
| Hungate | Preyer, N.C. | Zablocki |
| Jacobs | Price, Ill. | Zwach |
| Johnson, Calif. | Pucinski | |

NAYS—171

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abbt | Findley | McKinney |
| Anderson, Ill. | Fish | Mahon |
| Archer | Fisher | Mallory |
| Arends | Flynt | Mann |
| Ashbrook | Ford, Gerald R. | Martin |
| Belcher | Forsythe | Mathias, Calif. |
| Bennett | Fountain | Mathis, Ga. |
| Blackburn | Frenzel | Mayne |
| Bow | Frey | Miller, Ohio |
| Bray | Gettys | Minshall |
| Brinkley | Gialmo | Mizell |
| Broomfield | Goldwater | Montgomery |
| Brotzman | Goodling | Mosher |
| Brown, Mich. | Green, Oreg. | Nelsen |
| Brown, Ohio | Griffin | Pettis |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Gross | Pickle |
| Broyhill, Va. | Grover | Pirnie |
| Burke, Fla. | Gubser | Poage |
| Burleson, Tex. | Haley | Poff |
| Burlison, Mo. | Hall | Powell |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hammer- | Price, Tex. |
| Byron | schmidt | Purcell |
| Cabell | Hansen, Idaho | Quie |
| Camp | Harsha | Quillen |
| Carlson | Hastings | Randall |
| Cederberg | Hogan | Roberts |
| Chappell | Hosmer | Robinson, Va. |
| Clausen, | Hunt | Robison, N.Y. |
| Don H. | Hutchinson | Rogers |
| Clawson, Del | Ichord | Runnels |
| Cleveland | Jarman | Ruppe |
| Collier | Johnson, Pa. | Ruth |
| Collins, Tex. | Jonas | Sandman |
| Colmer | Jones, Tenn. | Satterfield |
| Conable | Keating | Saylor |
| Conover | Kemp | Scherle |
| Coughlin | King | Schneebeli |
| Crane | Kuykendall | Scott |
| Davis, Ga. | Kyl | Sebellus |
| Dellenback | Landgrebe | Shoup |
| Dennis | Landrum | Sikes |
| Derwinski | Latta | Skubitz |
| Devine | Lloyd | Smith, Calif. |
| Dickinson | Long, Md. | Smith, N.Y. |
| Dorn | Lujan | Snyder |
| Downing | McClory | Spence |
| Duncan | McClure | Stanton, |
| du Pont | McCollister | J. William |
| Erlenborn | McEwen | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Eshleman | McKevitt | Steiger, Wis. |

| | | |
|----------------|------------|-------------|
| Stephens | Waggonner | Williams |
| Stuckey | Wampler | Wilson, Bob |
| Talcott | Ware | Winn |
| Teague, Calif. | Whalley | Wyder |
| Terry | Whitehurst | Wyllie |
| Thompson, Ga. | Whitten | Wyman |
| Thone | Widnall | Young, Fla. |
| Vander Jagt | Wiggins | Zion |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Buchanan

NOT VOTING—57

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| Abernethy | Frelinghuysen | Mills, Md. |
| Abourezk | Gallagher | Nichols |
| Anderson, | Hagan | O'Neill |
| Tenn. | Hansen, Wash. | Passman |
| Baker | Harrington | Pelly |
| Betts | Harvey | Pryor, Ark. |
| Blanton | Hébert | Rallsback |
| Caffery | Heckler, Mass. | Rarick |
| Carney | Hillis | Rhodes |
| Carter | Hull | Riegle |
| Clancy | Keith | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Clay | Leggett | Rousselot |
| Conte | Lennon | Ryan |
| Conyers | Lent | Schmitz |
| Daniel, Va. | Long, La. | Springer |
| Davis, Wis. | McCloskey | Teague, Tex. |
| Dowdy | McDonald, | Ullman |
| Dwyer | Mich. | Veysey |
| Edmondson | McMillan | Waldie |
| Edwards, Ala. | Michel | |

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington and Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Mr. Leggett and Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Waldie and Mr. Harrington for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Carney and Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Clay and Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mrs. Dwyer and Mr. Abourezk for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Hull and Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts and Mr. Harvey for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Blanton and Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas and Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. McMillan and Mr. McCloskey for, with Mr. Veysey against.

Mr. Hillis and Mr. Rallsback for, with Mr. Mills of Maryland against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Daniel of Virginia with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Schmitz.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Springer.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES). I voted "yea." Had he been present, he would have voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill, together with the accompanying papers, are referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-344)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In recent years, a major source of aid to students attending post-secondary schools has been the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. During the year ending this past June 30, over 1,000,000 students were able to borrow \$1.3 billion to finance their education. Over 8,000 schools and 20,000 financial institutions are currently participating.

Support of this program has been bipartisan. It was created under the Administration of President Johnson, and it has been expanded and improved by the present Administration.

However, some provisions of the "Education Amendments of 1972," because of ambiguities in the language of the legislation, have had an unintended effect of raising the possibility that many thousands of students who have benefitted under the subsidized loan portion of the program in the past may not be able to obtain the loans they are counting on to return to school this fall.

We are doing everything possible in the regulations implementing the law to avoid this result, which was intended neither by the Administration nor by the Congress. But uncertainty remains. Because we are at the peak of the borrowing season under this program, I request that the Congress enact emergency legislation that would delay the implementation of the troublesome section of the law—specifically that it amend Section 132C(1), so that the lenders could continue to provide loans on the same basis as they did last year.

This would make it possible for students, parents, schools, and lenders to use a system with which they are all familiar, and which has served the students well. It would make it possible for students to obtain loans in time to go to school—which after all is the purpose of the program.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 16, 1972.

ADDITION TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House an addition to the program for tomorrow and the balance of the week. We have added to the program the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules this afternoon, House Resolution 1102, which provides for the consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 3726, to extend and amend the Export Administration Act.

REQUEST TO INSERT MATERIAL IN THE RECORD

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the estimated cost of \$1,402.50 I may be permitted to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of important testimony of six witnesses on the subject of world order.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Massachusetts state the purpose of his request again?

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is the important testimony of six witnesses on the subject of world order presented at hearings conducted by The Members of Congress for Peace Through Law.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. What was the cost again?

Mr. DRINAN. This was the testimony given by Norman Cousins and Dr. Richard Barnett, and four others at hearings conducted by this bipartisan group entitled The Members of the Congress for Peace Through Law.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. But would the gentleman from Massachusetts state the cost again?

Mr. DRINAN. The cost is estimated at \$1,402.50.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that numerous requests of the kind just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) have been made on both sides of the aisle, and if this practice is going to be persisted in the Chair is going to have to respect the rights of all Members accordingly.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this week, at the expense of the taxpayers, there was one insertion in the Record that, by the most conservative calculation, cost over \$4,050, involving some 31 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Notice has been served in the well of the House before. I think the Chair is respecting not only the wishes of the Members on both sides of the aisle, but the recent rule of the Committee on House Administration, where they re-instituted and re-instituted the decision that they would have to make their requests notwithstanding the estimated expense of printing undue amounts in the Record, and most of it is folderol. I hope that the Chair will persist in this. And that is exactly what I meant, and I serve notice that from now on I personally will demand that all those costing excessive amounts not be approved by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Missouri, of course, is within his rights to do so.

RETIREMENT OF HOLLIS R. WILLIAMS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR WATERSHEDS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the sentiments of the membership of the Congress when I here express regrets at the recent retirement of our good friend, Hollis Williams.

Hollis, a native of Arkansas, served as Deputy Administrator for Watersheds in the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

When he came to the day of his retirement, June 30, 1972, Hollis was completing 38 years of service. Mr. Speaker, for many of those years, I have had the honor to serve as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, including the Soil Conservation Service. In this capacity, I had a wonderful opportunity to know not only the value of the program, but the great part of its success that could be directly attributed to Hollis Williams. As a skilled technician and outstanding conservationist, Hollis had and has another wonderful quality—that is the ability to get along with the folks in his Department, with the Members of Congress with whom he worked, and above all with the people of the United States who, in the final analysis, have to cooperate in the successful completion of soil conservation work. During his period of service, I would like to point out that this country completed over 57 water supply reservoirs serving almost 300,000 people; 70 reservoirs providing 4.4 million user days of recreation; as well as many, many acres of improved wildlife habitat associated with these works. Conservation works are estimated to reduce erosion by an additional 30 million tons each of the last 2 years for a total reduction of 170 million tons below what might have been lost without this work. Drainage systems have been provided for over 850,000 acres and irrigation systems for over 200,000 acres so they may continue to produce the food and fiber this Nation needs.

With that record, you can see why it is that many of us, including Hollis, take much time trying to point out to our friends and neighbors who only recently discovered the environment that the Department of Agriculture and folks working with and under Hollis Williams have been doing something about restoring our environment through the years.

Mr. Speaker, my friend WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; BOB POAGE, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; and many others have covered many highlights of Hollis' service. I can say that we know of few men who have left the Government service who will be missed more or who have

left a greater monument to their service than Hollis Williams, a monument not of stone but of use to all who follow. After all, those who have title to land today are merely custodians of the land for the future. If we continue to save and improve our soil to leave to our children and our children's children a land rich in natural resources, they will make it fine, whatever our financial problems, for they could set up their own financial system. On the other hand, we could leave them a worn-out land and all the money in the world and then there would be no hope.

For Hollis Williams and his family, we wish many happy and fruitful years and hope that he will be able to continue his fruitful efforts in this vital field of conservation.

UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1972

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1972, the House passed and sent back to the Senate S. 1819, the Uniform Relocation Assistance Amendments of 1972. It is vitally important to our Nation's cities, and particularly to those unfortunate persons forced to leave their homes or businesses because of Federal programs, that these amendments be signed into law at the earliest possible date.

Our cities cannot afford to carry the financial burden recently imposed on them by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, Public Law 91-646. The very people Congress intended to aid, those forced to relocate, could very well be the ones most detrimentally affected by any further delays.

For clarification of the need for these amendments, I am including at this point a copy of my testimony before the Senate and House Public Works Committees on behalf of amendments I had offered, H.R. 10903:

Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on amending the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (PL 91-646) for the purpose of providing financial relief to our nation's cities.

Unless this Committee and the Congress act quickly, we will all be a party to placing a heavy financial burden on the cities of this nation, particularly those that are making the greatest efforts to improve the conditions of their urban existence. At the end of this month, the full effect of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 will begin to be felt.

Prior to the enactment of this law, there were only two relocation assistance programs in effect in the federal government, one in the Department of Transportation and the other in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under the now-repealed HUD program (Section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended dealt with relocation assistance and was repealed by PL 91-646), a tenant could have received up to \$1000 to relocate, plus \$200 moving expenses. A single

family home owner could have received up to \$5000 in replacement housing payments, plus \$200 moving expenses. A displaced business could have received up to \$25,000, which was a departmental payment since, unlike the preceding, payments for displaced businesses were regulatory, not statutory. All of these payments were made solely by the federal government.

Under the Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration's relocation assistance program consisted of payments made available to displaced individuals, families, and businesses, with the payments being made jointly by the federal government and local governments according to the matching provisions of the federal program responsible for dislocating the individual. It was this concept of making relocation assistance payments on a program matching basis that was incorporated in PL 91-646.

Under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1971, provisions for expenses incurred in moving were greatly expanded and ceilings for replacement housing payments and rental assistance payments were also greatly increased. The payment ceiling for rental assistance was raised to \$4000, and the replacement ceiling for housing payments was increased to \$15,000. These figures are certainly higher than was allowed under Section 114 (c) of the Housing Act, but the important factors are these: for the first time, there is a uniform program for all departments and agencies of the federal government, and the entire program is based on local matching with the federal government according to the matching provisions of the program participated in.

This of course means that for the first time every individual, family, or business displaced by a project involving the federal government will have the opportunity to relocate in a home, apartment, or business location similar to that which they were forced to vacate, without facing the type of financial burden which those before them have had to face.

Previously, when homeowners were scheduled to be displaced because of a federal project, they received a market price for their home. Unfortunately, unless they were displaced by a HUD or DoT program, they received no relocation assistance, and the sale price they received for their home seldom allowed them to purchase similar accommodations elsewhere.

This new relocation assistance law will remedy this problem. However, it has created financial problems for the cities, the magnitude of which could not have been foreseen by the Congress. Those cities active in developing new Urban Renewal programs must now match every HUD dollar they receive for relocation assistance, and up to higher ceilings than previously existed.

In order to assist the cities in the period between the initial passage of this act and the end of the fiscal year, at which time the matching provisions of the law come into effect, Congress provided a temporary federal payment of \$25,000 for relocation assistance.

Fortunately for many of the cities which have been very active in the past, the Comptroller General handed down a decision that all programs already in effect were excluded from the matching provisions of the law.

It appears that Congress has come up with a cure that is worse than the disease. In an attempt to offer equity and relief to those displaced by federal programs, the cities of this nation have been handed a financial burden of more than \$300,000,000 a year commencing June 30, 1972.

Because of the dire financial condition of many of our large metropolitan areas, the Administration and Congress have been attempting to provide meaningful financial assistance to local and state governments through various forms of revenue sharing. Most Committees of Congress right now have at least one form of revenue sharing under consideration or pending, and the House will be voting on general revenue sharing next week. It appears to me that to allow the matching provisions of 91-646 to come into effect without providing at least a minimal degree of financial relief is contrary to the general aims of Congress.

It is for this reason that I have introduced in the House HR 10903. My bill would amend Section 211 of 91-646 (84 Stat. 1894) by adding at the end of Subsection (c) the following new Subsection, (d):

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall alter the percentage of federal payment for any relocation assistance program in effect prior to the enactment of this Act, up to the maximum amounts authorized in those programs."

It is clear that this amendment is designed not only to provide a base under the new law for all HUD programs, but also to serve as a statement of policy that the federal government should provide the cities with at least the financial assistance they received in the past.

My amendment would provide for the first \$1000 provided for rental relocation payment [as in Subsection (c)(2) of Section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended] and the first \$5000 provided for replacement housing [Subsection (c)(3) of Section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended] to be funded by the federal government, and the remainder, up to the new ceilings, would be matched according to the provisions of the program being participated in. This same concept will be in effect for relocation payments provided displaced businesses, since the \$25,000 paid by the federal government was a regulation, not a statute level of payment as in the previous two cases. I used the term "program" in my amendment in order that both the statutory level and the regulatory level of payments could be covered.

In no way does my amendment affect other provisions for assistance in the new act, nor does it affect relocation assistance programs not in effect prior to the enactment of 91-646. It is aimed at restoring the federal level of contribution contained in Section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the financial assistance my bill would restore to the cities is a minimum, and that action must be taken quickly, since the end of the fiscal year is upon us. However, we must also be aware of the condition of our economy and face the fact that coming out of a protracted period of inflation has been a long and arduous process, and these factors must be given careful consideration when we undertake new authorizations for the budget.

The fiscal year cost of PL 91-646 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development can be estimated at \$312,000,000. Using the estimate of 75,000 displaced families, individuals, and businesses, the estimated cost to the U.S. Budget for my amendment would be approximately \$650,000,000 for replacement payments only. This is an increase of at least \$338,000,000. To continue the temporary level of federal payments of \$25,000 to the entire federal government cannot be accurately estimated as to cost with the figures I have been able to obtain, but the cost to the budget for

HUD would be approximately \$1,100,000,000 for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to state again that my concern is for providing financial relief to our cities, and that the minimum relief I feel Congress should extend is outlined in my amendment. Whatever level of assistance the Committee feels can be offered, let me urge that it be provided before the deadline of June 30, 1972.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

As I stated in my testimony, my bill offered the bare minimum of assistance that the Federal Government could extend to the cities and in turn to those forced to relocate. While the bill now awaiting a joint House-Senate conference is not the measure I had hoped for, it at least goes a long way toward correcting some of the ills created by Public Law 91-646.

Let me again urge that S. 1819 be reported at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to request that the various Federal departments and agencies responsible for the application of this law strengthen existing regulations and promulgate stringent future regulations pertaining to Public Law 91-646. We must assure that the types of speculative abuses that occurred under the various subsidized housing programs when they were first initiated are not permitted to recur. There have already been scattered accounts of suspected abuses by land speculators. I certainly hope that the Federal Government can cut short any misuse of public funds at the expense of victims of circumstances.

RESPONSES TO POSTAL SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, some Members may remember that I have protested the operation of the present postal corporation and strongly objected to the directive which post office officials issued saying postmasters should not write their Congressmen. I think this is censorship of the highest degree. Postal officials replied that postmasters could not write "under certain circumstances."

Last month, I sent a mailing to postmasters in my congressional district asking them to write me directly in response to a questionnaire which I enclosed. I believe the House will be interested in the comments which I am today inserting in the Record.

First, though, I must relate that when post office officials read I was asking postmasters to write, these same officials circulated a letter saying postmasters could write but their replies must be sent to me through the Postal Service Congressional Liaison Office—through channels in other words.

I sent out 118 questionnaires and as of this date, I have received only 31 replies—nine of these through the Postal Service Congressional Liaison Office.

Simple arithmetic shows 87 responses are still out.

The fullness of the answers ranged from blank pages to full-page typewritten letters. The major point of concern by far was the official order to cut operating costs, a move which necessitates cutting valuable clerk hours and which continues to decrease service to the postal customer—be it at the window, on Saturday, or throughout the entire weekend and following week. Some postmasters described local problems, but in general, the reaction to the new Corporation was one of stress and uncertainty. As one postmaster summed up the situation, "The Postal Service has always been the one thing in the United States the people could depend on, but it is fast losing ground. As I see it, we are ending up with several ways to send our mail, none of them very reliable."

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will read these remarks. I think it is evident that when only 31 replies out of 118 are received, there is some strong incentive somewhere, somehow, and for some reason not to write. Personally, I find it shocking to see that postmasters are forbidden, in effect, to write their elected representatives directly. In fact, not only are postmasters discouraged to write, but many are now actually fearful of writing—fearful they will lose their jobs as a result. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad state of affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1972

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to announce my intention of offering an amendment tomorrow to H.R. 13915, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972.

The amendment, which, I believe, will render this act more equitable and further promote the end of discrimination and the provision of quality education for all our children, will be offered at page 36 of the printed bill, striking out lines 11 through 14, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

(c) granting students the right to transfer to the school of their choice which provides the appropriate grade level and type of education (taking into account only school capacities) without regard to their race, color or national origin;

POPULATION STABILIZATION: A KEYSTONE OF WORLD ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, together with my distinguished colleague from Arizona (Mr.

UDALL) and 29 additional sponsors, a resolution to declare a U.S. policy of moving toward population stabilization by voluntary means. I believe that our resolution is the logical culmination of 2½ years of congressional exploration of the question of population stabilization. When this House considered the bill which created the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, I expressed the hope on the floor that there would be further action by the Congress even while the Commission deliberated. Indeed, there has been such action. In 1970 the Congress passed the pioneering Family Planning Services and Population Research Act, and repealed the Comstock Act which had prohibited the shipment of contraceptives or birth control information across State lines. In 1971 I joined with my colleague from Arizona in introducing the first version of this national population stabilization resolution.

While the Congress has acted, and the Commission deliberated, the American people have also made their feelings apparent. Public opinion polls now show that solid majorities of our population favor Government policies designed to encourage population stabilization. The fertility rate has been declining since the beginning of 1971. This has been called by some "the baby bust"; I think a better title would be "responsible parenthood." American women are not ceasing to have children. On the contrary, according to the Bureau of Vital Statistics, there were over 270,000 births in May of this year, and the natural increase for the month was 111,000 persons. But American women are planning to have smaller families, and I for one have no doubt that one of the factors in this planning is their awareness of the problems population growth poses for our society.

Birth rates are a highly volatile phenomenon; they have gone up and down in response to changing fashion. We must establish a national policy to bring some stability into this area, to enable us to plan for the future, and to assure that we will continue to move in the direction of population stabilization.

There is another reason for acting now to establish a U.S. policy. The United Nations has designated 1974 as "World Population Year," and a world population conference will meet in New York in an attempt to develop a plan of action for dealing with the world population crisis. If we need to establish global goals in the area of population, each society must be ready to indicate what its goals are. At the recent U.N. Conference on the Environment at Stockholm, population was only on the periphery of the agenda; even so, it became the subject for bitter disputes over charges that the idea of population stabilization was an expression of U.S. "imperialism." Many of those who make such charges will, no doubt, attack us whatever we do. But do we need to fuel their fires by our failure to act within our own borders on this critical international problem? I can think of

no single greater contribution we could make to the success of World Population Year than to commit ourselves clearly to the goal of population stabilization before that conference convenes in New York.

We must not let ourselves become complacent about the progress we are making; the clock in the Commerce Department auditorium keeps count of only 6 percent of humanity. Birth rates in the rest of the world are not going down with any consistency. U Thant, the former Secretary General of the United Nations, indicated before he retired that according to the best information he had available, mankind had at best 10 years to begin solving the complex of problems which faces it; after that date, the problem would simply have outstripped our collective ingenuity and ability to design solutions.

Apart from the compelling need to deal with the world population crisis, we must also consider our own national interest. The report of the Population Commission made abundantly clear the desirability of slowing and eventually stabilizing our growth rate. On the economic, social, and environmental fronts particularly, we stand a far better chance of dealing effectively with our problems if we stabilize our growth. With a small average family size, we can look to substantially higher per capita incomes. Our State and local governments will be better able to provide essential public services such as education, the costs of which have already outstripped their revenue raising capability. A wide range of environmental problems will become even more serious, with the most immediate impact felt in the areas of water resources and outdoor recreation.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of our resolution is to provide an ethical framework for this Nation as it shapes a population policy, one clearly committed to the principles of voluntarism, human rights, and dignity. I want to emphasize that this resolution does not advocate a two-child family—or any other particular family size. The decline in the birth rate in the past few years has not been the result of such a uniform pattern; an increased age at marriage, a larger number of unmarried and childless persons, a decline in pregnancies among women over 30, better contraceptives, and family planning services have all played their role. The principle of voluntarism means not only a theoretical absence of coercion, but the presence of real choice for each couple to decide how many children it wishes to have.

President Nixon said 3 years ago that:

One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today.

I sincerely believe that the enactment of this resolution would be, in the President's terms, "a cause for pride."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD the sponsors and complete text of the resolution:

Mrs. Abzug of New York.

Mr. John B. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Bingham of New York.
Mr. Blackburn of Georgia.
Mr. Cleveland of New Hampshire.
Mr. Dellenback of Oregon.
Mr. Dow of New York.
Mr. du Pont of Delaware.
Mr. Fisher of Texas.
Mr. Fraser of Minnesota.
Mr. William J. Green of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Harrington of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hicks of Washington.
Mr. Hillis of Indiana.
Mr. Leggett of California.
Mr. Mailliard of California.
Mr. Mallary of Vermont.
Mr. Matsunaga of Hawaii.
Mr. McCloskey of California.
Mr. Pike of New York.
Mr. Preyer of North Carolina.
Mr. Rees of California.
Mr. Riegle of Michigan.
Mr. Robison of New York.
Mr. Rosenthal of New York.
Mr. Scheuer of New York.
Mr. Seiberling of Ohio.
Mr. Waldie of California.

JOINT RESOLUTION

To declare a United States policy of achieving population stabilization by voluntary means

Whereas continued population growth beyond that already inevitable brings no social or economic benefits to our society, and

Whereas continued population growth magnifies social, economic, and political problems and, in conjunction with uncontrolled technology and high levels of per capita consumption, causes pollution and degradation of the environment, and

Whereas all citizens of the United States seek a world with healthy environment, clean air and water, uncluttered land, copious open spaces, natural beauty, and wilderness and wildlife in variety and abundance, in which the dignity of human life is enhanced, and

Whereas stabilizing population, concurrent with other measures to solve the problems of poverty, discrimination, urban decay, and environmental deterioration, would enhance the well-being of the people of our Nation, and

Whereas adoption of a national policy of population stabilization would lend credibility to the United States efforts to encourage solutions to the explosive population growth which, throughout the less developed world, obstructs economic progress, creates massive unemployment, and perpetuates widespread malnutrition and poverty, and

Whereas the demographic profile of the United States requires that population stabilization can only take place over a period of decades, and

Whereas delaying development of public policies to stabilize population magnifies the problems and the cost of their eventual solution, and

Whereas the provision of accurate and objective knowledge about the implication of demographic phenomena for our society will enhance the ability of individuals to make rational choices and decisions, and

Whereas more effective coordination of Federal programs related to population is necessary to insure their effective implementation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States to encourage, develop and implement, at the earliest possible time, policies which will, by voluntary means consistent with human rights and individual conscience, move to stabilize the population of the United States and thereby promote the future well-being of the citizens of this Nation and the entire world.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce, along with the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) and 29 of our colleagues, a joint resolution which we believe would be the appropriate beginning for a national population policy for this country. The need for this policy, I feel, has been clear for some time; population is simply too important a facet of our national life to be ignored in the formulation of government policies. Two and a half years ago the Congress passed the bill which created a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, and directed the Commission to conduct an inquiry into "the various means appropriate to the ethical values and principles of this society by which our Nation can achieve a population level properly suited for its environmental, natural resources, and other social needs."

In the spring of this year that Commission delivered its final report. That report contained a number of suggestions and recommendations aimed at both public and private institutions; some of the recommendations were highly controversial, others were not. But significantly, although there were many statements of individual views attached to the final report, there was not a single dissenter from the key finding of this Commission:

We have examined the effects that future growth alternatives are likely to have on our economy, society, government, resources and environment, and we have found no convincing argument for continued national population growth. On the contrary, the pluses seem to be on the side of slowing growth and eventually stopping it altogether.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to endorse that finding; to make it national policy.

Each Member of the Congress has been provided with a copy of the final report of the Commission, so I will not attempt to review all of its findings here. But to highlight the diversity and compelling nature of the arguments in favor of population stabilization, I would like to present a few of those findings:

First. The Commission found that per capita income would be substantially higher in the year 2000 with a two-child average family size as against a three-child average family size; that there would be adequate lead time for business to adjust to whatever shifts in demand patterns might occur with the smaller family size; and that there would be numerous other economic benefits to population stabilization.

Second. The Commission found that the problems we face in attempting to rescue our environment would be substantially lessened by population stabilization, especially in such areas as water resources and outdoor recreation. Indeed, the Commission projected that, with the three-child family, regional water deficits in the year 2020 would reach 110.6 billion gallons of water a day, more than double the 52.6 billion gallon deficit we would face with the two-child average. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if we continue rapid population growth all or part of 21 States

will face significant water shortages by the year 2020, even assuming maximum development of water storage facilities. The Commission also found that other environmental problems as diverse as pesticides and air pollution would be significantly more serious if we continue population growth.

Third, The Commission examined the burden placed on public services and government by the continuation of population growth. It found that to provide the same quality of education, the growing population would have to spend \$400 billion on education in the year 2000, while a stabilizing population would require only \$276 billion. A study done for the Commission by the Department of Commerce estimated that population stabilization would save State and local governments alone \$900 billion between now and the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this report leaves no reasonable doubt that this Nation must adopt a policy of population stabilization. The Population Commission has presented us with a wide range of alternatives we could adopt to achieve this goal by voluntary means. Some of these, such as more effective collection of data, better research programs, and the development of clear lines of authority for population matters within the Federal Government, are matters for consideration by the Congress and are not particularly controversial. Others, such as the issue of abortion, are in my judgment matters for consideration by the legislatures of the separate States. Furthermore, as is made clear by the report of the Commission itself, abortion is not an issue to be resolved on the basis of demographic considerations. It is a highly complex ethical subject and an area in which the role of the government is limited. And the fact that this Nation needs to stabilize its population cannot allow the government to interfere with the individual's right to follow his own philosophical and religious convictions.

There is no one magic formula which will produce population stabilization. It is not even a matter to be largely determined by government policy. Individuals make and must continue to make the crucial decision of how many children they wish to have. Surely one of the considerations on which that decision is based should be an understanding of how population growth affects the society in which one's children are going to live.

In my opinion, the most important finding of the Commission is that we need to find voluntary means for achieving population stabilization. It is that goal which we need to enact into national policy, and which this resolution would establish.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the special order by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

The SPEAKER. Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISASTER RELIEF IN PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WARE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has, in the past decade, contributed a great deal to the preservation of the Federal system; and to making State and local governments effective in a wide range of beneficial public programs. We have made this contribution by requiring the involvement of State and local government in planning and in administration. We have made their role significant by making them partners in the disbursement of funds raised by the Congress.

We believe that we have acted unselfishly; and in the best interests of the Nation. For, if we acted unilaterally with a monolithic Federal structure, we would not only deny ourselves the strength of State and municipal governments, but would insure their demise.

In most instances, the record of partnership and mutual trust is a good record. Acting in the role of funder and general planner, we have made it possible for tens of thousands of local and State government units to assume authority and responsibility. The Nation and the States are better for it.

However, there are some instances in which the immediate public interest, and the historic Federal interests have been damaged by abuse of our Federal programs. Most of this abuse has arisen when incompetence or selfish political motivation dominates a State or municipal agency. When this happens, the public is victimized.

Fortunately, such instances of incompetence and selfish political motivation are the exception, and generally restricted in their effect to single communities. Seldom does damage occur to major programs designed to protect the welfare of large numbers of citizens.

However, it has happened in the State of Pennsylvania to the massive programs we established and funded to provide Federal emergency disaster relief. The Governor of that State, Milton J. Shapp, has been so much involved in his efforts to discredit the Federal Government, that he has failed to mobilize his State government, and to offer calm, strong, and confident leadership to the people. Worse yet, his negative public exercises in picking political quarrels with Federal officials has hampered development of the very kind of partnership which must exist if the victims of Hurricane Agnes are to receive maximum aid as this Congress and the Administration offer.

Fortunately, there is a high degree of cooperation and good will in all States except Pennsylvania which were hit by Hurricane Agnes. In these cases, public service has been placed ahead of politics. But, not in Pennsylvania.

We have remained silent for nearly 2 months since the disaster destroyed livelihood, homes, businesses, and communities throughout central Pennsylvania's Susquehanna Valley. We hoped, day after day, that Governor Shapp would become less excitable and quarrelsome; and that he would settle down to

working in harness with the Federal Government. He has not done so.

Therefore, in hopes of letting him know that this Congress and the Nation are watching his performance, I wish to submit some of the Pennsylvania press reaction to his performance for the Record. I suggest that it may well also have a salutary effect upon future State and local officials who may be tempted to make political capital out of the misery of people by undercutting our Federal efforts, and seeking to cast our agencies in a bad light.

Let us unite in a cooperative effort to best serve those unfortunate victims of the flood who so sorely need aid.

The press articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Aug. 13, 1972]

HOT WORDS IN WILKES-BARRE

Feelings naturally run high in Wilkes-Barre and other flood stricken communities where, six weeks after tropical storm Agnes wrought unparalleled devastation, thousands are still unable to move back into their homes, if in fact their homes still stand.

Refugees (for this in truth is what many are) may be excused when their frustration and desperation turns occasionally to anger over bureaucratic delays in providing assistance. Officials too are on edge as they try to carry on immense responsibilities under the pressure of time and money.

Yet, it serves no purpose when individuals try to shout down each other, and public officials attack each other's motives as occurred in Wilkes-Barre Wednesday. Especially unfortunate was the display put on by Governor Shapp and George Romney, secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Recovery from the June flood requires extraordinary effort on the part of all government—local, state and federal—to aid wiped-out citizens. The need is for not only quick and temporary shelter, but for long-range financial help to relieve the sad plight of home and business owners.

On this latter point, the governor and secretary apparently hold differing philosophies on how far the Federal Government should or can go. Mr. Shapp calls for "total equity," including Federal Government payoff of mortgages on destroyed property. Mr. Romney says he does not believe government "should assume complete responsibility for the people."

It is unrealistic to expect the Federal Government totally to recompense flood victims for all financial loss. Nothing can reimburse families for the loss of everything owned, some of it cherished possessions of a lifetime. Nothing can repay them for the suffering, mental and physical, they endured.

Rather than argue about the ultimate limits of aid, however, both the state and federal governments must do everything possible now to put people on their feet. Given a new start, most individuals will again assume the burden of their own lives.

It was unfair to make Secretary Romney the butt of so much vocal abuse. The entire affair, in fact, creates at least suspicion that presidential year politics played a good part in it. Governor Shapp's own state administration, after all, has a responsibility too.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Aug. 13, 1972]

AGNES, ROMNEY AND SHAPP

President Nixon sent HUD (Housing and Urban Development) Secretary George W. Romney to Wilkes-Barre to get the "snags" out of the relief program for victims of the unprecedented floods generated by Hurricane Agnes.

One of the first "snags" Mr. Romney encountered was Gov. Milton J. Shapp of Penn-

sylvania. Gov. Shapp demanded the federal government do more than it is doing. A typical snide remark of the governor:

"I can't believe you would just leave people without any help."

Gov. Shapp also has been insistent that the "federal government make these people whole," which has been translated to mean that the government restore in full all the losses of the flood victims.

Regardless of the compassion which the sufferers of this calamity merit, holding out the promise of 100 per cent restoration of losses is cruel and impractical. There is a limit to which government can go to alleviate losses in any major disaster.

The government is laying out an enormous sum—\$1.2 billion—just in Pennsylvania alone. It is trying to help people find temporary homes in six states affected by Agnes.

Obviously, the relief has not been instant and thousands of victims still are frustrated. Bureaucratic sluggishness has been evident in some cases and this is inexcusable.

But what has Gov. Shapp been doing? If he is as concerned about the flood victims as he says, he must have more to do than quarrel with Mr. Romney, who went to the area to help.

But the real handicap to fast relief is the sheer magnitude of the disaster. Consider the statistics calculated by the federal Office of Emergency Preparedness:

Agnes spread her destruction along 4,500 miles of major rivers and 9,000 miles of tributaries. In the six states, 27 cities and 206 counties suffered disaster.

Thousands of people at all levels of government, in the Red Cross, Salvation Army and many volunteers, are working their hearts out to give the flood victims a hand. Mistakes, honest or just clumsy, are bound to happen.

But public griping, buck passing and sniping by politicians help nobody.

[From the Allentown Call-Chronicle, Aug. 11, 1972]

POLITICS AGAINST FLOOD RELIEF

In his Wilkes-Barre confrontation with Secretary George Romney of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Gov. Shapp gave another disgusting demonstration of how he has been using the sad plight of flood victims to recoup some of his own political fortunes.

The governor, who picked the wrong horse in Pennsylvania's Democratic presidential primary, has a long way to go to reinstate himself with his party. He has chosen the cheapest and most convenient route. In an election year, the more he ridicules the relief efforts of the Nixon administration, the more Brownie points he gets.

Romney was in Wilkes-Barre this week on orders of the President to see what could be done to cut through some of the red tape and speed up temporary and long-range help for those who need it so badly. He wasn't there long before he dismissed a score of workers on the department's specially hired staff because of their reported rudeness to those they were paid to help.

If Romney has any other recommendations he is very properly presenting them first to the President, not to Shapp. His job isn't to decide how the biggest federal disaster fund in this country's history is to be spent, but how to speed the recovery aid it is to provide to people who need it so urgently.

The governor, whose own programs for state flood relief won't be presented to the Legislature until next week, thus far has majored in telling the federal government what it should be doing. He has the right to make suggestions, both as the governor and as a private citizen, but he has no authority in Washington and at this point not too much stature.

His latest demand is for the federal government to pay off the mortgages of flood victims and assume their losses so they can get off to a fresh start and rebuild or re-

furnish with government grants and low-cost federal loans. Only Congress can authorize such a program.

If this had been anything more than a political ploy to embarrass the President during his re-election campaign, Shapp would have explored both the costs and the necessary legislation in private before offering false hopes to brave people who already have suffered so much. And short of that, he might have at least produced some cost estimates. The value of the outstanding mortgages he wants Washington to pay off shouldn't have been too difficult to estimate.

Unfortunately, up to this time most of the governor's flood-relief proposals have been long on ideas and short on specifics. He has been too busy assailing Washington to give either a realistic idea or an accounting of what, if anything, his own administration has been doing or expects to do. The least flood victims can hope for is that when he goes before the Legislature next week he'll do something more than play his usual political games.

The following is the text of an editorial by Tom Powell over WDAU-TV, Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, on Monday night, July 3, 1972:

"We can't see where Governor Shapp is accomplishing anything with his constant carping over the response of the federal government to the flood emergency in Pennsylvania.

"Within hours after the flood struck, Shapp had already prejudged the federal effort with a 'too little, too late' comment.

"Yet the flood victims know that the massive and heroic rescue and relief work last weekend, organized with the help of Congressman Flood, was largely a federal operation.

"Now, in the aftermath of the disaster, it is obvious to anyone willing to listen that every relevant federal program is being implemented to help rebuild the devastated areas and to get the victims back on their feet.

"More than 200 federal specialists have been sent into the state to assist in this work. In short, the national Administration is doing everything the law allows and then some to give assistance to flood victims.

"If Governor Shapp is talking about the adequacy of available federal programs rather than the commitment and concern of the Nixon Administration—and he has failed to make such a distinction clear—that's another matter.

"In fact, part of the mission of the President's task force is to determine whether new legislation is needed to make federal disaster relief more effective. Commerce Secretary Peterson told us today in Wilkes-Barre that on the basis of his impressions thus far, he believes there will be recommendations for new laws when the task force reports to President Nixon.

"In the meantime, it seems to us that Washington has available machinery running in high gear. Indeed it is doubtful that federal services have ever been arrayed in a major disaster on a similar scale or with similar speed.

"Governor Shapp ought to pipe down. Belittling the scope of the aid coming their way does nothing to lift the morale of flood victims who have shown great courage in their determination to rebuild.

"We suspect, moreover, that in a Presidential election year, the Governor might be whistling another tune if the occupant of the White House happened to be a Democrat seeking re-election."

[From the Sunday Independent, Aug. 13, 1972]

ROMNEY VISIT HAD IMMEDIATE BENEFITS; SHAPP'S ACTIONS STRICTLY POLITICAL

Why is it important to have your disaster area surveyed by a man of Cabinet rank as is Secretary of Housing George Romney?

One of the benefits was almost instantaneous as the day after he left our area, we were page 1 on the Thursday New York Daily News and also the complete centerfold of that newspaper.

And the New York Daily News is the largest selling newspaper in the United States. It didn't hurt us at all to let millions of readers all over the East know that after six weeks, we are still a long way away from having dug out.

Let alone rebuilt.

George Romney's visit also proved several other items, most of which we hope he relates first-hand to President Richard Nixon, who, Romney says, is not coming here . . . which we think is both a social and political error on Nixon's part.

However, George Romney can tell the officials in Washington that while the Housing Department is working as fast as it can and is doing more than has ever been done before in a disaster area, it is not enough.

He can pave the way for what might come as a surprise in Washington, and in Harrisburg. While the Housing Department is set up to try and handle such a disaster, the Internal Revenue Service may have quite a surprise in store.

Romney found out first-hand that the overall mood up here in the mud and dust isn't too great. And when people find out that the only real help they are going to get will come mostly from the Housing Department, that mood may get worse.

Which leads us also to the atrocious manner in which Pennsylvania's Governor Milton Shapp greeted the Housing Secretary. Shapp is obviously playing politics with our disaster, talking about aid over which the state has no control, and in general promising what is not his to give.

If he wants to give us something, give us a veto on a law that will provide 60% pay hikes to legislators, judges and Pennsylvania officials. Shapp makes a lot of noise in front of a camera. He can quietly put his signature where his mouth has been and he will be more believable.

Romney also endured insults from professionals who appeared sent here to cause trouble. But he left promising that his department would continue to do its best.

And right now without HUD, we wouldn't have come back at all. It may not be perfect, but it is working for us now.

EMPLOYEE BILL OF RIGHTS ACT—INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill that would amend the National Labor Relations Act in four respects in order to restore and protect precious freedoms of working men and women which have become threatened and infringed by practices of the National Labor Relations Board and labor unions, and loopholes in the existing labor laws.

The first provision of this bill would insure that employees would not have a union designated as their bargaining agent unless a majority freely chose that union in a secret ballot election. This amendment has become necessary because although Congress made it clear when it passed the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 that secret ballot elections were to be the method of determining whether workers wanted a union, the National Labor Relations Board has taken it upon itself to resurrect the infamous and much-abused authorization card as a

means of determining whether or not a union enjoys majority support. These cards have often been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation as to their purpose and effect. A worker is told that if he signs the card he will be helping to get an election, when in fact the card is ultimately used to prevent any election from being held. This has occurred because the NLRB has accepted these cards as a substitute for a secret ballot election. This of course denies to employees the most fundamental right which should be protected by our labor laws—freedom of choice to appoint a union to represent them or to decline to do so. The advantages of a secret ballot election as a means of protecting this freedom over a system of cards signed publicly under the pressures of an organizing campaign are self-evident. A secret ballot election is as absolutely essential to true freedom of choice in this area as it is in our municipal, State, and Federal elections.

This amendment will not interfere in any way in the situation where an employer voluntarily recognizes a union which does in fact represent a majority of the workers in a particular unit. It will, however, prevent the NLRB from imposing a particular union on employees who have not had the chance to express their preference in the truly democratic fashion, by a secret ballot election.

The second section of this bill, Mr. Speaker, would give the protection of a secret ballot election to another vitally important decision which employees who are represented by a union must make, whether to commence or continue a strike against their employer.

As the law stands today, there is no assurance that employees have any real voice in the decision of their union officials to call or continue a strike against their employer. This is a course of action which could lead to loss of employment, and therefore wages, for a considerable period of time. It could even result in an economic striker being permanently replaced. With these great consequences at stake, an employee should at least have the right to participate directly in the decision and to decide for himself whether he would rather stop work than accept the employer's last offer. Moreover, even if the union bylaws or charter provided for a strike vote it undoubtedly would take place by a show of hands of those attending a union meeting—an atmosphere which probably would do no more than rubberstamp the wishes of the union officers. Thus if fairness to employees is to be realized, and responsibility for a strike is to be fixed in those who will suffer by it, the law must provide for a strike vote by secret ballot.

The amendment offered here today would fill the need just described by having the National Labor Relations Board hold the referendum. Such a referendum could be requested by the union, the employer, or 10 percent of the employees in the bargaining unit, and it would be an unfair labor practice for a union to call or continue a strike if a majority of the employees voted to accept the employer's last offer. A strike vote request could be made at any time beginning 5 days before the employees were contractually free to

strike. The vote would then be held, and could be repeated once every 30 days while the strike continued. In addition, any employee who took part in a strike after a majority had rejected it would lose his status as an "employee" under the law. This bill will in no way interfere with the employees' economic weapon—the strike—but it will insure those employees freedom of choice in the determination of whether to use it.

The third section of this bill will correct one of the most outrageous abuses which exists under present law—the extraction of court-enforceable fines by unions from employees who dare to exercise the rights guaranteed them by the National Labor Relations Act. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, that such a measure is necessary in our free society, but it is abundantly clear that it is.

Under the provisions of the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments, a union was prohibited from expelling a man or woman from membership and then having that employee fired for not belonging to the union, unless the reason for expulsion was nonpayment of dues. Congress assumed this was a wise amendment of the law and intended that it protect employees from retaliation by union leaders when the employee did something the leaders did not like—such as cross a picket line or testify about corrupt or illegal activities of union leadership or attempt to influence other employees to vote out the union. They could no longer threaten that employee with the loss of his job for exercising these basic freedoms. However, unions designed a new form of coercion designed to keep union members in line—the union fine. Thus by imposing exorbitant fines upon employees who dared to challenge their power, union officials were able to achieve the same result as they had before, the stifling of individual employee rights; rights which this Congress had guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

One would think, naturally, that the NLRB would have quickly put a stop to this blatant attempt at repression and circumvention of the law. But acting as they have so often, in the interests of unions as opposed to workers, the NLRB sanctioned this practice. Thus, in the case of crossing a picket line to go to work or filing a deauthorization petition to obtain an NLRB election to determine whether the incumbent union is still favored by a majority, the Board allowed the union to do indirectly what they could never have done directly—effectively deny section 7 rights to their members.

It is left to the Congress once again to act to guard rights which the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments should have fully protected. My amendment would accomplish this by making it an unfair labor practice for a union to fine a member for exercising rights which are assured him under the law or for carrying out his employer's lawful instructions. There is no better way to correct the authoritarian abuses of union power which have become so common as to encourage greater democracy in union affairs by protecting the minority's right to dissent.

The fourth feature of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a new provision dealing with a union member's proportionate share of any political contribution wrongfully made by the union. It empowers a union member to invoke the assistance of the Federal Government for a proper accounting and proportionate refund of any union money—or other thing of value—improperly diverted to political purposes. Further it directs that the full record in any such situation be turned over to the Attorney General for his action against those responsible under the appropriate criminal statutes.

It is harsh enough that a working man or woman is required to pay dues to an organization he or she may not want to join at all at the peril of being fired. But if the union then uses the employee's money to support political candidates, the employee is forced into giving financial support to candidates he may not wish to support at all. This is obviously incompatible with our ideas of political freedom and so unions have been prohibited, in section 304 of the National Labor Relations Act, from making political contributions. However, there is presently no way for the individual employee to get back that portion of his money which was improperly diverted for that illegal purpose. This amendment would close this loophole. It would act as a deterrent to these abuses, and it would give just redress to the employee who has been forced to support a candidate against his will because the union has given his money to that candidate. Of course such contributions can take many forms besides direct dollar donations to a campaign funds—such as paying for political advertisements, furnishing union-paid campaign workers, and so on. This amendment is designed to cover these loopholes. It will not apply to lawful, separate funds comprised of voluntary contributions collected by a union. Congress dealt with that in another statute enacted earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the four important amendments contained in this employee bill of rights to the early attention of the House. They embody urgently needed reforms which will secure a greater measure of freedom for the working men and women of this country and restore to them liberties which the combination of big labor and a governmental bureaucracy have taken away from them.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a serious observation, for those who have ears to hear, that a new and persistent message has been competing for the attention of the Congress. While the advocates of this new message speak with modulated voices, there is, nevertheless, an obvious overtone of urgency, and even an implication of impending crisis in what is said.

I refer to those colleagues who speak in behalf of the approximately 12 million Spanish-speaking people in the United States who, with growing insistence, seek to be enabled to participate fully in American economic, political, and social life. To some degree, gains and achievements for these people have been hampered by a cultural and linguistic orientation and inclination somewhat different from the non-Spanish speaking. They have also been adversely affected by certain traditional cultural myths in this country which has produced stereotypes that do not square with reality.

There is a tendency to locate the interface with the Spanish speaking at the Mexican border, the Caribbean islands, resort cities of Central and South America, and the rural farming areas of this country. In actual fact, the real interface with the Spanish speaking is in the cities and towns of America, for it is, in the main a diverse urban population. It is also a unique population with unique problems and needs—with unique values and potentialities—and differing in these things among themselves as peoples differ. Spanish speaking individuals are just as American, just as consumer oriented, as their English speaking neighbors when it comes to buying goods and necessities, and making the choice of a life style. In fact, they comprise a consumer market estimated to be in excess of \$8 billion in spite of the fact that, by every index they are the most economically, culturally, and socially distressed segment of our society.

I am privileged to represent a large constituency of Spanish speaking in the Congress. I wish to add my own voice to the voices already raised. And I wish to commend those colleagues of mine who are supporting timely, wise, and compassionate legislation favoring the Spanish speaking, as well as all disadvantaged. I especially wish to commend those colleagues who were instrumental in bringing the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for Spanish-Speaking People into existence. Perhaps the most important, although largely unforeseen, role played by the Cabinet Committee, especially under the chairmanship of Dr. Henry Ramirez, has been that of "ombudsman." In virtue of its very existence, the Cabinet Committee is the principal point of contact for the Spanish speaking with the administration, Federal departments and agencies, and the legislature. In carrying out this role, and its other advocacy responsibilities mandated by law, the Cabinet Committee has done a remarkable job considering the fact that its funding level—\$860,000 in fiscal year 1972—has been grossly disproportionate to its field of challenge.

The Congress is only too well aware that huge operating budgets for civil rights, equal employment opportunities, and the great social programs have not proportionally served the Spanish speaking. Neither the Cabinet Committee nor Dr. Ramirez should suffer criticism for such failures but should command full support of the Congress to assist in bringing about, in the shortest possible time, progressive and equal access of Spanish

speaking to the institutions, services, and programs of the country—and to instill pride of heritage.

RURAL DRINKING WATER ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act today with the welcome cosponsorship of Congressman MOLLOHAN and Congressman MENDEL DAVIS. We have all joined in the resolve that Congress act quickly to meet a rural problem of startling dimension. Too many of our citizens lack the most basic requisite for decent living. Twenty-two million Americans do not have inside water or plumbing, in an age when most Americans feel underprivileged if they do not have an automatic dishwasher.

If my colleagues are surprised that over 20 million citizens are carrying their drinking water in buckets, there may be more surprises in store when the Federal Government moves to determine how many of these families walk considerable distances to gather their drinking water from polluted wells or streams, and how many of them pay exploitive prices for water from a tank truck or private water point. I cannot give these figures because they are simply not available in any form. No one knows how many individuals are living with the same kind of conditions which occasioned the expenditure of an estimated \$1 billion in foreign aid funds.

We have evidently been more efficient in meeting the household water needs of many foreign nations than we have in our own country. For whatever reason, we have not looked for the same problem in this country, and so we have not found it until the second decade of the space age.

I can assure my colleagues that there are millions of Americans who are without potable household water, and who consequently suffer from the same organic parasites and exhibit the same physical disabilities common to the poorest and least developed countries. If necessary, I will inundate this body with personal testimony to these facts. There is no end to the case-by-case data available, which portrays in the most intimate manner the effects which these conditions are having on American families.

If the Federal Government is to make any headway in improving these conditions, it must first have a better reading on the extent of the problem. The "Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act" requires a "rural water survey" as the first order of business. The survey would determine, in far more detail than now available, the number of persons who presently have no drinking water, or an inadequate supply, as well as the evident health effects resulting from such conditions.

The bill would further establish a "Rural Drinking Water Council" to oversee the rural water survey and to make policy recommendations based on the

survey results. Members of the Rural Water Council would include the Secretaries of Agriculture, HEW, and HUD, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Surgeon General. Nine Presidentially appointed public members would also participate on the Council.

On the basis of the policy recommendations of the Rural Water Council, the "Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act" authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to administer three grant programs for the construction of single or multifamily water supply and waste disposal facilities: a \$100 million grant program, a \$100 million loan program, and a \$20 million "incentive grant" program to encourage and facilitate organization of community corporations to sponsor necessary water supply and waste disposal projects.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to sponsor several bills during this Congress, but, to my mind, none has been more important and more in need of adoption than the "Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act" which Congressmen MOLLOHAN, MENDEL DAVIS, and I present to you today. I urge the support of my colleagues and their attention to the text of the "Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act," which follows:

H.R. 16414

A bill to provide for a rural water survey, to create a Rural Water Council, to provide incentive grants for rural water supply projects, and for other purposes

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Rural Drinking Water Assistance Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that the water supply needs of low income rural residents of the United States have been neglected to the extent that significant numbers of such residents are living without safe drinking water supplies, which condition is known to contribute to impairment of health by incipient organic diseases which cause lethargy and inhibit productivity.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Surgeon General of the United States, in cooperation with the Environmental Protection Agency, to provide for the improved health and welfare of rural residents of the United States to the maximum extent possible by encouraging the efforts of such residents to develop water supply systems which would dispense hygienic drinking water and water for other human needs, with the ultimate goal being to make such water readily available at a reasonable cost to every resident of the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) "Surgeon General" means the Surgeon General of the United States.

(3) "Council" means the Rural Water Council (as created by section 5 of this Act).

(4) "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each of the territories of the United States.

(5) "rural drinking water assistance area" means an area beyond the limits of existing

pipled water distribution systems, which is served by individual supplies (wells, springs, cisterns, etc.) of undependable quality or quantity, or both, or an area beyond the limit of existing piped water distribution systems within which area residents have no accessibility to a water supply for their dwellings.

RURAL WATER SURVEY

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary, in cooperation with the Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water Supply, shall conduct a survey, to be completed no later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, of rural drinking water assistance areas.

That survey shall include—

(1) an estimate of the number of residents (A) not presently served by a publicly or privately owned water distribution system or by an individual home water well; (B) inadequately served by such a water distribution system; and (C) experiencing, or in all likelihood experiencing, impairment of health due to the absence or inadequacy of such a water distribution system; and

(2) preliminary data identifying potential surface and ground water resources in areas where significant numbers of citizens exist without adequate water distribution systems.

(b) The Secretary shall conduct this study by such means and in such manner as he deems necessary, and is authorized—

(1) to make use of qualified personnel in the Environmental Protection Agency to work directly through State and local health officials;

(2) to make use of the personnel and resources of the Farmers' Home Administration;

(3) to make use of private consultants as he deems necessary; and

(4) to make use of such data as he shall request from the United States Geological Survey with respect to the location of potential surface and ground water resources.

(c) The results of such survey shall be compiled on density distribution maps making the identification of major problem areas readily apparent.

(d) The Secretary shall utilize such survey as the basis for prescribing such regulation as may be necessary to implement the provisions of this Act.

RURAL WATER COUNCIL

SEC. 5. (a) There is established the Rural Water Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall consist of the Secretary, who shall be Chairman, the Surgeon General, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and nine additional members appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The nine additional members shall be selected from among officers of State, interstate, regional and local government agencies, or persons representing other public or private interest groups contributing to, affected by, or concerned with, the quality and quantity of water provided to rural residents. The members of the Council shall serve without pay, or in the case of members who are Federal officers or employees, without additional pay. Of the members first appointed, three shall be appointed for two-year terms, three shall be appointed for three-year terms, and three shall be appointed for four-year terms. Each member appointed thereafter, except those appointed to fill a vacancy for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for a three-year term.

(b) The Council shall—

(1) review and affirm preliminary plans for the Rural Drinking Water Survey provided for in section 4, and determine the means by which the appropriate Federal agencies can obtain the data required for that Survey;

(2) consider the findings and results of the

Rural Drinking Water Survey and determine the means by which the appropriate Federal agencies shall meet the needs of the problem areas defined by that Survey in accordance with the purposes of this Act;

(3) oversee implementation of Federal policy with respect to rural water supply, and conduct studies to evaluate the implementation of Federal programs to meet rural water supply needs; and

(4) submit an annual report to the Congress explaining the progress of such Federal programs and delineating all unmet needs in this problem area.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

SEC. 6. (a) The Surgeon General shall continuously review the rural water supply projects assisted under this Act to determine whether they are so constructed and operated as to comply with public health drinking water standards established by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. In the performance of his duties under this section, the Surgeon General shall require an annual report concerning project compliance from the appropriate agency of each State receiving funds under this Act. No further assistance shall be given under this Act to any recipient of assistance under this Act while such recipient is determined by the Surgeon General to be in non-compliance with the public health drinking water standards established by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to cooperate with the appropriate State agency to provide guidance and consultation to recipients of assistance under this Act to enable such recipients to comply with the requirements of this section.

RESEARCH, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND INFORMATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary shall conduct, and is authorized to make grants to other appropriate public authorities, institutions, organizations, and individuals conducting, applied and theoretical research relating to the provision of adequate water quantity and quality for rural residents, and such research may include studies relating to the safe disposal of waste waters.

(b) Grants under this section may be made for research into the utilization of improved methods of establishing rural water supply systems in accordance with minimum health standards at costs which can be practically sustained. Grants may also be made under this section for research into logistical and management innovations taking into account varied regional characteristics and community needs.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make grants for the comprehensive development of plans for research and development of projects and programs authorized or assisted under this Act.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to make available to rural residents any information resulting from any research authorized or assisted under this Act. The Secretary shall also utilize Farm Home Administration offices to stimulate local interest in developing new water supply systems in low income rural areas.

GRANTS AND LOANS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL WATER SUPPLIES

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants not to exceed an aggregate sum of \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year to associations, including corporations, not operating for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies, for the establishment of rural water supply projects which provide water for drinking and other human needs and for the treatment of the waste water thus generated in such manner as will not threaten human health or the environment.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make

or insure loans not to exceed an aggregate sum of \$100,000,000 in any fiscal year to associations, including corporations, not operating for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies, for the establishment of rural water supply projects which provide water for drinking and other human needs and for the treatment of the waste water thus generated in such manner as will not threaten human health or the environment.

(c) In approving grants and loans under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) consider the intent of this Act to achieve parity in rural areas with the level of money already available for water supply purposes in urban areas; and

(2) give highest priority to the utilization of associations comprised of low income rural residents to develop water supplies.

(d) This Act is not intended to diminish the level of support provided by the Farmers' Home Administration for such projects.

INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants not to exceed an aggregate sum of \$20,000,000 in any fiscal year to support the organization of rural water supply and waste water treatment associations, if he determines, in consultation with the Rural Water Council, in the case of each such grant that such grant will facilitate the organization of a rural water supply association to develop a project to implement the purposes of this Act and that, because of low income or insufficient consultation and guidance, rural residents in the rural area to be affected by the grant are unable to complete initial organizing requirements and planning.

(b) Grants under this section shall not exceed ten percent of the reasonably anticipated project costs.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK KEMP ON BEHALF OF THE TOWER-KEMP PLAN

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Republican National Convention will open in Miami Beach. The central purpose of the convention, of course, will be to renominate the Nixon-Agnew ticket, but there is other important business before the delegates concerning the structure of the Republican Party in the years ahead. Thus, it is that during this week prior to the formal opening of the convention extensive discussion is taking place before the various convention committees on two vitally important issues: The first concerns the question of the means by which the party will attempt to attract growing numbers of young people, youth, and women; and the question of delegate reapportionment.

In cooperation with other Republican Members of the House, I have attempted in recent weeks to devise a plan for the party's future which will, in fact, make it as hospitable as possible to all segments of the electorate, regardless of age, sex, race, or regional affiliation.

On the question of delegate apportionment, the relevant committees of the party are now weighing the merits of a wide variety of proposals. All of these, I think, have been put forward in a constructive manner and deserve careful study. All of them, without exception, at-

tempt to answer the difficult question of how best to measure Republican sentiment across the land. As Senator JAMES BUCKLEY of New York stated before the Committee on Rules last Monday, good and decent men can and will reasonably disagree on how best to ascertain that sentiment. Some believe that it ought to be related primarily to population or the size of the voter turnout. Others believe that, while differences in State population should be accounted for, there are other considerations no less deserving of support—considerations which go to the nature of our Federal system and which recognize that, if the nominees of the party are to be victorious, the geographical distribution as well as the size of Republican strength must be accounted for.

As anyone who has ever tried to draw up an apportionment scheme can testify, the task of devising a scheme pleasing to most is a tortuous one. No matter what the plan is, some are bound to feel that their interests are inadequately accommodated under it. The trick, it seems to me, is to develop a plan which distributes both its benefits and its burdens in an equitable manner, one which neither penalizes nor rewards any segment of the party or section of the country unreasonably. Most of the plans now under consideration make an earnest effort to accomplish that goal, but they have aroused considerable controversy, particularly within those States and regions that will lose delegate strength if the plans are adopted.

After studying these plans over the past several weeks, I came to the conclusion that many of the criticisms raised against them were valid and just, and that the opposition was sufficiently widespread to raise doubts about the ultimate success of the plans once they reached the floor of the convention. It was for that reason that I sought an alternative plan, one which would have a high probability of success without penalizing one segment of the party at the expense of another. After talking with others in Washington and Miami, I became convinced that we would have to try to accomplish this goal.

Accordingly, I was pleased to join with Senator JOHN TOWER in offering a compromise plan—dubbed by some as the "Miami Compromise"—to the party. This plan is, I believe, the most equitable of all that have been proposed thus far.

It accommodates the interests of the large urban States by granting them an increased share of delegate strength over against the present rule; but, at the same time, that relative increase in strength for the large urban States is not bought at the price of unreasonably diminishing the strength of the small States. Moreover, I believe that this compromise does a better job than other proposals at distributing delegate strength over the entire Nation—making it difficult for any one region to dominate the others. And for these reasons, I believe, it will attract growing support among the members of the relevant committees of the convention, and eventually among the delegates themselves.

I know that it has been charged by

some that those of us from the larger States have no business supporting plans that do not maximize the strength of our own States as compared to the rest of the country. Indeed, some are even saying that Senator TOWER and myself are "selling out" the interests of our own State parties by trying to put forward a compromise plan of the kind we proposed yesterday.

Although I appreciate the concern of the people who feel this way, I must reject the premises on which they are basing their charges. We are all members of a national party trying to win national elections. Therefore, we must accommodate other interests in addition to our own self-interest.

We must work to reach a reasonable working compromise satisfactory to the large majority of our delegates. This is what Senator TOWER and I—along with others—are trying to do.

Furthermore, those who charge that we are selling out fail to point out that under our compromise plan New York would gain votes should we carry for the President this fall. To be specific, our delegate total would jump from its present 88 to 102. This can hardly be called a "sell-out" and I, for one, resist the charge that it is.

I am naturally pleased that this compromise plan has received the strong endorsement of Senator ROBERT DOLE, chairman of the Republican National Committee. I am also gratified that the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, HUGH SCOTT, has also praised the compromise formula. Senator SCOTT's support, I believe, is the best possible argument one could make against those who have alleged that the compromise works unfairly against the interests of the large, urban States, especially those in the East. And Senator DOLE's support suggests, at the very least, that the plan is also acceptable to the smaller States. We have, at last, found a plan worthy of support of all segments of the party, a plan that will produce both geographical balance and ideological moderation. I urge my Republican colleagues to study the plan and to support it.

I am inserting information on our plan at the conclusion of these remarks, along with an analysis of the other plan now being considered in Miami.

The subcommittee of the Republican National Committee's Rules Committee charged with responsibility in this area voted last night to report out a plan introduced by Mr. William S. Powers of Colorado. Our plan will go to the full rules committee today in the form of a minority report.

Mr. Power's plan is interesting and represents a lot of thought. Unfortunately, however, I feel it fails to provide the balance between competing interests that I have discussed today.

The Powers plan would enlarge the convention and thereby give almost everyone a few more delegates. But at the same time it would shift power significantly toward the 10 largest States to the detriment of the small and middle-sized States.

We, therefore, believe that it will be defeated in the full committee as we try to reach a reasonable middle ground that

will allow us to leave Miami with a united party.

I include the remarks of our distinguished minority leader GERALD R. FORD at this point.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

The Tower-Kemp compromise Republican Convention rule change regarding state representation at future conventions appears to properly distribute representation between the small states and the large.

I have long felt that the present bonus system discriminates against the large states, such as Michigan. The Tower-Kemp compromise eliminates this kind of discrimination. It seems to me it is fair to both large states and small.

While I cannot speak for the Michigan delegation, I believe the Tower-Kemp compromise because it is national in scope is worthy of the most careful consideration by the Convention Rules Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, as Republicans, we must recognize the national nature of our party. This election year will see a major realignment of voters and I want to encourage it. My desire to improve the relative composition of State delegations at our Convention stems from what I view as two fundamental requirements of the Republican Party: First, the need to help broaden the base of the party, and second, in light of the Ripon suit, the need to develop a system of rewarding Republican success that does not penalize smaller traditionally Republican States, and yet accounts for the voting strength of larger States.

Having been a part of the House ad hoc reform group, I am convinced that reforms along the lines presented by the ad hoc recommendations will lead to a more broadly based party. Our group did not, however, formally touch on the present question of delegate distribution among the several States, which is the question to which the Percy plan addresses itself.

I have, since the House reforms were made public, studied Senator PERCY's plan. I have serious reservations about it. Other Republicans obviously have reservations as well. The Percy plan places too great a reward with States solely by reason of their voting strength. While that should remain one criterion, equally important is the effort given to the election of a President. This should be a prime criterion for an incentive. The compromise incorporates both criteria.

In a very real sense, what the Percy plan does is strengthen the Northeastern States but at the expense of other regions. Though I am a Member of Congress from the State of New York, there is no honest justification for that kind of plan. Penalizing those States which traditionally have helped the Republican cause nationally, and rewarding those States which have not in real terms—electoral votes—contributed to victory on the national ticket, is inequitable and unrealistic. The Miami compromise does not pose that threat. What, it seems to me we want to do is strike a balance between those States that make an electoral vote contribution, and those that deliver high vote totals by reason of their population but do not deliver the electoral votes.

In my home State of New York, under the Miami compromise, our strength in the 1972 convention would be less than

under the present rule 30. However, the construct of the Miami compromise insures that a New York victory for the President would result in an increase in New York delegation strength from 88 delegates to 102 delegates. There is no question that there is a risk involved, but I think it is one worth taking. Under the chairmanship of Governor Rockefeller, and the cochairmanship of Senators JAVITS and BUCKLEY, the New York Committee for the Reelection of the President can carry New York for the President come November.

Together with the adoption of other reforms along with the Miami compromise, the Republican Party should be in excellent shape to help build what has become known as the "emerging Republican majority."

I include the following:

THE MIAMI COMPROMISE

The "Miami Compromise" represents an attempt to devise a reasonable delegate allocation formula that will meet the criticisms levelled against the current rule without seriously upsetting the current regional balance within the party.

The plan would allocate votes at the 1976 GOP Convention in the following manner:

Each state will receive a base vote equal to twice its electoral vote.

Those states carried by the Republican Presidential candidate will receive a bonus of three votes plus 40% of their electoral college vote. In computing this latter bonus all fractions will be rounded up to the next largest whole number of delegates.

Example:

Kentucky has nine (9) electoral votes and went Republican the last time. Therefore, if we were to apply the "compromise" formula Kentucky's vote would be computed as follows:

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Twice the electoral vote—2X9 | 18 |
| 2. A 3 vote bonus | 3 |
| 3. A bonus equal to 40% of 9 or 3.6 (rounded up to the next highest whole number) | 4 |
| Total | 25 |

If this plan had been applied to the 1972 convention the delegate total would be 1321 as compared to 1348 under rule 30. The maximum number of delegates under this plan (assuming a GOP Presidential sweep) is 1476.

This plan maintains roughly the same geo-

graphical power balance we have today while incorporating a population oriented incentive or bonus.

It has been examined by a number of constitutional authorities who believe that it is consistent with the standards set out in recent court decisions.

ANALYSIS

In analyzing the effect of the Miami Compromise we have applied it to two situations; one real and one hypothetical.

First, we reallocated the present convention on the basis of the new plan and then compared it to the allocation under Rule 30. This corresponds roughly to what one might consider a "normal" relationship between the various states.

Second, we worked out the applicable figures assuming a 50 state GOP Presidential sweep. This gives us a slightly different picture, of course, as many more states receive bonus votes.

Each analysis was done on a regional and national basis.

In each instance we have computed the percentage of the total convention vote a state receives under Rule 30 and the Miami Compromise, as well as the gain or loss both absolutely and on a percentage basis.

SHIFT IN CONVENTION INFLUENCE OF THE VARIOUS STATES UNDER THE MIAMI COMPROMISE PLAN

| State | Rule 30 | | Miami compromise | | Percentage of change |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | Percent | Actual delegate votes | Percent | Actual delegate votes | |
| Alabama | 1.26 | 18 | 1.36 | 18 | +8 |
| Alaska | .89 | 12 | .83 | 11 | -7 |
| Arizona | 1.34 | 18 | 1.36 | 18 | +2 |
| Arkansas | 1.34 | 18 | .91 | 12 | -32 |
| California | 7.13 | 96 | 8.40 | 111 | +18 |
| Colorado | 1.49 | 20 | 1.51 | 20 | +1 |
| Connecticut | 1.63 | 22 | 1.21 | 16 | -26 |
| Delaware | .89 | 12 | .83 | 11 | -7 |
| District of Columbia | .67 | 12 | .45 | 6 | -33 |
| Florida | 2.97 | 40 | 3.33 | 44 | +12 |
| Georgia | 1.78 | 24 | 1.82 | 24 | +2 |
| Hawaii | 1.04 | 14 | .61 | 8 | -41 |
| Idaho | 1.04 | 14 | .98 | 13 | -6 |
| Illinois | 4.31 | 58 | 5.00 | 66 | +16 |
| Indiana | 2.38 | 32 | 2.65 | 35 | +11 |
| Iowa | 1.64 | 22 | 1.74 | 23 | +6 |
| Kansas | 1.49 | 20 | 1.51 | 20 | +1 |
| Kentucky | 1.78 | 24 | 1.89 | 25 | +6 |
| Louisiana | 1.49 | 20 | 1.51 | 20 | +1 |
| Maine | .59 | 8 | .61 | 8 | +3 |
| Maryland | 1.93 | 26 | 1.51 | 20 | -22 |
| Massachusetts | 2.53 | 34 | 2.12 | 28 | -16 |
| Michigan | 3.57 | 48 | 3.18 | 42 | -11 |
| Minnesota | 1.93 | 26 | 1.51 | 20 | -22 |
| Mississippi | .97 | 14 | 1.06 | 14 | +9 |
| Missouri | 2.23 | 30 | 2.42 | 32 | +9 |
| Montana | 1.04 | 14 | .98 | 13 | -6 |
| Nebraska | 1.19 | 16 | 1.14 | 15 | -4 |
| Nevada | .89 | 12 | .83 | 11 | -7 |
| New Hampshire | 1.04 | 14 | .98 | 13 | -6 |
| New Jersey | 2.97 | 40 | 3.33 | 44 | +12 |
| New Mexico | 1.04 | 14 | .98 | 13 | -6 |
| New York | 6.54 | 88 | 6.21 | 82 | -5 |
| North Carolina | 2.38 | 32 | 2.65 | 35 | +11 |
| North Dakota | .89 | 12 | .83 | 11 | -7 |
| Ohio | 4.16 | 56 | 4.77 | 63 | +15 |
| Oklahoma | 1.64 | 22 | 1.74 | 23 | +6 |
| Oregon | 1.34 | 18 | 1.36 | 18 | +1 |
| Pennsylvania | 4.46 | 60 | 4.09 | 54 | -8 |
| Rhode Island | .59 | 8 | .61 | 8 | +3 |
| South Carolina | 1.63 | 22 | 1.74 | 23 | +7 |
| South Dakota | 1.04 | 14 | .98 | 13 | -6 |
| Tennessee | 1.93 | 26 | 2.04 | 27 | +4 |
| Texas | 3.86 | 52 | 3.94 | 52 | +2 |
| Utah | 1.04 | 14 | .98 | 13 | -6 |
| Vermont | .89 | 12 | .83 | 11 | -7 |
| Virginia | 2.23 | 30 | 2.42 | 32 | +9 |
| Washington | 1.78 | 24 | .91 | 12 | -32 |
| West Virginia | 1.34 | 18 | .91 | 12 | -32 |
| Wisconsin | 2.08 | 28 | 2.27 | 30 | +9 |
| Wyoming | .89 | 12 | .83 | 11 | -7 |
| Guam-Puerto-Rico-Virgin Islands | .81 | 11 | .83 | 11 | +2 |

SHIFTS IN CONVENTION INFLUENCE OF THE STATES UNDER THE MIAMI COMPROMISE PLAN (SWEEP 76)

| State | Rule 30 | | Miami compromise (sweep 76) | | Percentage of change |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | Percent | Actual delegate votes | Percent | Actual delegate votes | |
| Alabama | 1.26 | 18 | 1.69 | 25 | +34 |
| Alaska | .89 | 12 | .75 | 11 | -16 |
| Arizona | 1.34 | 18 | 1.22 | 18 | -9 |
| Arkansas | 1.34 | 18 | 1.22 | 18 | -9 |
| California | 7.13 | 96 | 7.52 | 111 | +5 |
| Colorado | 1.49 | 20 | 1.36 | 20 | -9 |
| Connecticut | 1.63 | 22 | 1.56 | 23 | -4 |
| Delaware | .89 | 12 | .75 | 11 | -16 |
| District of Columbia | .67 | 9 | .75 | 11 | +12 |
| Florida | 2.97 | 40 | 2.98 | 44 | 0 |
| Georgia | 1.78 | 24 | 2.17 | 32 | +22 |
| Hawaii | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| Idaho | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| Illinois | 4.31 | 58 | 4.47 | 66 | +4 |
| Indiana | 2.38 | 32 | 2.37 | 35 | 0 |
| Iowa | 1.64 | 22 | 1.56 | 23 | -5 |
| Kansas | 1.49 | 20 | 1.36 | 20 | -8 |
| Kentucky | 1.78 | 24 | 1.69 | 25 | -5 |
| Louisiana | 1.49 | 20 | 1.83 | 27 | +23 |
| Maine | .59 | 8 | .88 | 13 | +49 |
| Maryland | 1.93 | 26 | 1.83 | 27 | +5 |
| Massachusetts | 2.53 | 34 | 2.51 | 37 | +1 |
| Michigan | 3.57 | 48 | 3.66 | 54 | +3 |
| Minnesota | 1.93 | 26 | 1.83 | 27 | -5 |
| Mississippi | .97 | 14 | 1.36 | 20 | +40 |
| Missouri | 2.23 | 30 | 2.17 | 32 | -3 |
| Montana | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| Nebraska | 1.19 | 16 | 1.02 | 15 | -14 |
| Nevada | .89 | 12 | 1.75 | 11 | -16 |
| New Hampshire | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| New Jersey | 2.97 | 40 | 2.98 | 44 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| New York | 6.54 | 88 | 6.91 | 102 | +6 |
| North Carolina | 2.38 | 32 | 2.37 | 35 | 0 |
| North Dakota | .89 | 12 | .75 | 11 | -16 |
| Ohio | 4.16 | 56 | 4.27 | 63 | +3 |
| Oklahoma | 1.64 | 22 | 1.56 | 23 | -5 |
| Oregon | 1.34 | 18 | 1.22 | 18 | -9 |
| Pennsylvania | 4.46 | 60 | 4.61 | 68 | +3 |
| Rhode Island | .59 | 8 | .88 | 13 | +66 |
| South Carolina | 1.63 | 22 | 1.56 | 23 | -4 |
| South Dakota | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| Tennessee | 1.93 | 26 | 1.83 | 27 | -5 |
| Texas | 3.86 | 52 | 4.47 | 66 | +16 |
| Utah | 1.04 | 14 | .88 | 13 | -15 |
| Vermont | .89 | 12 | .74 | 11 | -16 |
| Virginia | 2.23 | 30 | 2.17 | 32 | -3 |
| Washington | 1.78 | 24 | 1.69 | 25 | -5 |
| West Virginia | 1.34 | 18 | 1.22 | 18 | -9 |
| Wisconsin | 2.08 | 28 | 2.03 | 30 | -2 |
| Wyoming | .89 | 12 | .75 | 11 | -16 |
| Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands | .81 | 11 | .61 | 9 | -25 |
| Total | 100.00 | | 100.00 | | |

HOSPITALS OVERCHARGE MEDICARE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the medicare program in 1967 U.S. hospitals have probably overcharged the medicare program by more than \$300 million. Pervasive mismanagement, administrative procedures, and incomplete audits by HEW and private insurance companies such as Blue Cross are the causes of these massive overcharges.

Federal funds have been used to pay for private-duty nurses, TV sets, and telephone service to medicare patients—all illegal under the Federal law. These abuses are detailed in a recent General Accounting Office report. The GAO audited 14 hospitals in five States and discovered that nearly \$500,000 had been illegally charged to medicare out of a total of \$20 million paid in medicare claims to the hospitals. The Federal Government has paid approximately \$19 billion to hospitals under the medicare program since its beginning in 1967.

If HEW and Blue Cross administer the whole medicare program as indicated by the sample in this GAO report, then the Federal Government has been gypped of approximately \$380 million. It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that GAO officials have told me that the mistakes and overcharges found in the GAO sample were "common" among other hospitals.

The overpayments are the fault of HEW and its contractors such as Blue Cross—not the hospitals themselves. The HEW regulations are overcomplicated in some instances, and in other cases needed regulations are nonexistent. In addition there is no evidence of any wrongdoing by the hospitals.

It should be noted that Blue Cross and other private insurance companies supervise the audit and payment of medicare to individual hospitals.

HEW permitted the hospitals to charge the medicare program for the cost of research, education, and commercial activities of the hospital not related to the care of the patients.

In addition, HEW has not prescribed regulations that prevent the hospitals from collecting more for the service of a hospital-based doctor than his normal fees. The result of HEW's sloppiness is that the hospitals are paid excessive fees for the work of their doctors.

A complicated medicare payment formula involving two different payment schedules has enabled some hospitals to be paid twice for the fringe benefits allocated to their resident doctors.

The medicare program is also illegally paying some of the bad debts of former patients. According to the GAO 30 percent of the bad debts charged to medicare by some 19 hospitals should be paid by the States through their medicaid or old-age assistance programs.

Mr. Speaker, today I am calling upon HEW's Secretary, Elliot Richardson, to tighten up and simplify the regulations so that the proper benefits are paid to

the needy and that hospitals are not inadvertently overcompensated for their services.

In a separate report recently issued by the General Accounting Office the GAO reports that millions of dollars of overcharges resulting from the medicare program have never been repaid by some 300 institutions that have terminated their participation in the medicare and medicaid program.

POSTAL RATES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation which would restore to the country a service abridged by U.S. Postal Service. On July 6, the postal rate for magazines and newspapers was increased by an average of 127 percent. Magazines and newspapers render a service to the American people which far outweighs any extra revenue an increased second-class postal rate might bring to the Postal Corporation.

The effective dissemination of news, information, and ideas is critically necessary in a free country. People need to know what is happening in their government. Indeed, they have an absolute right to know. That right can only be exercised if there is an effective means of disseminating the printed word to the people. The need of the American people to know and understand what their Government is doing cannot be abridged by the short-sighted and parochial philosophy that the Postal Corporation must show a rate of return favorably comparable to General Motors, ITT, or Kellogg's Corn Flakes.

The fact is, Congress intent in establishing the Postal Corporation was not the maximization of profits. Congress intent was clearly to improve the mail service and it chose to establish a semi-independent corporate bureaucracy over a Government bureaucracy only because it was convinced that the former could more effectively provide the American people with better service. It was never the intent of the Congress to establish an enterprise which would limit service in order to maximize profits. Through this bill Congress will not be interfering with the Postal Service. The Postal Service is a Federal entity over which the Congress has retained control and through which Congress may express and effect a national purpose.

Magazines, periodicals, and newspapers have always provided the American people with a relatively inexpensive source of information. Until the Postal Corporation's unilateral action to end what has been a 200-year practice, it has been the national purpose to provide maximum opportunity to facilitate the dissemination of ideas. The blind and slavish allegiance to the profit sheet is neither in the national interest nor is it consistent with American freedom.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to the fact that a similar bill was

introduced in the Senate by Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. NELSON's remarks, with which I associate myself, include an extensive history of Federal support of postal rates for periodicals as well as editorials from many newspapers and periodicals and appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1972, on page 22798.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 16393

A bill to encourage and support the dissemination of news, opinion, scientific, cultural, and educational matter through the mails

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "The Postal Service shall also be obligated to provide postal services at rates which will encourage and support the widest possible dissemination of news, opinion, scientific, cultural, and educational matter."

(b) Section 101(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read: "Postal rates shall be established to apportion the costs of all postal operations to all users of the mail on a fair and equitable basis that takes into consideration all aspects of postal policy."

Sec. 2. (a) Subchapter V of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3683 the following new section:

"§ 3683A. Prohibition against a per piece surcharge

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the rates of postage established for matter mailed under former sections 4358 and 4359 of this title may not include a per piece charge that is added to the basic rate of postage established for such mail matter."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter, preceding section 3601, is amended by inserting between items 3683 and 3684 the following new item:

"3683A. Prohibition against a per piece surcharge."

Sec. 3. (a) (1) Subchapter II of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3626 the following new section:

"§ 3626A. Special publication rate

"Each rate of reduced postage adopted under section 3626 of this title for matter mailed under former sections 4358 and 4359 of this title shall be at the rates that existed for such matter on June 1, 1972, for the first two hundred and fifty thousand copies of each issue mailed. The sender shall determine which copies of each issue that are to be sent at the rates provided under this section."

(2) The analysis of such subchapter, preceding section 3601, is amended by inserting between items 3626 and 3627 the following new item:

"3626A. Special publication rate."

(b) Section 2401(c) of such title is amended by striking out "and 3626" and inserting in lieu thereof "3626, and 3626A".

Sec. 4. Section 3626 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting in clause (1), after "4554 (b) and (c)", a comma and the following: "and for the nonadvertising portion of mail under former section 4359,"; and

(2) by amending clause (2) by—

(A) striking out "4359,"; and

(B) inserting after "4554(a)" a comma and the following: "and for the advertising portion of mail under former section 4359."

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS: MAJOR POLICY ISSUES

The **SPEAKER**. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, for governments at all levels—Federal, State, and local—the most difficult problems concerning the public elementary and secondary schools have to do with insuring equality of educational opportunity.

This is a hard concept to define concisely, but the formulation adopted by the President's Commission on School Finance is perhaps as satisfactory as any. They stated that equality meant insuring "to all children equal access to education that is good enough to meet their individual needs and the collective demands of a growing economy in a democratic society."

Concern about equal educational opportunity has risen for two principal reasons: First, the existence of gross inequities in the system of funding the public schools and second, the need to upgrade the quality of education provided to minority groups, especially blacks.

I. EDUCATIONAL FINANCE

Reform of the system of financing the public schools has become an urgent necessity. Public dissatisfaction is growing with the existing funding methods, which distribute financial resources and fiscal burdens unequally. In many areas, particularly in the large cities, rising costs have outstripped available school revenue. In several States, the courts have made change mandatory by invalidating existing school funding systems.

INEQUITIES IN SCHOOL FUNDING

More money does not necessarily mean better education. Per-pupil costs vary in different parts of the country and within individual States because of cost-of-living differentials, the size and composition of the student body, transportation needs, and many other factors.

Nevertheless, existing disparities in financial resources are so great that there can be no doubt that students in the poorer districts are placed at a substantial educational disadvantage.

These disparities show up in a variety of statistical indicators: school district financial ability—usually measured in terms of property valuation per student—school revenue per pupil, and school expenditures per pupil. In the extreme cases, the ratio between the wealthiest and poorest districts in a single State is as high as 85:1 in financial ability, 3.9:1 in revenue per pupil, and 24:1 in expenditures per pupil. For half of the States, the corresponding ratios are greater than 6.4:1 in financial ability, 1.8:1 in revenue per pupil, and 2.8:1 in expenditures per pupil. The figures for Indiana are 17:1, 3.8:1, and 2.2:1, respectively.

The principal cause of these differentials is reliance on the local property tax as the major source of school revenues. In 1971-72, 52 percent of all school revenues came from local sources, and 80 percent of all local education revenues came from the property tax.

Since property wealth bears no rela-

tionship to school population or other determinants of educational need, there are great inequities in the amounts of revenue that different districts can raise and the tax burdens they are required to bear. A typical example was mentioned by Minnesota Gov. Wendell Anderson when he proposed a new system of school finance to his State's legislature. Citing two school districts near Minneapolis, he pointed out that one levied a tax of \$581 on a \$20,000 home in order to spend \$536 per pupil, while the other levied \$369 on a similar home in order to spend \$837 per pupil. For the poorer district, this meant levying 30 percent more taxes on a home of the same value in order to provide 64 percent as much revenue per pupil.

HEAVIER EDUCATIONAL BURDENS

School costs have been rising steadily in recent years. Per pupil expenditures in elementary and secondary education are now 21.7 percent above the level of 1961-62. Total educational expenditures have grown faster than GNP; thus, an increasing proportion of the country's resources is being devoted to the elementary and secondary schools. The average annual rate of growth of school expenditures since 1962 has been 10.5 percent, while the average rise in GNP has been 7.3 percent.

Even though public school enrollment is expected to decline slightly after 1975, total expenditures will continue to rise, according to estimates made by the President's Commission on School Finance, which set the total figure for 1980-81 at \$86 billion, almost double the \$45 billion spent in 1970-71. The biggest factor in this growth will be increases in teachers' salaries, due to stronger teachers' unions and parental pressure for smaller classes.

Urbanization has aggravated the school finance crisis. The influx of low-income minority residents into the central cities has brought higher costs for education and all public services, and correspondingly higher tax rates. All these factors encourage the migration of middle-class residents and industry to the suburbs. Caught between rising educational costs and a declining tax base, many urban school districts have been forced to reduce school services.

As costs increase, many school districts have faced taxpayers' revolts. The property tax is regressive and falls particularly heavily on the poor and elderly. Growing public dissatisfaction is reflected in the fact that the proportion of school bond issues approved declined from 89 percent in the early 1960's to 48 percent in 1970.

COURT DECISIONS

Beginning with the decision of the California Supreme Court in *Serrano* against Priest in August 1971, several State and Federal district courts have held that methods of school finance which make the availability of funds dependent on the wealth of the individual district are in violation of the individual citizen's right to equal protection of the laws under either the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution or corresponding provisions of State constitutions. Be-

cause none of these cases has gone beyond the State or Federal district level, they do not apply nationwide. However, the Supreme Court has agreed to review a Texas case—Rodriguez against San Antonio Independent School District—and the forthcoming decision could establish a general rule that would affect all States.

The courts have not prescribed remedies. They have not invalidated any type of tax, including the property tax; nor have they attempted to delineate new procedures for raising and distributing school revenue. Instead, they have indicated that State legislatures should assume responsibility for reforming financial systems to insure that revenues are not a function of local wealth.

ALTERNATIVE FOR REFORM

Proposals for establishing more equitable school finance systems fall into three categories: reform of existing systems which share funding responsibility between the State and local districts, assumption by the States of the revenue-raising functions currently exercised by local districts, and increased Federal aid.

MORE EQUITABLE STATE/LOCAL FUNDING

Practically all States provide State funds to individual school districts according to some sort of distribution scheme designed to reduce the disparities in total school revenues between poor and wealthy districts—the States provide 40.9 percent of total nationwide revenues for elementary and secondary education. However, even under these distribution formulas, the maximum variations in revenue per pupil are substantial—better than 1.8:1 in half of the States. This is mostly due to the political necessity of giving all districts a share of the State funds; the rich districts are made richer, while the poor districts do not receive enough money to close the gap separating them from their wealthier neighbors.

Some of the steps proposed to modify existing systems of shared State and local funding are:

First, standardization of property tax rates and assessment criteria. This would equalize local tax burdens and might even have some equalizing effect on revenues in those poorer areas where property assessments are below the average level for the State.

Second, adjusting formulas for distribution of State funds so as to equalize per pupil revenues for all districts. The hitch here is in setting the uniform funding level. Putting it below the level of the richest districts would, in effect, require direct redistribution of locally raised revenues from those districts to poorer districts—a politically difficult task. Setting the standard level at or close to that of the wealthiest districts would mean a sharp increase in total spending.

Third, power equalization. This method ties State aid to the local tax effort. The State would set a maximum level of per-pupil funding which it would guarantee to each school district that taxed at a prescribed rate. This would be done by having the State make up the

difference between revenues raised by the local district at the prescribed rate and the guaranteed level. Districts which chose to tax themselves at a lower rate would be guaranteed a proportionately lower level of support by the State. As with the plan discussed in paragraph 2, the key issue would involve setting the funding level guaranteed by the State.

Fourth, creation of new district boundaries, which would more nearly equalize financial resources. The political difficulties of this scheme seem insuperable. Wealthy districts would resist spreading their resources over larger areas. Almost certainly suburban and inner-city areas would have to be joined. In addition, there would be the problem of having to redraw district boundaries periodically to take into account shifts in population and wealth.

FULL STATE FUNDING

Many students of school finance have concluded that there is no point tinkering with the current mechanism of joint State-local funding in an effort to make it more equitable. They favor giving the States full responsibility for all non-Federal educational finance. This was the recommendation made earlier this year by the President's Commission on School Finance—the McElroy commission.

Full State funding would involve two principal tasks: Changes in taxation, and establishment of an equitable formula for allocation of funds to individual school systems.

Taxation measures proposed in connection with full-State funding schemes include:

First, property tax reform, to reduce and distribute more equitably the property tax burden. A plan proposed for New York would fix the rate at the present statewide average. Minnesota has recently established a statewide base rate considerably lower than the average of present tax rates. The Minnesota plan also gives special reduced tax rates to urban districts in recognition of their higher educational costs and heavier burden of noneducational services.

Second, development of new revenue sources for the schools. Most proposals for full-State funding provide that an increasing proportion of school revenues will be drawn from existing State tax sources, such as the income and sales taxes. This, of course, means raising State tax rates. In addition, there has been some discussion of developing new State fiscal resources, such as value-added taxes. The end-result of full-State funding would be that the property tax would come to supply a decreasing proportion of school revenues. Under the Minnesota plan, the share of property tax receipts in total school revenues will decline from 57 to 30 percent.

As for allocation of funds, a number of criteria have been proposed:

First, the simplest would be to equalize per-pupil revenue in all districts.

Second, distribution according to cost differentials and need. This approach would recognize that some districts require extra financial assistance either

because of higher-than-average cost-of-living or because of special educational requirements, such as vocational programs or special instruction for handicapped and disadvantaged students. Each district would be provided an equal base level of support; this would then be adjusted upward as necessary to reflect cost and need differentials.

FEDERAL AID

To date, Federal aid—which currently amounts to about 7.1 percent of total expenditures for elementary and secondary education—has been concentrated in programs designed to meet specific needs, such as assisting disadvantaged children and compensating districts where large amounts of real estate are federally-owned and thus not on the tax rolls. However, there have been a number of proposals to provide general Federal support to the public schools and to increase the Federal share of total expenditures to 20-40 percent.

An expanded Federal program could serve various objectives. It could help to reduce disparities in financial resources among the States. In some cases, these are as striking as those which separate school districts in a single State. Per-pupil revenues in 1970-71 ranged from a high of \$1,777 for Alaska and \$1,577 for New York to a low of \$586 for Alabama. Indiana ranked 18th, with a per-pupil revenue of \$966, slightly below the national average of \$982.

Federal aid might also be used to alleviate the inequities of existing State-local funding systems. Increased Federal support could substitute for revenues currently provided by the local property tax, allowing the reduction or elimination of that levy. Federal grants could also be employed to induce States to reform their school finance systems, with the amount of Federal assistance tied to progress toward State assumption of full responsibility for financing the elementary and secondary schools.

CURRENT PROPOSALS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

So far, the principal initiative of the Nixon administration in the area of school finance has been education revenue sharing (S. 1669, H.R. 13915). This bill does not represent a major shift in the role of the Federal Government, either in terms of resources contributed or activities supported.

The administration revenue-sharing proposal is intended to improve existing categorical programs by consolidating them in support of five general objectives and permitting greater flexibility in the allocation and utilization of funds. Under the proposal, funds would be available for five principal purposes: First, education for the handicapped, second, education for the disadvantaged, third, aid to federally impacted areas, fourth, vocational education, and fifth, special materials and services. Total Federal funding in these areas would increase from \$2.8 to \$3 billion.

The administration has not formally proposed large-scale general Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, although administration spokesmen have pointed out that adoption of the President's welfare reform and general reve-

nue-sharing programs would release State funds that might then be used for education. In addition, the President has ordered a study of a Federal value-added tax, intended to support Federal school aid that would replace revenues currently obtained from the local property tax. The key issue with the value-added tax is whether it can be designed in such a way as to reduce its regressiveness.

In the current Congress, a number of bills calling for general Federal aid have been introduced, but there does not seem to be any prospect of early action on any of them. Some of these specify that Federal aid may replace specified amounts of school revenues obtained from State and local taxes; others provide that the Federal funds must be in addition to those currently provided by State and local governments.

KEY ISSUES: POLICYMAKING AUTHORITY

There seems to be widespread support for retaining a high degree of local control over school policy even if most revenue-raising responsibilities are shifted to the State and Federal levels. All major proposals for reform stress the importance of giving maximum discretion to local school boards in the employment of school funds. Furthermore, the courts, while invalidating existing funding procedures, have been careful to point out that local control is a valid and desirable objective of public policy and that revision of educational finance to conform to the court rulings should be possible without undermining local control.

Nevertheless, general endorsement of local control does not mean that there is unanimous support for the existing system of local school administration. The President's Commission on School Finance has recommended that school districts be reorganized to provide more efficient administration and a better balance of educational burdens.

The argument is always made that power follows the purse and that decreased reliance on local sources of revenue will sooner or later cause policymaking authority to shift from the district to State and Federal agencies. Much will probably depend on the depth of interest which each community shows in its schools, because the local boards will have important powers if they care to use them. In proposing increased State funding in Michigan, Governor Millikan pointed out that the local school boards would lose only one function—that of finding ways to raise school revenue. Under this plan, the local districts would continue to adopt their own budgets, determine courses of study and select textbooks, hire and set salaries for teachers and administrators, and request voter approval for new construction. In addition, local planning will be made easier because available school revenues will be more predictable.

ALLOCATING FUNDS

Regardless of what system is adopted for greater equalization of educational resources, the formula for distribution of funds to the local school districts will be a highly sensitive political issue.

The greatest difficulty involves the wealthier districts. They will certainly

resist strongly any scheme that would reduce per-student expenditures below current levels. Yet, guaranteeing all districts in the State revenues equal to those of the wealthiest districts will be beyond the resources of most States, at least in the short run.

Most proposals for reform have specified that no district will be funded below its current spending level. For example, in New York, the Fleischmann commission proposed to set a standard level of funding at the 65th percentile of all current local funding levels. Districts above the 65th percentile could continue spending at existing rates but could not go above these levels; poor districts would be gradually raised to the 65th percentile.

Another sweetener for the wealthy districts is to permit supplementary local financing within a very limited range. The new Minnesota plan allows districts to use local property taxes to support school expenditures up to 10 percent above the basic funding level guaranteed by the State.

A somewhat different allocational problem is presented by proposals to provide extra funds to compensate those districts with higher than average costs and greater than average educational and public service burdens. Devising a formula to establish the level of supplemental financing is also likely to involve hard political bargaining.

Many of the same questions arise in determining how to distribute Federal school aid to the States. A study prepared for the National Educational Finance project—NEFP—has recommended that supplemental assistance for handicapped and disadvantaged children and other extraordinary requirements be provided through the continuance of existing Federal categorical programs. General Federal aid would then be directed toward equalizing the resources of the States.

The NEFP examined various schemes. Providing a guaranteed level of per-pupil expenditures to each State would do the most to equalize resources; however, at any realistic funding level, it would mean that many of the most populous States—that is, New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—would not be entitled to any Federal money because they already spend at a rate above the federally guaranteed level.

To avoid this problem, aid might be distributed on the basis of equal per-pupil grants to all States. This method would, however, have a weaker equalizing effect.

Another method would be to distribute Federal funds according to the tax effort, measured in terms of the percentage of net income devoted to education in each State.

The relative equalization attained under these various schemes can be shown by comparing the ratio of per-pupil expenditures in the States with highest and lowest spending rates. Presently the ratio is 2.53 to 1. The NEFP estimated that under a guaranteed-spending-level plan, the ratio would be 1.57 to 1, with equal pre-pupil grants to all States it would be 2.18 to 1, and with assistance

tied to the local tax effort, it would be 2.24 to 1.

Cost will certainly be a key factor in determining what steps can be taken to reform school finance. Unfortunately, the various proposals—both State and Federal—are so varied that meaningful comparisons are not possible. However, some of the cost estimates that have been made may give an idea of the magnitude of State and Federal efforts that might be required.

In reforming school finance within the States, the key cost factor is the standard level of funding to be established. The President's Commission on School Finance calculated for all States the additional cost of equalizing per pupil expenditures at varying percentiles of current spending. For Indiana, the figures are:

| Additional cost (million) | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Percentile: | |
| 50 | \$33.0 |
| 60 | 47.9 |
| 70 | 71.3 |
| 80 | 76.9 |
| 90 | 112.9 |
| 95 | 161.9 |

To put these figures in perspective, it is worth noting that total spending for elementary and secondary education in Indiana in the last few years has been in the neighborhood of \$900 million.

As for the actual reform proposals, the new Minnesota plan will raise minimum per pupil spending in all districts from \$404 to \$750 over a period of 2 years. At the same time, property tax rates have been reduced by an average of 10 percent by drawing more of school revenues from the State income tax and other State taxes.

In Michigan, Governor Milliken has proposed to increase the State income tax by 2.3 percent and to institute a value-added tax while cutting individual and business property taxes. He claims that by 1980 the annual yield from the increased income tax will be 23 percent higher than would have been provided by the property tax at existing rates.

A few cost figures for proposed Federal programs are available. In working out various schemes for general aid to equalize State resources the national educational finance project set the total amount of Federal general assistance at about \$7 billion. This figure assumes the continuance of existing categorical aid programs which presently run about \$2.8 billion.

Administration thinking on general Federal assistance is based on the amount of revenue that might be raised by a value-added tax. The President has stated that a 3-percent VAT would have a net yield of \$12 billion, after taking into account deductions and rebates to low-income taxpayers.

The President's Commission on School Finance calculated the cost of five different plans to use Federal grants to induce States to assume funding responsibilities presently met by local school districts. The estimates ranged from \$4.9 to \$7.9 billion.

CONCLUSIONS

First, within each State, full equalization of per pupil expenditures for all dis-

tricts will be possible only after an extended transition period, because of the political obstacles to reducing current spending levels of the wealthy districts.

Second, nevertheless, most States should have the capability to reduce substantially existing disparities in spending levels as well as to equalize and reduce the burden of property taxation in the space of a relatively few years.

Third, to achieve this will require a shift of funding responsibilities from local to State authorities and increasing reliance on State income and sales taxes for school revenues. Any required increases in these taxes can be partially offset by reductions in the property tax.

Fourth, in allocating schools funds, supplemental financing should be made available to those districts with extraordinary educational costs and burdens; for example, districts where enrollments include a large proportion of disadvantaged students.

Fifth, the Federal Government can help by continuing to provide categorical assistance to meet the special needs of urban districts and others with extraordinary educational burdens and instituting a program of general aid that can provide States the inducement and support needed to accelerate reform of existing school finance systems and reduce inequalities in educational resources among the States.

Sixth, shift of the bulk of school funding responsibilities to the States and Federal levels is not necessarily incompatible with the retention of meaningful policymaking authority at the local level.

II. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR MINORITIES

There is general agreement that educational facilities available to minority groups, particularly blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and Indians, are inferior. There is no agreement on what remedial actions should be taken.

RACIAL ISOLATION

The most controversial issue concerns the relationship between racial isolation and educational quality.

Those who believe there is a link between the two consider that school integration is necessary to improve the educational achievement of minority students. Many would add that, whatever the educational results, integrated schools are necessary to stem the growth of racial animosities that could undermine the stability of American society.

Studies to evaluate the impact of integration on education and of social attitudes have yielded contradictory results. A number of reports on schools that have been integrated show that black students have made educational gains and that there has been no negative effect on the performance of white students. On the other hand research concluded recently by Prof. David Armor of Harvard found that black children showed no significant increase in educational achievement following integration. Professor Armor also concluded that integration resulted in heightened racial identity on the part of both black and white students.

Racial isolation is associated with the

inequities in school finance discussed in the first part of this paper. School districts with heavy minority enrollments tend to be those where the gap between financial resources and educational needs is great. Furthermore, an influx of minority students often aggravates a district's school finance problems by increasing costs and leading to an exodus of middle-class residents and industry.

GOVERNMENT AND SEGREGATION

Whatever economic, social, and educational case may be made for or against integration, it poses a practical political problem because of Government action aimed at ending school segregation. The principal impetus has come from the courts, but Federal action under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the voluntary initiatives of a number of State and local authorities have also played a part.

The key issues for Government decisionmakers are what constitutes undesirable racial separation in the schools and what steps are appropriate to eliminate it. Since the courts have taken the lead in attacking segregation, the answers which the courts have given to these questions are the focus of the current controversy over integration.

JUDICIAL DOCTRINE

In the last 5 years, the courts have both broadened the definition of illegal school segregation and expanded the range of remedial actions applied. This has meant that integration has become a problem not just for the South but for the North and West.

The earlier school segregation cases, beginning with the first Brown decision in 1954, were addressed to dual school systems sanctioned by State law. This so-called de jure segregation was distinguished from de facto segregation, which arose not from laws governing school attendance but from other factors such as residential patterns.

Since 1969, a series of lower Federal court decisions has blurred the distinction between de jure and de facto segregation. In these cases, most of which involve nonsouthern school systems, the courts have examined a broad range of actions by local and State authorities to see whether they have been taken with "purpose to segregate."

Two rules have been applied in determining whether such a purpose exists. The more common one holds that if any nondiscriminatory reason for the actions taken by the school authorities exists, then the action is not illegal. The other rule states that where the segregatory consequences of the particular action of the school authorities are foreseeable, those authorities have the burden of showing that such action was taken for educationally required, nonracial reasons.

Typical of these recent cases is the 1971 Federal district court decision involving the Indianapolis schools—U.S.A. against Board of School Commissioners of the city of Indianapolis. In ordering further action to reduce segregation, the court cited such official actions as drawing school attendance zone boundaries to follow racial residential patterns, and

school construction policies which added to existing black schools but not to white schools.

The recent Federal district court decision involving the Detroit schools represents the high water mark of the judicial trend that has been developing since 1969. In that case the court ordered desegregation throughout a whole municipal area on the grounds that the existence of racially identifiable schools can be traced to actions taken by State authorities that had the effect of fostering segregation. In so doing, the court in effect held that desegregation cannot be confined to individual school districts.

The task of the courts in dealing with these so-called "northern" desegregation cases has been complicated by the lack of applicable Supreme Court rulings that might provide guidance. However, the Supreme Court in January agreed to review a case involving the Denver schools, and a decision is expected in the next court term.

Simultaneous with developing a broader definition of illegal segregation, the courts have become more deeply involved in specifying remedial measures. The courts first faced this problem in the South, where it was found that mere elimination of the legal authority for dual schools did not end segregation, either because of residential patterns or because of efforts by the school authorities to circumvent desegregation orders through such techniques as "freedom-of-choice" attendance plans.

The courts have tried a number of techniques. However, three aspects of court-ordered desegregation plans have been responsible for most of the public controversy on desegregation: First, the use of racial school-attendance quotas, second, busing, and, recently, third, student transfers between suburban and inner-city school systems. The courts have justified the use of such devices on the grounds that residential patterns make them the only possible way to reduce significantly racial isolation in the schools.

THE POLITICAL PROBLEM

The strong public reaction that has arisen in many areas where desegregation has been ordered is rooted in a complex tangle of factors: racial prejudice; concern over possible deterioration of educational quality and school environments, particularly if suburban children are required to attend inner-city schools; and resentment over what are seen as arbitrary actions by the courts and by State and Federal bureaucracies. The problem for those who must devise governmental policy is to find a compromise that will permit progress toward improved education for minorities and at the same time win the acquiescence of white parents and taxpayers. Finding a solution is complicated by uncertainty over how far the courts are likely to go in ordering further action on desegregation.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

Before examining some of the specific proposals that have been made to deal with schooling for minorities, it might be useful to categorize the techniques that

are involved. Most plans include one or more of the following elements:

First, guidelines for school desegregation. This means establishing statutory and administrative rules to govern desegregation so that the burden of regulating this process can be shifted from the courts to the executive and the legislature. Guidelines may be negative, in that they seek primarily to limit and reduce the scope of desegregation already ordered by the courts; or they may be positive, in that they seek ways to advance the integration process.

Second, compensatory measures. This approach calls for provision of extra financial support to improve school facilities and to devise special remedial programs to meet their needs. The focus, in most cases, is on improving schools in areas where minority students reside rather than on shifting attendance procedures to promote racial balance.

There is a lack of agreement over the effectiveness of compensatory measures in equalizing educational opportunities for minorities. The controversy parallels that over the usefulness of integration in serving the same objective.

The criticism of compensatory education is based primarily on studies evaluating the title I program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, under which Federal funds have been provided to support remedial programs for disadvantaged students. These studies showed that title I programs had not improved minority-student performance in fundamentals such as reading and mathematics.

On the other hand, an extensive study prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity argues that, if properly planned and administered, additional funding to improve school services available to minorities would have significant benefits.

Third, elimination of residential segregation. The assumption underlying this approach is that no long-term solution to the problem of equal educational opportunity for minorities is possible as long as residential segregation continues. Measures which seek merely to integrate the schools are of little value as long as they can be circumvented by shifting residential patterns. What is usually proposed are positive steps to provide low-income housing in suburban areas.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

This seeks to halt busing by prohibiting the assignment of students to schools on the basis of race. At present it does not seem to have any prospect of passage.

1971 EDUCATION AMENDMENTS ACT

Antibusing provisions are contained in this legislation, which the President signed last week. It prohibits implementation of court orders requiring transfer of students until all appeals have been exhausted. The constitutionality of these provisions has been questioned on the grounds that they violate the separation of powers by restricting the authority of the courts to enforce constitutional rights. In terms of its practical impact, this measure is relatively weak, in that its only effect is to delay rather than to impede court action.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

As set forth by the President last March, the administration approach combines negative guidelines on desegregation with a limited program of compensatory Federal aid.

The President's busing moratorium involves legislation that would establish a blanket suspension of all busing orders through July 1, 1973. It would also prohibit busing below the sixth grade if the amount of busing proposed exceeded that already employed by a school district prior to undertaking desegregation. It is open to the same criticism on constitutional grounds as the provisions of the 1971 Education Amendments Act but constitutes a more sweeping effort to limit the courts, since, under some circumstances, busing is prohibited regardless of what action may be taken by the courts.

The Equal Educational Opportunities Act, proposed in conjunction with the busing moratorium, would earmark Federal aid to provide special grants of \$300 per low-income student to support compensatory education programs. These are funds already authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or the emergency school aid provisions of the 1971 Education Amendments Act.

THE RIBICOFF PLAN (S. 1282 AND 1283)

This plan combines positive guidelines and Federal assistance to achieve school integration with a limited program to encourage residential integration.

Senator RIBICOFF's principal bill is S. 1283, entitled the Urban Education Improvement Act. Its objective is to promote school integration on a metropolitan-area-wide basis, using Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas—SMSA's—as units for this purpose. The criterion for integration would be to have all schools, suburban and inner city, in the SMSA have a percentage of minority-group pupils equal to at least half of the percentage of minority group students in the metropolitan area as a whole. Inducements would be provided in the form of Federal assistance to meet costs of integration, and suspension of other types of Federal school aid to those metropolitan areas that refuse to integrate. The means to achieve integration would be determined by State authorities in consultation with advisory boards representing local citizens.

The companion measure (S. 1282) seeks to promote residential integration by requiring Federal facilities and Federal contractors to expand or locate only in those communities willing to provide adequate housing for their low- and middle-income employees. This is a measure of limited applicability and dubious administrative feasibility—which probably accounts for the fact that it contains a rather broad provision authorizing Presidential waivers.

THE PREYER BILL (H.R. 13552)

Drafted by Prof. Alexander Bickel of Yale Law School, this bill calls for state-wide plans to alleviate racial isolation and eliminate disparities in educational facilities—as measured by such criteria

as teacher-pupil ratios. It thus attempts to combine both positive guidelines for integration with compensatory measures.

Unlike the Ribicoff bill, Representative PREYER's proposal does not set any fixed racial balance as a standard against which integration is to be measured; however, it does contain a provision authorizing free transportation for students who wish to transfer from schools where their race is in the majority to those in which their race constitutes a minority.

In explaining the bill, Representative PREYER of North Carolina stressed that it is designed to provide a positive alternative that would make it possible for the courts to become less active in prescribing desegregation measures. It is also intended to diminish emphasis on racial quotas and busing by making racial balance only one of several possible acceptable means to improve educational opportunities for minorities.

Like the Ribicoff bill, Representative PREYER's proposal uses a carrot-and-stick approach to obtain State compliance. Federal aid to carry out approved State plans is authorized. On the other hand, Federal assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and other educational enrichment and desegregation programs is to be cut off if States fail to come up with satisfactory plans. Presumably the Federal authorities would have a good deal of discretion in approving State plans and thus might raise the requirements for busing and racial balance if they desired.

CONCLUSIONS

First, devising means to improve educational opportunities for minorities is essentially an administrative and political task; yet, it has been left primarily to the courts, which are poorly equipped to discharge such a responsibility.

Second, in the absence of adequate Federal, State, and local programs to meet minority needs, the courts will continue to be the principal avenue for seeking solutions.

Third, the available data do not point to any single approach as the best means for improving the educational achievement of minority students. One possible explanation is that the relative effectiveness of such measures as integration and compensatory education is closely tied to the particular circumstances in individual school districts, including the amount of funding, the quality of planning and administration, the concentration of minority students, and the nature of local political leadership.

Fourth, over the long run, programs which take a metropolitanwide approach may have promise because they would allow the social and economic costs of providing for minority students to be broadly and equitably shared. However, such programs are certain to meet with resistance in the absence of funding that permits improvement of inner-city schools and sensitive political leadership that consults fully with the local groups affected.

Fifth, in the short run, there may be no alternative but to place considerable reliance on compensatory measures and to seek means to make these more ef-

fective. However, in the absence of solid evidence that these measures can provide substantial equality of opportunity, they cannot be considered more than an interim solution.

FIRST PATMAN SCHOLARSHIP
STUDENT SELECTED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last year CUNA International, the worldwide credit union movement, and the Texas Credit Union League established a \$2,000 graduate scholarship in the field of business administration at the University of Texas honoring the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN.

I can think of no finer tribute to Mr. PATMAN than such a scholarship since he probably knows more about the financial systems of our country than any person I could name. His work in the area of credit unions is unparalleled, earning him the title of godfather of the credit union movement. He has sponsored every piece of Federal credit union legislation since the Federal Credit Union Act, of which he was a cosponsor, was passed in 1934.

It is fitting, therefore, that the first recipient of the Patman scholarship is a young man with outstanding academic qualifications. He is Bruce H. Fairchild of Dallas, who established an academic record of 3.71 out of a perfect 4.0 during 4 years at Southern Methodist University. In addition, he was on the dean's list for academic performance each of his 4 years. All this was accomplished while working part-time as a comptroller trainee and internal auditor for a large national retailer.

In presenting the scholarship to Mr. Fairchild, which incidentally is the largest in the history of the Business Administration School at the University of Texas, Chairman PATMAN, in commenting on the role of credit unions, said:

There is a lot more to finance than just commercial banks.

The presentation of the scholarship award is described in the August issue of the Credit Union magazine, and I am enclosing it in my remarks since it praises so highly the work of a distinguished Member of this body.

The article follows:

[From Credit Union magazine, August 1972]

FIRST PATMAN SCHOLARSHIP AWARDED AT
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

An aspiring doctor of philosophy in finance is \$2,000 closer to his academic goal, thanks to the Wright Patman Scholarship endowed by the credit union movement.

Bruce H. Fairchild, 24, of Dallas, Texas, who begins his graduate work this fall at The University of Texas, was awarded the first annual scholarship recently in ceremonies on the UT campus—with the man for whom the scholarship is named, Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), the "godfather of the credit union movement," doing the honors.

The Wright Patman Scholarship was conceived by Texas League Managing Director James M. Barry as a way for the movement

to demonstrate to the dean of the Texas congressional delegation "The esteem held for him by the entire credit union movement."

It is endowed by the CUNA International Foundation (\$1,500 a year) and the TCUL Educational Foundation (\$500), and administered through the University of Texas. The annual scholarship is open to any student at the master's level in finance at UT's College of Business Administration, and scholastic merit is the only criterion for receiving it.

And Fairchild, a modest, soft-spoken Kansas native with thinning blond hair and a neatly-trimmed moustache, demonstrated outstanding scholastic merit.

As a bachelor of business administration candidate at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, he racked up a 3.71 upperclass grade-point average (out of a perfect 4.0) and made the Dean's List for Academic Performance all four years at SMU. And he did it while working part-time as a comptroller trainee and internal auditor for a large national retailer.

Fairchild wants to earn his master's and his CPA, then study for a Ph. D. and teach at the university level. As a teacher he hopes to "contribute something of value to the students, the university and the business community . . . something of value, either moral or material, to society."

In presenting the scholarship to Fairchild, Rep. Patman called the establishment of the scholarship "a new recognition—a very important recognition—of the work of the credit unions in this state."

He said the scholarship "adds a new dimension to the University," and complimented the school "for recognizing the accomplishments—and the potential—of credit unions."

"As this scholarship recognizes," he said, "there is a lot more to finance than just commercial banks."

Patman called on credit unions to establish similar scholarships at other colleges. "It would be wonderful," he said, "if this program could grow to the point where a credit union scholarship could be established in every single state university."

Credit unions everywhere in the movement can help support the Wright Patman Scholarship—and perhaps build the scholarship program in other colleges and universities—by contributing to the CUNA International Foundation.

Contributions of any size from credit unions, chapters and individuals are welcomed. They should be marked "for the Wright Patman Scholarship" and sent to the Foundation at P.O. Box 431, Madison, Wis. 53701. Contributions are tax deductible.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer the following amendments to H.R. 13915:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 13915

The bill is amended by adding thereto the following:

"TITLE VII—CONFORMITY TO THE CONSTITUTION
"Section 701. Nothing in this Act is intended to be inconsistent with or violative of any provision of the Constitution."

HARMFUL BUSING PROHIBITED

Section 403 is amended by striking the section and substituting the following:
"Section 403. No court, department, or

agency of the United States shall, pursuant to section 402, under the implementation of a plan that would require the transportation of any student if the time or distance of such travel is so great as to risk either the health of the student or significantly impinge upon the educational process."

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 13915, THE EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the House will consider tomorrow H.R. 13915, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act. As a courtesy to our colleagues and to protect my own rights under the procedures that will be followed in connection with this legislation, I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD, the full text of the various amendments I intend to offer to the bill.

I will be more than happy to discuss any or all of these amendments with my colleagues.

The amendments follow:

Amendment to H.R. 13915 by Mr. BADILLO.

At page 19 strike lines 21 through 24 inclusive, and at page 20, strike lines one through three, inclusive.

At page 20, strike lines 4 through 8 inclusive.

At page 20, strike lines 9 through 11, inclusive.

At page 20, strike lines 12 through 19, inclusive.

At page 33, after line 6, add the following new subsection:

"(g) permitting any general or special purpose unit of local government to exercise powers with respect to planning, zoning, subdivision controls, building codes or permits, or other matters affecting land use in such a manner as to prevent the reasonable provision of low and moderate income housing in undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped parts of any community within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, or to discriminate in any other way (on the basis of amount, type, location, or otherwise) against low or moderate income housing in any such community."

At page 33, line 23, after the phrase "students on such basis" add the following:

"or, unless the United States Commissioner of Education, after appropriate consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and after such investigation, including local public hearings, as he may deem appropriate, determines that there has been insufficient provisions for low- and moderate-income housing in the community or communities served by the educational agency making such assignment."

At page 36, line 20, substitute new subsections (f) and (g) and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly:

"(f) the removal of land-use barriers, such as planning, zoning, subdivision controls, building codes or permits, to development of low- and moderate-income housing;

"(g) the construction of new low- and moderate-income housing;"

At page 37, lines 7 and 8, strike the words "type of education" and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"equal educational opportunity"

AN AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED TO THE EQUAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be debating the Equal Education Opportunities Act, otherwise known as the busing bill. I intend to offer an amendment to the bill which is designed to prohibit neighborhood assignment plans where residence in the neighborhood has been unconstitutionally denied to families or students on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

For those who would like to support this amendment, the section 2(a)(2) is amended by adding at the end of the subsection the following language:

"unless residence in the neighborhood has been unconstitutionally restricted on the basis of race, color, or national origin."

Section 203 is amended by adding at the end of the section the following proviso:

"Provided that residence in the neighborhood has not been unconstitutionally restricted on the basis of race, color, or national origin."

EXPLANATION

The purpose of these amendments is to prohibit neighborhood assignment plans where residence in the neighborhood has been unconstitutionally denied to families or students on the basis of race, color, or national origin. This is consistent with constitutional principles enunciated by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Brewer v. School Board of Norfolk, Va.*, 397 F.2d 37, 92 (4th Cir. 1968) —

Assignment of pupils to neighborhood schools is a sound concept, but it cannot be approved if residence in a neighborhood is denied to Negro pupils solely on the ground of color.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EQUAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD an amendment which I will offer tomorrow during the debate on the bill H.R. 13915, Equal Educational Opportunities.

REMOVAL OF INFRINGEMENT OF COURT JURISDICTION

Amend section 403(a) by striking out "court".

Amend section 403(b) by striking out "court" wherever it appears in the first sentence of section 303(b), and by striking out the third sentence of section 303(b).

Amend section 403(c) by striking out "court".

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 13915 I intend to offer the following amendment:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 13915 BY MR. HAWKINS

On page 31, after line 19, add the following:

"Sec. 102. Section 704 of the Emergency School Assistance Act is amended by inserting at the end of Section 704 the following:

"(c) For the purposes of making grants under this title to carry out the plan described in 706(a)(1)(E) and Sec. 402(f) of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1973 and for each fiscal year thereafter the sum of \$1,500,000,000 and no funds appropriated under subsection (a) shall be used for such purposes.

"(d) No funds are authorized to be appropriated under subsection (c) for any fiscal year until funds appropriated for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are at least equal to the funds appropriated for such title for the fiscal year immediately preceding, and subsection (a) of this section is fully funded."

INTRODUCTION OF THE LEAD-ZINC ACT OF 1972 AND THE ZINC ORE DUTY-SUSPENSION BILL

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1971, Representative McCLURE and I introduced the Lead-Zinc Act of 1971, a bill that would have a beneficial effect on the domestic economy, and which would also provide for stable prices and an adequate supply of lead and zinc to U.S. consumers. This bill has not been acted upon by the Congress. Today, joined by Representative McCLURE and 14 other colleagues in the House, I am introducing a new bill, the Lead and Zinc Act of 1972, that is intended to substitute for the 1971 bill. The 1972 act is identical to the 1971 bill, except for a refinement, and a change made necessary by events since the introduction of the 1971 bill. In a few moments I shall explain the principal provisions of the 1971 bill and why it is necessary and desirable to revise the 1971 bill, but before I do I wish to review the difficulties confronting our lead and zinc industries which have compounded grossly in the past year.

The situation is especially critical in zinc. When I spoke on May 20 last year to this House about the 1971 bill, I called attention to the closure of a number of our zinc smelters. Since then more zinc smelter closures have been announced. The United States had 14 zinc smelters in 1969. By the end of next year seven of those smelters will be closed, and the United States will have lost about 40 percent of its zinc smelting capacity within a 4-year period.

Our zinc mining industry is in trouble, too. Last year, production was the lowest

it has been since 1961, and known reserves are not being developed. American zinc reserves are not as rich as those found in some locations abroad but they are vast. They contain about 30 million tons of zinc and account, according to the Interior Department, for about 25 percent of known free world reserves.

Lead mining presents a more cheerful picture because the producing companies have been developing new, high-quality ore bodies, mainly in southeastern Missouri. The United States has about 36 million tons of lead in its reserves and these amount to approximately 40 percent of known reserves in the non-Communist countries.

In lead metal production, however, the picture is not so cheerful. While two new smelters and refineries have been opened, three others have been closed and there has been no increase in metal production during the past several years. Healthy mining and healthy smelting and refining industries go hand in hand. If we are to develop our lead ore reserves the way that they should be developed, we need an expanding lead metal producing industry, not a stagnant one.

In the meantime our lead and zinc industries are under heavy pressure from imports of foreign ores and metals. These imports now account for about 50 percent of our total zinc consumption and about 20 percent of our total lead consumption. On all too frequent occasions they depress prices and create instability in our markets, undermining the confidence that is necessary if our domestic lead and zinc producers are to carry out the additional investment that is sorely needed to maintain and expand much needed domestic production of these two essential metals.

While the American lead and zinc producing industries are confronted by instability and declining production, their main foreign competitors are undertaking major expansions of production. For example, the production of zinc metal will rise by more than 500,000 tons in Western Europe and Japan during the next several years, and Canadian zinc ore production nearly doubled in about 7 years. This raises an obvious question: How can foreign producers justify so much expansion when American producers cannot?

One of the main reasons is that foreign governments extend subsidies and tax exemptions to their mining and metals industries, and make important contributions to exploration costs. For example, most of the lead and zinc smelters and refineries going up in Western Europe, Japan, and Canada are benefiting from government grants or subsidized, low-interest loans.

Foreign subsidies and tax advantages put American lead and zinc producers at a substantial disadvantage in international competition. It is time that we take effective action to correct this disadvantage, not just for the sake of the companies and workers involved, but for the sake of our entire country.

The Secretary of Interior recently sent to the Congress his first annual report under the Mining and Minerals Pol-

icy Act of 1970. That report shows America's rapidly growing gap between the fuels and minerals our growing economy needs, and the fuels and minerals that we are actually producing. The Secretary's report underscores the need for increased investment by the domestic producers of these essential commodities.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act itself, among other things, calls for the development of economically sound and stable domestic mining, minerals, and metal industries and the orderly and economic development of domestic mineral resources and reserves to help assure satisfaction of industrial and security needs. The Lead and Zinc Act of 1972 being introduced today is fully in accordance with that act and will aid in promoting development of economically sound and stable lead and zinc industries in the United States.

The Lead and Zinc Act of 1972 is designed to meet the long-term problems of the lead and zinc industries by substantially increasing stability, thereby preserving what we still have and creating the confidence that is necessary if further investment is to take place. Like the 1971 bill, the 1972 act amends the tariff schedules of the United States to provide for rates of duty higher than present rates after certain quantitative levels of imports have been reached in a calendar quarter. It puts no absolute limitations on the importation of lead and zinc metals, ores and other articles made of lead and zinc that are specified in the bill.

The quantitative limitations proposed in this bill are moderate. They bear entirely reasonable relation to current import requirements of metals and of ores needed by our industries to supplement current levels of domestic mine and smelter production. They likewise have reasonable relation to imports over the past several years.

Consequently, the higher rates of duty would apply only at a point where, without their imposition, U.S. production could be displaced by imports in excess of real need.

As to changes, the 1972 act recognizes the unfortunate need for increased imports of zinc metal that has come about by reason of smelter closures. To meet this circumstance the Act increases the quantitative limitation on zinc metal imports by 50 percent over the limitation in the 1971 bill.

The other change is a refinement that provides flexibility with respect to quantitative limitations under changing consumption levels. Under the bill being introduced today the quantitative limitations on lead and zinc metal imports could be adjusted every 2 years to reflect changes in consumption. The 1971 bill did not have such provision. This flexibility will better recognize the interests of consumers and, incidentally, enable foreign producers to share in any increase in consumption in the U.S. market.

The 1972 bill, like the one of 1971, provides that with one exception the present rates of duty shall apply until the quantitative limitations have been reached,

with the higher rate of duty applying thereafter.

The exception is in the case of zinc ore. Here the bill provides that imports up to the quantitative limitation shall be entered free of duty rather than at the present rate of 0.67 cent per pound. On imports beyond the quantitative limitation the present rate of duty would be restored.

This exception is proposed because an important part of zinc metal production in the United States is from the processing of imported ores in U.S. smelters. These smelters must compete at foreign sources for their import requirements and the relaxing of the duty on zinc ore will improve their position. It is essential that the United States encourage importation of raw materials for processing ore rather than importation of finished materials, in this case zinc metal. This provision of the 1972 act will aid in that purpose.

The exception for zinc ore is related directly to a second complementary bill being introduced today, the Zinc Ore Duty Suspension Act. The Congress will require time, of course, to consider the Lead and Zinc Act of 1972. But our zinc smelting industry is in critical need of urgent assistance in the form of relief from the present duty on zinc ores as contemplated in the Lead and Zinc Act of 1972. It is in the national interest to provide that assistance not only because the zinc smelting industry is a long-established part of our metals economy and an important employer but also because that industry may be needed to process increasing quantities of American ore which may become available under the conditions that the Lead and Zinc Act of 1972 can create.

The Zinc Ore Duty Suspension Act provides this necessary assistance to the zinc smelting industry by suspending the present 67-cent-a-pound duty on zinc ore for 1 year beginning the day after enactment of the act. If the Congress sees fit to pass this bill soon, as I hope it will, I would further hope that during the 1-year duty suspension the Congress will take favorable action on the Lead and Zinc Act of 1972.

Mr. Speaker, there are two principal reasons why it is in the Nation's interest to provide reasonable assistance to our lead and zinc industries. First, these industries are essential to our country, especially in time of national emergency. Second, the further growth of our lead and zinc imports will have a serious impact on our balance of payments. During the past 15 years the United States has imported almost \$3 billion worth of lead and zinc ores and metals, not counting manufactured and semimanufactured goods of lead and zinc. It has been estimated that during the next 15 years these imports, at today's prices, will total more than \$6 billion.

The two bills introduced today would help protect our national and industrial security and would ease our serious balance-of-payments problems. The Zinc Ore Duty Suspension Act would give some prompt relief to a zinc smelting industry that is badly in need of relief. The Lead and Zinc Act of 1972 will help to remedy

the competitive disadvantage at which American lead and zinc producers find themselves in competing with subsidized foreign companies, and it will generate confidence and encourage expansion so that much of our growing consumption requirements can be met from domestic sources in future years.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 requires that we make the attainment of these goals possible.

I hope that many Members of the Congress will support these measures that will aid in bringing economic soundness and stability to the lead and zinc industries and thus contribute to improvement of the Nation's minerals posture which is gravely in need of improvement.

IN PRAISE OF A GOOD PUBLIC SERVANT: JAMES L. SLAVIN

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, regrettably we all receive a number of complaints from constituents about bureaucratic callousness in agency relations with individuals. As distressing as this is, it is gratifying when one finds that the heads of departments are concerned about the way their employees treat individuals and anxious to correct the insensitivity that often permeates agency relations after years of operation.

This happened to me not too long ago when I received a complaint from a constituent that a local unemployment office seemed unable to communicate with a man seeking assistance who spoke only Spanish. This was in a neighborhood with many Spanish-speaking residents. In this case the applicant was so frustrated because he could not speak nor understand English that he broke down in tears. The response of the agency employee was one of unconcern for the man's problem and disregard for his feelings.

I brought this matter to the attention of James Slavin, metropolitan area director for the State Unemployment Insurance Bureau. Mr. Slavin's response was commendable. First, he did something that few agency officials ever do and that is admit that the incident was "inexcusable." Then he outlined the steps he had taken to insure that it would not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to criticize a Federal, State, or city administrator where the facts demand it, and so I am delighted to have the opportunity to praise a good public servant—James L. Slavin. For the interest of our colleagues I would like to insert in the Record my correspondence with Mr. Slavin. It follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1972.

JAMES SLAVIN,
Metropolitan Area Director, Unemployment
Insurance Bureau, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SLAVIN: I would like to call your attention to a situation which was described to me by a constituent which should, if accurately stated, be corrected.

She told me that at your office located at 250 West 90th Street, Manhattan, those com-

ing in to apply for unemployment benefits are overwhelmingly Spanish speaking. She also stated that there are no Spanish speaking employees who can respond to the questions of those seeking assistance. She indicated that she was mortified when one man, in line before her, not able to speak or understand English, began to cry because he was not able to discuss his case with the State employee. And, when my constituent said, "Shouldn't you get someone who understands Spanish to help?" The employee is alleged to have responded, "He understands no check." Well, he obviously didn't understand the reasons why he was not entitled to benefits and he began to cry.

I would appreciate your ascertaining whether the facts related to me are correct and if so, seeing to it that bilingual personnel be available at that location to deal with such situations in the future.

If this situation exists at this particular office, it may in fact exist elsewhere in the system and I would think you would want to look into that too.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
New York, N.Y., July 26, 1972.

Congressman EDWARD KOCH,
Federal Plaza.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is in reply to your letter of July 17 in which you informed me that one of your constituents was distressed by the action of one of our staff members in our local office at 250 West 90th Street and that that situation led to your questioning whether or not we have ample Spanish speaking employees to serve the Hispanic population of that district.

I regret that the incident occurred. 36% of the claimants served by the office are Spanish speaking although 80% are bilingual. In this office we have seven Spanish speaking staff members who are on call as interpreters or to answer questions in Spanish when the need arises.

Let me repeat, the incident you described was inexcusable.

There are Spanish speaking staff members in all our offices. Interpretation service to our Spanish speaking population has been our objective for many years. In order to assure that our service objective is not forgotten, I have sent a copy of your letter to each of our District Superintendents that it may become part of their management exchanges with the District Office Managers who in turn will be expected to take it up in their training of local office staff.

Thank you for calling this to our attention. When we slip, it is necessary to bring us back in line by the kind of information that you have given us.

Very truly yours

JAMES L. SLAVIN,
Area Director—Insurance.

VIETNAM: OUT NOW

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, recently it was announced that the last ground combat troops were leaving Vietnam. That was good news, but it ought not deceive any American into thinking that our involvement in this miserable war is still not huge.

The ground combat troops are gone, but an immense armada of warships has replaced them and our air capabilities in Thailand have been enlarged. Our bombs

rain down on North and South Vietnam with more intensity than ever before, and at an estimated extra cost for this fiscal year of over a billion dollars and an increased cost of personal anguish and material destruction that cannot be estimated.

We have been told by successive administrations that this war is worth the lives of thousands of young Americans and worth our great financial expense, because we are defending a free and democratic society. This continuing delusion is perhaps our society's greatest tragedy.

Recent news stories have described the increased censorship of Saigon's press. All opposition to and even criticism of the Thieu regime has been silenced and some papers have been forced to shut down. In addition to stifling the press, Mr. Thieu has terrorized his own people in a fashion that too many Americans believe only the Communists of North Vietnam would employ.

The police reportedly have arrested and jailed over 15,000 citizens of South Vietnam during the past few months in an arbitrary and brutal exercise worthy of the most vicious police state. According to reliable accounts, many of those arrested have been women and children, and many have been subject to extreme forms of torture while imprisoned.

We cannot escape the fact that we are accomplices in these atrocities.

Our Government provides the aid to the South Vietnam police force and prison system which permits the continuation of these arrests and brutalities. And Air America, an airline operated for the CIA, reportedly is used to transport "prisoners" to Con Son, the prison where the torture takes place and the site of the infamous "tiger cages."

Our Government is quick to speak out in official condemnation of atrocities committed by the North Vietnamese, but says nothing of Mr. Thieu's actions. No doubt it is foolish to expect that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would be any more benevolent toward the people, but how long will the Nixon administration insist on the wild belief that the Thieu government bears any resemblance to a free and democratic form of rule?

The Governments of North and South Vietnam deserve one another, but neither Government deserves our blood and treasure. It is hard to distinguish between the brutalities of Mr. Thieu and those of the Communists. Yet, as the war drags on, it becomes increasingly clear that we have lost over 55,000 lives and over \$100 billion not in defense of freedom, but in defense of the Thieu regime. It was a tragic delusion to believe that democracy as we know it, would develop in South Vietnam if our soldiers defended that land, but it is a greater tragedy to continue the death and destruction of this war as the defenders of Mr. Thieu's corrupt dictatorship.

We hear a lot about ending the war with honor. The only way to gain honor now is to end our support of the Thieu dictatorship and set a date for the immediate withdrawal of all our forces, con-

tingent only on the return of our prisoners of war.

A FEDERAL LIGHT ON CRIME PROGRAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems for city dwellers today is street crime. For many people, the streets have become corridors of fear at night making them prisoners in their homes after dark.

There is no easy solution to the problem of street crime, but there is one practical step that can be taken to deter this crime: improve street lighting. The installation of high pressure sodium lights, illuminating the streets far better than traditional lighting, has proven effective in reducing crime rates.

On March 22 I introduced a bill, H.R. 14022, to establish a "Federal Light On Crime Program." This legislation would mandate the expenditure of \$30 million in each of the next 3 years specifically for the purchase and installation of high pressure sodium lights. The funds would be distributed in grants directly to local governments on a 75 percent Federal, 25 percent local share basis.

Using the same amount of electrical power, high pressure sodium lights give approximately four times the lighting level provided by traditional lights. In a sense, they turn night into day and their effectiveness as a deterrent against crime is undeniable.

In Washington, D.C., after installation of high-level lighting in high-crime areas, crime decreased by 31 percent.

Gary, Ind., installed 5,000 new street lights. Criminal assaults dropped 70 percent and robberies 60 percent.

In Chattanooga, Tenn., crime in a 12 block area dropped 70 percent after lighting.

The program I have proposed involves relatively low costs and can have an immediate impact on reducing street crime. This is a program designed to light our streets for people rather than just for cars. It is a program designed to return the streets to the people.

New York City and other localities have initiated their own high-level lighting plans on a limited scale, combining private and local government funding. Some such lights illuminate parts of our own East Side even now. In addition, a number of responsible landlords are installing their own high intensity lights on their property to light up the sidewalks and sitting areas that surround their buildings. One apartment complex where this is needed and hopefully will be done by the landlord is Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, owned by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and located in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will give prompt consideration to H.R. 14022. Federal funding could conceivably insure that whole communities would be illuminated, to the benefit of residents and merchants alike. We must do what

we can to move the country to the day when we can all "see the light" and end the terror in our streets.

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS ON THE WORD OF GOD

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the National Congress on the Word of God will be held at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C., on September 5, 6, and 7, 1972.

The Congress is intended to revitalize preaching and ministering to the current crisis in faith and will bring together laity, theologians, religious educators, and bishops to witness the power of the word of God.

This will be a truly ecumenical endeavor with people of all faiths invited, and with officials of a number of faiths participating. The Word of God Congress will be one of the significant religious events of 1972 and may well pave the way to much greater ecumenical cooperation between Catholics and Protestants in North America.

Furthermore, the Word of God Congress may lead to increased Catholic participation in the year-long national evangelistic program, "Key '73," which will get underway this fall with emphasis on renewal of the local churches, calling to repentance and prayer, and calling the continent to the word of God by placing the Old Testament in the homes of Canada and the United States.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the general public I would like to insert at this point a statement on the Word of God Congress, by Mr. Robert Donihi, former director of the office of public information, U.S. Catholic Conference.

BISHOP BERNARDIN ENDORSES GOSPEL
PREACHING RENEWAL
(By Robert Donihi)

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 8.—The General Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the United States Catholic Conference (NCCB-USCC) today urged the nation's Roman Catholic priests "... and all the people of God, to come together to witness the power of the Word of God to resolve the crisis of faith." Advocating attendance at the National Congress on the Word of God, September 5-7, in the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, Bishop Joseph L. Bernardin noted that "the thrust of the Congress is toward a theology of biblical preaching—preaching that is rooted in revealed truths personally experienced by the preached rather than in human rhetoric, however interesting or socially useful."

Bishop Bernardin said that Pope Paul VI set the stage for the Word of God Congress with the words: "If the faith fails to find any believers, is this because it is taught in an old, abstruse way, cut off from life and contrary to the tendencies and tastes of today? Ought we not renew the kerygma—the announcement of the Christian message—if we want to find hearers and followers?" (Sept. '70).

Bishop Bernardin added, "Scriptural, theological and historical evidence argue that preaching is the foundation of the Church's life of faith, but the sobering fact is that

most Catholic Christians are not sufficiently enriched by what they hear from Church pulpits, their major channel of contact with Christian truth.

"Addressing myself especially to my brother priests, I urge participation in this great celebration of the Gospel message and the renewal of its preaching; the Congress seeks to make specific application of revealed truths to the life of the Church." Toward that objective he then recommended enrollment of the clergy in the Congress' eight Concurrent Conferences on Kerygmatic Renewal to be held Wednesday afternoon, September 6.

"These conferences are intended to bridge the gap between theory and practice in the Church," he said, "by exploring the essential relationship of the Christian message to diverse areas of specialized professional church activity." He identified the eight Concurrent Conferences as Preaching and the Bible, Preaching and Communications, Preaching and Conversion, Preaching and Ecumenism, Preaching and the Liturgy, Preaching and Priestly Ministry, Preaching and Religious Education, Preaching and Social Development.

"Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," said Bishop Bernardin, "the conferences will seek to break new ground in understanding the Christian apostolate. Expert leaders and speakers have been invited to guide participants into an examination of the efficacy of their specialty in the light of the crisis of faith. Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it."

The program of the National Congress on the Word of God has been praised by: Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, Secretary of the 100,000 member National Conference of Catholic Charities and Vice President of Caritas Internationalis who comments that "It stimulates people to a greater awareness of their social responsibility in reflection of the Gospel message"; by the prestigious and influential Roman Catholic magazine *The Priest* which devoted its current cover, editorial and lead article to the Congress; and by the 400 certified preacher-members of Inter-Com. Inter-Com has voted to hold its annual meeting in conjunction with the National Congress, despite the fact that Inter-Com board members' terms are thus shortened by several months.

BASEBALL

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet made good on my promise to bring baseball back to the Capital.

I can report progress however. Monday night Washington baseball fans emphatically told the baseball establishment in no uncertain terms they were wrong when they allowed the Senators to move to Arlington, Tex., where they are known as the Rangers.

By turning out over 32,000 strong for an exhibition game between the New York Mets and the Boston Red Sox, they answered the unproven charge that Washington fans will not support baseball. Now when we get that kind of resounding support from our constituents, we respond. We get moving in a hurry.

We can only hope this demonstration of love for the game here in the Capital has the same impact on baseball hierarchy.

The reason for my asking for time this morning is to thank the players, coaches,

managers, and officials of the New York Mets and the Boston Red Sox for playing the exhibition game for charity. A special nod of appreciation should go to the owners, Mrs. Payson of the Mets and Mr. Yawkey of the Red Sox.

Both teams are within striking distance of their division leads. But as a game here, it meant little from the competitive viewpoint to the players who are tired going into the last of the baseball season. Yet they gave of their time and effort and gave their best.

Exhibition though it was, the game had a great deal of meaning for we fans. On behalf of all area baseball fans I would like to extend a deeply felt thanks to baseball, the Mets, the Red Sox, and all their personnel from batboys to owners. They deserve it.

With due justice to the professionals involved, I exclude Vinegar Bend, in this particular case, a word should also be said for the amateurs. To be strictly non-partisan, I must sadly observe that once again the majority went down in defeat. However, the victors in the annual congressional game are to be congratulated on their victory—better now than in November—and the losers to be applauded for being "nice guys."

Our deepest and most profound thanks should also go to the Almas Shrine Temple. If I may be permitted to mix a metaphor, I would like to say that Shrine Potentate Dr. Lloyd E. Church and his cochairmen, Wally Moore and Bill Press, really carried the ball for us in this charity game. They and all of the gentlemen of the Temple deserve our congratulations for their work and devotion to a worthwhile cause.

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1227

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1227, the interim agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. This agreement is the result of 2½ years of negotiations between the Soviets and ourselves, and I believe that it signals the start of a new and constructive era in Soviet-American relations. The promise of this new era is that it will be one in which we will be able to terminate the wasteful strategic arms race, a race which continues to cost billions of tax dollars each year, but which does little, if anything, to make us more secure.

Despite the tremendous advantages that are likely to result from these agreements, several short-run problems have been generated. Paradoxically, the SALT I agreements have been used by the Nixon administration to justify even greater defense expenditures. At one point, the Secretary of Defense went so far as to say that he would oppose the SALT I agreements if they were not accompanied by the passage of the administration's defense budget. The result of this process has been that, although we have

signed an agreement to limit strategic offensive weapons, we are rushing ahead with the development and procurement of expensive weapons programs wherever possible under the terms of the interim agreement and in those categories not covered by the agreement.

The best known of these unnecessary and exorbitantly expensive weapons systems are the B-1 bomber, the Trident submarine, and the Washington area ABM. I indicated my opposition to the B-1 bomber and the Trident submarine at the time of the military procurement authorization bill, and, therefore, today I will only speak about the Washington ABM.

Mr. Speaker, the ABM is the classic example of a weapons system in search of a justification. As arms control expert Henry R. Myer astutely pointed out in an article in the Washington Post of July 30, 1972, at different times over the past decade, at least five different functions have been advanced as the primary purpose of ABM deployment: Defense of the American population against an all-out Soviet countercity attack; defense of the population against an attack by a small nuclear power such as the People's Republic of China; protection of American land-based missiles; use of the threat of ABM deployment as a bargaining chip in the SALT negotiations; and, finally, defense of Washington.

Unfortunately, the last of these purposes is the least credible in a list of very dubious justifications. Under the terms of the recent SALT agreement on ABM's, we are only allowed 100 launchers per ABM site, and, therefore, even if we accept the questionable assumption that our ABM will be 100-percent effective, the Soviets will be able to overcome the Washington ABM and destroy the National Command Authority with the expenditure of but 101 warheads.

In addition, in contrast with statements by some administration spokesmen, because most of the Soviet missiles are not targeted on the National Command Authority, this ABM provides only a modicum of protection against an accidental launch, and it provides that protection at a very great cost. Thus, like the B-1 bomber and the Trident submarine, the Washington ABM will be but another extraordinarily costly weapons system which will do little to improve our strategic defense posture; obviously, the lesson of this is that the fact that we are permitted to deploy a Washington ABM does not mean that we ought to do so.

The development and deployment of these and other new weapons systems, however, goes to the very heart of the current negotiating strategy, a strategy of building bargaining chips so as to negotiate from a position of strength. But, although there are obviously advantages in having some bargaining chips, a policy of intentionally building new strategic weapons is hardly likely to have a beneficial effect on the delicate SALT negotiations; instead, such a policy will fuel the arms race both by complicating the strategic equation and by strengthening the arguments of the Kremlin's hardliners.

Certainly a far wiser, and less costly,

policy would be to fund these programs on a contingent basis. Leslie H. Gelb and Anthony Lake have written:

Of course, the President needs bargaining chips. But, there is a fundamental fallacy in his approach: new weapons systems do not actually have to be deployed in order to give him bargaining power. This power derives from the American potential to deploy, not actual deployment. Continued research and development and the placing of funds in escrow would give the President the same leverage without the cost.

In this way, instead of building our bargaining chips, as we have done with MIRV and ABM, we could attempt to negotiate them away in the pursuit of strategic stability.

In addition to the problems which have resulted and will continue to result from the administration's bargaining strategy, there is also a major weakness in the interim offensive agreement itself, the virtual absence of qualitative limitations. Thus, although the agreement froze the numbers of certain type of strategic weapons which each side could build, it did almost nothing to limit the qualitative improvements which could be made on these weapons. As a result, the cycle of action and reaction which has characterized the Soviet-American arms race of the past two decades can be perpetuated through the development and deployment of systems such as the MK-19 multiple, hard-target warhead, a weapon which has an obvious first-strike counterforce potential.

Therefore, in SALT II we must begin the more difficult task of obtaining comprehensive strategic arms limitations which address both the quantitative and the qualitative sides of the arms race. To reach this goal, we will undoubtedly have to engage in long and tough negotiations with the Soviets, but, with the ratification of the ABM treaty by the Senate, at least we now have a precedent for such an agreement. We have limited the quality and quantity of defensive weapons which each side can retain, and, now, we must do the same for offensive weapons.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the real significance of the SALT I accords is the potential which they represent, the potential to put a stop to what has been called the "mad momentum" of the arms race. Without the ABM treaty and the interim offensive arms agreement, we would probably be about to embark upon the procurement of an extensive new strategic weapons arsenal; with these agreements we are about to freeze the arms race on a plateau of stability, security, and mutual deterrence. In the words of the Foreign Affairs Committee report on this resolution—

While offering the prospect of a more secure and peaceful world, the SALT agreements will permit the United States to take those steps necessary to maintain a strategic posture which both protects our vital national interests and guarantees our continued security.

If a nuclear holocaust is to be avoided, this is certainly the course that we must pursue.

THE LATE A. E. RIDGELL

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. E. Ridgell, known to most of us as "Manny" has passed on to his reward after serving the House of Representatives for almost 40 years—it would have been 40 years in October, I am told. I also understand that a quarter of a century was spent as superintendent of the House Office Buildings. He was a fine, outstanding gentleman, and was an inspiration to those around him.

When he was called upon to take care of a matter, no matter how small or how large, he made an endeavor to satisfy a Congressman or his staff. He never took a negative attitude about the accomplishment of some task, but was always willing to try to the utmost to succeed, and I rarely ever knew him or his staff failing to succeed in what they set out to do. The smooth running operation of this large place does not just happen, as I suppose we are sometimes prone to think of it, but it is because of dedicated people like "Manny" Ridgell that it functions so well.

He will be greatly missed. Although his death seemed untimely, it is more the quality of a life that counts than the quantity.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT, H.R. 13915

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to advise our colleagues that when H.R. 13915, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, is brought to the floor, I intend to offer the following amendments:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 13915 TO BE OFFERED BY Mr. SCHEUER

On page 37, line 8, substitute a comma for the period after "student" and the following new language: "or unless the implementation of such a plan is required by the Constitution of the United States."

On page 37, line 20, substitute a comma for the period after "agency" and add the following new language: "or unless the implementation of such a plan is required by the Constitution of the United States."

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL LEADERS COMMENT ON THE FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT PROBLEM

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, for almost a year now proposed legislation has been pending before the Ways and Means Committee dealing with the problem of imports and foreign investment. From time to time, I have urged the holding of public hearings so that we can move ahead on this very important prob-

lem. Pending such hearings, I have occasionally placed in the RECORD statements on various sides of this question. It is my hope that such statements will promote a better understanding in Congress and among the public to the issue as involved in this complex field.

In an effort to make some progress in dealing with some of the less complex and less controversial aspects of the problem, I introduced two bills last Thursday, the Trade and Economic Conversion Adjustment Act of 1972 and the Foreign Trade Amendments Act of 1972, and made a statement on the RECORD as to my own thinking on the subject. My statement appears at page 27686.

Today I would like again to offer viewpoints of some other people on various sides of the issue, represented by interviews reprinted in the August 1, 1972, issue of *Forbes* magazine under the headline "Where Have All the Jobs Gone?" Four viewpoints are represented in the interviews.

The first interview is with Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger, chief economist of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Goldfinger discusses the reasoning behind the Burke-Hartke bill relating to controls over imports and foreign investment by American-based multinational corporations.

The second interview is with Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers. The UAW represents workers in three major industries: Automobile, aerospace, and farm equipment. While the automobile industry has seen 15 percent of the U.S. market captured by foreign imports, the other two industries have a heavy stake in the export market. As a result, the UAW has a different approach than the AFL-CIO.

The third interview is with Russell DeYoung, Chairman of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., whose international headquarters is in Akron, Ohio, in the congressional district that I represent. Goodyear is one of the largest corporations in the United States and one of the largest multinational corporations. Some 40 percent of Goodyear's sales and earnings come from its overseas operations. Goodyear recently released its financial report for the first 6 months of 1972 and reported sales and earnings exceeding all previous company records. Nevertheless, employment at Goodyear's plants in Akron, and the Akron plants of the other major tire companies, has been declining.

The fourth interview is with Joseph Wright, chairman of Zenith Radio Corp. The electronics industry, of which Zenith is a member, has been especially hard hit by import competition. In the last 5 years, overall employment has declined by some 219,000 jobs. Many U.S. electronics manufacturers have shifted production to other countries. Paul Jennings, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers estimates that 120,000 jobs have been exported by such decisions. In 1970, Zenith laid off almost 3,000 workers and began building black and white television sets in Taiwan. This was followed by an announcement that Zenith would have to lay off another 4,000 workers by moving

its small screen color production out of the United States. However, Zenith did not make that move and kept all small screen color production in the United States.

I include the interviews with these prominent labor and business leaders immediately following these remarks:

WE'RE UNDERMINING OUR INDUSTRIAL BASE

(By Nathaniel Goldfinger)

Businessmen see foreign investment differently than you do. They say that because of cost differentials, tariffs and other considerations the U.S. company would lose the foreign market were it not producing on the scene.

GOLDFINGER. Oh, there may be some elements of truth to that, depending upon the product and the country involved. But you see, there is an extremely important point here, and that is that what may be a rational decision for a private corporation such as a Ford Motor Co. or an IBM may not be a rational decision for the American economy and for American society. In fact, a decision made by the management of a private multinational corporation may work out to the advantage of that private corporation, but it may well result in the displacement of American labor, in the export of American technology, and it probably will result in the export of American capital. Moreover, such a decision may well undermine the industrial base of the country.

That's what organized labor and other supporters of the protectionist Burke-Hartke Bill worry about when they hear the bankers and academics talk of the U.S. moving toward a "post-industrial," no-growth society.

GOLDFINGER. If we continue to get more and more emphasis on investment in foreign production by U.S. companies, we are going to lose our industrial base. We are beginning to lose some of our service jobs related to production, and not too far down the road we will be losing some, if not much, of our research and development because R&D always tends to follow production. The talk of those people who speak glibly of a service economy is the talk of those who unfortunately have not given much thought to the nature of our economy. Service jobs, most of them, are low-wage, menial jobs. It's not all surgeons and research chemists, by any means. You know, it's generally forgotten that the American consumer is an American worker, and the fact that the American market is a lucrative market is based upon the wages of the American worker. As we continue to get more and more emphasis on investment in foreign production by U.S. companies, the labor share of income will go down, whereas the profit share will rise. Professor Peggy Musgrave (of Northeastern University and one of the few academics in labor's good graces) says it well: "Foreign investment may enhance the private profitability of U.S. capital, but it is likely to reduce the real wage to U.S. labor as well as the Government's tax share in the profits."

But the prime responsibility of corporate management is supposed to be to seek out the greatest profit. In theory, everybody benefits from this greater return on invested capital. Is labor introducing a new criterion for corporate management? That it should invest with an eye not only to the greatest profit, but the greatest domestic employment as well?

GOLDFINGER. Well, we think they should have that in consideration. But that is not our primary drive. What we are saying is that all through American history, and particularly in the past 100 years, we have had the development internally in the U.S. of various types of regulations and restraints on private corporations and corporate operations. I mean this dates back into the late

1870s and certainly came to the fore in the 1930s. We have a whole series of regulations as part of American law and the American system. And yet when you look at the international economic area, you find that there is no regulation and the Government operates on the basis of the mythology of *laissez-faire*.

And you would propose a bill such as Burke-Hartke to counter *laissez-faire*. How do you see the effects of such a bill?

GOLDFINGER. One benefit would be in maintaining a diversified economy. The way things are going, we are undermining our industrial base. The adoption of Burke-Hartke with the restraint and regulations on imports and on the outflow of technology and the outflow of capital would help to maintain a more diversified type of economy.

Why do we need such drastic medicine as Burke-Hartke? Wouldn't market-disruption quotas do the job?

GOLDFINGER. The U.S. position in international trade has been deteriorating in composition as well as in total volume. During the 1960s, imports of manufactured goods approximately tripled, but exports of such goods merely doubled. We're now affected not simply in about three or four old industries, we're affected across the board. Even in the sophisticated new industries.

Would a return to a trade surplus assuage labor's anxiety and blunt the passion for Burke-Hartke?

GOLDFINGER. I doubt it, because there are so many parts of the country seriously hurt by imports. Anyhow, improvement in the trade balance by itself is not the solution for the problem we're talking about. What's involved in the future is a whole improvement in the relationship of our exports and our imports.

So you want a big fence to keep capital at home and foreign goods out. This would certainly protect U.S. labor and its wage rates from foreign competition. However, if we need, as the AFL-CIO says, the regulation of international profit-seeking by corporations, do we not need controls on labor's demands in the wage and work rules area? Controls for the goose and controls for the gander.

GOLDFINGER. Well, you see, in the international economic area, the issue is this: Capital is mobile, labor is not mobile. This is one of the crucial issues involved in this whole matter. That capital can move relatively easily out of one business into another or from one part of the country to another, or from the U.S. to Mexico or to Taiwan. However, people cannot move very easily and communities cannot move at all. So that what you have here are people and whole communities that are being sacrificed.

Supporters of multinational corporations cite capital flows that show the U.S. benefiting from repatriated earnings from foreign investment. These arguments make no impression on labor. They feel the profits come at the expense of labor's share of the national income.

GOLDFINGER. I'll give you some examples, small examples, but they add up. In March 1970 *The Wall Street Journal* reported that Zenith Radio, which was in the process of completing a large plant in Taiwan, announced that it would reduce its work force by about 3,000 jobs [for Zenith's version, see p. 22]. Joseph S. Wright said that in addition probably another 4,000 layoffs would occur in 1971. Paul Jennings, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, reported to the Joint Economic Committee in July 1970 that Westinghouse closed its Edison, N.J. TV plant and transferred the production to one of its Canadian affiliates as well as to Japanese firms. Emerson Radio & Phonograph, a division of National Union Electric, discontinued production of TV sets, closing down its Jersey City, N.J. plant and transferring production to Admiral which in turn transferred production of major TV

product lines to Taiwan. Warwick Electronics transferred production from its Illinois and Arkansas plants to its Mexican facility. Bendix left Elmira and Long Island, N.Y. to produce in Mexico. I could go on and on.

Okay, but maybe U.S. labor just can't compete in these fields. U.S. labor's productivity is not what it used to be, some people say, and the real problem is U.S. wages growing faster than U.S. productivity.

GOLDFINGER. The American worker operates the machinery and equipment that is provided by the company. Now, when the company provides the same kind of machinery and equipment and knowhow in its foreign plants, then it is increasing, very substantially increasing, the productivity and technology levels of that foreign plant. And it is making it possible to have the same or similar productivity levels as in the U.S. at much lower wages and at much lower labor standards frequently. Also often with lower tax rates and other kinds of advantages. So that we lose exports to the country where such a foreign subsidiary is operating, and then we lose out in third-country markets because of the competition from these foreign subsidiaries.

These countries you speak of with much lower wage rates and labor standards are obviously not European, but developing countries such as Mexico and Taiwan. These countries need foreign investment if they are to bring their people into the modern industrial world. How do you reconcile this problem?

GOLDFINGER. Those developing countries need viable economies. But frequently, foreign investment distorts the economy of the developing country by siphoning off labor into production for export. Here the bankers and academics in the U.S. and some of the people in the developing countries have placed an utterly undue emphasis on trade as the answer to their problems. The answer to their problems is not trade in itself, but the development of viable economies, which to a great extent depends upon internal domestic markets. We get back once again to this issue that what is rational for the firm may be harmful to the country.

So basically, what you're asking is that regulation be imposed upon corporations to prevent them seeking the greatest return on investment in instances where that greater return is located outside the United States.

GOLDFINGER. We're saying there's a country here, and there are people here, working people and consumers. There are communities with a tax base, there is a Federal Government with its tax base, and this country should not permit itself to be undermined by its own policies. Regulation is necessary. Just as it was necessary to regulate the stock market and the large corporations, so it is necessary to regulate these international economic relationships, and it is particularly necessary to regulate the outflow of technology and of capital.

TARIFFS AND QUOTAS DEMAND RETALIATION

(By Leonard Woodcock)

Can you explain how the UAW differs from the AFL-CIO on foreign trade? Do you support the Burke-Hartke Bill?

WOODCOCK. No, we do not. Our chief objection is the emphasis on tariffs and mandated quotas which will demand retaliation by other countries. This would lead to a substantial slackening of world trade, and this could have very drastic consequences for all of us.

Does that mean you support a free trade policy?

WOODCOCK. We support the general notion of free trade, but we have never been free traders period, because we live in a real world. We believe there should be licensing for export of capital, after a Presidential

appointed board decides this is in the nation's interest.

Let's go back to the time when Kennedy was President and Ford over here was going to buy up the remaining piece of Ford of Britain. This was at a time when the dollar was in difficulty, and the President publicly asked the Ford Motor Co. not to do it, and Mr. Ford said he was going to do it for the good of Ford. I think that sort of thing is wrong. The president of a private company shouldn't be able to say that his decision is superior to the recommendation of the President of the United States.

What about an agreement like the U.S.-Canadian auto pact? Hasn't this meant a loss of American jobs?

WOODCOCK. When the auto agreement first went into effect in 1965, our balance of trade in vehicles and parts was running \$600 million per year in our favor. Now it has swung to a negative balance of over \$100 million. I'm not sure this could have been prevented, actually, because I don't know whether Canada could have sustained the drain that it had before the pact. The alternative would have been to have the Canadian market entirely sealed off, in which event there would probably have been fewer jobs on both sides of the border.

So you would agree that it is necessary to have plants abroad to serve foreign markets?

WOODCOCK. I don't disagree with that. Caterpillar Tractor is an excellent example because in every situation where they have placed a plant in a country, their exports from the U.S. to that country have shot up. They build parts in Japan, for example, which they bring here; they also build components here for the Japanese market, so you get a two-way flow. But the flow in each direction has substantially increased.

What about the argument that high American labor costs price U.S. companies out of the market? Do you think there is any basis for this claim?

WOODCOCK. I don't think so. If you take the decade of the Sixties, the last half was pretty bad. Productivity was bad, inflation was bad and our relative position in the international scheme of things worsened. During the first five years, it was the reverse. Our unit labor costs went down steadily. Except for Canada, we had the best record of any country—better than Japan, Italy, Western Europe.

Why did things change?

WOODCOCK. Because of the Vietnam war. Johnson and the Congress didn't have the courage to increase taxes in 1966 to balance the thing out. As the inflation problem increased, labor began to fight to make up for its lost position. When it did this, labor became part of the problem. No question about it.

Let's talk about productivity. Some industry leaders say that the solution to unemployment in America is getting people to want to work.

WOODCOCK. Well, if that thesis is correct and everybody suddenly started working twice as hard, the problem would get even worse—there'd be half as many jobs! But there is an attitudinal problem. Look at absenteeism. They used to control this by the terror of discipline. It doesn't work anymore. There's the apocryphal story about the guy who was always working only four days a week. Finally the plant manager asks him: "How come you only work four days?" "Because I can't live on three," he says.

But if he's making enough in four days, isn't he getting too much money?

WOODCOCK. If his expectancies are less. You know, the counterculture is having a pervasive effect.

Do you really notice your members wanting to live in smaller houses with fewer TV sets?

WOODCOCK. I think it's possible. Then, too, you have a higher level of education. You take a second shift. They work from 3:30 to midnight. I think they could think of some better things to do on a Friday night than go into that damn plant. On Saturday, when they get time and a half, the absenteeism is sometimes greater than on regular workdays.

What can be done about it?

WOODCOCK. The solution may be, particularly if we have the chronic unemployment we seem to, to shorten the workweek, but use the plant all week round. I can see one crew working four days and another working three, including Saturday and Sunday, but the second might get paid as much as the first because they've got those two undesirable days.

But what does industry get for that besides the job that used to be done anyway? What is labor giving?

WOODCOCK. We'd get the work done.

AMERICA HAS TO GO BACK TO WORK

(By Russell DeYoung)

Proponents of the Burke-Hartke Bill claim that building plants abroad steal jobs from American workers. What about Goodyear?

DEYOUNG. Starting from 1962 we've increased our foreign jobs by 12,000 and our domestic by 21,000. In other words, our growth in the U.S. has been 75% faster than our growth in foreign countries.

Can you actually say that those foreign factories create American jobs?

DEYOUNG. Definitely. First, since we own those factories, we manufacture a lot of the machinery and molds for them. A lot of our research and development depends on those resources. We figure that 11% of our Akron employment is directly related to our foreign operations.

Wouldn't there be more jobs here if you didn't have overseas factories?

DEYOUNG. We wouldn't have the business. When we didn't have a factory in France, we didn't export tires to France. You've got tariffs, and productivity costs, and national pride.

If your foreign factories haven't adversely affected U.S. employment, how do you explain the United Rubber Workers' president claiming that since 1961 Akron has lost 10,000 jobs in rubber-related industries?

DEYOUNG. He's probably counting shoe products, and he's probably right there. We don't make shoe products. What I think he means, though, is that the stuff's moving out of Akron to other parts of the U.S. That's more of a problem than the foreign operations. We've built big plants in Union City, Tenn., in Gadsden, Ala., Fayetteville, N.C. Akron used to be the center of everything; now it's getting to be one of our smallest plants.

Why?

DEYOUNG. People don't want to work. It's as simple as that.

So you would say that the solution to unemployment would be for labor to stress productivity?

DEYOUNG. I think the great thing to increase employment is people going to work. You've got to keep in mind that labor costs have two bases—not only the rate, but the willingness to produce. We don't mind paying a guy a good wage, but we want him to work. We've had cases abroad where the union says: "These men are not producing; why don't you get rid of them for us?" Here, if they start producing, that's when the union may want us to get rid of them! I'm not picking on labor, but I think America has got to go back to work.

How do you do this?

DEYOUNG. I don't know. You try to indicate that you think people ought to go back to work, and labor puts their hands up and says: "Oh, you mean sweatshops again!"

Nobody's talking about things like that. But people have got to start producing. We talk to the union about potential loss of jobs in Akron, and you know what they tell the workers? "The company's kidding you." The only time they believe you is when the operation is dead. We had to move foam padding out of Akron. We lost \$3 million a year on one little department. We moved it down South. And I told the union—I had 'em sitting around that table. "We want to help you in every way we can," they said, "but we're not going to give up our hard-won gains." How do you get it across?

Should there be more government programs to relieve unemployment?

DEYOUNG. I think Abe Lincoln was a great guy when he said: The Government should never do for the people what they can and should do for themselves. Just like your parents. They can coddle you, and if you're not making good they can give you more money. But that doesn't help you any. Let you get hungry a few times, then you'll start scratching around. What the leaders of labor ought to start saying is: "We want a fair day's work for a day's pay." And some of the things labor stands for are good, I mean, you've got to have a good pension system. I think that when a guy gets laid off, he should be carried for a time until until he gets back. Those things are good. But when I was going to school if I didn't work part time, I didn't eat. We've made it too easy on ourselves.

WE DON'T LIKE TO HAVE PRODUCTION IN A FOREIGN COUNTRY

(By Joseph Wright)

WRIGHT. Let me tell you something straight off. Despite our wage rates in this country, which are substantially higher than in Japan and many times what they are in Taiwan and Mexico, our mass-production operation here is as efficient as anywhere else in the world. We have lines here in Chicago that operate at 120%-130% of efficiency. There's no way you can ask people to work any harder than that.

Then why has the electronics industry suffered such a serious decline?

WRIGHT. Our problem basically came from the fact that Japan had a closed home market in which it maintained prices at levels far above their prices in the U.S. Then, too, Japan's currency evaluation was an absolutely artificial barrier to our ability to compete fairly. That 360-1 relationship of the yen and the dollar, formulated at a time when Japan was devastated, was largely what made the difference between 75 cents an hour in Japan and \$3.50 an hour here. When the yen was revalued, this immediately readjusted wages between the U.S. and Japan by almost 20%.

How were you able to keep color production in the U.S. when you had to go to Taiwan for some of your black-and-white sets?

WRIGHT. When we set that plant up in Taiwan, we were assuming that our Government was going to go on with its policy of more than 30 years of really not appearing to give a damn about matters of trade and the economy. We had the State Department in complete control of all our foreign policy; you just got the feeling that those people couldn't care less about the nitty gritty of our affairs. Now, if we had to decide again on whether to put up a plant in Taiwan to produce black-and-white sets, it would be a much more marginal decision.

Did labor make any concessions to enable you to keep color production in the U.S.?

WRIGHT. I don't think there was ever any *quid pro quo*. I will say that our unions, while they've been tough bargainers, haven't just shut us down like some of the transportation and construction unions. Some industries have had to fight like the dickens

to put in automated programs that increase efficiency. We haven't had that problem; knock wood we never do. And we do pay our people. We have them on incentive pay wherever we can. If they can work at 120% of efficiency, they get at least 20% extra pay. Anyone who slows that line up, so everyone starts to lose efficiency pay, gets pretty unpopular.

Do you have any other incentive programs?

WRIGHT: Since the early Fifties we've had a profit-sharing plan where 20% of our pretax profits—after 6% on invested capital—goes into a fund for the benefit of the employees. After 30 years, someone who has worked here at an hourly job can leave with \$80,000 to \$100,000 in cash money.

What percent of sales are exports?

WRIGHT: Not more than 5% overall. One reason is that most countries absolutely prevent us from shipping our goods into that market. If we set up a factory over there, it can cost three times as much to make, say, 10,000 sets as it would be to add a line to one of our plants here. Let me give you an example. We have a plant in Mexico, where we're required to buy components locally. The bill for materials—just the parts, in boxes—came to more than the whole U.S. price for a finished comparable set.

Aren't there any advantages to offshore production?

WRIGHT: We don't like to have production in a foreign country if we can possibly avoid it. We'll actually pay a premium to have it here in the U.S. First of all, when you build a plant abroad to serve that market, you're subject to much less stable political situations. Second, you have the problem of logistics: getting everything in and being able to handle the flow of materials efficiently. This means duplicating overheads like quality control and advanced engineering. Third, when you're ready to get your finished product in here, you're subject to dock strikes on the West Coast.

So if unfair practices like dumping didn't exist, you could keep all your production here in the U.S.?

WRIGHT: Exactly right. It would be a challenge, but we think we can do it.

What would have happened if you hadn't moved to Taiwan?

WRIGHT: We would have had to drop that end of the business. It was impossible for us to compete under conditions as they then were. Look, from 1968 to 1971 our employment went from a peak of around 25,000 to 18,000. If everything had kept on going the way it was, my estimate was that our work force in this country would have shrunk to around 10,000 or 12,000 by 1975. Now I feel much more sanguine that we're going to grow. In fact, we've got a building program for some new engineering facilities right here in this complex.

FOREIGN AID SPIGOTS

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the worst fictions that is perpetrated here on Capitol Hill is that the Congress is getting stingy with its foreign aid giveaways. We are not stingy, we are not even careful. At a time when we are running into red ink spending to the tune of \$40 to \$50 billion in real deficit terms, we see a continuation of wasteful foreign aid to friend and foe alike.

The advertised figure of this year's foreign assistance act is \$2.13 billion. Little by little, the Congress has built up a series of more than 20 spigots which drain the taxpayers' money into the for-

eign aid rat hole. I am not saying that all foreign aid is wasted. We have done some good in the past 25 years but, on the whole, it is a rather dismal record indeed. It is uncontrollable and uncontrollable because the Congress has let the State Department fritter away our resources by giving more than \$150 billion away in direct foreign aid with very little oversight or limitation.

That this \$2.13 billion figure only shows part of the picture is best indicated by a brief recitation of the numerous foreign aid spigots which pour out our taxpayers' money in more than two dozen ways. Here is a brief listing:

New requests for authorization and/or appropriation, foreign assistance—Fiscal year 1971

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Foreign Assistance Act (mutual security) | \$2, 163, 000, 000 |
| Supplemental for supporting assistance | 100, 000, 000 |
| Overseas Private Investment Corporation | 37, 500, 000 |
| Receipts and recoveries from previous programs | 386, 325, 000 |
| Military assistance (in defense budget) | 2, 260, 300, 000 |
| International military headquarters | 57, 300, 000 |
| Economic assistance (in defense budget) | 117, 000, 000 |
| Foreign military credit sales fund | 272, 500, 000 |
| MAAG's missions, and military groups | 167, 300, 000 |
| Export-Import Bank, long-term credits | 2, 900, 000, 000 |
| Export-Import Bank, regular operations | 1, 082, 096, 000 |
| Export-Import Bank, export expansion program | 100, 000, 000 |
| Public Law 480 (agricultural commodities) | 932, 500, 000 |
| Inter-American Development Bank (supplemental) | 205, 880, 000 |
| International Development Association | 160, 000, 000 |
| Asian Development Bank | 20, 000, 000 |
| Asian Development Bank—special funds (supplemental) | 25, 000, 000 |
| Asian Development Bank—special funds | 35, 000, 000 |
| Expanded multilateral assistance | 540, 000, 000 |
| Peace Corps | 98, 800, 000 |
| Permanent military construction—foreign nations | 190, 200, 000 |
| Contributions to international organization | 144, 611, 000 |
| Educational (foreign and other students) | 45, 474, 000 |
| Ryukyu Islands | 6, 952, 000 |
| Migrants and refugees | 5, 787, 000 |
| Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands | 60, 000, 000 |
| Latin America Highway (Darlen Gap) | 20, 000, 000 |
| | 12, 133, 525, 000 |

Mr. Speaker, figures are not yet available for the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1972, but a cursory study would indicate the figure to be higher than the \$12-plus billion shown here. This gives the American people a better idea of the true cost of foreign aid. Coupled with what I call backdoor foreign aid, the figure would be increased by another 50 percent of this astronomical figure.

Backdoor foreign aid consists of trade concessions which allow nations, in lieu of direct aid, to reap benefits at the expense of the American worker by dump-

ing their products on our market. We also have support prices for commodities such as coffee and sugar. We subsidize the export of cotton and wheat for foreign competitors. On and on goes this monstrosity. It is time we put our country, its solvency and welfare, first, and call a halt to these giveaway programs.

BUSING CHARADE

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, speaking as one who has opposed forced busing for the past 8 years, it can now be readily seen that the pro-busing forces are on the verge of a great victory. They have simply worn down the majority in this body which has consistently opposed forced busing and by Fabian tactics have little by little accomplished their goals despite overwhelming public opinion against forced busing. There has been a failure of leadership on this issue and the White House, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Office of Education must shoulder their share of the blame. They have talked one way and acted another.

I am including with these remarks my minority views on the bill, H.R. 13915, the so-called Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972. They follow:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. ASHBROOK

This is not an anti-busing bill. Even its most vocal sponsors admit this. They will candidly tell you that, in some ways, it authorizes and approves of busing as a tool in desegregation (whatever that is) and in some ways it operates as a limitation or restriction on forced busing. This is accurate, it does both. But the principle it establishes and the proportion in which it will (1) encourage forced busing; and (2) prohibit forced busing, are a matter of great concern to me. H.R. 13915 can be likened to the old frontier story about the "prairie sandwich." The chef proclaimed it was made equally of rabbit and horse meat. On closer investigation, the cowhands found that what the chef was referring to was one rabbit and one horse. In this case the limitations are the rabbit and the horse represents the forced busing authorization.

Under the guise of gaining relief from forced busing, the whole battle against forced busing may well be lost by the passage of this bill. Up to this time, when the House of Representatives has spoken, it has spoken against forced busing. It has done this in many ways. In the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Congress went squarely on record against the concept of forced busing for racial balance. Since that time, in the Whitten Amendments, the amendments I offered last November and the amendments of other Members, the House has uniformly voted against the concept of forced busing and usually by overwhelming votes. My record against forced busing has been very clear. If this bill in fact would curb forced busing, I would be for it. It will encourage rather than discourage forced busing in our schools.

On November 4, 1972, by a vote of 233-124, the House adopted the Ashbrook Amendment to prohibit funds for busing where the purpose is for racial balance. On March 8, 1972, we voted to instruct the House conferees to insist on the Ashbrook-Green-Broomfield Amendments and uphold the House position against forced busing. Again,

on May 11, 1972, the House instructed its conferees by 275-124 vote to not yield on our anti-busing amendments. Although these provisions were softened in conference, the House position on the adoption of the conference report was still against forced busing.

By the passage of this bill we will first and most fundamentally accomplish what the bureaucrats have been seeking for the past ten years—a statement of Congressional approval of forced busing. The U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare during the past two administrations have consistently favored busing but have been forced to use covert means to accomplish their goals. Withholding of funds, disapproval of plans until busing is included, etc., has been the stock and trade of the bureaucrats who have encouraged busing schemes. By the passage of this bill, they will receive what they have wanted, namely, direct Congressional approval of forced busing as a tool.

What the Congress is asked to do is simply this: endorse the use of busing as a proper tool in revising the composition of our schools throughout the country. Then, after approving of the concept of busing, enact some limitations or restrictions on busing. Many of the limitations are good and those who are promoting this legislation stress these limitations. However, the basic shortcoming of this legislation is that it does categorically endorse forced busing, something the Congress has not done up until now and should not do at this point.

Given this Congressional approval, it will be very easy for bureaucrats to promote busing schemes. Never mind the Congressional caveat that forced busing be used only as a last resort. This will bring about more busing than we have ever seen up to now.

Let there be any doubt about what we are doing, study sections 402 and 403(c). The former says—

"In formulating a remedy for a denial of equal educational opportunity or a denial of the equal protection of laws, which may involve directly or indirectly the transportation of students, a court, department, or agency of the United States shall consider . . . (emphasis added).

Section 403(c) provides—

No court, department or agency of the United States shall require directly or indirectly the Transportation of any student if such transportation poses a risk to the health of such student or constitutes a significant impingement on the educational process with respect to such student. (emphasis added)

Here in clear terms is a statement, for the first time, of Congressional intent favoring busing. The bureaucrats can shape the ifs, ands, buts and wherefores to fit. The important fact is that we approve of forced busing IF the conditions merit. Who determines the conditions, the remedies, the amount of busing necessary? The bureaucrats. This they will have no trouble doing. It will operate as little or no restraint on courts. We will encourage more of the Detroit type decision by courts now that we authorize and promote the metro and magnet school concept.

What will be the consequences on the enactment of H.R. 13915? I believe the following logical results will occur:

(1) What the federal bureaucrats have been able to do up to now by subterfuge, indirect intimidation, cajoling and "off the record" advice in drawing up plans which include busing, they will now be able to do in the open with the full force and thrust of law and congressional intent behind them.

(2) Given this congressional statement of approval on forced busing, you will see more forced busing in the next few years as a result of this reversal of position.

(3) For high schools, the metro school con-

cept of joining intercity schools and suburban schools will be fully utilized under sections 402(d) and 401(g).

There are numerous objections to this bill which cannot be cited in detail here. The opener provision should be reinstated in the bill to assure equality of treatment to every section of the country. In Section 202, teachers should be added to make sure that racial balance not be required. In Section 203, the first eight words "Subject to the other provisions of this title," kill an otherwise salutary effort to encourage neighborhood schools and should be stricken. These are but a few of the booby traps in this legislation.

This bill is a fitting tribute to Congressional doubletalk and sidestepping of the issues. That a pro-busing bill should be heralded by advocates and attacked by civil rights forces as an anti-busing bill is not unique. We have debt ceilings that are not ceilings, temporary taxes that are permanent, reciprocal trade that is not reciprocal, voluntary programs which are compulsory, aid without control which is full of controls ad infinitum. This is one more to add to the collection to confuse the average citizen. What the citizens will understand, however, is the forced busing you will subject him to if this bill passes.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the whole thrust of the pro-busing forces has been to convince the American people that anything short of racial balance in our schools, achieved by forced busing, dooms a substantial portion of our student body to inferior education. Facts show otherwise.

The current controversy over the issue of forced busing to achieve racial balance has unfortunately been framed in the context of a highly distorted image of American public schools. The popular notion seems to be that white students generally attend the best equipped, most adequately financed schools, while most children of racial and ethnic minorities are relegated to dilapidated schools with facilities grossly inadequate for normal academic growth. This widespread view of our public schools is even shared by many persons who oppose busing. It is one of those things that everybody knows.

Perhaps we can get a more accurate picture of our public schools systems by recalling some of the findings of the Coleman report. Entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity," and published by the U.S. Office of Education, the Coleman report is the result of an exhaustive study, directed by James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University in the fall of 1965, covering nearly a million students in 6,000 different schools all across the Nation. The purpose of the study was to examine differences of educational opportunity among racial and ethnic groups and many of the findings run counter to the conventional wisdom. While allowing for a variety of area and regional differences, that is—"In the nonmetropolitan regions, elementary schools attended by Negroes less often have a centralized library, but in the metropolitan South and Southwest the reverse is true"—the report shows that on a national average "schoolchildren of all groups differ relatively little in the physical school facilities available. In elementary schools, they all have about the same number of pupils per instruction room and teacher; number of make-

shift instruction rooms; and percentage of students in schools with an old building.

The report further claims that to the extent such differences do exist their effect upon academic achievement is negligible:

Differences in school facilities and curriculum, which are the major variables by which attempts are made to improve schools, are so little related to differences in achievement levels of students that, with few exceptions, their effects fail to appear even in a survey of this magnitude."

As unconventional as these findings may seem, they cannot, in any way, be attributed to any preconceived notions on the part of the report's primary author. On the contrary, according to Christopher Jenks writing in the New York Times of August 10, 1969, Coleman had expected to find that—

Nonwhite schools usually have less adequate facilities, inferior curriculums and worse teachers, as well as less affluent and academically adept student bodies.

Based on the Coleman report and other related studies, Jenks, a Harvard professor and coauthor with David Reisman of the Academic Revolution, came to the following conclusions:

1. The resources—both fiscal and human—deoted to black and white children's schooling are not dramatically different except, perhaps, in certain parts of the south. Nor do we devote substantially greater resources to educating middle class children than to educating lower class children.

2. Variations in schools' fiscal and human resources have very little effect on student achievement—probably even less than the Coleman report originally implied.

Based on the findings of Professors Coleman and Jenks, one might be tempted to remark that liberals who propose massive busing of schoolchildren in order to overcome the supposed inequities in our public schools bear a strong resemblance to the legendary Don Quixote, who went charging off to do battle with a "giant monster," only to discover it was nothing but a windmill.

This is not to suggest that the observations of the Coleman report cited above or the conclusions of Professor Jenks are necessarily the last word on the subject. Other studies and other conclusions must also be taken into consideration. The point is, however, that when people in high office advocate social engineering, with schoolchildren as sociological guinea pigs, in order to eradicate alleged evils, it might be worthwhile to take the time to discover whether such evils really exist. They may, in fact, be no more real than the "Emperor's New Clothes."

INTRODUCTION OF "LEAD AND ZINC ACT OF 1972" AND BILL SUSPENDING ZINC ORE DUTY

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be a cosponsor of the two bills which the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has just introduced. As always, he has given the

House a very clear explanation of the problem and of the legislation, and there is little that I can add. I would like to say a few words, however, on a couple of points that are of particular interest to me.

My concern for the welfare of our lead and zinc industries and for their workers goes back many years, and during that time I have cosponsored bills which were intended to stabilize the two industries. I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Interior Committee since 1963, and in each of the past 4 years had the honor of being invited by the Department of State to be a congressional member of the U.S. delegations to the annual meetings of the International Lead and Zinc Study Group.

My own State and my own district were at one time a substantial supplier of lead and zinc, especially zinc. Unfortunately, our mines and other installations have had to close. Perhaps if we had enacted effective legislation years ago some of those closures would not have taken place.

In Kansas we know what it means to have a mine or smelter close down. It means the loss of hundreds of jobs, especially when supporting services and industries are taken into account.

Nationally, the closure of the zinc smelters and the decline in zinc mine production to which Chairman ASPINALL referred have meant the loss of some 5,000 jobs. Counting supporting jobs, the loss may be closer to 20,000 persons thrown out of work. These figures are even more distressing when it is remembered that many of our lead and zinc mines and smelters are in small communities where employment opportunities are scarce.

We are going to witness more jobs lost and more trouble for our lead and zinc industries unless effective action is taken. We can take such action if we realize—as I believe we are beginning to realize—that other governments do not hesitate to assist their industries, including their lead and zinc industries, through outright grants, interest subsidies and tax devices. The governmental assistance to foreign producers puts our producers at a competitive disadvantage.

I would like to mention just a few examples, Mr. Speaker. The Japanese Government is deliberately encouraging the growth of Japan's nonferrous metals industry. The Bank of Japan, in effect, guarantees the debts of major Japanese companies. Earlier this year it was reported that the Government was planning to lend Japanese mining and metals companies up to \$500 million at interest rates about half the normal commercial rate to stockpile unwanted ore. I do not know how much the Japanese Government has given in outright grants to its lead and zinc producers, but I understand that in Japanese fiscal year 1970 the grants to all industry amounted to about \$115 million.

Japan is not the only country which gives grants to its industry. In 1969 the Canadian Government started a program of incentive grants and loan guarantees to assist the establishment of new plants

and the expansion of others. Under this program the Government has given—not lent—\$8 million to a company which established a new zinc smelter, costing about \$70 million, in Ontario. Also in Canada, for over 30 years new mines have been exempt from Federal taxes for the first 3 years after start-up. This program will continue until 1974.

In Australia mine operators are allowed to write off in the year of expenditure—or in the year prior to expenditure—capital costs to the extent of income. This, of course, has the important benefit of increasing revenues early in the life of a property.

A new lead and zinc metal production facility is being established in Italy, and an existing zinc smelter is being expanded. Both of these facilities are in the south of Italy where the Government gives grants of up to 20 percent of expenditure for plants and equipment. The Italian Government also offers other financial inducements to firms investing in the southern part of the country.

The United Kingdom Government gives grants of 20 to 22 percent of capital expenditure to firms investing in "development areas" covering much of Great Britain. The British also have embarked on a \$120 million program to assist exploration for minerals. Under this program, the government lends 35 percent of the exploration cost to companies, and the loans do not have to be repaid unless the exploration results in a productive mine.

I could mention other examples, Mr. Speaker, but I believe I have cited enough to make my point: other governments are deliberately tipping the scales in favor of their own producers.

At this point, some of my colleagues might ask if it is not true that the U.S. Government does a great deal for its minerals and metals producers. It is correct that our producers benefit from a depletion allowance, but other countries, Canada and Japan, for example, have depletion allowances also. And they have other programs, such as those I have just mentioned, which go far beyond anything done at the Federal and State level in this country.

Under our Defense Production Act about \$15 million is available to industries essential to defense. Grants and low-interest loans are not available under this act, however. The money is lent at commercial interest rates.

The Economic Development Act primarily benefits small firms and provides no significant assistance to corporations undertaking large-scale investment projects. I say this because under the act loans, not grants, are made only if financing is otherwise not available.

Many of the States do have programs to encourage the establishment of industry. These programs are praiseworthy, but budgetary and other restraints make them of limited value to firms planning investments which involve, as do lead and zinc investments, from \$25 million to several hundred million dollars.

In short, Mr. Speaker, our lead and zinc producers have been put at an unfair, competitive disadvantage. The legislation introduced today would help to

put our industries on more even terms with their foreign competitors. I join with the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in expressing the strong hope that many Members of this House will support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL Z. WESTERFIELD, JR.

(Mr. DIGGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today to pay tribute to an old and valued friend, Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr., who died on July 19 at his home in Monrovia, where he was serving as U.S. Ambassador to Liberia.

Ambassador Westerfield was born in Chicago, Ill., and received his early education in Washington, D.C. He graduated from Howard University magna cum laude. In these early years and throughout his short but highly productive life, he was a scholar in the truest sense—one for whom living was learning. Mr. Westerfield received the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Harvard University. He made his own contribution to the academic world as assistant professor of economics at Lincoln University, dean of the School of Business Administration, and professor of economics at Atlanta University, and visiting professor in the Graduate School of Business Administration at his alma mater, Harvard University.

During these years, Dr. Westerfield devoted his time and energies not only to the discharge of his professional duties but also—and perhaps, even more importantly—to his students, counseling them, encouraging them, inspiring them and urging them on to develop their greatest potential. He was untiring in his efforts to impart to them the values of intellectual curiosity and a zest for learning.

In 1961, Dr. Westerfield became Associate Director of the debt analysis staff in the Treasury Department. Soon thereafter, he became Deputy Director in the Office of International Affairs. His area of concentration was the economics of underdeveloped areas, with particular reference to Latin America and Africa.

Dr. Westerfield's Government service also included positions as economist with the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Industrial Economics Branch of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

An extensive and in-depth knowledge of economics, together with a deep concern for people, exemplified Samuel Westerfield, the man. His family, friends and associates, therefore, rejoiced in the rare and perfect choice, when, in 1963, he was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. This marked, as they knew it would, the beginning of a new thrust in his career.

In 1964 he was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economics and Planning in the Bureau of African Affairs. During this period, Samuel Westerfield, Jr., gained a vast yet intimate knowledge of Africa and its peoples. One had only to talk briefly with Dr. Westerfield to discern his unassuming manner,

his sensitivity and understanding of people. These qualities brought him finally to the post he held until his death—U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Liberia—a position in which he further nurtured the strong bond of friendship and respect he had worked to build between the United States and the continent of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Westerfield was a conscientious, dedicated public servant who inspired us all with his zeal and his devotion to the ideals of American democracy.

But more than that, he was a trusted friend to all who knew him well. He was that rare kind of man who combined gentleness with strength, and kindness with conviction. Throughout his life, he showed the qualities of leadership and compassion. Sam Westerfield, like other men who have proved their virtue in action, has left behind him not only the record of his efforts, but also the warmth of his genuine affection for all men.

W. E. B. Du Bois, the great black leader, once wrote:

If a man die shall he live again? We do not know. But this we do know, that our children's children live forever and grow and develop toward perfection as they are trained.

The selflessness, courage, and integrity of Ambassador Westerfield have provided his children and the children of the world with a lesson in humanity, a lesson which, if learned well, will insure a better world for us all.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to submit for inclusion in the record of these proceedings some of the thoughts and reflections of those who knew and respected Ambassador Westerfield. I submit the following materials to be included:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 9, 1972.

Ambassador Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr., was an inspiration for all who knew him personally and an example for those who could know him only through his record of achievement. As an educator, administrator and diplomat, he filled his life with public service in the finest American tradition.

He set a tone and a pace in United States-African relations which will guide our course for many years to come. His untimely death at his post in Monrovia this July was a tragic loss not only for his family, friends and colleagues, but for the Government and fellow citizens he served with such distinction.

He leaves a legacy that will keep him alive in the minds and hearts of countless men and women at home and abroad for a long time to come.

RICHARD NIXON.

DEAR MRS. WESTERFIELD: The sad news of Ambassador Westerfield's death has just reached me and my heart goes out to you and your family at this time of sorrow. Your great loss is shared by all of us who had the privilege of knowing the Ambassador. His life was one of dedication and accomplishment in service to our nation.

Mrs. Nixon and I extend our deepest sympathy to you and the entire family. Our prayers and thoughts are with you.

RICHARD NIXON.

TEXT OF MESSAGE FROM WILLIAM R. TOLBERT, JR., PRESIDENT OF LIBERIA TO PRESIDENT NIXON

I have been shocked by the sudden and untimely death of his excellency Samuel Z.

Westerfield your Ambassador to Liberia which occurred at about one o'clock Wednesday morning during my absence from the Capital. Ambassador Westerfield was an able and capable representative of your Government whom I found to be conscientious, frank, understanding and dedicated to the task of deepening and improving the relationship between our two nations and people. His death is indeed a tremendous loss to all who knew him. On behalf of the Liberian Government and people, Mrs. Tolbert, and in my own name I express our profoundest sympathy to you and the Government and people of the United States of America for this tragic and sad occurrence. Please be good enough to convey to his family our heartfelt condolences for the irreparable loss they have sustained. With assurance for my highest personal regards.

AUSTIN, TEX., August 1, 1972.

Sam Westerfield was a professional in his nation's cause and we are all the better for the service he performed with such skill and zeal. He was a good man and a firm friend. I will miss him, as will America.

L.B.J.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD BROOKE

I was deeply saddened to learn of the sudden and untimely death of my dear friend and respected colleague, Ambassador Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr.

Sam and I were friends since childhood. We attended Shaw Junior High, Dunbar High School and Howard University together. We shared many interests and experiences over the years.

Sam Westerfield was gifted with an exceptional mind and was one of the hardest working and best-informed men in the African Bureau of the Department of State.

He loved Liberia, and the multitude of friends he made there. He, in turn, was highly respected by the Liberians. His term of service was marked by increased understanding and ever-improving relations between our two countries, and on his home visits he spoke often and proudly of the great progress the Liberians were making in providing increased opportunity for all their people.

The knowledge and sensitivity which Sam Westerfield brought to his work may never be duplicated. But his example can serve to inspire and his widely-publicized insights into problems of development can likewise serve to inform, all those who follow in his path.

But, Sam Westerfield also had a great heart and a great soul. He loved his mother and father, he deeply loved his wife Helene, his son Sam III, his daughter Sheila, his sister Anna and his stepsister Alice. He loved his friends and he loved his God.

Sam Westerfield was a good man and he will be sorely missed.

IN MEMORY OF AMBASSADOR
SAMUEL Z. WESTERFIELD JR.

In the death of Ambassador Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr., Liberia has lost a good friend and United States-Liberia relations a faithful and knowledgeable servant.

Ambassador Westerfield came to his duties in Liberia not only fully equipped but because of his background and personal experience possessed as well with those sensitivities which the traditional relationships between the United States and Liberia sorely needed.

My own acquaintance with Sam dates back to over ten years ago when I assumed my duties here. That was the time of a new thrust by Africans to win back freedom and dignity and consequently prompting a new and lively interest in African affairs in the United States. Sam never pretended to be an expert on Africa. On the contrary, anxious to learn all he could and free from preoccupa-

pation about stereotype stories on Liberia, it was always rewarding to talk to him about developments taking place in Africa.

It was therefore with much joy that I welcomed his assignment to Liberia. Soon after his arrival there, he impressed all with his sincerity to serve the cause of United States-Liberia friendship and most Liberians in both official and private circles began to look on him as a friend. Our late President Tubman and now President Tolbert held him in high esteem and when the Liberian government and people paid him tribute at his death, they knew that they had lost a friend.

S. EDWARD PEAL,
Ambassador of Liberia.

SAMUEL Z. WESTERFIELD: A PROFESSIONAL
ECONOMIST IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Andrew F. Brimmer)*

While I knew Dr. Samuel Z. Westerfield for nearly fourteen years as a personal friend, it is his work as an economist on which I will focus on this occasion. As a professional economist, several facets of his life stand out: (1) his intellectual awakening during his student days under the tutelage of teachers working on the frontiers of economic thought and analysis; (2) his academic career during which he sought to build institutions as well as develop competent economists; and (3) his career in the public services—first as an adviser and participant in the shaping of his country's international economic policy and finally as his nation's Ambassador to a country whose ties with us are old and close, but which are also complex and changing.

EDUCATION OF AN ECONOMIST

Dr. Westerfield studied economics at Howard University in the mid- to late-1930's—receiving his B.A. in 1939. This was a time when the worse depression in the nation's history still lay upon the land, and the wastage of men and resources was everywhere visible. Vigorous efforts to cope with a variety of depression-created economic ills were being pressed (particularly under the revolutionary impetus of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal programs). But this was also a time of intellectual ferment in economics—as the revolution in thinking sparked by John Maynard Keynes swept through the economics profession. The impact of both revolutions on the mind of Sam Westerfield was deep and lasting.

At Howard, he benefited from the close and personal guidance of Professor Abram L. Harris, who was then head of the Department of Economics. Dr. Harris himself was one of a handful of Negroes who had travelled the hard and exacting road to a Ph. D. in economics (from Columbia University in 1931). He studied (and wrote on) the economic problems of blacks with penetrating insights. However, his lasting interest was focused on classical and neoclassical economics—particularly as embodied in the works of John Stuart Mill, Karl Marx, Werner Sombart, Thorstein Veblen, and John R. Commons. In these writers he saw a deep concern for the welfare of those (industrial workers, small farmers, and small businessmen) who were casualties of a malfunctioning capitalist system, and he found many of their ideas and proposals for social reform particularly attractive.

In Professor Harris' classroom, from his writings, and in numerous individual discussions, Sam Westerfield came to share his tutor's perception of the nature and tasks of economics. In this conception, economics was not simply a narrow and technical body of principles describing production, distribution, and prices in a market economy.

*Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Rather—laying aside the uncertain claims of neutrality expressed by many economists with respect to difficult questions such as income distribution and the fairness of economic legislation—the discipline of economics was viewed as a toolkit to be used to improve the lot of those by-passed in the competitive process.

When Sam Westerfield entered Harvard University in 1939 as a graduate student, he found an environment in ferment—yet hospitable to the sentiments he had brought from Howard. In those years, several economists at Harvard University were in the vanguard of the Keynesian Revolution in economics. Among these were Professors Alvin Hansen and Seymour Harris. In fact, Professor Hansen had already established himself as the leading American exponent of the views identified with John Maynard Keynes, the English economist who effected a fundamental reorientation in economic thinking in the mid-1930's. Among other things, Keynes and Hansen argued that—left to itself—the capitalist system had an inherent tendency to generate depressions which were not self-correcting. Consequently, it was the duty of national governments to employ fiscal policy (i.e., tax and spending policies) to stabilize output and employment.

Sam readily absorbed this new approach to economic analysis. He thus became a member of the first generation of economists to be trained in the new field of macroeconomics—the analysis and assessment of those factors which determine the level of output and employment in the economy as a whole. He was particularly interested in the monetary aspects of economic activity. He pursued this interest under the guidance of Professor John H. Williams and subsequently wrote his dissertation in the field. (His study was entitled "American Investment Companies and the Money Market, 1900-1950: A Study of Their Origin, Development, and Economic Significance," 1951.)

On the other hand, Sam Westerfield certainly did not confine himself to his field of specialization at Harvard. He took a variety of graduate courses in economic theory, international trade, economic history, and statistics—as well as in money and banking. For a time he also worked on the input-output project, under the leadership of Professor Wassily Leontief, the aim of which was the construction of a comprehensive framework for the study of inter-industry flows of production in the United States.

As far as I can determine, Sam Westerfield was the fourth American Negro to earn a doctorate in economics at Harvard. Preceding him were Robert C. Weaver (1934), William H. Dean (1938), and Booker T. McGraw (1939). Like them, he stuck to the mainstream of economics. Weaver wrote his dissertation on "The High-Wage Theory of Prosperity." Dean's study was entitled "Theory of the Geographic Location of Economic Activity," and McGraw wrote on "French Monetary Policy, 1927-38." As indicated above, Westerfield wrote on "American Investment Companies." The common thread connecting all of them is a basic commitment to the acquisition of technical expertise in economics—a competence which enabled them to cope with a variety of complex economic problems which they had to face later in their careers.

In passing, I might note that the number of American blacks completing the Ph. D. program in economics at Harvard remains distressingly small. I was enrolled in the program for three years (1952-55), with a concentration in monetary economics and economic development. I received the Ph. D. in 1957, with a dissertation entitled "Monetary Policy, Interest Rates, and the Investment Behavior of Life Insurance Companies." In the intervening years, only a handful of

American blacks have entered the program. Although a number of these have finished course work, and several are currently enrolled, apparently at this juncture none have been awarded the Ph. D.

Sam's first year at Harvard was financed by his family, but he was awarded a Rosenwald Fellowship for his second and third years (1940-41 and 1941-42). After completing his course work and passing his qualifying examinations, he took leave from the University to do research while holding a fellowship from the Social Science Research Council. As part of that project, he enrolled at the University of Michigan in 1944-45 where he conducted research on the United Automobile Workers. He also spent a brief period in 1944 as an economist with the War Labor Board. During the Summers of 1940, 1941, and 1945, he was an instructor in economics at Howard University.

So, by the end of World War II, Sam Westerfield had devoted six years to academic preparation at the graduate level—mainly at Harvard University which was the best Economics Department in the country. He had acquired solid experience in research relating to some of the most pressing economic problems facing the nation, and he had also served an apprenticeship in teaching. Yet, through it all, he had kept his fundamental concern for those left on the margins of an increasingly affluent society.

ACADEMIC CAREER

At this juncture, Dr. Westerfield began an academic commitment which he never really relinquished. After marriage in September, 1945 (to Helene Bryant who later became a faculty member in the School of Social Work at Howard), he went to West Virginia State College as Assistant Professor of Economics. This was a one-year appointment to replace a permanent member who was on leave. In this assignment, Sam taught a range of undergraduate courses. In January, 1947, he was appointed Assistant Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Department of Economics and Business Administration at Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Missouri. Here he also taught several undergraduate courses in economics—particularly in the area of macroeconomics. In addition, he spent a good part of his time trying to build the curriculum—with special emphasis on the business administration component. This effort was in keeping with his already evident conviction that the black community needed to build those institutions—and acquire those skills—which provide the foundations for long-run economic progress.

Unfortunately for Sam, while these were all good deeds in the cause of racial advancement, they allowed him little time to devote to his dissertation—which was still unfinished. So, during the academic year 1948-49, he faced a hard choice: he could continue an effort at institution-building which was beginning to bear fruit or he could clear his desk of everything else and concentrate on the completion of his dissertation. He chose the latter course and returned to Harvard for the academic year 1949-50. As already mentioned, he accomplished the task and was awarded the Ph.D. in 1951.

From Harvard, he moved to Atlanta University in 1950 as Associate Professor of Economics. In 1952, he was promoted to Professor of Economics and named Dean of the School of Business Administration. In this position, he spent a decade building what was—and perhaps still is—the strongest business school at any of the predominantly black academic institutions. In the early stages of the new program, there was little or no money for research or program support at these institutions. A highlight of the new curriculum was the early introduction of data processing courses. Dr. Westerfield persuaded one of the leading equipment pro-

ducers to design and equip a laboratory at the school which subsequently evolved into a fairly comprehensive electronic computer facility. Thus, the School of Business at Atlanta University became one of the pioneers in training black students in the emerging field of computer-based management.

It was at this juncture that I became acquainted with Sam Westerfield. I had heard of him long before then, of course. When I arrived at Harvard in the Fall of 1952, I soon learned that he had recently left after completing his dissertation. However, it was not until December, 1958, that we finally met—during the Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association in Washington, D.C. At the time, I was teaching economics at Michigan State University. During our first meeting, Sam invited me to visit the School of Business. I was finally able to do so in the Spring of 1959, and I gave several lectures in the area of monetary economics. Sam was very generous and talked with me at some length about the possibility of my joining the School's faculty. While I was naturally flattered, I had to say no. I had just joined Michigan State, and I had underway (with the University's support) a major study of capital market activities of life insurance companies. At the conclusion of my three-day visit, I came away from Atlanta with the conviction that Sam Westerfield had gone a long way in the task of building a strong center for the training of black managerial personnel.

Reflecting the enhanced quality of the new program, enrollments grew rapidly. Students came primarily from the Southeast region of the United States, but other sections were also represented. Moreover, there was always a sizeable enrollment of foreign students—particularly from Africa but also from India and China among others. In the early years of the expanded program, most of the M.B.A. graduates found jobs outside the Southeast. This was plainly a mirror image of the continued racial discrimination in employment that was so rampant in the region. In fact, it was well into the 1960's before a new graduate could look forward to finding jobs in the area—a reflection of the gradual erosion of barriers under the impact of anti-discrimination laws and the campaign to achieve equal opportunity in employment. A sizable number of graduates of the Atlanta Business School have gone on to highly successful careers in the corporate sector and the public service.

By the Spring of 1959—after nearly a decade of institution building at Atlanta—Sam Westerfield decided the time had come to renew his own intellectual resources. So he accepted a position as a Visiting Professor in the Graduate School of Business at Harvard University for the 1959-60 academic year. This was Sam's third sojourn in Cambridge, and he used it to advantage. He was able to expand his familiarity with some of the newly emerging techniques of cost and budget analysis as well as to catch up on some of the recent literature in his field. But above all, he was able to renew old friendships and to make new acquaintances that were to broaden his ties in the economics profession in subsequent years.

At the conclusion of his year at Harvard, Sam Westerfield received a grant under the African Universities Program sponsored by the University of Chicago and the Merrill Trust Fund. This grant enabled him to make his first trip to Africa in the Fall of 1960. He toured colleges in both East and West Africa with the primary aim of recruiting students. Along the way, he was also invited to lecture at University College in Ibadan, Nigeria, and at University College in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

In January, 1961, Sam returned to his post at Atlanta University. However, almost immediately, Washington began to claim part of his time as a consultant in the Treasury De-

partment. In fact, while he was still Dean of the Business School, he actually commuted between Washington and Atlanta—spending about half of each week in each place. Finally, at the end of the spring semester, he resigned his academic post to join the New Frontier. But in leaving, he left behind a strong base on which new strength could build to expand further the education of black youth in the fields of economics and business administration.

SERVICE ON THE NEW FRONTIER: U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Sam's public service career began in June, 1961, when he was appointed Associate Director of the Debt Analysis of Staff of the Treasury Department. This group was actually a research and policy development unit which supported the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs. At that time, C. Douglas Dillon was Secretary, and Robert V. Roosa was Under Secretary. Roosa had studied at Harvard in the 1940's (although he had received his Ph. D. at the University of Michigan). While there he had worked with some of the same faculty members who had guided Sam Westerfield—especially John H. Williams who had later steered Roosa to the research department of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. It was from the latter institution that Roosa was appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury in January, 1961. As he set about developing a staff to carry out the expanded reach of the Treasury in monetary matters, Roosa induced Sam Westerfield to become part of his team. As already indicated, Sam began participating as a consultant early in the year and later joined the group on a full-time basis.

It was while Sam was serving in this capacity that I had my second contact with him. In the Summer of 1961, Sam played a prominent role in planning for a three-day National Conference on Small Business which was later held in Washington, D.C., beginning November 30, 1961.

Encouraged by President Kennedy, it was sponsored by a number of Federal Government agencies—principal among which was the Department of Commerce. Representative Charles C. Diggs, Jr., served as Chairman. The main thrust of the conference—set in greetings from the President—was "... to enhance and further the participation of Negroes in the business life of the nation. . . ." Sam served with H. Naylor Fitzhugh as co-chairman of the Research and Program Committee, and the two of them prepared the conference summary. (The full report of the conference was published by the U.S. Department of Commerce under the title "Problems and Opportunities Confronting Negroes in the Field of Business," 1962). Sam also served as moderator of the workshop on "Business-Growth Opportunities." At his invitation, I presented a paper on "Economic Growth and Investment Opportunities—with Special Reference to Negro-Owned Businesses." At the time, I had recently moved to the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.

The conference brought together on a single program 46 men and women from Government, business, public affairs, and the academic community who—for the first time in the memory of those participating—made a comprehensive assessment of the problems and prospects for black businesses under the sponsorship of the Federal Government. A re-reading of the conference report a decade later indicates how thoroughly the participants did their work. Virtually all of the issues about the role of black-owned business which have been debated in recent years were anticipated and weighed. Likewise most of the proposals to improve the prospects for black businesses which have been advanced in the last few years were also anticipated and examined critically. To no small degree

the level and quality of the conference's contribution to an appreciation of the issues involved are due to Sam Westerfield's efforts.

Late in 1961, Sam shifted his assignment in the Treasury Department and became Senior Adviser in the Office of International Finance. From that post, he became Deputy Director of the Office of International Affairs. It was in this area, that he began to have a genuine impact on the shape and content of the nation's economic policy. He specialized in the economics of developing areas—particularly Latin America and Africa. In this role, he served as a member of the U.S. Delegation to the Inter-American Economic and Social Conference held in Mexico City in 1962.

SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

His growing interest in the problems of developing countries—that vast proportion of the world still left out of the mainstream of industrial progress—led Sam Westerfield in 1963 to accept an appointment as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State. Here he was assigned to the Economics Bureau where he worked on a range of policy issues—but with special emphasis on United States economic relations with emerging nations. He was particularly concerned with the content and functioning of long-term commodity agreements which were designed to stabilize the incomes of those developing areas so heavily dependent on exports of raw materials and agricultural products to the advanced industrial countries. A substantial part of his effort was concentrated on the coffee and cocoa agreements. While this area of activity was both satisfying and rewarding to Sam, he eventually became convinced that his own talents might find greater scope if he were to devote more of his time to problems on a broader scale.

Acting on that conviction, in 1964 he moved to the Bureau of African Affairs where he became Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economics and Planning. Although he became Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs in 1967, he retained his basic concern with economic issues on the Continent. Among his special interests were United States relations with the Economic Commission for Africa. He was convinced that this organization could play a much stronger role in regional planning and development in Africa and thus deserved enlarged support from the United States. In a similar vein, he was one of the strongest advocates of U.S. financial support for the African Development Bank headquartered in Abidjan, Ivory Coast. He saw this institution as fully capable of developing to the point where it would have the technical capacity to perform for Africa the same kinds of functions which the Inter-American Development Bank is performing for Latin America. Consequently, he argued vigorously for the activation of the financial support which this country indicated in the mid-1960's might be forthcoming.

Sam also worked on a number of problems involving relations between African countries, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank—always, of course, as a representative of the United States.

He traveled extensively in Africa and Europe in carrying out these assignments. So, when the time came for him to take on new responsibilities, he knew well—and was widely known in—the African continent.

AMBASSADOR TO LIBERIA

Those new responsibilities came when he was sworn in as Ambassador to Liberia in September, 1969. In this new role, his duties were much more sharply focused on bilateral relations between the two countries. Yet, his overriding interest in the problems of Africa as a whole was by no means diminished. Moreover, while he had to be concerned with the entire agenda of diplomatic relations, his special focus on economic issues was always evident.

During his first year in Monrovia, I had an opportunity to observe his performance at first hand. He invited me to join him during the Independence Day celebration in late July, 1970. I was able to spend a week with him. While his duties on that occasion were obviously heavy, he introduced me personally to a wide cross-section of Liberian official and private life. These contacts—including a visit with the President of the Republic—gave me a rare opportunity to see an American Ambassador at work representing the interest of his country in the very best tradition. This task is particularly difficult for any Ambassador in the case of Liberia whose special relationship with this country is long, complex—and changing noticeably.

Sam was especially interested in my discussing a range of economic questions with government officials, businessmen, members of the academic community, and the press. At that time, a major issue being debated focused on whether Liberia should have its own central bank and its own currency—rather than continue to use the United States dollar which had been in circulation for a good many years. Typically, Sam saw clearly the advantages which the use of the dollar brought to Liberia—including special access to U.S. private capital. But he also could appreciate the disadvantages this implied for Liberia—including a lack of control of its own monetary and credit policy. However, rather than taking a dogmatic view that continued circulation of the dollar was the only course worth pursuing, Sam encouraged both Liberian officials and private businessmen (including Americans) to think through objectively the issues involved and ultimately to create a monetary system that was best for Liberia. In that way, he was convinced the system would also be best for the United States in the long-run.

Sam displayed the same sensitivity and perceptiveness in the position he took with respect to the crucial role of foreign investment in Liberia. While European capital is becoming more prominent, American private investment remains the dominant form of foreign capital. Americans are particularly represented in rubber plantations and iron ore mining. These investments are covered by long-term contracts drawn up a number of years ago. In recent years, pressures to re-write the contracts to improve the benefits (i.e., greater share of profits) accruing to Liberia have intensified.

Again, Sam Westerfield encouraged the development of solutions which would benefit both countries. He saw clearly that Liberia had to attract more foreign capital if it is to develop its resources and raise the standard of living of its people. To do this, it must offer a reasonably secure and hospitable environment to foreign private investors. At the same time, he understood the desire of Liberians to revamp agreements of long-standing which many felt were no longer in keeping with the terms and standards which other emerging nations were able to effect to govern foreign participation in their natural resources. This debate was still in progress at the time of his death.

Looking beyond his official duties, Sam Westerfield also reached out to help Liberia create an institution to train its youth to improve the management of its own resources. As Chairman of the Advisory Committee, he provided the leadership of the group which established the School of Business at the University of Liberia. Thus, for the third time, he shared his energies and skills in an effort to build an institution to further the acquisition of expertise in economics and business by black people.

Finally, Sam continued to look beyond his immediate preoccupations to the horizon of new possibilities of African progress. He consistently encouraged the idea of regional planning in the Continent. His support of the Economic Commission for Africa and the

African Development Bank was in keeping with that concern. He took special interest in the variety of effort in West Africa to improve food production—especially rice.

Yet, he was not blind to the obstacles on the path to that goal. He knew that the colonial legacy left little (outside of East Africa) on which regional economic planning efforts could be based. Nevertheless, he remained hopeful that the idea would eventually take root and prosper.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

While Sam Westerfield spent the last decade of his life searching for means to improve the lives of the poor population in developing lands, he also never lost his concern for the depressed status of his fellow blacks in the United States. As indicated above, he was a prime-mover behind the 1961 Washington Conference on Negroes in business. During the intervening years, he continued to participate in efforts along the same lines. He had a special interest in the progress of black-owned banks and life insurance companies. Finally, as a member of the Executive Council of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, he encouraged research on economic aspects of the black experience in America.

So, with the death of Sam Westerfield, I personally lost not only a friend but a fellow worker in the task to improve the welfare of those on the margin of an increasingly affluent society.

JULY 19, 1972.

Mrs. SAMUEL Z. WESTERFIELD, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. WESTERFIELD: I was profoundly shocked and saddened to learn of Sam's death in Monrovia. We knew him as an able and dedicated man who served our country with distinction. He will be sorely missed by his many friends and colleagues at home and abroad. At this time of great sadness, my wife and I extend our sincere condolences and heartfelt sympathy to you and your family. We share your loss.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

TEXT OF MESSAGE FROM ROCHEFORTE L. WEEKS,
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF LIBERIA,
TO SECRETARY ROGERS

The announcement of the sudden death of His Excellency Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr., United States Ambassador to Liberia, has shocked us and all who knew him. Ambassador Westerfield was an outstanding American, an effective and resourceful representative of the Government and people of your great country and a good friend, who distinguished himself during the years he served the United States of America here. Ambassador Westerfield was loved and respected by many and will be missed by many. We deeply regret his untimely passing and extend to you on behalf of the Liberian Government, our deepest sympathy and profoundest condolences for the loss you have sustained. Please be so kind to convey these sentiments also to the members of the bereaved family. May his soul rest in peace and may light perpetual shine upon him. Sentiments of Esteem.

REMARKS BY HON. DAVID NEWSOME, ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICA AT FUNERAL, JULY 25, 1972

Ambassador Peal, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: On behalf of Secretary of State Rogers and the officers of the Department of State, I wish to pay tribute to a fine diplomat and a friend, Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr. Ambassador Westerfield was unique. His expertise and his vision bridged oceans as it bridged specialties. He was as much at home in the cities of Africa as he was in Baltimore or Boston. He was as adept at unravelling the mysteries of the balance of payments as he

was at explaining the intricacies of African politics. He was as well known and as respected in Commerce and Treasury as he was in the Department of State.

At a time when our wider knowledge and association with independent Africa and its economic and political life was just beginning, Ambassador Westerfield brought to bear upon this relationship the perception of a scholar and special sensitivity of a friend. He helped to open up and to create meaningful links with Africa at a most critical and important time. His career, all too brief, was climaxed by his astute guardianship of that unique relationship between the United States and Liberia.

I want, also, to say a word about Sam Westerfield, a friend. When I came to the Bureau ten years ago, new to black Africa, it was Sam who gave me a sense of the vitality of that region. It was Sam, also, who first helped to make me aware of the feelings and sensitivities of Afro-America. His empathy with people, his deep and sincere concern for their problems, his willingness to listen, his courage, and his optimism made him a special kind of friend.

We shall miss Sam Westerfield, the Ambassador, who through special talents and sensitivities made a distinct and critical contribution to our relations with Africa. We shall miss Sam Westerfield, the friend, who conveyed through his quiet personality a distinct kind of feeling for the peoples of two continents.

TEXT OF MESSAGE FROM ANGIE BROOKS-RANDOLPH, AMBASSADOR AT LARGE OF LIBERIA TO
PRESIDENT NIXON

The sudden death of the American Ambassador Samuel Westerfield brings sadness to his friends and colleagues in Liberia because he gave the best of himself to promote friendship and better understanding between the peoples of our two countries and Africa as a whole. Please accept sincere condolences for the loss sustained in his death in which my husband Commissioner Randolph joins me.

REMARKS OF O. RUDOLF AGGREY, DIRECTOR FOR
WEST AFRICAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF
STATE

Sam Westerfield was a goal-conscious man of rare perception. An innovative teacher, his keen interest in Africa preceded by more than a decade his distinguished career in the Foreign Service. To his exacting tasks, first as administrator and later as diplomat, he brought the inquiring mind and quest for truth that mark the genuine scholar. Those of us who followed his work in the private and public sectors alike know a major personal objective of this dedicated man was to help increase the quality as well as the quantity both of Afro-American and African professionals in economics, particularly in business administration. He stressed the essentiality of such human resources to the progress of the American and African nations toward a better life for all their citizens. He pursued this objective continually and with marked success at home and abroad as may be seen in the numerous positions of great trust and wide influence now held by those he taught, advised or counseled. For so many, Sam Westerfield's death is a great loss, but the contributions he made to his nation and his people remain vital.

EULOGY FOR SAMUEL Z. WESTERFIELD

(By Hon. Walter Washington, Mayor,
Washington, D.C.)

I bring an expression of profound sympathy from the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

Samuel Z. Westerfield throughout his life, wherever he found himself, has worked with the tools at hand to help build a better world. Firm in his belief that democracy is going

in the right direction, he has used every opportunity to strengthen and broaden the concept of equality for all men whatever their station and wherever they live.

Today I am most grateful that only one year ago I had the privilege of being with him at his post in Liberia. My wife and I shared the warm family life that he and his wife created in a country where they both felt at home and where together they served the highest interests of the people of their country and of the people of Liberia.

As a participant in official discussions, I saw the respect and affection the leaders of an African country accorded a man whom they admired and trusted. Sam Westerfield was more than a Beautiful American in a foreign post—he was a world citizen working with reverence for all men who gave the word "brotherhood" a new and deeper meaning.

He understood and respected the hopes and the problems of the young emerging nations of the African continent who, after centuries of oppression, are once again striving to revive the technologies, the skills and the creativity that contributed so much to their history. And he sought ways to assist the countries of West Africa to use the gifts of their past heritage as stepping stones into the present technologies and the self-sufficiency modern techniques can provide.

With generosity of spirit, with understanding, with commitment and with dedication, Sam Westerfield sought to help all human beings rise to their highest potential as thinking men, as feeling men and as producing men.

Sam Westerfield had a sense of the rightness of things. He was a serious man, a man of humor and of sensibility with balance. He was a charming companion who softened the hard edges of life with gentle humor and illuminated complex situations with an insight born of long study and hard work.

Today we must remember the many students he inspired throughout a long and distinguished teaching career, the co-workers in the Department of State whom he helped to a deeper understanding of issues often clouded by fictions about race or by overzealous manifestations of patriotism. We can take comfort in knowing that he made a difference not only in the lives of those he touched but also in the lives of thousands he did not know but in whom he passionately believed.

May the Lord abundantly bless his family and challenge his friends to greater commitment in his memory. He would want no other memorial.

WORDS OF COMFORT TO THE SAMUEL Z. WESTERFIELD FAMILY

(By Bishop Frank M. Reid, Jr.)

Let the family, friends, fraternal associates and vocational yoke-fellows know that I stand here today as retiring priest and prophet to this religious community called Metropolitan to remind you not to be ensnared in the web of evasiveness in this moment. For truly the wisest of all generations is so unwise as to shunt aside the meaning of death because of an apparent lack of complete comprehension. This means that we shall verbalize our massive misgivings with words like tragic—untimely—grief—sorrow. As priest and prophet I appeal to you to transcend this level of limited understanding and call to you the joy of sacramental celebration.

Today, we rejoice that Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr. was a third generation Sunday School Teacher, and that his son has done honor to this heritage by being involved as a teacher in our program of Christian Education. This is not an occasion for grieving but of grateful remembrance that God was made manifest in his life. For we can say for him as James Reston said in eulogizing another great American, "He preserved the vanishing gift of actually listening to what

other people were saying, and then thinking about it, before he answered". There are those who would tearfully reflect that this is the termination of his service to the U.S. State Department. I would remind you that Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr. was an Ambassador of Jesus Christ first and always and always—and as such knew the sacramental celebrative aspect of death as expressed in the words of the Apostle Paul—"Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." In this moment we must heed the call to commitment—"Therefore my beloved brethren and family, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

REMARKS OF HERSCHEL SULLIVAN
CHANCELLOR, PH.D., BROOKLYN COLLEGE

The death of Ambassador Samuel Westerfield is a deep loss for the blacks, the United States, and indeed mankind.

My first contact with the Ambassador occurred as a student at Spelman College, where we all viewed this Dean of the Atlanta University Business School with awe and admiration.

In his professional life, he combined the best of academic rigor with political insight, of wisdom with pragmatism, of compassion with realpolitik.

In a sense he represents a classic prototype of that exceptional generation of black men and women educator-activist, influenced by the Atlanta University Center, who went beyond to serve their people and their country.

Sam Westerfield is the third great black man of Atlanta University to die in Africa within the past 9 years. The first, Wm. E. B. Dubois died an educator in exile with Ghanaian citizenship; the second, Whitney Young as a visiting leader of a major civil rights organization, and now this Ambassador as a representative of the American President in Africa. This symbolism should not be lost: that of Africa as an ancestral land reasserting a claim over the best of her own. While we mourn the death of this extraordinary man, let us take note of the rebirth of Africa's relevance to black America.

REMEMBERING SAM WESTERFIELD

(By Sterling Tucker, Vice Chairman, District of Columbia City Council)

I knew Sam Westerfield as a family friend, as a supporter of our work in the City Council and of my work in the Urban League. He was a gentle man of deep intellect and creative spirit—interested in many humanitarian causes and devoted himself unselfishly to them. His effectiveness as a leader and scholar sprang from his dedication to purpose and quiet yet persistent pursuit of noble objectives. Sam was easy to know and enjoyed the company of people.

A philosopher once said that no man is so great as a good man struggling with adversity. Another philosopher noted, however, that there is one man who is even greater and that is the good man who comes to relieve that adversity. I believe that Ambassador Westerfield, through his life's work, personified that good man who came to relieve adversity.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., August 5, 1972.

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIGGS: I should like to share my thoughts with you over the passing of Sam Westerfield who died while serving as our ambassador to the Republic of Liberia. His death was all the more shocking to me since we had so much in common. Sam managed to accomplish most of the things that men of our generation dreamed about: a

brilliant academic career capped by the Ph.D. from Harvard; a professorship and deanship at Atlanta University; and an enviable government career leading to a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the African Bureau and finally to an Ambassadorship.

Sam took an active part in the affairs of the Black community of the United States of America and in the whole movement towards re-establishing links between Blacks in our country and those in Africa. He could be counted upon whether at AMSAC meetings or at the meetings of the American Negro Leadership Conferences on Africa to introduce a tone of quiet wisdom.

But what I remember most about Sam are his qualities of a kind and gentle man. He was quite considerate about others and extremely modest. I remember the embarrassment with which he accepted the accolades of his fellow board members at the last meeting of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in Washington. Sam had a sharp wit and a wry sense of humor. We shall miss him as we too go through the paces of our earthly existence. Our best memorial to Sam could only be a rededication to the things for which he stood: excellence in all things academic, administrative, diplomatic, governmental, and political; a devotion to the ethnic group into which nature and history had placed him; a dedication to achieving the long-sought equality of black people everywhere from all forms of degradation and tyranny; and to continue the struggle to improve the material as well as the spiritual life of all mankind.

Mr. Congressman, I know that you share these sentiments. Please permit me to join you in honoring a great man.

Sincerely,

ELLIOTT P. SKINNER,
Franz Boas, Professor of Anthropology,
Chairman of the Anthropology Department
of Columbia University, and former
U.S. Ambassador to Upper Volta.

IN MEMORIAM: AMBASSADOR SAMUEL Z.
WESTERFIELD

(By JOHN CONYERS, JR.)

I would like to join with my colleagues in honoring the memory of Ambassador Sam Westerfield whose untimely death at the age of 52 leaves a void not easily filled in the minds and hearts of those whom he knew and served. His gentleness and kindness won him many friends wherever he went, and served him well in his varied pursuits as educator, administrator and public servant.

Sam Westerfield was a confirmed humanist. In applying standards of compassion and faith in the perfectability of man to the science of economics, he created an art. Whatever the pursuit, he was faithful to his goal of improving the lot of others through the diligent application of the tools of economics.

Growth and development were among his primary concerns throughout his professional life. As an administrator and educator, he valued the development of his students and their education. He was consequently instrumental in building the school of business administration at Atlanta University. As a black American, he worked toward enhancing the participation of blacks in American business life, for he fully appreciated the importance of economic independence to the achievement of full equality.

And, as an international economist, he campaigned vigorously for United States' financial support of African economic development. It was this appreciation of the vitality and potential of West Africa and his sensitivity to the complexities of the colonial legacy which won him many African friends.

The passing of Sam Westerfield is more than the personal loss which we all share. It is the loss of a fine American and outstanding public servant who combined the best of all possible worlds—the high-minded-

ness of the educator with the skill of the economist and the dedication of the public servant. He will indeed be sorely missed.

THE LATE AMBASSADOR SAMUEL Z.
WESTERFIELD

(By Louis Stokes)

The late Ambassador to Monrovia, Liberia, Samuel Z. Westerfield, was perhaps as close to the concept of the Renaissance man as a twentieth century man can become. In his short 52 years, he went from educator, to economist, to intelligence officer, to African expert, to Ambassador. It is difficult to chart the course his life may have followed if he had lived. But there is no question that his future would have been as challenging and as interesting as his past.

Samuel Z. Westerfield was born on November 15, 1919. He graduated from Howard University in 1939 and received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Harvard University in 1949 and 1950 respectively.

Prior to entering government service, he taught at Howard, West Virginia State, Lincoln, Harvard and Atlanta Universities. In 1969, when he was selected to serve as Senior Advisor to the Office of Intelligence Affairs, Mr. Westerfield was the Dean of the School of Business Administration at Atlanta University.

From the field of intelligence, Ambassador Westerfield moved to international relations. In 1963, he served as the United States' representative to ECAFE. During that same year, he became the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, Bureau of Economic Affairs, the Department of State. In the course of 1964, Samuel Westerfield served on the Foreign Service's Board of Examiners and became the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economics and Planning in the State Department's Bureau of African Affairs. Three years later, he assumed the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. Two years after that, he was appointed to the Ambassadorship for Monrovia, Liberia.

Ambassador Westerfield served his country, and the world, under both Democratic and Republican Presidents. His commitment to his fellow man went beyond the confines of partisanship, to a lifelong advocacy for harmony among people of all religions, races, creeds and colors. He was a courageous spokesman for full U.S. recognition of the independent nations of Africa.

Above all else, Sam Westerfield was a kind and gentle man. During my visit to Africa in 1971, he and his wife Helene opened their doors to me in a gesture of friendship, and hospitality. I will miss him and the field of international diplomacy will feel his absence for a long time to come.

IN MEMORIAM TO AMBASSADOR SAMUEL Z.
WESTERFIELD

(Remarks by Hon. RALPH H. METCALFE)

America was saddened to learn of the sudden death of Ambassador Samuel Z. Westerfield. He was still a young man at the time of his death, yet he had already set a record of accomplishments unequalled by many who live a much longer life.

I was not fortunate enough to have known Ambassador Westerfield personally, but I admired him at a distance both as a person and as a public servant. I was especially impressed with his reputation of devotion to his students while he served as Assistant Professor of Economics at Lincoln University, Dean of the School of Business Administration and Professor of Economics at Atlanta University, and Visiting Professor in the Graduate School of Business Administration at Howard University.

In a time when many young people are searching for a meaningful role in a complicated society, Dr. Westerfield's inspiration and encouragement to them to develop to their fullest potential will be greatly missed.

It was with this same very human quality of devotion to his fellowman, that Dr. West-
 erfield as Ambassador for the United States
 to Liberia, gained the reputation of being a
 man sensitive and understanding of the peo-
 ple of that country. This humanness, coupled
 with his vast knowledge of African affairs,
 nurtured the relationship which he helped to
 build between the United States and Liberia.

This truly dedicated public servant will be
 greatly missed both here and in Liberia.

HON. SAM WESTERFIELD

(By Hon. GEORGE W. COLLINS)

From Chicago's Dunbar Vocational High
 School to the ivied, hallowed halls of Har-
 vard; from the black ghetto of Chicago's
 southside to United States Ambassador, that
 is the simple, but eloquent story of the late
 Sam Westerfield, scholar, teacher, leader.

Born to poverty, he rose to become a fi-
 nancial advisor in our national government.
 Born to a racist and inferior educational sys-
 tem, he rose to become a teacher of his
 people. Born to the staticism of one of this
 Nation's most deprived ghettos, he rose to
 leadership in our State Department.

Sam Westerfield was little known to his
 people. He did not beat the drums of pub-
 licity; he did not blow the horn of self-
 importance. Rather, his headlines were that
 of a job well done.

In God's grace, Sam Westerfield walked
 lightly through his role in life. He, indeed,
 epitomized the words of our late president
 John Fitzgerald Kennedy: for in truth Sam
 Westerfield asked not what this wonderful,
 mixed up Nation could do for him; he did
 his best for his Nation.

A copy of my statement will be sent to the
 Chicago City Council and the Chicago Board
 of Education in the form of a resolution
 memorializing Sam Westerfield, urging that a
 monument and school be named in his
 honor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of ab-
 sence was granted to:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for part
 of August 16, August 17, and August 18,
 on account of official district business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to
 address the House, following the legisla-
 tive program and any special orders
 heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN for 30 minutes, today, to
 revise and extend his remarks and in-
 clude extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the re-
 quest of Mr. YOUNG of Florida), to revise
 and extend their remarks, and to in-
 clude extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALL, on August 17, 1972, for 30
 minutes.

Mr. WARE, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, today, for
 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP, today, for 15 minutes.

(The following Members (at the re-
 quest of Mr. MAZZOLI), to revise and ex-
 tend their remarks, and to include ex-
 traneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, today, for
 20 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON, today, for 45 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MEEDS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BADILLO, today, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHISHOLM, today, for 5 minutes.
 Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, today,
 for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAWKINS, today, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to
 revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous
 matter notwithstanding the fact it ex-
 ceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL
 RECORD and is estimated by the Public
 Printer to cost \$382.50 and to be printed
 in the permanent RECORD along with his
 special order of August 15.

Mr. SARBANES in five instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND to extend his remarks
 following those of Mr. BURKE of Massa-
 chusetts, today, on Mr. GERALD R. FORD's
 time.

Mr. SEIBERLING, and to include ex-
 traneous material, notwithstanding the
 fact that it exceeds two pages of the
 RECORD and is estimated by the Public
 Printer to cost \$382.50.

Mr. McFALL during his remarks in the
 Committee of the Whole on H.R. 16071,
 and to include a chart.

Mr. MIZELL to extend his remarks in
 the body of the RECORD.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon to extend her
 remarks made during debate on the res-
 olution by the chairman of the Commit-
 tee on Rules.

(The following Members (at the re-
 quest of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) and to
 include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. WARE in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in two instances.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in three in-
 stances.

Mr. SCHMITZ.

Mr. MALLARY.

(The following Members (at the re-
 quest of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include ex-
 traneous matter:)

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. SARBANES in three instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. BEGICH.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. REID.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANGEL in four instances.

Mrs. CHISHOLM in two instances.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. DRINAN in two instances.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. HATHAWAY.

Mr. MOORHEAD in five instances.

Mr. PIKE.

Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. MILLER of California in five in-
 stances.

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. 2806. An act to authorize appropriations
 for additional costs of land acquisition for
 the national park system; to the Committee
 on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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 follow-
 ing titles, which were thereupon signed
 by the Speaker:

H.R. 5065. An act to amend the Natural Gas
 Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, and for other
 purposes;

H.R. 9092. An act to provide an equitable
 system for fixing and adjusting the rates of
 pay for prevailing rate employees of the Gov-
 ernment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10676. An act for the relief of Lester L.
 Stiteler; and

H.R. 15097. An act making appropriations
 for the Department of Transportation and
 related agencies for the fiscal year ending
 June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signa-
 ture to enrolled bills of the Senate of the
 following titles:

S. 559. An act for the relief of Albina Lucio
 Manluco;

S. 889. An act to restore the Postal Service
 seniority of Elmer Erickson; and

S. 2704. An act for the relief of Rita Rosella
 Vallerini.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move
 that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly
 (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), un-
 der its previous order, the House ad-
 journed until tomorrow, Thursday, Au-
 gust 17, 1972, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2255. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production), transmitting a report on Navy research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 or more during fiscal year 1972, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2256. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain potential water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2257. A letter from the vice president, Government affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corp., transmitting reports on (1) the average number of passengers per day on each train operated by AMTRAK, and (2) the on-time performance of the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad, covering the month of July 1972, pursuant to section 308(a)(2) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2258. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woodsy Owl," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2259. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2260. A letter from the acting executive director, Blinded Veterans Association, transmitting the audit report of the association for the year ended June 30, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting part II of a two-part report on railroad-highway grade crossing safety, pursuant to the Highway Safety Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-605); to the Committee on Public Works.

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. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3323. (Rept. No. 92-1349). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2 (Rept. No. 92-1350). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1102. Resolution providing for the consideration of the conference report on S. 3726. A bill 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 (Rept. No. 92-1361). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5668. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ronald W. Grout, U.S. Air Force; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6467. A bill for the relief of Harold J. Seaborg (Rept. No. 92-1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10552. A bill for the relief of the Rescue Mission Alliance of Syracuse (Rept. No. 92-1353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11047. A bill for the relief of Donald W. Wotring (Rept. No. 92-1354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11629. A bill for the relief of Corp. Bobby R. Mullins; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11749. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Thomas J. Tremba, U.S. Army (Rept. No. 92-1356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11814. A bill for the relief of Claude V. Alcorn and 21 others; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12903. A bill for the relief of Anne M. Sack; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11631. A bill for the relief of Robert Gibbons; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8215. A bill to provide relief for certain prewar Japanese bank claimants; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABOUREZK (by request):
H.R. 16384. A bill to amend the act of August 8, 1968 (Public Law 90-468) to provide for the reservation of certain areas for park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:
H.R. 16385. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 to further cultural activities by making unused railroad passenger depots available to communities for such activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ABZUG:
H.R. 16386. A bill to provide youth services grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. BARING, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. EVINS of Tennessee):
H.R. 16387. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of zinc be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. BARING, Mr. SKUBITZ,

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. EVINS of Tennessee):

H.R. 16388. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 16389. A bill to encourage and assist the States in registering voters and in achieving efficient and convenient conduct of elections, and to establish within the Bureau of the Census and Election Assistance and Voter Registration Administration to carry out a program of election assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOLAND (for himself and Mr. JACOBS):

H.R. 16390. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 16391. 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.

H.R. 16392. A bill to provide compensation to U.S. commercial fishing vessel owners for damages incurred by them as a result of an action of a vessel operated by a foreign government or a citizen of a foreign government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 16393. 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 Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 16394. 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. GUDE (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. KING, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. YATRON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOOREHEAD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DRINAN, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 16395. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, to provide financial assistance for handicapped individuals establishing or operating small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ESCH, Mr. STEELE, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. SHRIVER):

H.R. 16396. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, to provide financial assistance for handicapped individuals establishing or operating small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16397. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to provide a group life insurance program for State and local government law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16398. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide in certain cases for an exchange of credits between the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and the civil service retirement system so as to enable individuals who have some coverage under both systems to obtain maximum benefits based on their combined service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16400. A bill to provide that State and local sales taxes paid by individuals shall be allowed as a credit against their liability for Federal income tax instead of being allowed as a deduction from their gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to tenants of houses or apartments for their proportionate share of the taxes and interest paid by their landlords; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself and Mr. MATTHIAS of California):

H.R. 16402. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to include chickens, turkeys, ducks, geese, guineas, pheasants, and squabs within the definition of "poultry"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 16403. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Algona, Iowa, for airport purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 16404. A bill to amend the Federal-aid Highway Act to provide for a system of economic growth center highways to revitalize and diversify the economy of rural areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 16405. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise certain requirements for approval of new animal drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 16406. A bill to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 16407. A bill to provide credit against individual income tax paid for elementary and secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 16408. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself and Mr. MIZELL):

H.R. 16409. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act to provide for economic growth center highways to revitalize and diversify the economy of rural areas and smaller communities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 16410. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive after attaining age 72; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16411. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$5,000 a year (plus an additional amount to reflect the needs of other persons in the same household) the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without any deductions from his benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. WINN, Mr. FREY, Mr. FLOWERS, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 16412. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for certain additional reports to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 16413. A bill to establish an independent and regionalized Federal Board of Parole, to provide for fair and equitable parole procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York (for himself, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina):

H.R. 16414. A bill to provide for a rural water survey, to create a Rural Water Council, to provide incentive grants for rural water supply projects, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 1287. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the 23rd day of September of each year as "National 'Miss Twins U.S.A.' Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BELL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DOW, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS of Washington, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.J. Res. 1288. Joint resolution to declare a U.S. policy of achieving population stabilization by voluntary means; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.J. Res. 1289. Joint resolution to declare a U.S. policy of achieving population stabilization by voluntary means; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MINK):

H. Con. Res. 687. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of parts I and II of hearings entitled "Discrimination Against Women"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. SISK, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. SMITH of California, and Mr. LATTA):

H. Res. 1103. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to House consideration of certain Senate amendments, to provide for the Delegates from Guam and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 16415. A bill for the relief of Luigi Santaniello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 16416. A bill for the relief of Howard Lindberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, August 16, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our governor, whose glory is in all the world, we commend this Nation to Thy merciful care, that being guided by Thy providence, we may dwell secure in Thy peace. Grant to the President of the United States and to all in author-

ity, wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness, and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve this people in Thy fear; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

—COMMON PRAYER.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had

agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5065) to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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.