

Charles Tamburello
James A. Tangen
Chris A. Taylor
Lucius O. Taylor
Timothy B. Taylor
Harold E. Thomas
John K. Thomas
Michael R. Thomas
Thomas H. Thomiszer
Charles B. Thompson
John R. Thorpe
James E. Thurmond
Howard M. Tillison
Richard R. Tinney
John R. Tomasiewicz
Duane W. Toole
Calvin D. J. Trestell
Leighton J. Tru III
Rodney H. Trump
Thomas S. Tullis
John A. Uldrich
Edwin L. Ulmer
Jay P. Unwin
John L. Urban
David P. Vaillancourt
John A. Vangladeren
Edward B. Vanhaute
James R. Volker
William V. Vonborries
Frederick W. Vosbury
Paul J. Vuchetich
Paul B. Wade
David C. Wagner
Jeffrey Q. Wagner
Raymond E. Wagoner
Gary W. Walker
James D. Wallace
Vincent A. Walsh
Glenn H. Ward
Andrew G. Washington
Douglass C. Watson
Gary J. Watson
Timothy P. Watson
Bryan L. Watts
Stephen E. Watts
John O. Webb, Jr.
Michael R. Webb
Joel N. Weber
John L. Webster
Stephen B. Webster
Walter E. Webster II
Steven E. Wehmeyer
John R. Weir
Michael R. Welch
Gerold W. Weldon, Jr.

John W. Weldon, Jr.
Raymond M. Welsh
Kenneth E. Wenzel
Allan G. Wesley
Lynn G. Wessman
John M. Westhoven
John D. Wherry II
Randy D. Whitaker
Laurence B. White
Robert B. White
William L. White
Donald B. Whitfield
Richard J. Whitney
Patrick S. Wieger
Jeffrey S. Wilburn
Donald J. Willey
Craig R. Williams
James G. Williams, Jr.
James M. Williams
John S. Williams
Mark P. Williams
Michael R. Williams
Thomas G. Williams
Tyler E. Williams
William J. Willkie
John P. Wilmeth
Bryce H. Wilson
James O. Wilson
John H. Wilson III
Harry R. Wilt
Henry L. Wise
Lance Wismer
James W. Witherspoon
Thomas O. Witthauer
Wayne D. S. Wong
Howard J. Woodard
John A. Woodward
John H. Woodhouse
Randy A. Worley
Charles B. Wright
David K. Wright
Richard C. Wright II
Chris A. Wuethrich
Arthur A. Wyder
Jeffrey N. Wynne
Joseph E. Yarborough
Arthur W. Yaremchuk
Austin G. Young
Donnie C. Young
Joseph B. Young
Roger A. Zajicek
James M. Zalipski
James A. Zayac
Michael G. Zebrowitz
Edward W. Zesk
Alfred E. Zimmermann

The following-named U.S. Navy officers to be temporary commanders in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward F. Cantow.
Joseph A. Matan.
Joel E. Winker.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent captains in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Philip M. Lightfoot, Jr.
Ralph F. Meincke.

Stanford P. Sadick (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent commander in the

Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Eugene M. Brandt (civilian college graduate) to be a temporary commander in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

HM3 Michael G. Knight to be a permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps (allied science) of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Morris K. Terry, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be reappointed from the temporary disability retired list as a permanent lieutenant commander in the Navy, limited duty (aviation maintenance) subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert S. Betz
James E. Brown
Thomas C. Chestney
Thomas E. Comey
Brad M. Kasson
Robert W. Mariner

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Wayne J. Galante
Robert D. Gear
Ronald F. Harrington
John D. Matheson

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

John F. Hensley.
Taras W. Shpikula.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Stephen J. Ancowitz
David R. Hoffman
Peter F. Johnson
John J. Keller
James L. Lippert, Jr.
James D. Moore
Robert L. Pentecost
Bruce J. Sailor
Ernest R. Smith

Robert F. Carey, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Robert F. Brewer
Dennis M. Davidson
Earl P. Dick
Garry L. Holtzman
David G. Kemp
Ernest E. Kundert
Heige A. M. Wanger

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Edward C. Clark
Dennis L. Depry
Theodore W. Fetter
Howard P. Fischbach
Dennis L. Johnson

Sandra L. Kachkowski
John W. Knispel
Harry J. Long III
William K. McCord
Donald C. McPhail
Joseph A. Miller
James G. Murphy
Harold W. Nase
Richard E. Otski
Carsten S. Ronlov
David G. Schwarz
Barry J. Sell
Joseph J. Smith
Peter W. Soballe
William W. Tanner
Louis S. Williams III
John E. Wimmer, Jr.
Christie W. Winkler
John J. Woods, Jr.

The following-named (Navy enlisted scientific education program Candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard W. Call
Michael A. McKay
Thomas W. Morrisette
Ronald C. Neyer
Theodore A. Orlando
Gerald L. Paulk
Thomas W. Pearson
Bernard J. Rubin

Berton T. Schaeffer, U.S. Navy officer to be a temporary commander in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Harvey L. P. Resnik (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent commander and a temporary captain in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Ex-Lt. Samuel W. Sax to be a permanent commander in the Line (Special Duty Public Affairs) in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Kirk K. Kazarian (civilian college graduate) to be a temporary commander in the Medical Corp in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named chief warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty, for temporary service in the classification indicated and as permanent warrant officers and/or permanent and temporary warrant officers, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

ENGINEERING

David W. Arnold
Edward E. Barnhart
George A. Brandon
Joseph M. Brown
Robert P. Browngardt
Hoyt N. Burrows
Edwin A. Foskett
Donald L. Gay
Joseph E. Grange
Luther H. Hager, III
Wendell Harris, Jr.
Donald L. Hausauer
Charles E. Hebert, Jr.
George F. Heeger
Douglas L. Hunt
James E. Hutcheson
David R. Hyster
James A. Kerwin
Joseph L. Lacambra
Jerry P. Lane
Wallace R. Lueck
Rodney R. McWane
Walter C. Morgan
Bobby L. Moss
Roger A. Nance
John D. Payton
Carl J. Schultz, III
John E. Sides
John L. Watson
Frank West, Jr.
Albert G. Wolfe
Earl L. Wolford

COMMUNICATIONS

Ernest A. Dirkes.
Philip M. Lightfoot, Jr. (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent captain in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 5, 1972

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

Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord and He will lift you up.—James 4: 10.

O God, our Father, whose love never lets us go, whose strength never lets us down, and whose light follows us all our

days: in the glory of a new dawn grant unto us the spirit of understanding and courage as we face the tasks before us. May we now and always seek the highest good for our Nation and for all our people.

In these difficult days and trying times let not any shadow of defeat or discouragement depress our minds but may Thy spirit lift us up, hold us steady and make

us steadfast that we may ever do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee.
In the spirit of the Master we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings 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 with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7375. An act to amend the statutory ceiling on salaries payable to U.S. magistrates.

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

S. 173. An act for the relief of Mrs. Naoyo Campbell;

S. 2483. An act to provide a national program in order to make the international metric system the predominant but not exclusive system of measurement in the United States and to provide for converting to the general use of such system within 10 years;

S. 2741. An act to amend the Act of September 7, 1957, authorizing aircraft loan guarantees, in order to expand the program pursuant to such Act;

S. 2816. An act for the relief of Mary Danos Nayak;

S. 3252. An act for the relief of Renato M. Dloquino;

S. 3583. An act for the relief of Gerald Vincent Bull;

S. 3671. An act to amend the Administrative Conference Act;

S. 3835. An act for the relief of Reynaldo Canlas Baecher;

S. 3858. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the program of medical assistance to areas with health manpower shortages, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
August 25, 1972.

His Excellency A. LINWOOD HOLTON,
Governor of Virginia,
State Capitol,
Richmond, Va.

SIR: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, effective at the close of business on Tuesday, August 29, 1972.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. POFF.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
August 31, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the

White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 12:55 p.m. on Thursday, August 31, 1972, and said to contain a Message from the President concerning federal pay comparability.

With kinds regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

FEDERAL PAY COMPARABILITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-439)

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 Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As we approach the October date on which pay rates for Federal employees under the statutory pay systems would normally be adjusted, I wish to advise the Congress that I will recommend a pay increase for Federal employees effective January 1, 1973. I believe it is appropriate to point out that section 3 of Public Law 92-210, the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, requires that this adjustment this year be delayed until January 1973.

The pay raise required by section 3 of the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments was limited by the terms of the law to the guideline that the Pay Board has established for pay increases throughout the economy, 5.5 percent a year. Clearly it was the intent of this law to see that Federal employees would be treated in a comparable manner with private enterprise employees under the Economic Stabilization Program. In recognition of this intent, on January 11, 1972, I directed that Federal wage employees should also have their pay increase limited by the Pay Board guidelines.

The necessary comparability studies have been completed and, under the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970, I will recommend that the increase necessary to achieve comparability, be paid, starting January 1, 1973, the first date our employees will be eligible to receive an increase under the Economic Stabilization Act. Our employees received their full 5.5 percent annual increase last January, and therefore their next increase cannot be effective until January 1, 1973. The provisions of Public Law 92-210 preclude submission of an alternative plan under section 5305(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

I believe it is important to express once again my strong personal support for the principle that our Nation's public servants should receive pay that is comparable with pay in private industry. For our Government to operate efficiently in these increasingly complex and demanding times, we must have a civil service of the highest caliber, and to recruit and retain these necessary employees, we must offer them a fair and just wage. Nevertheless, in our efforts to stabilize and revitalize our Nation's economy, it is also appropriate that they be treated the same as employees in the private sector,

who are also able to receive such an increase no more frequently than once every 12 months.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 31, 1972.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUGIA DI GIORGIO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

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

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

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MARGARIDA ALDORA CORREIA DOS REIS

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

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

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

There was no objection.

EMILIA RUFFOLO

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

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

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

There was no objection.

DONALD P. LARIVIERE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

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

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

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

There was no objection.

ARLINE LOADER AND MAURICE LOADER

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

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

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

There was no objection.

FREDI ROBERT DREILICH

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

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

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

There was no objection.

DENNIS YIANTOS

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

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

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM JOHN WEST

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

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. GAVINA A. PALACAY

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

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

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

There was no objection.

ANKA KOSANOVIC

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CAPT. RONALD W. GROUT, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5668) for the relief of Capt. Ronald W. Grout, U.S. Air Force.

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

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

There was no objection.

HAROLD J. SEABORG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6467) for the relief of Harold J. Seaborg.

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

H.R. 6467

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to advance Harold J. Seaborg, captain, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (retired), of Edmonds, Washington, to the rank of rear admiral (lower half) on the retired list of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Harold J. Seaborg the sum certified to him by the Secretary of Commerce as being an amount equal to the difference between (1) the retired pay which the said Harold J. Seaborg would have been entitled to receive during the period beginning January 1, 1971, and ending on the effective date of his advancement pursuant to the first section of this Act if during such period he had held the retired rank of rear admiral (lower half), and (2) the retired pay he actually received during such period.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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.

RESCUE MISSION ALLIANCE OF SYRACUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10552) for the relief of the Rescue Mission Alliance of Syracuse.

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

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

There was no objection.

DONALD W. WOTRING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11047) for the relief of Donald W. Wotring.

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

H.R. 11047

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Corporal Donald W. Wotring, United States Marine Corps, retired, service number 2140988, of Savannah, Georgia, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$688.26, representing overpayments of active duty pay for the period beginning July 1, 1967, and ending December 31, 1967, received by him as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald W. Wotring an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

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

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.

CPL. BOBBY R. MULLINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11629) for the relief of Cpl. Bobby R. Mullins.

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

H.R. 11629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled That Corporal Bobby R. Mullins, United States Marine

Corps, retired, of Fairborn, Ohio, who suffered the loss of both legs as the result of hostile action in Vietnam, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$430.86, which amount represents the total of overpayments paid to him prior to his retirement on May 28, 1968, such payments having been made as a result of administrative error which occurred without fault on his part and without his knowledge. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Bobby R. Mullins, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts already paid by him, or withheld of any sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

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

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7: Strike "\$430.86, which amount represents" and insert "\$341.49, representing".

Page 1, line 8: Strike "May 28, 1968" and insert "May 30, 1968".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

1ST LT. THOMAS J. TREMBA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11749) for the relief of 1st Lt. Thomas J. Tremba, U.S. Army.

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

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

There was no objection.

CLAUDE V. ALCORN AND 21 OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11814) for the relief of Claude V. Alcorn and 21 others.

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

H.R. 11814

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

Sec. 2. The transportation of Claude V. Alcorn, Adrian C. Almond, Aubrey V. Ansell, Thomas Armstrong, Gary A. Bailey, Ronald W. Bradshaw, Harry M. Braudrick, John B. Brewington, Fructoso D. Cabanela, Thurston C. Davis, Donald W. Dodge, Marcus L. Hyde, Junior, Peter E. Johnson, James L. Jones, William G. King, Henry E. Mowbray, Jack L. Norris, Charles Ricketts, Junior, Gerald L. Sellers, Bobby L. Templeton, Lee M. Tillman, or K. C. West to Seattle on the NOAA vessels "Davidson" in September 1967, "Oceanographer" in December 1967, "Fairweather" in

March 1968, or "Rainier" in May 1968, shall not be deemed transportation at Government expense in connection with a change of permanent duty station for the purpose of computing their entitlement to travel expenses for such change of permanent duty station under the provisions of section 5724 of title 5, United States Code and applicable regulations. The travel expenses of each of the above-named persons in connection with their transfer of duty station to Seattle in 1967 or 1968 shall, upon a request made within ninety days of the enactment of this legislation, be computed or recomputed in accordance with appropriate Office of Management and Budget regulations: *Provided, however,* That in making such computation or recomputation, transportation on board the vessels at the times referred to in this section shall be disregarded: *And provided further,* That if any of the persons named herein has already received payment for such travel, that amount shall be deducted from the recomputed travel expenses and any remainder paid or credited to the employee.

Sec. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in subsection (a) of this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 13 and 14: Strike "in accordance with appropriate Office of Management and Budget regulations" and insert "to provide payment of mileage traveled in privately owned vehicles at a rate not to exceed 12 cents per mile and per diem at a rate not to exceed \$16 per day for actual travel time between duty stations not to exceed 8 1/2 days".

Page 2, line 23: Strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ANNE M. SACK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12903) for the relief of Anne M. Sack.

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

H.R. 12903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, Anne M. Sack, of Cincinnati, Ohio, shall be considered the widow of the late Robert A. Sack (CSA 1113671), notwithstanding the period of legal separation between their first and second marriages to each other.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, add the following: "Sec. 2. The annuity authorized by this Act shall be payable on and after January 3, 1972."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT GIBBONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11631) for the relief of Robert Gibbons.

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

H.R. 11631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$454.08 to Robert Gibbons in full settlement of his claim against the Government for reimbursement for loss of his household effects and personal property incident to a shipment from Phoenix, Arizona, to Baghdad, Iraq, in connection with his assignment in Iraq pursuant to a grant agreement ad-

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$454.08" and insert "\$74.30".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

OSSIE EMMONS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5416) for the relief of Ossie Emmons and others.

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

H.R. 5416

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following named persons the amounts set forth opposite their respective names in full settlement of their claims against the United States for losses and damages they suffered due to the flooding of their lands due to the release of waters of the Wappapello Reservoir on or about September 25, 1965, without warning or notice which would have enabled them to take steps to avoid or minimize losses from the flooding caused by that release:

Tenant	Landlord	Affected acres	Tenants share	Landlords share	Farm numbers
Ossie Emmons, Dudley, Mo.	A. R. Pierce, Clarkton, Mo.	150	\$5,125.00	\$2,122.50	B-844
Robert Harrison, Fisk, Mo.	Glen Harrison, Big Bend 1719, Poplar Bluff, Mo.	65	2,220.84	1,110.41	C-1356
Gail Mansbridge, Fisk, Mo.		50	2,562.50		A-3381
H. F. Mansbridge, Fisk, Mo.		30	1,538.50		A-3537
Wiley Mattingly, Route 1, Dudley, Mo.	Eva Mattingly, Route 1, Dudley, Mo.	110	3,757.34	1,879.16	B-1761
Rhea Stone, Route 1, Dudley, Mo.		200	10,250.00		B-1557
Ray Henson, Route 1, Dudley, Mo.	Albert Price, Route 1, Dudley, Mo.	100	3,416.67	1,708.83	B-1654
Leon Wilkerson, Fisk, Mo.	Bernard Cravens, 818 North Sassafras, Dexter, Mo.	150	5,125.00	2,562.50	D-2073
Robert Harrison Fisk, Mo.	Juanita Cravens, Fisk, Mo.	135	4,612.50	2,306.25	B-647
Robert Huber, Route 1, Campbell, Mo.		20 (corn)	2,500.00		H-1746
			1,350.00		

SEC. 2. No part of each amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 15 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 2, opposite the name "Robert Huber", under "Tenants share" strike "2,500.00" and insert "1,350.00".

Page 2, line 4, strike "15" and insert "10".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

SARA B. GARNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12099) for the relief of Sara B. Garner.

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

H.R. 12099

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on such terms as it deems just, the United States Postal Service is authorized to compromise, release, or discharge in whole or in part the liability of Sara B. Garner, Postmaster at the Ryland, Alabama, post office, for the loss resulting from a burglary on February 7, 1971, at that post office.

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.

RICHARD L. KRZYZANOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15865) for the relief of Richard L. Krzyzanowski.

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

H.R. 15865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Richard L. Krzyzanowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 13, 1966, upon payment of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, after the date "February 13, 1966" strike out the following: "upon payment of the required visa fees".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

OLYMPIC TRAGEDY

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

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, two developments during the brief period of our recess have given pause to civilized men and women the world over. One to which I shall address myself later in the day, is the Soviet Union's demands that Jews who wish to emigrate must be ransomed.

The second, which occurred only this morning in Munich, was the murder of two members of the Israeli Olympic team and the kidnaping of 14 others by a group of Arab guerrillas.

This act can only be described as the work of mindless and inhumane fanatics, and our horror at it is heightened by the fact that it intrudes upon the spirit of international cooperation which surrounds and pervades the Olympic Games. I have today cabled the International Olympic Committee asking for suspension of the games until the hostages are released and the danger has passed and I am pleased that they have acted to do so, at least for the present.

We who sit here in Congress, and those who sit downtown at the White House, can and must do more than ask others to act. It is extremely difficult for the United States to move against these terrorists directly, but we certainly can move against those nations which serve as their bases of operations and give them aid and comfort.

We can cut off direct loans and grants to them, especially those of a military character, under our foreign aid program.

We can prohibit their commerce from entering the United States, whether by air, sea, or land.

We can prohibit American-owned aircraft and ships from landing in these countries.

We can bring them before the United Nations and ask it to declare sanctions or embargoes against them.

If this country really has a commitment to world peace and tranquillity, we can demonstrate it by moving economically against those nations which harbor and countenance such international out-

laws as those who perpetrated today's tragic events in Munich.

FURTHER OUTRAGES BY ARAB TERRORISTS

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sense of outrage over the killings in Munich of two Israeli athletes by Arab terrorists. It seems incredible that hate and hostility, so alien to the spirit of the Olympic games, could invade the very village where the great athletes of the world have been quartered in such peaceful relations. Even now as I speak these same Arab terrorists, not content with the tragedy they have inflicted upon the innocent, threatened to kill more members of the Israeli team unless outrageous conditions for releasing their fellow terrorists are met.

I cannot help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Arab world will evidence in this situation some degree of conscience. They have often in the past gloried in the mindless slayings perpetrated by their own terrorists, but surely now with the weight of world opinion arrayed against them, they will take some steps to call a halt to these outrageous acts. For their failure to do so will clearly indicate that they have no sense of decency, no sense of humanity, no respect for peace.

We call upon the Arab world to take positive action to bring about a release of the athletes held hostage.

OUTRAGEOUS ATTACKS BY ARAB TERRORISTS

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attack on the quarters of the Israeli Olympic competitors and the holding of hostages is an outrage to the entire world community. The Olympics have long been a neutral ground for competition among the world's athletes. These Arab criminals have turned it into a political battleground.

The United Nations should take immediate action to end this affront. Past inaction by the UN has given a green light to the Arab terrorists to continue to disrupt world peace and threaten the lives and safety of people virtually everywhere. Instead of being all too quick to pass resolutions condemning Israel as they have done in the past, the UN should be taking a strong stand against Arab intransigence and Arab support for such emissaries of violence as are present in Munich today.

West German Chancellor Willy Brandt has shown his own personal courage in taking charge of the situation himself. Since the Olympics are an international activity, UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim also should take whatever steps are necessary to release the hostages.

How much longer will the world community have to bear these outrages? Both the United States and Israel have offered fair peace plans to settle the Middle Eastern situation. The Arab States supported by the Soviet Union and the UN have continued their conspiracy of silence and terrorism. Terrorist attacks will never be brought to an end until the world community joins in condemning the Arab States' support for these hoodlums and for an atmosphere of war in which they operate.

CONDEMNATION OF OLYMPIC TRAGEDY

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken this morning with our Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush. I have asked him to introduce a motion of censure against the Arab nations of the world who have yet to speak out and condemn the vicious killers who have already taken the lives of two young Israelis taking part in the Olympics in Munich. The gathering together of young people from all nations to take part in this great athletic competition has always been looked on as a way of bringing nations together and creating a common area of understanding in the world. Actions such as the ones that are taking place in the Olympic Village in Munich, endanger the whole future of the Olympics. It is my hope that we here in Congress will also condemn this horrible incident.

SCHOOL BUSING

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, despite the repeated actions of this body in expressing its opposition to forced school busing, thousands of school children are returning to classes this week either on buses or under the pending threat of court-ordered busing.

Just last week we had new evidence of the courts misreading of the will and intent of the Congress in a busing case in Augusta, Georgia. Even in the Detroit metropolitan area where the moratorium bill which I sponsored has delayed massive cross-district busing, the courts seem determined to press on until they can find some new means of justifying such an order.

As the author of the Broomfield amendment to delay implementation of busing until appeals have been exhausted and as one who worked hard for passage of the Equal Education Opportunities Act just a few weeks ago, I am frankly shocked and dismayed.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have signed and placed at the desk today a motion to discharge H.R. 13916, the President's busing moratorium bill from further consideration by the Judiciary Committee. This measure establishes a moratorium on new busing orders until

July of 1973 or such time as the Equal Education Opportunities Act is signed into law.

I urge all of my colleagues to give this measure their careful consideration and invite them to join me in this effort to bring an important antibusing measure to the floor for a vote as soon as possible.

While H.R. 13916 is designed to expire on the passage of the Equal Education Opportunities Act, we all know that measure faces, at best, a rocky road in the other body. Passage by the Senate is by no means assured.

Keeping this sobering political fact in mind, and realizing that recent court pronouncements on antibusing legislation have ignored the clear and obvious intent of Congress, I suggest that it is vitally important that H.R. 13916 be brought up for a vote.

It will buy valuable time for this Congress, and if necessary, the Congress that convenes after the fall elections to get to the task of legislating an end, once and for all, to forced busing.

OUTRAGE COMMITTED BY ARAB TERRORISTS

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Olympic games have been suspended for 24 hours due to the outrage being committed against the Israeli Olympic team.

Mr. Speaker, I think the fanatics operating throughout the world under the guise "Palestinian Liberation" have forcibly committed the ultimate outrage. There have been previous instances such as the Lod Airport massacre where more people have been killed and endangered; however, never have these international bandits so defied the worldwide community of civilized nations.

I wonder how we would feel, Mr. Speaker, if a group of international bandits were holding our Olympic team as hostages. And particularly since two of our allies, namely, England and Germany, are reported to be allowing offices of two bandit organizations to be operating openly in Munich and London.

It has been reported that the Popular Front for Liberation of Palestine, who have taken credit for the hijacking and bombing of aircraft 2 years ago, has an office operating freely in London and that the Black September Group, who claims credit not only for the present outrage but for the Lod Airport massacre, are operating openly and freely in Munich. I think that it is high time that all of these groups that are so freely breaking international law be placed in the same category as aircraft hijackers and any country allowing them sanctuary be boycotted by all civilized countries.

MRS. JULIA RIVERA VINCENTY

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

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to your attention the announcement by the President of his intention to designate a distinguished Puerto Rican, Mrs. Julia Rivera Vincenty, as an alternate member of the U.S. delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mrs. Vincenty, our secretary of labor and the daughter of one of our great labor leaders, is a woman of great talent and dedication. Her identification with the cause of the working man has helped her perform in an outstanding manner as the secretary of labor in Puerto Rico. Her background and ability, including the cultural ties with Latin America which she shares, along with all of us in Puerto Rico and with millions on the mainland, will be a positive asset to the United States in the difficult task of maintaining a meaningful dialog with other peoples in the assembly of the nations of the world. The President is to be commended on an excellent choice.

THE SUSPENSION OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the dastardly act perpetrated by the Arab guerrillas should be condemned throughout the world. Olympic officials took the only action they could in suspending the games for 24 hours, but world officials must take immediate remedial action against these cowardly criminals who have grievously sinned against humanity.

WORDS OF CONDEMNATION ARE NOT ENOUGH

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today the world is witnessing another act of brutal terrorism. It is tragic that the Olympic spirit of good will and brotherhood has been marred by this act of barbarism and murder, but an even greater tragedy is that this act continues the series of brutalities that have been committed against the people of Israel. This assault against Israel's athletes will be condemned, but after it is over little will be done to stop the Arab terrorists that are left to roam the world and strike where they will.

Airplanes have been hijacked and destroyed, innocent passengers have been killed at Israel's Lod airport, and civilians have been injured in the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv—all by Arab terrorists. Immediately after these atrocities there have been words of outrage by the nations of the world; and yet those countries that could take steps to stop the guerrillas refuse to acknowledge their responsibility, say nothing of acting to stop these unconscionable transgressions.

The Security Council refuses to condemn the Arab nations from which these terrorists operate. France refuses to acknowledge its responsibility for having

allowed a plane destined for Lod airport to be loaded without security precautions. And in the instance of a more subtle form of brutality, many of the free nations of the world fail to condemn the Soviet Union for first denying its citizens the right of free emigration and then placing an unconscionable ransom on each individual wishing to leave.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, leaders of the world's nations condemn this latest act of terrorism, as one that transgresses the spirit of the Olympics but their exhortations are of little consequence for their protestations of today will be belied by their failure to act tomorrow.

THE SUSPENSION OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House: I concur in the statements, very strong statements, that have been made here by the past several speakers with respect to what has happened in Munich. I was particularly impressed by the remarks made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH). Violence, unfortunately, is found in too many places in the world today, and despite the reliance that we have on the United Nations, and other peacekeeping organizations, we find very little performance in action against violent agitators anywhere.

This particular violence, because it affects the Olympic games, which have attracted international attention and in which many nations are participating, is brought more forcibly to the attention of the American people. Of course, the committee was absolutely right in suspending the Olympics until such time as this violence ceases.

However, I think more than that, Mr. Speaker, is the need to adopt international sanctions that will prevent and will punish violence of this nature all over the world, wherever practiced.

I have been surprised to see the reluctance on the part of some nations to subscribe to a treaty now being perfected, having to do with hijacking in the air throughout the world, and the return of those who engage in those practices.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks that have been made, but I also say, as the gentleman from New York said, that words are rather meaningless unless they are followed through with concrete action.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13089, ACCELERATED REFORESTATION OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13089) to provide for acceleration of programs for the planting of trees on national forest lands in need of reforestation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 14, 1972.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), the author of the legislation, for the purpose of explaining the action of the conferees.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House on May 3 of this year by a vote of 371 to 5, it was designed to establish a supplemental national reforestation fund. It did that by earmarking a portion of the \$65 to \$75 million of funds collected on import duties pursuant to section 32 of the act passed August 24, 1935. There is a great deal of discussion about the proper methods of forest management in the United States, but both Houses of the Congress know that if we do not plant trees to harvest in the future there will be none to harvest and therefore this reforestation is important. We are about 5 million acres behind in reforestation. We have additional millions of acres on which trees were never planted.

When the other body passed the bill unanimously, it amended by deleting all references to section 32 and calling for direct appropriation not to exceed \$65 million annually.

There are two points worth noting. First of all, although the other body did delete any reference to section 32, under the existing law the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies can transfer funds from section 32 to other appropriations processes, and therefore it is still possible that section 32 funds can be transferred for reforestation.

The \$65 million figure is realistic. The Forest Service can utilize that much money in trying to catch up and keep up with the reforestation problems. The House conferees receded. The conferees of both bodies insisted, in total agreement, that if we did not get adequate funding through this process, we would return again to some earmarking program so that we can move forward the programs which are deemed absolutely essential.

I recommend that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take extensive time but I do wish to point out, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Iowa, that it was the position of the conferees that they would like to have a reasonable time for the appropriation process to be permitted to function in an effort to provide adequate funds for the reforestation which this bill seeks to accomplish.

I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the conference report which indicates that the conferees have agreed to this conventional appropriation process with the clear understanding that this approach should first be tried for a reasonable period of time,

and if the evidence indicates that the high priority needed for reforestation effort is not being made, a search for more direct financing methods will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13089, legislation designed to set up a fund to promote reforestation in our National Forest System. I am a cosponsor of this legislation.

That reforestation is needed in our national forest system is evidenced by the fact that forestry experts estimate that our country is about 5 million acres behind in tree seeding and planting in our national forests.

Something should be done expeditiously to correct this situation, because the trees of our national forests are a valuable natural resource, serving many purposes. Some of these trees will lend a beauty to our American landscape, while others will make a wonderful contribution to the lumber supply that is vital to various phases of our construction industry.

H.R. 13089 is unique in that it would promote a sustained-yield forest management program. This would have the effect of gradually taking up the slack in our lax tree seeding and planting program of the present and establishing a dynamic program of reforestation that will keep us current and in tune with our needs of the future.

The legislation before us would implement a dynamic reforestation program by setting up a Supplemental National Forest Reforestation Fund. This fund would be supported through money which is now made available to carry out various programs popularly referred to as section 32 programs; that is, programs designed to encourage the exportation, consumption, and diversion of agricultural commodities. Funds obtained from imports serve as a guideline for money applied to these activities. In the case of the Supplemental National Forest Reforestation Fund, the amount of money directed to this fund would be equal to the gross receipts from duties under our custom laws on wood and paper and printed matter.

The approach used in H.R. 13089 for raising funds for reforestation is, I feel, superior to various other fund-raising approaches, for most of these are based on a base of timber sales, which involves timber cutting. H.R. 13089, however, gets away from the concept of stimulating the cutting of timber to obtain funds for reforestation practices and, in the process, encourages uniform rather than accelerated timber cutting.

The legislation also contains the beneficial feature of requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Congress with respect to the "scope of the total national forest reforestation needs, and a planned program for reforesting such lands, including a description of the extent to which funds authorized by this act are to be applied to the program." This would have the effect of providing the Congress with an accurate perspec-

tive on the needs for reforestation in our national forest system, along with keeping the funds generated by H.R. 13089 properly oriented in the reforestation program.

H.R. 13089 is constructive legislation. It deserves your support.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the passage of this legislation in the House on May 3. I feel I must oppose the passage of this conference report.

The bill, as it originally passed the House of Representatives, provided between \$65 and \$75 million per year for reforestation of national forest lands. This money was to have been supplied out of the section 32 funds, a provision which I objected to since there are several vital child feeding programs dependent on section 32 funds which, at the present time, are not being adequately funded. The conference committee dropped this provision, and now the money will be supplied out of direct appropriations.

I still object to this bill. It is a complete subsidy of the timber industry at taxpayer expense. It provides \$65 million in the first year for timber replanting to repair the mistakes and failures of the timber industry to properly reforest cut-over lands. Why should the taxpayers of America pay to restore forests which were cut and ravaged to provide easy profits for the lumber industry. Reforestation should be a contractual liability of those who cut and spoil forest lands. This bill simply bails out the giant timber companies and saves them from the expense of attempting to restore the lands they cut.

On August 26, I received a very vivid description of the clear-cutting and logging practices which the Forest Service is permitting on some Western forests. Mrs. Virginia Aveni of Lyndhurst, Ohio, in my congressional district described some of the logging practices which she saw on her recent vacation to the Teton Forest area:

AUGUST 24, 1972.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: I hesitated to break into my vacation by driving down the road, only a mile or two away, from our house to look at the clearcutting on Teton Forest, but as the logging trucks were rolling past the house almost daily during the week, I finally broke down and drove up the Mosquito Creek logging road to survey the scene.

On two occasions we followed two roads about fourteen or fifteen miles (six or seven miles on each road) and saw about a dozen swaths which have been cut in the last three or four years. There was no replanting in evidence on any of these areas, those freshly cut or several years old.

A local lumberman told us that thousands of seedling pines had been bought (perhaps raised) in Idaho by the Forest Service, transplanted in the early spring when the snow was still deep at an elevation five thousand feet higher and naturally colder (the sap would have been flowing in the seedlings, of course), and consequently most of them had died! At any rate, we didn't even find them, though we were told we had driven past the transplanted area . . . and let me add that one does not drive over 15 or 20 miles an hour on those roads.

The Mosquito Creek area has steep slopes, thin topsoil, and I'd say a significant amount

of that is ending up in the creek and the Snake River in the spring. Isn't protection of the water shed part of the Forest Service's charge? Who is recording the run-off?

Another area I observed is the Brooks Lake section of Shoshone Forest. A clear-cut strip from perhaps 100 feet to 300 feet wide and at least three miles long (we followed it that far on road and by foot before turning around) showed the same damage to an adjacent stream.

These are the only two forests, and relatively small areas at that, which we saw. My neighbor, however, hiked in the Targhee Forest west of the Tetons and returned one afternoon to tell me it was the worst area "aesthetically" she had seen. She told me that they seemed to be cutting "at a terrific rate."

A local geologist . . . described an area in the Wind River Indian Reservation where one can drive for half a day through a clear-cut.

The type of massive clear cutting described in this letter should not be permitted in the first place—and in the second place, the public should not be made to pay for the corrective reforestation. Some may say that this bill is a "conservation measure." It has a conservation effect—but the wrong persons are paying the cost. I am in favor of reforestation; I am for a ban on further clear cutting—but I am also in favor of having those who are responsible for this massive damage to our public lands pay for the repair of that damage.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express once again my strong support for the creation of a positive and effective means to finance the reforestation requirements of our national forests.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation with its prime mover, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL). We have worked closely with other of our colleagues who are interested in and knowledgeable about the national reforestation problem.

While I must confess to having mixed feelings about the fact that we were unable to obtain the precise method of financing the accelerated reforestation program that was included in our original bill, I do consider this legislation a vital and significant step forward and, most importantly, formal congressional recognition of the need to increase the speed of our reforestation efforts.

Modern, scientific tree management practices can insure trees forever in a way that combines the utilization of forest products with recreational esthetic and ecological enhancement. However, foresighted management requires adequate funding support. The National Accelerated Reforestation Act can provide that funding level even though we face a 10-million acre backlog.

The benefits to be gained from a major reforestation program are great while the costs are relatively small. We must make this investment and the sooner, the better.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 303, nays 1, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

YEAS—303

Abbitt	Downing	Kazen
Abzug	Drinan	Keating
Adams	Dulski	Kee
Anderson,	Duncan	Kemp
Calif.	du Pont	King
Anderson, Ill.	Edmondson	Kluczynski
Anderson,	Edwards, Ala.	Koch
Tenn.	Edwards, Calif.	Kuykendall
Andrews, Ala.	Ellberg	Kyl
Andrews,	Erlenborn	Landgrebe
N. Dak.	Esch	Landrum
Annunzio	Evans, Colo.	Latta
Archer	Fascell	Lennon
Ashbrook	Findley	Lent
Aspin	Fish	Link
Barrett	Fisher	Long, Md.
Begich	Flood	McClary
Beicher	Flowers	McCloskey
Bell	Flynt	McClure
Bennett	Foley	McCollister
Bergland	Ford, Gerald R.	McCulloch
Bevill	Ford,	McDade
Blaggi	William D.	McDonald,
Blackburn	Forsythe	Mich.
Boggs	Fountain	McFall
Bow	Fraser	McKay
Brademas	Frelinghuysen	McKevitt
Brasco	Frenzel	Madden
Brinkley	Freyl	Mahon
Brooks	Fulton	Mallary
Broomfield	Garmatz	Mann
Brotzman	Gaydos	Martin
Brown, Mich.	Gettys	Mathis, Ga.
Brown, Ohio	Gialmo	Matsunaga
Broyhill, N.C.	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Broyhill, Va.	Goldwater	Meeds
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Melcher
Burke, Fla.	Goodling	Metcalfe
Burke, Mass.	Grasso	Miller, Ohio
Burleson, Tex.	Gray	Mills, Md.
Burlison, Mo.	Green, Oreg.	Minish
Burton	Griffin	Minshall
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	Mitchell
Byron	Gross	Mizell
Cabell	Grover	Monagan
Carey, N.Y.	Gubser	Montgomery
Carlson	Gude	Morgan
Carter	Hagan	Murphy, Ill.
Casey, Tex.	Hailey	Myers
Cederberg	Hall	Natcher
Chamberlain	Hamilton	Nedzi
Chappell	Hammer-	Nelsen
Clancy	schmidt	Nix
Clark	Hanley	O'Hara
Clausen,	Hanna	O'Konski
Don H.	Hansen, Idaho	O'Neill
Clawson, Del	Harrington	Passman
Clay	Harsha	Patman
Cleveland	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Collier	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins
Collins, Ill.	Heinz	Pettis
Collins, Tex.	Helstoski	Peyser
Conable	Hicks, Mass.	Pickle
Conte	Hicks, Wash.	Pike
Conyers	Hillis	Poage
Cotter	Hogan	Podell
Coughlin	Hollifield	Powell
Crane	Hosmer	Preyer, N.C.
Culver	Howard	Price, Tex.
Curlin	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Daniel, Va.	Hunt	Purcell
Daniels, N.J.	Hutchinson	Quie
de la Garza	Ichord	Quillen
Dellenback	Jacobs	Railsback
Denholm	Jarman	Randall
Dennis	Johnson, Calif.	Rangel
Derwinski	Johnson, Pa.	Rarick
Devine	Jonas	Rees
Diggs	Jones, N.C.	Rhodes
Donohue	Karth	Roberts
Dow	Kastenmeier	Robinson, Va.

Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roussetot
Roy
Roybal
Ruth
St Germain
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.

Snyder
Staggers
Stanton,
J. William
Stanton,
James V.
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Terry
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vigorito

Waggonner
Waldie
Ware
Whalen
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wyllie
Wymann
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwack

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Dellums.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Abourezk.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Spence.

NAYS—1
Vanik
NOT VOTING—127

Abernethy
Abourezk
Addabbo
Alexander
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Badillo
Baker
Baring
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bray
Byrne, Pa.
Caffery
Camp
Carney
Celler
Chisholm
Conover
Corman
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellums
Dent
Dickinson
Dingell
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Fuqua

Gallifanakis
Gallagher
Green, Pa.
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Horton
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Tenn.
Keith
Kyros
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, La.
Lujan
McCormack
McEwen
McKinney
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
Mailliard
Mathias, Calif.
Mayne
Michel
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills, Ark.
Mink
Mollohan
Moorhead
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nichols
Obey

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Carney with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. White with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Gallifanakis.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Runnels.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Caffery.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Dowdy.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE
SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of the clerks, 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. 12350) entitled "An act to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes."

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I entered the chamber just after the conclusion of the last rollcall.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Floyd.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Conover.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Robison of New York.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Reid with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Had I been present to answer my name, I would have voted "yea."

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12350, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMEND- MENTS OF 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12350) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 18, 1972.)

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 12350, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972. This report has but one principal purpose, and that is to extend for an additional 3 years, until June 30, 1975, the basic provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act passed in 1964.

This is the fourth occasion that I have brought a conference report on economic opportunity legislation before you since becoming chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I ask myself, in the words of the old World War II slogan, "Is this trip necessary?"

This particular trip is necessary because the President on last December 9 vetoed the bill approved by the House in 1971. So we had to start the proceedings all over again this year.

The Committee on Education and Labor reported its bill on February 1, and on February 17, it was approved by the House by a vote of 234 to 127.

The conference report before us today authorizes the appropriation of \$2,359,300,000 for fiscal 1973, and \$2,448,000,000 for fiscal 1974, to carry out the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Subsequent to the President's veto of S. 2007 last December, both the House and Senate made an honest effort to meet his objections.

In his words:

The most deeply flawed provision of this legislation is Title V, Child Development Programs.

We have met that objection, Mr. Speaker, by eliminating this section entirely. To make it perfectly clear, I will say again, there is no new child development program in the conference report before us today.

The President objected to the legisla-

tion passed last fall on the ground that it took away his flexibility to delegate OEO programs to other departments, and prevented him from spinning off successful and continuing programs to the service agencies.

The conference report contains no prohibition on the President's spinoff authority, and the conferees consider that objection as fully satisfied.

The veto message listed two objections to the title of the 1971 act dealing with the Legal Services Corporation. The conference report deletes the entire title, and provides for no change in the existing structure of the Legal Services program.

Mr. Speaker, these were the principal objections stated by the President in his December 10 veto message. More than half of that message dealt with the Child Development title which is no longer in the legislation.

I personally feel that the conference report is good legislation. And, if it does not go as far as I would like to have gone in some programs—the Job Corps and Headstart for instance—I recognize the need for accommodation and compromise in the legislative process.

The Senate and House conferees met in full and free discussion, and this report represents an earnest effort to reach agreement. It is a fair and reasonable agreement, and I unreservedly commend it to you.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that it seems no longer required that we come before the House to defend the philosophy and the concept of the Economic Opportunity Act. Congress and the Nation have accepted it as just and right. Eight years ago, this was a near-revolutionary piece of legislation, dedicated to the proposition that, with a little help, poor people would work themselves out of poverty. The prime requirement was that the door of opportunity be opened.

Congress has tried to open the door. Unfortunately, the tide of inflation and demands for war spending have countered our efforts in many instances. We simply have not been able to make the kind of spending effort necessary to accomplish the job fully. We still have a long way to go.

Only last month, on July 12, the Bureau of the Census confirmed this unhappy fact. The Bureau reported that the number of Americans in poverty remained essentially unchanged last year.

The number rose in 1970 for the first time in a decade. It had fallen every year from 1961 through 1969.

The Bureau reported that 25.6 million Americans were below the poverty level in March of 1971. The number was 25.4 million a year earlier. Naturally these figures are estimates, and are based on samplings of the population. The poverty level last year was established at an income level of \$4,137 for a nonfarm family of four.

These are, of course, shameful figures. No one can take comfort or satisfaction from having 25.6 million of his fellow Americans in poverty. But in 1960, there were 39.8 million below the poverty threshold. We apparently have done something right, somewhere, even if it has not been enough.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to mention only a few of the ongoing programs dealt with by the conference report. I spoke at some length about the OEO programs last February when the bill was before the House. I do, however, want to comment on some of the major ones.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR PROGRAMS

To carry out the work and training programs created by title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, the conference agreement authorizes the appropriation of \$900 million for fiscal 1973 and \$950 million for fiscal 1974.

These funds provide for the continued operation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, a universally popular program.

It also provides funds for the continued operation of the Job Corps—an agency whose downgrading by the Department of Labor I genuinely deplore.

Granted, there were some faults in the original Jobs Corps organization, but by 1969 we had most of them worked out and were beginning to see some real dividends from the program. Centers at Camp Breckinridge in Kentucky and the Gary Center in San Marcos, Tex., are outstanding. Just at that point, an ill-advised decision was made to transfer the Jobs Corps operation to the Department of Labor, and to reduce drastically its scope. The administration fumed and complained about the cost per enrollee, and said it could do better with some little shirttail operations called mini-centers. I don't know how many of those mini-centers they have in operation right now—the last figure I saw indicated something like 23,000 enrollees. But I doubt we are even approaching the 35,000 trainees we once had in the Job Corps before the hatchet work began. Some cost studies I have seen indicate that the mini-centers are even more expensive than the old Job Corps, which looks better all the time.

In a contract study undertaken earlier this year by the Institute of Naval Studies, Center for Naval Analysis, these findings were reported:

The New Job Corps Centers established after the program redirection of 1969 appear to have higher cost per man month than the previously established centers. The cost differential is due to a large extent to the high costs of off-site training and basic education. In addition to the higher costs, the new centers are at best as effective as the older centers.

The study went on to say that the length of time an enrollee remains on the job appears to bear a strong positive relationship to job placement, wage rates and relocation of trainees outside of their original community. You will remember that a sharply reduced training period was one of the features of the redirected mini-center program.

The report stated:

Given the importance of the length of time an individual stays in the program, it is significant that the proportion of individuals who complete the Job Corps program has declined sharply between FY 1968 and FY 1972. In addition, the new centers have the lowest completion rates of all center types.

These Department of Labor programs also include mainstream and the concentrated employment program. Both of these have been of great benefit to many

sections of the country, and deserve continuance.

There is ample testimony in the files and in hearings on the worth of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It has performed well for youngsters in the in-school, out-of-school, and summer programs. The broadening of this program contemplated by the conference report is well deserved, and I know the House is in agreement.

HEADSTART

Probably the most significant expansion in funding in this conference report is that involving Headstart, which is surely one of the most popular programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government.

At the time the House acted on the Economic Opportunity legislation last winter, the best estimate we could find was that approximately 1.6 million children were then in need of Headstart services. There is no evidence that the number has decreased today. We are going on the assumption that we are now serving only 1 in 5 of these children. Because of this, the conference report recommends the authorization for Headstart be increased to \$485,000,000 for fiscal 1973, and \$500,000,000 for fiscal 1974.

FOLLOW THROUGH

To make sure there is a continuity of the learning process produced by Headstart, the conference report also recommends broadening Follow Through, with the authorization being set at \$100,000,000 for each of the next 2 fiscal years.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

To fund the programs being carried out by the OEO itself, the conference report recommends the expenditure of \$840,000,000 for fiscal 1973 and \$870,000,000 for fiscal 1974.

Of this total, \$328,900,000 is set aside for local initiative for each of the next 2 fiscal years. This is to cover the operations of the community action agencies. Another \$71,500,000 annually for

the legal services program is included in that total figure.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH

In my opinion, some of the most effective work in the entire antipoverty programs has been done in the field of health care. Poverty is hard enough to bear. But poverty complicated by illness is much worse. With this in mind, the conference agreed to a \$100,000,000 authorization for both fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974.

EMERGENCY FOOD

It has been demonstrated that, even with all of our various feeding programs, we still are not reaching all of the people who need help. The \$23,500,000 appropriation for fiscal 1972 just was not getting the job done. There was not enough to go around. And the administrations fiscal 1973 request for \$3,500,000 was totally unrealistic in view of the need. For this reason, the conferees agreed that \$30,000,000 should be spent annually for emergency feeding programs undertaken by the OEO.

SOS

A program called senior opportunities and services has been especially beneficial among the elderly poor of this country. This is a group all too often forgotten in a youth-oriented society. The conferees recommend spending at the \$8,800,000 level for the next 2 years, recognizing that this is but a token operation in comparison to the work to be done in this area.

ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION

The conference report does contain the new program which the House bill proposed last year—a program in the field of environmental action. This is a special emphasis program, providing for payment to low-income people to work on projects designed to combat pollution and to clean up a rapidly degenerating physical environment in America.

I feel the poor can be usefully employed in removing solid wastes, in

clearing streams, in carting away all of the unsightly old automobile bodies that choke the roadways and creeks in many places. They can work on projects designed to upgrade the water supplies and improve the processing of sewage. They can plant trees, improve our parks, and help reclaim lands which have sustained ecological damage from mining operations and other forms of man-generated or natural destruction. The conference report recommends a modest \$5 million for this new program.

RURAL HOUSING

I am happy to say that the conference report retains the new program of rural housing which the House bill initiated last year. The recommended authorization is \$15 million for fiscal 1973, and \$20 million for fiscal 1974.

This program could fill a genuine need among the isolated and the poverty bound of the Nation. I know the House agrees.

These, Mr. Speaker, are but a few of the major programs involved in this conference. Members have had an opportunity to study the report, and to see what we have done.

Eight years ago, Congress committed itself to a plan to eliminate poverty for those who want to improve their lot through their own efforts. It has sometimes seemed that we have had to run very fast indeed—as Alice in Wonderland said—to keep from standing still.

We all know that there is much suffering in the land that is keyed directly to poverty. We all want to do something about it. This is simply one more opportunity for us to act.

If we continue to tolerate poverty and the status quo in America, we must know that we shall have to pay a price. The cost of the economic opportunity program is insignificant alongside the long-range cost of maintaining poverty.

I include the following:

[In millions]

	1972 approp- riation	1973 budget request	1973 con- ference report	1974 con- ference report		1972 approp- riation	1973 budget request	1973 con- ference report	1974 con- ference report
Department of Labor programs.....	\$802.9	\$900.3	\$900.3	\$950.0	Environmental action.....			(\$5.0)	(\$5.0)
Headstart.....	376.3	393.6	485.0	500.0	Rural housing.....			(15.0)	(15.0)
Follow Through.....	60.1	57.7	70.0	70.0	Consumer action.....			(7.5)	(7.5)
ACTION.....	37.0	56.4	58.0	58.0	Design and planning.....			(10.0)	(10.0)
OEO total.....	724.6	760.2	840.0	870.0	Youth recreation and sports.....	(33.0)		(4.5)	(4.5)
Local initiative.....	(298.6)	(333.6)	(328.9)	(328.9)	T. and T.A., SEOO, R. & D.....	(74.6)	(\$123.3)	(109.6)	(109.6)
Legal services.....	(61.9)	(71.5)	(71.5)	(71.5)	Title III.....	(36.1)	(36.0)	(36.0)	(36.0)
Comprehensive health.....	(107.6)	(95.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	Titles VI and X.....	(18.5)	(20.6)	(18.0)	(18.0)
Emergency food.....	(23.6)	(3.5)	(30.0)	(30.0)	Title VII.....	(26.8)	(30.7)	(40.0)	(40.0)
Family planning.....	(24.0)	(15.0)	(20.0)	(20.0)	Other.....	(22.0)			
SOS.....	(8.0)	(8.0)	(8.0)	(8.0)	Add-ons: Title VIII (VISTA).....			16.0	
Alcoholic counseling.....	(1.9)		(18.0)	(18.0)					
Drug rehabilitation.....	(18.0)	(23.0)	(18.0)	(18.0)	Total.....	2,003.7	2,168.2	2,359.3	2,448.0

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I note that there is an appropriation for family planning of \$20 million. The law still holds that this money cannot be used to promote abortions as pertaining to family planning; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to my distinguished colleague,

the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH) that I personally have never been much impressed with the family planning program, but it is in the bill, and it has been in the legislation for several years. The conferees and the minority members supported this provision to a greater extent I think than did the chairman of the committee, but nevertheless it is in here. I am not well versed in this field, but a majority of the Congress felt it worth while when they enacted the legislation. And the Nixon ad-

ministration recommended \$15,000,000 for it in this fiscal year.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say that I am not here advocating abortions, or anything of that kind. And this legislation was never intended to be useful in promoting abortions. I do not believe in that philosophy.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the committee will recall, when we had the OEO bill before us in the House I joined with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) to try to get the committee on both sides of the aisle to accept an amendment for the aging which we felt was most worthwhile.

We proceeded to offer our amendment upon the assumption that it is bad enough to be poor and then a little worse to be old and also poor but the very worst combination is to be old and poor, and add to that the isolation that comes from living in a rural area. The gentleman from Kentucky may recall that the amendment added \$50 million, which divided equally would be only about \$1 million per State for projects for the elderly poor in rural areas. This was the first time some pinpointed assistance had been directed to these most worthy recipients.

We are advised that the other body continued to carry this \$50 million for these special programs, and yet if I recall the wording of the conference report correctly—and I do not have it before me—that the words “elderly” or “senior citizens” or “older Americans,” as the Older American Act calls our “senior citizens,” has been stricken from the conference report and the only reference is at page 9 of the report which permits the Director to provide assistance for projects to assist older persons.

We understand that the conferees agreed on the merit of these special programs for our older persons. But I am asking the chairman at this time if that paragraph on page 9 in the report has reference to the Scheuer and Randall amendment? Is this the paragraph which survived the conference—after both bodies had their own separate amendment to provide special projects for the aging?

Mr. PERKINS. It is my understanding that it does have reference to the authorization. In behalf of the older Americans, I certainly agree with the gentleman from Missouri that the Congress has not done enough for older Americans, and we should have done much more in this conference report.

But there was a tendency to cut back on all authorizations and this is one area where we should not have cut back. We gave the administration flexibility, however, as to where they can make an expenditure for the older Americans if it so desires. It is left entirely to the administration—to the people who administer the programs.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further—the intent of this body was there—the legislative history was written at the time the OEO authorization passed the House. If it was the intent of the other body that \$50 million be earmarked for the elderly then regardless of the paragraph on page 9 of the report no matter how it is worded then it remains the legislative intent of both bodies of the Congress that special assistance programs means programs for older persons who may or may not reside in low-income areas and who are not served by other programs?

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me mention the comprehensive health program. We have had some of the most effective work in the entire antipoverty programs in the field of health care. With this in mind, the conference agreed to the \$100 million authorization for both the fiscal year 1973 and the fiscal year 1974, and hope this will allow for the expansion of these valuable programs.

In further answer to the gentleman from Missouri, the program called “the senior opportunities and service program” has been especially beneficial among the elderly poor of this country. This is a group that is all too often forgotten in a youth oriented society. The conferees recommended spending at the \$3,800,000 level for the next 2 years, recognizing that this is but a token operation in comparison to the work to be done in this area.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDALL. Is the so-called SOS program specifically funded at the amount of \$8 million, what has long been known as the Senior Opportunities Services?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman and may I be permitted to add that in our congressional district these SOS programs have been of great benefit to our older citizens.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, we should have provided more money for these programs, but there was a tendency to do a lot of penny-pinching on the part of the conferees to make sure that we got a conference report. That was the reason that many of these programs have been cut to the bone. It is the best we could do with the view that we may be able to obtain a conference report and make it veto-proof.

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

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, we have had some questions on section 19 of the bill, which provides that there shall not be lower standards set on the day-care programs than were established in the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, on August 31, I received the following letter from the Secretary of HEW Richardson regarding section 19 of the legislation we are considering here today:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 31, 1972.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I understand that Section 19 of the proposed Economic Opportunity Act Amendments would require that the 1968 Federal Day Care Requirements be minimum requirements. The 1968 Requirements have made an appreciable contribution toward the development of quality child care. However, I believe that comprehensive review and revision of the requirements is now in order for a number of reasons. As you may know the Department, in conjunction with parent groups and child care specialists within and

outside government, is currently undertaking such an effort.

The 1963 FDCR were designed primarily for care delivered in day care centers. However, the bulk of all day care today continues to be delivered in a child's own residence or in a small family day care home. The proposed revised standards recognizes the special features of all three major day care settings (centers, family day care homes, and in-home care) and define specific requirements for each to ensure quality care regardless of setting.

One major weakness of the 1968 Requirements has been the difficulty of ascertaining compliance with the standards. The specific standards are frequently imprecise and hard to measure. The proposed revision of the Requirements would not eliminate all of these difficulties, but the new version would increase significantly the Federal Government's ability to effectively measure and enforce the standards. For example:

Definitions have been clarified and made more precise.

Each Federal requirement is accompanied by one or more measurable criteria for evidence of satisfactory compliance.

The components of safe, healthy, and developmental care have been changed, where possible, from general pronouncements of intent to specific criteria.

The revised standards are designed to reflect Federal experience with day care since 1968. For example, on the key issue of staff/child ratios, the 1968 ratios measured the number of adults per child, whether or not the adults were qualified caregivers and regardless of whether or not they provided care to the children. Thus secretaries, bus drivers, and custodians could be included. Based on our experience since 1968, there is general agreement among child development specialists that the ratios are more appropriate when defined in terms of the actual hours of qualified care provided per child, rather than an arbitrary number of adults present in the facility. We therefore would not want Section 19 to limit our flexibility in dealing with this problem.

Thus our primary concern over the interpretation of Section 19 arises in instances in which a quantitative measure in the 1968 requirements may be lowered in a revised version but would not in any way endanger the quality of care involved. Because we expect revised standards to improve the clarity, enforceability, and specificity of the 1968 requirements, no lowering in quality of care would occur. We would like, therefore, through a colloquy on the House floor, to make it quite clear that designation of the 1968 requirements as minimum requirements does not mean that every revised standard must be as stringent in quantitative measure. Rather the object of designating the 1968 requirements as minimum is to maintain quality.

I believe that our revised standards will represent a significant improvement over the 1968 version—an improvement that will increase both the quality and the quantity of Federal day care programs.

I therefore urge you to utilize the enclosed colloquy to insure a degree of flexibility in the revision of the 1968 standards.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the request from Secretary Richardson, and because it was not the intention of the House through this provision to tie the hands of HEW; for the purpose of establishing legislative history, I would like to ask the Chairman of the Full Committee a question. As you know, experience with the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements over the past several years has shown that in some cases the meas-

urement or standard which was promulgated at that time has not really helped to insure the proper quality of care. In many instances, the standard has proven too vague for effective enforcement. In other cases, compliance with the quantitative measure which was chosen has not necessarily resulted in the high quality of care which that measure was intended to foster. As a result of the experience gained since 1968, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is now in the process of reconsidering the 1968 standards, and the expectation is that several of them will need revising in light of that experience. Since we in the Congress recognize that standards must be readjusted over time to respond to changing needs in the rapidly developing field of early childhood, and in considering amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, we felt it important to include in those amendments a provision, which was written into section 19, insuring that any new standards would maintain at least the level of quality prescribed by the 1968 standards. My question to the gentleman concerns the possible flexibility which HEW and OEO may have to revise the standards. Would this provision prohibit the revision of any standard which has been found to be an ineffective or imprecise measurement of the quality of care or conditions of a day care center?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my distinguished colleague, this is designed to give the administration considerable flexibility.

Section 19 of H.R. 12350 requires that any future standards which are adopted by HEW and OEO be no less comprehensive than the 1968 standards. According to the House committee report, this means that the 1968 standards are minimum standards. But the committee did not intend section 19 arbitrarily to prohibit changes and modifications designed to clarify the 1968 standards or to improve their ease of applicability and enforceability. If a particular standard or quantitative measurement in the 1968 requirements was ill-conceived or has been ineffective in meeting its purpose, another approach should be developed. However, there can be no changing of requirements which would have the effect of lowering the quality of care which would be permissible under Federal standards.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am specifically concerned about Secretary Richardson's intentions, as expressed

in his letter, with respect to child-staff ratios. While we certainly do not intend that bus drivers, secretaries, and custodians be counted as staff and would welcome clarifications in that regard, the majority conferees would view any reduction in the child-staff ratios contained in the 1968 agreement as lowering the quality of care.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the able chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this is another provision in the OEO conference report that I would also like to highlight at this time, because I feel that it is a very significant and meaningful step forward in our dealing with the handicapped children of this Nation. The conference report contains the following new section:

(2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish policies and procedures designed to assure that not less than 10 percentum of the total number of enrollment opportunities in the Nation in the Headstart program shall be available for handicapped children (as defined in paragraph (1) of section 602 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended) and that services shall be provided to meet their special needs. The Secretary shall implement his responsibilities under this paragraph in such a manner as not to exclude from any project any child who was participating in the program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the status of handicapped children in Headstart programs, including the number of children being served, their handicapping conditions, and the services being provided such children.

This section, although part of the Senate bill, represents a culmination of years of activity and interest in behalf of many Members of Congress in both the House and Senate and it reflects our concern that the handicapped be afforded every opportunity that every other citizen is entitled to. This provision is particularly significant in that it is the first time the Congress has directed that opportunities be extended to handicapped individuals as part of regular Headstart programs. It has long been my feeling that although some handicapped children need special services, many severely handicapped youngsters with minimum accommodations and a maximum of understanding can fit into regular programs for normal children.

I want to emphasize that this provision means handicapped under the Federal definition as defined in paragraph 1 of section 602 of the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act and not merely individuals who have "handicapping conditions." Throughout the existence of the Headstart program, through its medical component, it has found thousands and thousands of children who have handicapping conditions such as visual problems which require eyeglasses or children with a slight hearing loss speech disorders, or emotional problems. These children have been served under the Headstart programs and will and rightly should continue to be served under this program. It is now hoped that as a result of this amendment that Headstart will serve children who are totally blind, totally deaf, and severely physically and mentally handicapped.

It has been said for years that a child who is poor is handicapped. I would add to that that a child who is poor and also severely handicapped is doubly handicapped and there can be no greater service than to help these youngsters to truly gain a headstart, giving them the opportunity to participate, to grow, and hopefully, benefit through this program.

I think it is important to emphasize the provision which specifies that children who participated in the program last year will not be excluded from participation in the program this year if they are still qualified for enrollment. Since Headstart normally enrolls 4- and 5-year-olds, and there is a general turnover of about 50 percent each year, I can anticipate no problems in meeting the requirements of this section as new enrollment opportunities in programs throughout the Nation open up. It is my hope that Headstart programs throughout the country will actively work with community based organizations for the handicapped as well as schools, universities, and agencies serving the handicapped in every State in an effort to identify, recruit, and assist in helping to place handicapped children in local Headstart programs. I can see no circumstances under which a handicapped child should be denied entrance to a Headstart program if he is qualified and his parents want him to participate.

So that my colleagues can understand the scope of this amendment and how it affects each State, I am inserting at this point in the Record a chart produced by the Office of Child Development for Project Headstart showing the new obligatory authorities, the number of children, the number of grants, and the number of centers in each State for fiscal years 1971, 1972 and a projected estimate for fiscal 1973:

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT HEADSTART PROGRAM—STATE WORKSHEETS

Name of State	Fiscal year 1971				Fiscal year 1972				Fiscal year 1973 estimate			
	NOA	Number of children	Number of grants	Number of centers	NOA	Number of children	Number of grants	Number of centers	NOA	Number of children	Number of grants	Number of centers
Alabama	9,650,812	13,002	33	240	9,891,480	13,632	32	214	10,249,526	13,500	31	214
Alaska	1,357,571	1,091	3	41	1,413,668	1,580	3	45	1,460,235	1,500	3	44
Arizona	2,403,534	3,562	4	68	2,478,260	2,571	4	59	2,565,022	2,500	6	55
Arkansas	4,755,259	7,003	22	203	5,174,429	7,510	22	193	5,365,061	7,400	22	193
California	24,344,519	19,175	38	672	25,595,743	15,466	40	626	26,486,843	15,400	43	626
Colorado	4,402,596	5,115	23	142	5,136,386	5,088	26	196	5,300,265	5,000	23	196
Connecticut	2,184,146	3,246	13	95	2,159,737	2,728	13	85	2,240,389	2,500	13	85
Delaware	967,288	1,283	5	35	1,001,186	888	3	17	1,039,068	800	3	17
District of Columbia	4,201,441	2,010	3	65	3,718,340	3,729	2	99	3,850,447	2,600	2	99
Florida	11,929,130	14,213	39	285	12,312,342	14,171	37	215	12,752,293	12,400	36	215
Georgia	6,344,679	11,168	34	196	6,938,730	12,306	30	178	7,369,286	10,400	30	178
Guam ¹												

¹ Included in Pacific trust territories.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT HEADSTART PROGRAM—STATE WORKSHEETS—Continued

Name of State	Fiscal year 1971				Fiscal year 1972				Fiscal year 1973 estimate			
	NOA	Number of children	Number of grants	Number of centers	NOA	Number of children	Number of grants	Number of centers	NOA	Number of children	Number of grants	Number of centers
Hawaii.....	2,303,908	1,100	4	69	1,916,332	1,178	3	43	1,971,229	1,100	4	43
Idaho.....	1,377,867	1,264	10	30	958,460	1,194	9	30	992,676	1,100	9	30
Illinois.....	13,443,645	15,332	47	408	14,714,852	15,802	45	390	15,244,240	15,800	46	390
Indiana.....	4,903,858	6,541	32	221	5,647,789	7,254	29	233	5,854,307	7,300	28	233
Iowa.....	2,952,152	3,515	26	129	3,108,671	4,090	21	85	3,222,317	4,000	21	85
Kansas.....	3,804,944	2,223	17	50	2,947,709	2,454	18	57	3,055,245	2,800	18	57
Kentucky.....	9,447,495	18,701	62	520	8,957,406	17,543	56	104	9,277,701	16,600	58	104
Louisiana.....	8,162,138	10,727	30	194	8,574,660	11,586	30	94	8,891,158	11,300	28	94
Maine.....	1,665,432	1,851	19	72	1,777,972	2,015	17	75	1,813,960	2,000	16	75
Maryland.....	3,885,370	4,360	19	142	3,820,671	4,144	21	129	3,885,716	4,200	19	129
Massachusetts.....	6,781,321	6,496	33	184	6,986,667	6,186	32	173	7,243,418	6,200	31	173
Michigan.....	7,273,368	9,914	44	352	7,821,851	10,241	41	317	8,104,264	10,300	42	317
Minnesota.....	3,672,624	5,888	35	228	4,027,097	6,204	29	199	4,170,202	6,200	29	199
Mississippi.....	35,040,296	31,213	28	497	34,394,282	31,010	27	470	35,628,482	31,600	27	470
Missouri.....	8,424,877	8,443	19	319	8,760,736	9,315	16	257	8,797,527	8,500	18	257
Montana.....	1,164,349	1,102	12	32	1,352,239	1,802	11	42	1,561,405	1,900	9	42
Nebraska.....	1,790,314	3,040	15	78	1,803,622	2,872	13	64	1,850,189	2,100	15	64
Nevada.....	445,571	260	3	10	490,775	398	1	14	549,349	400	2	14
New Hampshire.....	861,034	945	7	21	913,268	948	6	26	930,316	700	6	26
New Jersey.....	8,464,145	8,714	31	226	8,805,746	7,533	28	217	2,116,265	7,200	27	217
New Mexico.....	2,399,737	3,981	21	92	2,610,010	4,517	18	94	2,706,548	4,500	18	94
New York.....	23,479,231	17,195	62	385	23,989,933	13,665	60	337	24,841,798	13,600	61	337
North Carolina.....	9,644,806	16,034	57	409	10,026,058	15,415	54	339	10,390,214	14,500	54	339
North Dakota.....	350,255	953	13	20	618,246	1,226	13	17	637,798	1,000	12	17
Ohio.....	10,499,359	14,544	52	531	11,391,525	14,951	49	466	11,799,960	14,900	50	466
Oklahoma.....	5,977,033	10,210	27	268	5,915,262	8,554	26	257	6,132,778	10,400	25	257
Oregon.....	1,486,696	1,908	18	70	2,286,070	1,880	17	59	2,364,409	1,800	17	59
Pacific trust territories.....	533,527	2,562	8	88	554,788	2,408	6	61	574,304	2,100	5	61
Pennsylvania.....	9,991,684	13,002	72	370	10,657,500	12,818	69	371	11,045,005	11,800	69	371
Puerto Rico.....	6,233,980	6,730	5	257	6,791,139	6,622	3	258	7,033,045	6,700	4	258
Rhode Island.....	936,526	1,280	9	30	97,462	1,658	10	32	1,025,344	1,500	9	32
South Carolina.....	6,029,189	10,563	26	142	6,277,101	8,948	22	141	6,504,393	8,800	22	141
South Dakota.....	715,278	974	9	40	661,859	435	7	34	680,320	1,000	7	34
Tennessee.....	7,156,350	11,742	38	309	8,234,810	11,273	34	279	8,524,686	12,600	26	279
Texas.....	15,689,894	22,069	91	464	15,898,044	20,548	88	422	16,478,625	21,300	89	422
Utah.....	1,241,367	2,156	12	55	1,412,464	2,038	10	46	1,571,678	1,500	9	46
Vermont.....	818,368	896	8	39	1,026,818	995	5	35	1,071,165	800	5	35
Virgin Islands.....	710,030	640	3	13	723,056	780	1	13	749,940	800	1	13
Virginia.....	5,110,614	5,655	42	191	5,228,416	5,907	43	167	5,416,735	5,900	41	167
Washington.....	4,138,086	2,813	32	115	4,331,955	3,802	25	121	4,474,836	3,320	25	121
West Virginia.....	3,583,596	5,697	31	220	4,135,961	5,411	25	355	4,283,954	5,400	24	355
Wisconsin.....	3,882,952	4,473	33	168	4,339,826	5,372	28	157	4,495,161	5,400	27	157
Wyoming.....	476,675	845	7	22	590,958	1,492	7	21	610,510	1,400	5	21
Indians and migrants.....	10,673,000	11,495	62	327	12,214,000	11,136	83	432	12,669,000	12,300	84	432
Total.....	328,211,686	390,914	1,435	10,476	344,484,373	388,803	1,367	9,450	357,007,445	379,000	1,358	9,450

It is my hope that within the next year there will be 37,900 handicapped children participating with normal children in Headstart programs throughout the Nation. Further, I hope that the Office of Child Development will work closely with the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped so that their expertise and experience can be utilized to enrich not only the new handicapped students but the entire Headstart program.

In my years here in the Congress and in the State legislature I have come to know handicapped children and their parents. I have learned from them the terrible impact that being excluded from the benefits of our society has upon their self-identity. To open the door through legislation such as this is an important beginning but I call upon my colleagues and all those concerned about the handicapped throughout the Nation to actively work to make the intent of this law a reality for these children.

I would think all the Members could support this legislation. There were two very strong objections by the administration, I understand, to the conference report as we first agreed on it. One was with respect to the Legal Services Corporation. Rather than work out a Legal Services Corporation in the conference, as the chairman has indicated, we just dropped the Legal Services Corporation and we left the legal services exactly as it is in the present law. I still have a desire for a Legal Services Corporation and my own feeling is the administration wants it,

but we can bring such legislation up in the next Congress.

My own feeling is that there ought to be a separate corporation and that the issue of accountability be thoroughly considered. There was always a question as we considered the corporation legislation this time as to whether board members selection procedures in both the House- and Senate-passed bills would be free to vote their independent, personal feelings, or would be bound to reflect the views, interests, or official positions of their organizations. At best they would have been irrevocably bound by formal resolution.

The President, in my opinion, should be free to choose the most qualified persons available. Obviously, he should look to bar leadership both for advice and for talent, but in the final analysis be free to decide not to appoint an individual if he feels that that individual would bring unnecessary controversy to the board, inject partisan politics, or be antagonistic to legal services.

There was a difference of opinion on this issue and rather than get into that fight here I think we did the right thing by dropping it out of the conference report which was the right of conferees under the rules of the House.

Second, the authorization figures were much higher than the administration had asked for, and we cut those back to almost the administration's budget request; \$200 million over the budget rather than \$900 million per year. I think this

legislation gives OEO flexibility and I hope we can pass it so that the people in the OEO and all the Community Action agencies can know what the authorization is they are going to operate under for 2 years. During the last year they operated without an authorization and have been under an appropriation which presumed authorization.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say in response to the gentleman from Minnesota, we went way out in the majority party to meet the objections of the President. I personally witnessed while we were going on under the continuing resolution, that some of the better programs, such as the emergency food and medical care program, for instance, were being entirely phased out in certain sections of the country and we were not able to do anything about it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first conference report that I have failed to sign in the number of times I have been a conferee on bills before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, and this will be the first time that I will vote against the authorization for OEO contained in this conference report.

I do so as a symbol of my extreme displeasure at the manner in which both Houses of the Congress are being bludgeoned—and I use the word advisedly—bludgeoned by the White House

on this bill, and particularly with regard to the Legal Services Corporation which was in the original OEO bill.

I would like to take time to explain the history of that legislation and then leave it to history to determine who really killed the Legal Services Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, back in March—March 18, to be exact—of 1971, 100 Members of this body and of the other body introduced a bill, which was in the House H.R. 6361. We introduced the bill because it was our feeling that the legal services program in OEO, while one of the most successful of all the OEO programs, ought to be insulated from political pressure, but not isolated from the needs of the poor.

We recognized, and I believe anyone who has studied this legislation and the activity carried on under it recognized, that the legal services program is a controversial program.

By its very nature it is controversial. All the more reason to insulate it from political pressure if it is going to work correctly. So we set out to do this.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, to do this after the recommendation of the Ash Commission of President Nixon and after the recommendations of the American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, the Legal Aid Defenders Association, and every other recognized bar association in the United States.

At the time we introduced that bill the administration also had a bill introduced which created an independent Legal Services Corporation. These two bills varied in some respects, primarily in two.

First of all, there were, by the testimony of almost all of the experts who appeared before our committee, some very serious shortcomings in the administration bill insofar as there were many instances which would provide interference between the individual Legal Services Corporation lawyers and their clients. My recollection is there were at least four instances in which we had testimony that even a lawyer accepting employment with the Legal Service Corporation under these circumstances might well constitute a violation of the professional code of ethics.

These two bills varied in one other very important respect, which is with regard to the appointment of the board of directors, that is, the people who ran or were to run the Legal Services Corporation.

The bill introduced by the 100 Members with strong bipartisan support, provided primarily that some of the selections—I think five of them at that time—were to be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, one was to be made by the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and others were to be made on recommendations of the client and the community and the Legal Services Corporation lawyers, and others were to be made because those people were heads of national bar associations and were recognized as having supported and worked for this legislation.

Under the administration proposal all of the board of directors were to have

been appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The only admonition was that no more than six of the 11 could have been from any one political party.

We had extensive hearings not only here in Washington, but we traveled, as I recall it, into Louisiana, California, and a number of other places and heard testimony on this legislation. We received the word from the White House that the bill that the 100 Members, the bipartisan bill, had agreed to, was unacceptable particularly because of the composition of this board. We recognize it might provide some problems to the President in exercising his prerogative. We entered into rather intensive negotiations between some of the Members on the Democratic side and some of the Members on the Republican side. These negotiations were carried on in entire good faith on both sides. Particularly I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUITE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN), for the fine cooperation and good will which they exercised in attempting to reach a compromise that we felt would be acceptable.

We did reach that compromise. We reached a compromise which we felt would preserve the prerogatives of the President and yet make the Legal Services Corporation a truly independent corporation in the sense that it would be insulated from political activity and political pressure. We brought that bill to the House of Representatives and passed it as a part of the OEO bill by a very substantial margin.

Indeed, we defeated an amendment to cut it out by an overwhelming majority. And it is my recollection, and the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong, that the minority leader of the House voted for this proposal as it went through the House.

It was part of the OEO bill which was vetoed by the President. As the chairman stated earlier, the major objection the President had to that OEO bill, as we all know, was the early childhood development program, but he also had a few choice words for the Legal Services Corporation, indicating his displeasure again and in fact saying we had not gone far enough in protecting his prerogatives on the appointment of this board.

So after the veto we went back to the drawing board again with the same people, and sought a further compromise to further elevate the prerogatives of the President and to lower what we considered to be the insulation for a fully independent Legal Services Corporation, and we brought that back to the House.

We were told that the prerogatives of the President had to be preserved so that only he could appoint people to the board of directors—that was the only way that we could maintain a separation of powers.

I just happen to have before me about six illustrations, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Farmers Land Bank, the communications satellite program, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and others, in which the President

has not insisted on his complete prerogative with regard to the appointment of Commissioners. So I think that argument is invalid.

But in any event we made further compromises and we brought that bill back to the House with those compromises, and passed it again through the House, and the Senate was doing the same thing, a bill very similar to ours was being again passed through the Senate. We went into conference and reached agreement again, after compromising and, I might say, we even went beyond the scope of the House and Senate bills to reach that compromise, we went further in the President's direction than either the House or the Senate bills, and would have had a bill here, which provided even more concessions to the President.

After a while, during which some extreme pressures were brought upon the Senate by the White House, the Senate asked for another conference—

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. As I started to say, the Senate asked for a further conference, the conferees were again appointed, and we went back to conference without having brought this bill even to the floor. At that time we were informed that the White House indicated that the Legal Services Corporation, even in the shape it was in then, was still unacceptable, and that if it passed in that form the President would veto it—and we had this on pretty good authority. My preference would have been to pass the bill and let the President veto it, because, you know, if he is going to kill the legal services program it ought at least be buried in the White House, and not here in the Congress, but I was a minority of the conferees. The conferees agreed rather than going as far as the President wanted to go with his appointment of the board, to cut out the legal services program entirely.

Now, it is a kind of a bad choice of alternatives, but I must say that, presented with the alternatives that the President laid down, and the type of board he wanted, and the type of program that presently exists, the present program is probably the best because we at least have some oversight authority.

But to do so—to go as far as the President wanted to go to sign the bill, it seems to me would be to abandon the very reason for creating an independent Legal Services Corporation because it would not be independent at that time.

I do not fault my colleagues on either side of this aisle. Indeed, I have high praise for some of the Members on the Republican side who worked very hard, especially the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLBORN), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUITE) to get a bill and to get an acceptable Legal Services Corporation. But I do fault the President of the United States for the pressure that was brought on these con-

ferrees to knock this Legal Services Corporation out.

I think the record ought to be amply clear that the total responsibility for killing in 1972 the Legal Services Corporation is the responsibility of the White House—and not the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that we have with the Legal Services Corp., of course, is trying to insulate it from political pressure—and that is what we want to do and what we have done in the past to insulate similar organizations from political pressure is to have the board members appointed by the President and then that they be confirmed by the Senate. This is what the Presidents Corporation would have done.

There is another question of accountability as well. While we have high regard for organizations such as the American Bar Association, the Association of American Law Schools, the National Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association and the American Trial Lawyers Association—there is still the question of their accountability.

In our governmental system, we usually make those who are responsible for administering a program for which Federal funds are appropriated accountable through us to the taxpayers. We have, of course, the General Accounting Office as an arm of the Congress. But the basic argument is accountability during administration not a checkup afterwards.

The administration wanted their legal services corporation—and that is what they wanted in place of what we had agreed to originally in conference. They felt that that would provide for the accountability. But as the gentleman from Washington indicated, we could not agree in conference on the kind of corporation that could get by both the Congress and the White House and, therefore, it was a move on the part of the conferees to drop the corporation at this time—and not the White House.

That was the only thing that we could agree on in conference—that could be agreed on both in conference and in the White House. That is why we bring this report to you now.

Next year, as I indicated earlier, I would like to see us work out a corporation, but there is still going to be an issue before us—the issue of accountability—who will be responsible or how will they be responsible to the taxpayers who put up the money for these programs?

Legal services attorneys are different from other attorneys. Other attorneys in private practice are responsible to their clients and to their law firm, if they belong to a law firm.

But in this case, they are being paid by the Federal Government and in this way we are writing really a new chapter each year as this program develops. I believe it is an absolute necessity for the poor to be able to have the legal services or the services of an attorney just like anyone else who can afford it. That is why I am pleased that we have embarked on this experiment. The last chapter has not been written yet, and I think we will just

have to wait for the next Congress to do it.

This bill is much better than the House passed bill from my view. As I said, it drops the corporation, so we do not have that conflict before us now and it reduces substantially the authorization for appropriations.

As I was going over the figures, I see that we have \$2,369.3 billion for fiscal year 1973 as compared to \$3,090 billion in the first conference reported bill. This represents a reduction of over \$700 million.

It is well within the budget ball park. I am satisfied with this legislation.

I did not vote for the bill when it went through the House, but I think it is such a vast improvement over what we passed in the House, that I am certainly constrained not only to vote for it but I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. QUIE. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Minnesota's yielding.

I should like to clarify, if I might, the figures that have been used here. As I understand it, the budget request of appropriations for fiscal year 1973 was \$2,168.2 million?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the conference report which is before us now, the authorization is \$2,369.3 million?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the conference report that was originally proposed but never acted on by the House was for \$3,090.2 million?

Mr. QUIE. As I read it over, that is a correct figure from the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The net result is that the conference report for the authorization before us now is roughly \$700 million less than the originally proposed conference report?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And roughly \$200 million in authorization above the proposed appropriation for fiscal year 1973?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

I would also say to the gentleman that our committee has probably done better on this conference report in staying close to the budget request than on any piece of legislation we have brought before the House.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), who was in the well a moment ago deplored the fact that provision for the Legal Services Corporation, had been stricken from the conference report. Next, I listened carefully to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. QUIE—who stated that one of the faults with the corporation was its lack of accountability to the Congress. I agree with the latter view. The Legal Services Corporation provides for little or no control by Congress.

Some of my colleagues may be wondering why I am taking this time. The

reason is that I just want to be sure and certain that the Legal Services Corporation is dead. It is sort of like visiting a funeral home, not to pay your respects or condolences, but to be certain and positive that the reports of the demise of the alleged deceased is accurate.

I want to be sure that there is no Legal Services Corporation in this conference report; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PERKINS. That is gone. We go back to the old law, the present law.

Mr. RANDALL. Well I want to add that the Congress has had a most unfortunate experience with creating corporations. In the matter of the Postal Corporation or Postal Service as it is sometimes called we created something like a corporation replete with officers and directors but the Congress lost all contact and control. Today the Service can bring people from anywhere in the United States and put them into postal jobs in any of our districts.

As we understand, this Legal Services Corporation, it is completely beyond accountability to the Congress. They could appoint someone like the notorious William Kunstler, or a person with similar views and pay him a salary of \$100,000 a year and none of us in the Congress could do anything about it; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not think it would have gone that far.

Mr. RANDALL. You would agree there is the possibility; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. I hardly think so. The Legal Services Corporation is a dead duck now.

Mr. RANDALL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

One more comment. When this bill was before the House I was with the gentleman on the funding for our older citizens; yet with this improvement we still have some grave doubts about the administration of portions of the program. Perhaps the gentleman knows, and I hope my fellow Members know, that we happen to have had the job of chairing the Subcommittee on Government Operations which has been looking into the matter of 60 students who are traveling over in Europe on poverty funds. I can report we will continue this inquiry next week. At this point it looks like nearly half of those or at least more than a third did not come from families within the established poverty guidelines. Also there is some evidence that those who made the trip were related to employees and/or members of the board of directors of the Monmouth, N.J., community action program.

We all recognize the worthwhile overall goals of the poverty program. Is it the gentleman's conclusion, and you have been familiar with the program for years that the administration and management have improved over the years, with the exceptions, of course, of some few incidents like these students improperly traveling abroad? It has been my observation the administration of the poverty program has come a long way in its improvement since the early days when we had the LeRoy Jones Theatre—the "hate-white theatre"—in New York, and other things of that kind.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me state to my distinguished colleague that the Congress in my judgment never intended any such administration of any program of that type. It was an error on the part of someone. As I understand the situation, as soon as the Office of Economic Opportunity found out about the proposal, they canceled out the grant, which they should have done forthwith. That is what I understand, that they did this.

Mr. RANDALL. That points up the importance of the Governor of a State retaining a veto over such programs as legal services. As I understand it the Governor of New Jersey vetoed or canceled the funds for grants for the 60 students to travel abroad as a part of the poverty program.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire about the language which we find on page 15 of this report, entitled "Rural Programs." Under this legislation we have listed a series of activities that the OEO can carry on as a supplement to existing similar programs under agricultural law.

The first question I would like to ask the chairman of the committee is this: How does this program differ from the Farmers Home Administration law on the books or the new Rural Development Act which was signed into law last week?

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the language on page 15 of the report, part B—"Rural Programs," starting with the "Statement of Purpose" and then I will get to the "Financial Assistance" part of it. How does this differ from existing law under the Farmers Home or the new Rural Development Act?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a provision that was in the Senate bill. It was not in the House bill. The conferees agreed to it in conference.

Mr. KYL. But how does it differ from existing law? I do not care where it started. I want to know what it means. I am talking about section 722(a) which says:

The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance including loans . . .

Mr. Speaker, does it include grants? It says "including loans."

Mr. PERKINS. I construe that to mean loans as well as grants.

Mr. KYL. It is the gentleman's opinion and the committee's opinion that these funds will all be disbursed as loans and not grants?

Mr. PERKINS. I construe this sentence, even though it uses the words "including loans" to mean both.

Mr. KYL. If that is firm in legislative history, let us move forward. Is it assumed OEO would consolidate the Farmers Home Administration loans?

Mr. PERKINS. The Farmers Administration administers this program here, as I understand, through delegations. This has made some change from the present program, presently administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. KYL. Is this an amendment to the Farmers Home Administration Act?

Mr. PERKINS. No. It is the OEO amendment, but the program is currently operated by the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. KYL. But all this language on page 15 involving all this action could be administered by Farmers Home Administration? And it will be administered by OEO?

Mr. PERKINS. Section 28 of the conference report specifically prohibits the delegation of title VII.

Mr. KYL. May I ask a further question?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that from the outset the Economic Opportunity Act when first enacted into law in 1964 had a rural program in the bill, and that program was delegated to the Farmers Home Administration to administer. This makes some amendments.

Mr. KYL. May I ask the gentleman further, when it comes to establishing new industries, and so forth, is there an antipiracy provision attached to this legislation?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that there is no such provision, as I read it. We have very little industry in the rural areas. This is an incentive, as I see it, to try to attract industry to those areas.

Mr. KYL. This originated in the Senate or in the House or somewhere else. Does the gentleman say that if a new industry is set up in a new area, we will pay no attention to whether they steal that industry from some other area of the country or not?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me make this statement. There is no piracy here involved. This is trying to make loans for the purpose of establishing some industry where they do not have industry. I do not believe we are robbing Peter to pay Paul with a provision of this kind.

Mr. KYL. When the rural development bill was before the House, the House apparently did not buy that, and insisted that we have a strong provision.

A moment ago the chairman said that these were all loans, not grants. If the gentleman will look at subparagraph (b), he will see it says:

The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to local cooperative associations—

And so on, and then this language: for the purpose of defraying all or part of the costs of establishing and operating cooperative programs for farming, purchasing, marketing, processing—

And so forth.

Are those loans, or are they grants?

Mr. PERKINS. The costs which may be defrayed are specifically listed in section 722(b).

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. This is broader language. It could be a defraying of all or part of the costs of establishing and operating cooperative programs for farm-

ing, purchasing, marketing, processing, and to improve their income as producers, et cetera. It also says:

Costs which may be defrayed shall include but not be limited to—

(1) administrative costs of staff and overhead;

(2) costs of planning and developing new enterprises;

(3) costs of acquiring technical assistance; and

(4) initial capital where it is determined by the Director that the poverty of the families participating in the program and the social conditions of the rural area require such assistance.

Mr. KYL. Let me ask the chairman another question.

If I get 15 low-income farmers together in my area, and they decide to form a cooperative for the purpose of buying and selling, am I to understand that under this language the Government can pay all of their administrative costs, staffing, overhead, and development costs of the enterprise, as well as the costs of acquiring technical assistance and initial capital? Could all of that come forth under this program?

Mr. PERKINS. Under the language it is broad enough to make loans to cover the whole situation.

Mr. KYL. Loans or grants?

Mr. PERKINS. Loans and grants to cover the situation.

Mr. KYL. Are these loans or grants, or are they both?

Mr. PERKINS. It is my construction of the whole section that loans and grants are intended.

Mr. KYL. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota his construction of the language in this bill? Is it all loans with no grants?

Mr. QUIE. I cannot read it that way myself, because I see it is left open.

The gentleman from Kentucky refers to the fact that this is like the old law. That I have not refreshed myself on, as to whether that is a law which provides for grants or not.

On the aid to cooperatives, groups of poor farmers can get together now under what was the law. We do not have a present law under OEO, because that all expired. Under that law, they could run a cooperative. I doubt they were limited to loans.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we have had loans in the original act ever since we enacted the act in 1964. I do not know whether they intended any grants here or not. In my judgment, it is loose language.

Mr. QUIE. I suggest, from a reading of the articles of the cooperatives, there was grant money involved. I would be glad to stand corrected, but that is my recollection. It seems to me this authority was the salvation of all the authorities in the present law. There is some additional authority, because if you will turn over to part C on the support program, it spells out there in section 731(c) that the director shall provide directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements such technical assistance and training of personnel, and so forth. There it is clear and it is spelled out, and we know what they are talking about. You are

referring to part (b) of section 722 where the director is authorized to provide financial assistance to local cooperative associations. It was my assumption that it was being done the way it was under the old law and therefore I thought it was being done through grants.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman from Minnesota say that the administration under this act would be under the Agriculture Department unless there was specific delegation to the OEO?

Mr. QUIE. I would say it would be under the OEO unless there was a specific delegation by the OEO to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

On that same point—and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will stay here for this discussion—I would like to point out that it would be entirely possible for 15 well-to-do farmers to form a cooperative under the language, at least as a casual reading would so interpret it, because it does not limit participation in the cooperatives to low-income farmers but simply says that these may be assisted in rural areas containing concentrations or substantial numbers of low-income persons. The "low income" refers to areas and not to those eligible to take part in the cooperative's formation. I do not see how this can be read other than to authorize a grant of substantial amounts of money to cooperatives. It says all or part of the cost of establishing and operating the cooperative programs for abstract purposes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I again go back to the point that the gentleman from Minnesota made? This is not new authority. Since its inception in the Economic Opportunity Act it has had authority in rural areas and in those sections of the country with substantial concentrations of low-income families, such as in Hawaii, New Mexico, Alabama, and a number of States across the country in which cooperatives have been formed and loans have been granted.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman say with certainty that this is the language that has been on the books previously, or is it a redraft of this language?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No, I cannot say with certainty, because I do not have a copy of the OEO Act in front of me, but without being able to tell you for certain which words have changed, it is a restatement of the present act. I do understand, however, that the present act authorizes loans only.

Mr. FINDLEY. It seems to me to be wide open authority. Of course, there is a limitation of funds, but within the money available it permits the director of OEO certainly to finance a multitude of operations in areas where cooperatives may be formed.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. The intent of this program was to help the poor farmers and cooperatives and not permit the well-to-do cooperatives or farmers to operate under this program. It specifically refers to low-income farmers. Of course, that is reasonable, that a farmer would be able to receive something under this act if he qualifies.

This is an amendment to the original bill. And if you will notice in that paragraph there, section 722, it is clearly loans, and especially section 722(a) where we provide financial assistance "including loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not resulting in an aggregate principal indebtedness of more than \$3,500 at any one time, to any low-income rural family where, in the judgment of the Director, such financial assistance has a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families."

That is clearly a loan, and cannot be made to wealthy farmers.

Mr. FINDLEY. The language to which I referred was subsection (b), and as far as I can see there is no direct relationship between (a) and (b). Subsection (b) authorizes very clearly the granting of sums to provide all or part of the cost of operating cooperatives, and it does not restrict such cooperatives to low-income persons.

Mr. PERKINS. It says:

The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to local cooperative associations in rural areas containing concentrations or substantial numbers of low-income persons for the purpose—

And so forth.

Mr. FINDLEY. That refers to the area and is not a qualification for participation in the cooperative.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that if you go down to where it says:

Costs which may be defrayed shall include but not be limited to—

And then go to (4), it says:

initial capital where it is determined by the Director that the poverty of the families participating in the program and the social conditions of the rural area require such assistance.

I think the interpretation of that would be that, first, the family has to be in poverty and, secondly, it has to be in an area where there is a general condition of poverty. It cannot be where there are some poor families in areas where there is affluence, if there is such a thing in rural areas.

Mr. FINDLEY. I want to say to the gentleman further that that may be the intention, but the least that can be said about this section is that it was very sloppily drawn because the words which precede items (1), (2), (3), and (4) say "Costs which may be defrayed shall include but not be limited to—".

Mr. QUIE. I know.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, section 723(a) under "Limitations on Assistance" says:

No financial assistance shall be provided under this part unless the Director determines that—

and I think this clarifies it—

(1) any cooperative association receiving assistance has a minimum of fifteen active members, a majority of which are low-income rural persons;

That is a limitation that applies to the whole of section 722(a) and 722(b).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time so that I may ask three questions.

First, the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), I am sure recalls the amendment which he offered in committee for a new housing program under OEO for the poor in rural America.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is that still in the conference report?

Mr. PERKINS. That is in the conference report?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is there any provision for coordinating this new housing program for rural people with the multiplicity of other housing programs we already have for rural America?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman from Oregon that this was suggested, planned, and formulated by rural Americans from North Carolina, Wisconsin, and other States who came before the committee saying that the present rural housing programs were completely inadequate and not working, and there was just enough money here in the authorization for the \$10 million for an experiment by the OEO. The rural areas of the country by and large have been bypassed completely by the Federal housing efforts.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I remember, the time the gentleman offered it, I called the Committee on Banking and Currency and asked how many housing programs we had for rural America and the answer from the chief of staff was—"Oh, a slew of them."

I said, "How much did we spend last year?" It was several hundred million dollars—I have forgotten how much.

Does the gentleman feel that with the several programs we already have and with several hundred million dollars being spent that if they will not work, that now with a new program under a new agency—OEO—with \$10 million it will work. It will eat up new administrative costs in the new bureau or agency—that we can be sure of.

Mr. PERKINS. This is more or less an experiment. I think the money will be well expended and I hope the money is appropriated in order to allow some demonstration projects that will prove beneficial to rural America insofar as housing is concerned.

In my area, the Appalachian area, housing is the greatest problem that we have and the other programs have not worked in the rural Appalachian area.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the chairman. Though, I am not persuaded

a "war on poverty" housing program will better insure good programs than HUD or Farmers Home Administration housing programs. The second question goes to the tendency on the part of the OEO experts to transport youngsters to various parts of the world with taxpayers' dollars. The most recent one which has created a great deal of press comment is in regard to the 67 youngsters from New Jersey who were taken on a trip to Europe and to Africa with "War on Poverty" funds. The chairman may recall that a few years ago the OEO took a group of youngsters to South America for the summer months and the explanation from the Director of the OEO at that time was to give them cultural advantages—that rich young people traveled abroad—why was it not all right for poor children to have the same opportunities?

If the chairman recalls, I offered an amendment designed to stop this traveling abroad at taxpayers expense—unless it was to become Federal policy to provide funds for all young people to travel abroad courtesy of the American taxpayers.

Then there was a more recent incident where the OEO brought presidential scholars who qualified under the poverty guidelines—brought them to Washington with all their expenses paid while other presidential scholars in my area and in other areas had to work during the summer picking beans and berries and working in various kinds of activities to pay for their trip back here and to pay for their expenses even though they were also presidential scholars. But OEO paid for the selected ones.

I can recall these three instances and I suspect that for everyone that we know about, there are others that happen.

Would the chairman tell me—is there anything in the conference report that would prevent—I mean an affirmative action or statement on the part of the conferees that the OEO is forbidden from spending poverty funds to take youngsters to foreign countries for the summer or other times, or paying their expenses back here to Washington on trips which other young people pay for with the money they earned? It seems to me very unfair that middle-income kids have to work to pay their expenses—but individuals under the Office of Economic Opportunity have the free ride.

Is there any language that would prevent these kinds of expenditures in the future?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentlewoman, in my area not one-third of the youngsters who are eligible to participate in the poverty programs have that opportunity. It was never intended that the program be administered in the way that the gentlewoman describes—traveling abroad and paying expenses—was not the intention of the committee or the part of the Congress.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I think it is an arbitrary decision where the administrators of a program make decisions of that type and I think they are clearly violating the

intention of the Congress and of the law. I do not know of any specific provision in the bill prohibiting traveling abroad because it was intended that these funds be to benefit the poor in the United States.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then the answer of the chairman is that there is no language that actually would prohibit them from doing this in the future?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I have not heard of that many instances, but I do know the Governor of New Jersey, our former colleague, vetoed it just as soon as he learned of the situation and as I understand, the grant was canceled because it went far beyond the intent of the Congress.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The third question I would like to ask is this.

During hearings in the committee on the ACTION program, and ACTION sponsored programs connected with colleges and universities where college and university students are doing volunteer work in a community, if the chairman will recall, I brought to the attention of the committee that ACTION required as a criteria for eligibility for Federal funds that any institution of higher education must agree to give students academic credit at that university for community work the students did. If the chairman recalls, I introduced an amendment which would prohibit the OEO from requiring as an eligibility criteria the granting of credit to students. The committee and the House approved this amendment.

The reason I offered the amendment was because it seemed to me that this is a very unwise departure on the part of the Federal Government and of the Congress to get into the internal operation of a college or university and require it to give credit for a specific program for which the university or college itself might or might not want to grant credit.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly agree with the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Is this provision in the conference report?

Mr. PERKINS. I never have disagreed with the gentlewoman along that line. It is not intended that the OEO interfere with the workings of any college.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But my question, Mr. Chairman: Is that amendment that I offered and that was approved by the House—is that a part of the conference report, or was it deleted?

Mr. PERKINS. I am not certain, but I know that I supported your position. I supported the gentlewoman on that amendment in committee.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I want to direct the attention of the chairman to page 25 of the conference report, it refers to this:

The House bill prohibited any funds appropriated for programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity or ACTION from being used to finance any activity in which students in higher education perform voluntary or community service where, as a condition for eligibility for funds, an institution is required to award credit to students for training or experience derived from such voluntary or community service. There was no comparable Senate provision. The House recedes.

So, I must assume that the House did recede and that it is not a part of the conference report.

Mr. PERKINS. I have had my recollection refreshed by counsel. He tells me, and it is true, that the universities in the country requested that we drop the program because they felt that they could not give credit for the university year for ACTION program, and at the urging of the universities the section was dropped in conference.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. You say the universities felt that they could not give credit? That is what my amendment provided—that ACTION or no other agency could require a university to give academic credit for community work.

Mr. PERKINS. If your amendment was adopted, that is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But as a result ACTION may continue to require universities to give credit now because my amendment was deleted in conference.

Mr. PERKINS. No, they are not required to give credit.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. You just said, "No, they are not required to give credit"—and yet the House receded on the amendment, so I must assume that ACTION is free to continue its policy to require a college or university to give credit to students funded by Federal programs under ACTION's jurisdiction or the university will not receive the funds.

Mr. PERKINS. It is not required. It is my hope that the universities will work out an agreement with ACTION to their mutual satisfaction and that no one will be forced to do anything against their will.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The chairman says "it is not required"—but neither is it prohibited. I read from the conference report just a moment ago and I fear the conference action will now be interpreted as congressional approval of ACTION's policy in the past. Mr. Speaker, for these three reasons and others, I find myself in a position where I cannot support the conference report. Some individuals may view any vote against "war on poverty" funds the same as a vote against "God, mother, or country." Yet when millions and millions of dollars appropriated to try to end poverty—are indeed spent for other purposes—it seems to me, at a minimum hypocritical, and even a betrayal of the interests of the poor to allow funds to be continually wasted or misspent. In Federal, State, and local funds, this country is spending more than \$40 billion a year on programs designed exclusively for the poor; this includes welfare, public housing, food stamps, medical services for ADC, et cetera; programs for which middle-income Americans are not eligible. The OEO or war on poverty funds comprise only a fraction of the total—but of all the other programs to help the poor, I know of few examples that can match OEO in waste, inefficiency and in some instances outright misuse of moneys appropriated.

It is high time we reviewed the duplication, the overlapping, the waste and put money only in those programs that

have an affirmative record of accomplishment.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I did sign the conference report, and I shall not therefore today vote against the conference report. If I detect the sentiment of the House, it is weary of the efforts to secure passage of legislation extending the Economic Opportunity Act in such a fashion that it will incur no veto by the President. In all honesty I must say that such an approach is unbecoming the role of an independent legislative branch of the Government.

The conference report authorizations have been reduced to levels below those which can make a meaningful commitment to a major domestic problem; also 2 years' effort to establish a procedure by which legal services programs could be insulated from political manipulation and effectively administered with inputs of professional standards and the needs of poor clients has been thwarted by the threat to the conference that if the Legal Services Corporation were retained in the bill and the funding levels for poverty programs were not substantially reduced, the President would veto the poverty bill for the second time.

Mr. Speaker, George Orwell's prediction for 1984 has missed the mark by 12 years. It is here now just as in the name of peace we are waging war; just as we are repudiating the "welfare ethic" we are doubling the welfare roll during the current administration; just as we have been "moving in the direction of full employment" we have doubled unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, in this stage of events the administration apparently feels free to ignore even recent history for its actions of the day. In connection with the Legal Services Corporation, let me remind my colleagues that on May 5, 1971, with great fanfare the administration submitted its proposal to establish a Legal Services Corporation. The bill, H.R. 8163, was introduced on May 6 by Mr. QUIE for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. POFF.

That measure called for the formation of an independent Legal Services Corporation governed by an 11-member Board of Directors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than six members of the Board could be a member of any one political party.

In this respect the proposal differed markedly from bipartisan legislation introduced by me and by 102 other Members of the House on March 18. There was a marked difference because the legislation of March 18, H.R. 6360 and H.R. 6361, would have truly insulated the Corporation from political manipulation by requiring a 19-member Board of Directors to be composed of six legal organization members—that is the president of the American Bar Association,

the president-elect of the American Bar Association, the president of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the president of the American Association of Law Schools, the president of the American Trial Lawyers Association and the president of the National Bar Association—six members, three selected by the Clients' Advisory Council and three selected by the Project Attorneys' Advisory Council; five members appointed by the President; one member appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States and one member to be the Executive Director of the Corporation selected by the Board.

Such a composition, in my judgment and in the judgment of the numerous cosponsors of this legislation, would have truly insulated the Legal Services Corporation from political manipulation but at the same time assuring the formulation of sound and effective policies governing the provision of legal services to the poor.

In my judgment, these strong provisions in H.R. 6360 were substantially diluted in the process of clearing the measure through the Education and Labor Committee, when the Legal Services Corporation became a new section in H.R. 10351 reported by the Education and Labor Committee on September 8, 1971 (H. Rept. 92-471).

Mr. Speaker, the legislation to create a Legal Services Corporation received careful study and consideration by the committee. Hearings were held for 6 days in March of 1971, 11 days in April, 10 days in May, and 2 days in June. Subsequently, the proposal was debated and amended in five open legislative sessions of the committee in July.

As the measure passed the House, the Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors was to be appointed largely at the discretion of the President. In this respect the appointing power read as follows:

SEC. 1004. (a) The Corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of seventeen individuals appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Members of the board shall be appointed as follows:

(1) one member shall be appointed from lists of nominees submitted by the Judicial Conference of the United States;

(2) seven members shall be appointed from among individuals in the general public, no fewer than three of whom shall be members of the bar of the highest court of a jurisdiction;

(3) two members shall be appointed from among individuals who are eligible for assistance under this title after due consideration is given to the recommendations of the client members of the Advisory Council as established in 1003(c);

(4) two members shall be appointed from among former legal services project attorneys after due consideration is given to the recommendations of the attorney members of the Advisory Council;

(5) one member shall be appointed from lists of nominees submitted by the Association of American Law Schools;

(6) four members shall be appointed from lists of nominees submitted by the American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defender

Association, and the American Trial Lawyers Association. Members appointed under this clause subsequent to the initial board shall be from lists submitted by the American Bar Association, the National Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, and the American Trial Lawyers Association in accordance with procedures established by the board of directors.

Following passage by the Senate, the ensuing conference report gave the President greater control who was to serve on the Board. In this regard the conference report (H. Rept. 92-682) provided:

"Sec. 904. (a) The Corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of seventeen individuals appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Members of the board shall be appointed as follows:

"(1) Six members shall be appointed from among individuals in the general public, not less than three of whom shall be members of the highest court of a State.

"(2) Two members shall be appointed from lists of nominees submitted by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

"(3) Two members shall be appointed from among individuals who are eligible for assistance under this title from lists of nominees submitted by the Clients Advisory Council.

"(4) Two members shall be appointed from among former legal services project attorneys from lists of nominees submitted by the Project Attorneys Advisory Council.

"(5) Five members shall be appointed as follows—

"(A) one member from lists of nominees submitted by the American Bar Association;

"(B) one member from lists of nominees submitted by the Association of American Law Schools;

"(C) one member from lists of nominees submitted by the National Bar Association;

"(D) one member from lists of nominees submitted by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association; and

"(E) one member from lists of nominees submitted by the American Trial Lawyers Association.

Each initial list and any subsequent list shall include at least three and not more than ten names for each position to be filled.

Despite this, though both Houses approved the conference report extending the Economic Opportunity Act and making provision for the Legal Services Corporation, the President vetoed the measure on December 9, 1971.

On February 2, 1972, following additional hearings and markup of new legislation, the Education and Labor Committee reported H.R. 12350, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972. Again, the measure included provisions for the creation of a National Legal Services Corporation vesting in the President largely the power to appoint the Board of Directors but not vesting in him the total discretion which he had called for in H.R. 8163.

Upon Senate passage of H.R. 12350, House and Senate conferees diligently hammered out the differences in the bill and in a conference report filed on July 26, 1972, made provisions for the creation of a Legal Services Corporation vesting far more discretion in the President in appointing the Board of Directors than was provided in either the House or Senate-passed versions of H.R. 12350.

I had grave misgivings about the propriety and most certainly the legislative

wisdom of giving the President more power in the appointment of Directors than either the full House or the full Senate had been willing to do in their original treatment of H.R. 12350. Nevertheless, we were bluntly told by those who were purported to know the wishes of the White House that unless this kind of power and authority over the Board were given to the President there was a very good chance that the President would again veto an extension of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Mr. Speaker, sooner than the ink was dry on this conference report (H. Rept. 92-1246), the rumors were prevalent that the conference report faced almost certain Presidential veto. Undoubtedly this influenced the recommitment by the Senate of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the new conference report on H.R. 12350 (H. Rept. 92-1367) filed on August 18, 1972, contains a "bare bones" extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. Deleted are the additional authorizations for the Economic Opportunity Act which cleared the House of Representatives in both previous bills. Authorizations for Headstart are sharply reduced and provisions to create a Legal Services Corporation have been deleted entirely.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my remarks to one specific section of the conference report.

Section 16, "Special Assistance," empowers the Director to provide financial assistance for programs designed to serve low-income individuals, particularly the elderly, who are not being effectively served by other OEO programs.

This section is the direct result of an amendment I offered on the floor of the House on February 17, 1972. The amendment in turn was a result of hearings held by Field Subcommittee No. 1 of the Education and Labor Committee in New York in June, 1971.

Testimony was presented to this subcommittee by S. Elly Rosen representing the Association of Jewish Antipoverty Workers. Mr. Rosen contended that the Jewish poor in New York City were not being served by the poverty program.

Upon the conclusion of the hearings, I asked both OEO and the New York City Human Resources Administration, to conduct separate investigations of Mr. Rosen's charges.

These investigations subsequently confirmed the substance of Mr. Rosen's allegations. The reports concluded that large numbers of the poor in New York City resided in areas other than the 20 officially designated poverty neighborhoods and were not, therefore, eligible to participate in OEO-sponsored programs. The reports also noted that the vast majority of OEO programs were designated to serve the young and that the elderly poor who did in fact live in the 20 poverty neighborhoods were not being served by these programs.

New York City reacted to these findings in a positive way. A \$1 million grant

was obtained from the State for the Jewish Agency for Service for the Aged to establish a citywide program to serve the needs of the Jewish elderly poor whether or not they resided in officially designated poverty areas.

More recently, Human Resources Administrator Jule Sugarman met with representatives of other ethnic groups, Italians, Greeks, and Orientals, to devise programs which will serve the poor amongst them who are not currently being served by OEO programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported and will continue to support the Office of Economic Opportunity and its emphasis upon helping the youthful low-income population break the cycle of poverty.

However, there are low-income individuals, primarily the elderly, who are not currently receiving services from OEO either because they reside in areas not within the jurisdiction of community action agencies or because they are elderly and are not part of a prime target population of OEO.

I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) would not also attest to the fact that it is the consensus of the Congress and the intent of the Congress that the elderly poor be served in meaningful ways?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. The elderly poor should be served in a meaningful way. But I do not say that we should include them here in a duplicatory program at all. The Older Americans Act is where we intended they be served, but if they are not being served in some instances there, at least there is authority to serve them here. But I hope the Director will not have duplicate programs that will duplicate programs under the Older Americans Act.

Mr. SCHEUER. None of us want duplicative programs, but it is clear that some of the elderly poor are not being served by any Federal program. It is my hope that section 16 will be used by the Director of OEO to support efforts, such as those of New York City, to remedy this situation.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, another thing that bothers me, and I like it better here, in this language we do not lay out what we are going to do and then do not do it. I think one excellent program was in the nutrition bill but it included more people than we could ever fund. I think we ought to zero in on the target, and not promise to do more than we can do.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I rise in support of the conference report. Although the legislation contains many programs of vital importance to the quality of life in our Nation, I feel that we have missed the opportunity to sig-

nificantly improve the delivery of legal services to the poor. The conferees voted to delete the provision for an independent nonprofit Legal Services Corporation only after making every reasonable attempt at compromise. After more than two intensive years developing the proposal for a corporation, I feel deeply disappointed that we will not see enactment of this measure during this session. Since the independent Legal Services Corporation has twice been approved by the House, I believe my colleagues deserve a full and detailed explanation of the attempt by the conferees to develop a workable compromise.

THE VALUE OF THE LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the legal services program has been one of the most controversial agencies of the Federal Government. That is to be expected, when thousands of heretofore unrepresented citizens gain access to the rights and remedies in law that have been designed for all Americans. Yet in spite of the critical attention focused on the program, it has generally enjoyed the support of leading citizens, both in and out of Government. As Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW recently told the Texas Bar Association:

Since the inception of the Legal Services Program, most members of the American Bar have demonstrated their continued and steadfast support for it. In a variety of ways, our profession has proven its sincere interest in providing legal assistance to the poor. This is indeed commendable.

The Legal Services Program has done a great deal of good by furnishing poor people with legal counsel and effective access to the courts. The lawyers in the program have generally reflected great credit on our profession through their dedication to the concept of justice and their willingness to sacrifice self-interest in order to help poor people.

I want to emphasize that I am very much in favor of providing legal services for the poor. Inability to afford counsel should not and must not affect one's right to justice. Furthermore, contrary to what you may have heard, I am not opposed to suits against government to redress grievances. Anyone with a legitimate grievance against a governmental agency or instrumentality should have the opportunity to obtain a resolution of that grievance.

THE PROPOSAL FOR AN INDEPENDENT CORPORATION

As the Vice President has noted, those with legitimate grievances against governmental instrumentalities must have an opportunity to obtain justice. Unfortunately, it has become all too clear that such a program cannot effectively preserve the attorney-client relationship if it is itself an ordinary instrumentality of the Federal Government.

In recognition of the problems created by locating legal services in the Office of Economic Opportunity, the President's Commission on Executive Reorganization declared:

We believe strong that its (the Legal Services program) retention in the Executive Office of the President is inappropriate. At the same time, it is a unique Federal program which extends the benefits of the adversary process to many who do not have the ability to seek legal help.

In our view, this program should be placed in an organizational setting which will permit it to continue serving the legal needs

of the poor while avoiding the inevitable political embarrassment that the program may occasionally generate . . .

Therefore, we recommend that the functions of the Legal Services program be transferred to a non-profit corporation chartered by the Congress.

The proposal to establish an independent corporation received the strong support of President Nixon in the spring of 1971:

This program can provide a most effective mechanism for settling differences and securing justice within the system and not on the streets. For many of our citizens, legal services has reaffirmed faith in our government of laws. However, if we are to preserve the strength of the program, we must make it immune to political pressures and make it a permanent part of the system of justice.

MEETING THE CONCERNS OF THE PRESIDENT

Since that time, the debate has centered not on the question of whether there should be a Legal Services Corporation, but rather on the degree of independence that institution should be given. The Congress has felt that the highly respected bar associations and legal aid groups should play a specific role in selecting members for the Board of Directors. Such legislation has twice been approved by both the House and the Senate. The President, however, has expressed a desire to have a free hand to select the Board. Also, in vetoing the initial version of this legislation, the President asked that steps be taken to: first, insure the accountability of the corporation to the American people; second, establish a degree of control by our governmental authorities; and, third, confine the activities of program attorneys to the purposes for which the program was designed—legal representation of the indigent.

Both Houses gave detailed attention to the President's concerns during the spring. In the Senate, every administration-sponsored amendment was accepted on the floor. The conference committee met in July amidst speculation that unless we further altered the legislation, the bill would be vetoed. The veto rumors came only from low-level officials—never from the President himself. I contended that we should not make further changes, since we had been reasonable in giving the President freedom to directly appoint a majority of the Corporation's Board of Directors and to choose the rest from lists submitted by the Nation's highly respected professional bar and legal aid groups. I also argued that any further grant of power to the Executive over appointment to the Board of Directors would unnecessarily weaken the independence of the Corporation from the political process, the very problem this mechanism had been designed to deal with.

The Senate conferees, however, seemed less interested in designing a bill to meet the needs of the legal community than in setting up an organization to fit every requirement of the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, careful consideration of the conference report submitted to this body on July 26 will demonstrate that the conferees had paid close attention to the issues raised by the President, and

forthrightly met every objection. I shall include an analysis of that report in the Record following my remarks.

Basically, the conference granted the executive the power to appoint all members of the Board of Directors, removing the requirement that he choose some from mandatory lists submitted by the bar associations and legal aid groups. We insisted, however, that the legislation retain language allowing these knowledgeable organizations to make suggestions to the President for appointments to the Corporation's directorship. The conferees also placed strict prohibitions on lobbying and political activities, and provided for detailed oversight procedures for the Congress and the President.

The conference committee sent the bill back to both the House and Senate for final approval. We were set to vote and forward the bill to the President before the recess, when unexpectedly the Senate conferees decided to recommit the bill for further revisions—a highly unusual procedure.

We had no choice but to return to the conference, where the Senate's representatives told us they still feared a veto. They wanted us to remove even the provision which would allow the legal profession to submit nonbinding recommendations—which the President would be free to accept or reject—for membership on the Board of Directors.

I was convinced that the conference committee had already designed a bill the President could sign. I felt any further weakening of the legislation would break faith with the legal profession and the client community, seriously damaging the delivery of legal services to the needy. The Senate conferees, however, absolutely refused to approve any legislation unless it further undermined the independence of the Corporation. It became clear they had little interest in a strong legal services program, and that we would have no OEO bill unless some further compromise was achieved.

I then proposed that we keep the program within OEO and strengthen it by establishing an associate director for legal services, a prestigious advisory council, and removing the State's veto power. The House conferees agreed to this compromise, but the Senators still refused to go along.

At this point, the House conferees faced a dilemma: would the legal services effort be better off in a watered-down corporation, or would the program fare better by remaining unchanged in OEO? We consulted with a wide variety of project attorneys, client groups, and leaders of the American bar. It was their overwhelming opinion that the Senate's proposal was untenable, and that the program would be more successful in OEO than in an emasculated corporation. Acting on this advice, the proposal for the Legal Services Corporation was stricken from the bill.

Of course, despite this setback, the program will continue to function within the Office of Economic Opportunity. I continue to believe our original proposal was sound, and I remain heartened by the fact that it was twice accepted by both the House and the Senate. I am convinced that in time the administration

and future conference committees will see the merit in approving a strong and independent Legal Services Corporation to serve people who cannot afford a lawyer.

The analysis referred to follows:

ANALYSIS OF HOW THE FIRST CONFERENCE REPORT (No. 92-1246, JULY 26, 1972) MET THE OBJECTIONS EXPRESSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION

I. ACCOUNTABILITY

Both the President and the Congress were given the authority to inspect the records of the Corporation.

The Office of Management and the Budget, and the Office of Economic Opportunity were allowed to review and comment on the budget and other activities of the Corporation.

State Bar associations were given the opportunity to review and comment upon grants to be made in their states.

The Executive Committee was structured to require that three of the five members come from the public appointees of the President.

Advance notice was required of all Corporation meetings, and such sessions were to be open to the public.

The Corporation had to make annual reports to the Congress and the President.

There was to be an annual Congressional review of funding for the Corporation (and it should be noted that the Administration's bill called for three year authorizations.)

Independent audits were to be made annually.

II. CONTROL

The legislation gave the President complete authority to appoint all members of the Board of Directors, and removed all requirements for mandatory lists, retaining only language allowing the bar associations and legal aid groups to submit non-binding recommendations.

The Administration fully controlled the transition since the Director of OEO was made the incorporating trustee.

The authorization for the Corporation was limited to two years (again, it should be noted that the Administration bill offered less control, in that it created a permanent authority.)

III. RESTRICTIONS ON ACTIVITIES

The conferees retained the language of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Cabell) concerning standards of eligibility for the client community.

A strict prohibition was made on the use of legal services funding for all partisan and non-partisan activities on behalf of political candidates.

All employees of the Corporation were to be covered by the Hatch Act.

Employees of the grantees were strictly prohibited from using their official status or facilities for their private political activities, and the Board was allowed to issue guidelines to circumscribe these activities.

Members of the Board were prohibited from participating in decisions which would have affected programs in which they had an interest.

The outside practice of law was prohibited except in cases of specifically authorized pro bono work.

Soliciting and advertising were prohibited (a concern which had been overlooked in the original administration proposal).

Guidelines for appeals were established.

Neither funds nor personnel were to be utilized in any criminal proceeding. Also, the substance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) was retained, giving the Corporation the authority to limit suits against law enforcement officials arising out of actions or failures to act in connection with criminal convictions.

In addition, strict limitations were placed upon the manner in which legal services attorneys pursue their activities. As Vice-President Agnew has noted, law reform is a legitimate activity, while certain concerns should be kept in mind: "Law reform . . . should be pursued through responsible professional representation before legislatures and governmental agencies and through amicus briefs or intervention in existing cases—not through demonstrations or other high pressure tactics."

The bill reported by the conference committee on July 26 directly addressed the issues raised by the Vice-President:

The House accepted the strict, administration sponsored controls in the Senate bill on legislative advocacy, limiting the role of legal services employees to requests by a client or member of a legislative body.

The legislation also forbade the legal services attorney to identify the grantee or corporation with the cause at issue. This concept reflected the idea that even a private law firm does not necessarily "identify" itself with its client's goals, even though it would provide complete and unqualified representation for its client's interests.

Extra-legal activities, particularly so-called "confrontation politics" were rigidly proscribed. This provision included prohibitions on illegal picketing, boycotting, demonstrations, and any violent activity.

STRENGTHENING THE CORPORATION

Since even this compromise was dropped when the bill was recommittees, the language of the July 26 report is no longer of crucial importance. However, in the interest of clarifying future discussions, I should like to address several items in the July 26 report essential to the development of a viable Legal Services Corporation.

I. TRANSITION PERIOD

Even though the conferees had deleted from section 903 any statutory requirement for the Director of OEO (as trustee) to consult with the National Advisory Committee on Legal Services in carrying out his responsibilities, the conferees, as strongly indicated in the July 26 conference report, fully expected the Director to utilize the expertise of, and consult with the NAC in carrying out each and every responsibility under this section. It was expected that the NAC would be consulted on a regular and periodic basis and would be provided the necessary resources to assist in carrying out these important functions. The conferees were referring to the NAC as constituted on 15 April 1972 as was detailed in the Senate provision in this regard.

The functions of the Director of OEO, as trustee, during the initial approximate 90-day period (until the first meeting of the Board) were limited to the functions specifically outlined in Section 903 (as qualified in Section 905).

The Conferees, and members of the relevant committees felt that the nature, operations, personnel, and commitments of the program in OEO should remain stable during the entire transition period. In fact, Section 916(b) required all personnel employed by the Office of Legal Services in OEO to be transferred to the Corporation. In the opinion of the conferees, it was not intended that the Director of OEO alter the direction or nature of the program during this period. It was hoped that the Director and the Board would cooperate during the second 90 day period in carrying out these sentiments.

II. LEGAL SERVICES LAWYERS SEEKING REFORM ON BEHALF OF THEIR CLIENTS

The Conferees adopted a Senate Amendment slightly altering the language and policy section regarding "securing orderly change" and "resort to orderly means of change" be stricken in favor of "settlement of disputes". This was intended to remove

the connotation that legal services attorneys are overly aggressive in seeking change and authorized to seek change by lawless and violent means. Senator Javits stated on page 23259 of the Congressional Record on 29 June 1972 "this is a process of peaceful rather than revolutionary change." Senator Cooper, the proponent of the amendment stated "when I raised this question, I certainly did not want my proposal to suggest any inhibitions upon the right to seek change." Senator Cooper stated further "of course, according to the Canons of Ethics lawyers would represent the people in every proper way that would be required to represent them."

In addition, it was seen as clear from the statute and the reports of both committees that the recipients of legal services must be guaranteed the right to seek any lawful objective through any legally permissible means granted under our system of law. As President Nixon stated on 5 May 1971 in a message to Congress urging the creation of a National Legal Services Corporation: "The legal problems of the poor are of sufficient scope that we should not restrict the right of their attorneys to bring any type of civil suit. Only in this manner can we maintain the integrity of the adversary process and fully protect the attorney-client relationship so essential to our judicial process."

III. REGULATION OF PRIVATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF EMPLOYEES OF PROGRAMS ASSISTED BY THE CORPORATION

Section 907 allowed the Board to promulgate appropriate guidelines relating to the private activities of employees of programs assisted by the Corporation. This provision was originally placed in the bill by the previous House/Senate Conference in November 1971. It was tied to the legislatively enacted language regarding the identification of the program or the Corporation with the private political activities of employees. In fact, the Corporation's authority in this area was necessarily limited because a distinction had been made in the legislation between corporate employees who would have been subject to the Hatch Act, and employees of program assisted by the Corporation who would have been restricted only by subsections (1) and (2) of Section 1502(a) of Chapter 15 of Title 5 of the United States Code.

IV. CLIENT ELIGIBILITY

The Conferees accepted the House Amendment, Section 906(a) with regard to the establishment of eligibility standards for clients. This amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Cabell) on 17 February establishing the authority for the corporation to prescribe criteria for the establishment of eligibility standards. The statement by Mr. Cabell and the colloquy with other Members indicate clearly that these guidelines should be flexible in terms of criteria and area of the country, that local governing boards would have been allowed to establish their own guidelines under these circumstances, and that this amendment was a further amplification of Section 906(a) (8).

V. CONCLUSION

I should like to note that all the conferees—representing both parties and the full spectrum of views on legal services—signed the July 26 conference report.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), I indicated to the gentleman that part B on page 15 of the conference report would go to the Office of Economic Opportunity unless the Director delegated it to the Department of Agriculture. When I sat down I realized I had not answered correctly, and on page 20 of the report there is a prohibition against the transfer of title VII of this

act to another agency. Therefore it would be administered only by OEO and it would take congressional action in order for the Secretary to transfer it over.

Another comment I would like to make, since the gentlewoman from Oregon raised the question of sending young people to another country, I recall other instances of that nature, and as far as I am concerned one way we could help eliminate some of what I call mismanagement in the operation throughout the years would be to abolish the regional offices.

I do not like the regional offices, because they are not answerable to anyone. OEO finds out after it is done, here in Washington, and then they have the scandal or mismanagement on their hands.

I have always felt that regional office responsibilities ought to be handled through the States. Then if there were a situation like that, the Governor of New Jersey would have been responsible, because the administration in the State would have been under his auspices or under the State auspices. The Governor and the State legislature are answerable to the people of the State.

That is one of the problems with respect to this whole organization and the way it has been operated through the years, that the regional offices are not answerable to the people.

So long as that is the case, we are going to have trouble.

The Federal Government, in its effort to decentralize, moved to regional offices. It decentralized some of the operations, but that has not been effective.

The people in the regional office, when there is an important decision, turn it over to Washington. But the regional offices makes so many mistakes and is just not sufficiently attuned to the needs of the people as they are peculiar to a State.

I have said before in the committee, and back home, and I say here on the House floor, we ought to abolish the regional offices, and then we would have a better administration of Federal programs when the Federal Government deals through State offices.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I certainly agree that I would much rather see State administration. Then we might have a much better chance for success.

Would the gentleman also agree that if the Congress just wrote into the law that none of these funds were to be spent for travel of young people outside of the States that would cure it?

Also, at one time we had a \$150 a month limitation on what could be spent for a disadvantaged young person, and that was first interpreted by the Federal Agency to mean \$1,800 a year but more than \$150 might be spent in any given month. Later, as I understand it Congress even removed the \$150 a month limitation.

If the Congress would provide these provisions in the law itself—it would perhaps put a stop to the nonsense we are constantly confronted with.

Mr. QUIE. I would say the gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sorry it was not in the conference report a few years ago when the first abuses were called to the attention of Congress.

May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota his understanding of the provision so far as institutions of higher education are concerned. As I understand it now, if ACTION has a program and they pay students to work in a community effort—or a voluntary effort for pay, whatever they want to call it, OEO is now in a position to say to the university or the college, "Unless you give these youngsters academic credit at your institution of higher education for the work they have done, you are not eligible for any funds under the program."

Mr. QUIE. I believe we are talking about ACTION now, as having voluntary programs. Other than that caveat, I would say the gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does the gentleman know of any time in the area of higher education when the Congress has gone into the internal management of colleges and universities and made a requirement that they give credit for specific programs funded by outside agencies?

Mr. QUIE. I would say the Teacher Corps is the one program I am aware of where it is necessary, if they are going to take part in the program, that they get a master's degree as a result of the Teacher Corps program.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is where they give a degree under the Educational Professions Development Act. But never have we gone to a university and said, "For this particular program of community work—you shall give credit."

Mr. QUIE. No, I do not know of any program where that is said. Of course, we are not saying that in the legislation here, either.

The question the gentlewoman had was whether the authority then remains to do it, and I would say yes, the authority remains. I do not believe they would be going contrary to law if ACTION set up a program and said that as a result of it they had to give credit for it.

I hope they will not operate that way. I hope it will be done on a cooperative basis, so that it is something the institution of higher education wants to do, rather than being something mandated on the part of the Government.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. In the present law there is a prohibition of Federal control. Section 614 states:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

That is in the present Economic Opportunity Act, and remains unchanged.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. I have listened to the series of inquiries made by the gentlewoman from Oregon, and I have sensed a great deal of doubletalk here.

One question she asked is why you could not write into this a specific prohibition.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman that you can write it in legislation but not here, because this is the conference report. The other body already passed it. We do not have any means of getting at that. We could have done it when the bill passed the House.

Mr. COLLIER. That I understand, but the point is it is not there.

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. COLLIER. And it could be there. It could be clarified, and we would not have to engage in a lot of doubletalk.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. The scandal occurred too late for us to get it done when the House passed the bill.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12350, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972.

As a member of the committee of conference on this important legislation, I support the bill and urge its approval by my colleagues. The basic purpose of the measure is to continue the programs first authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, with revisions.

The bill extends the antipoverty program for 3 more years so that our Nation can continue its efforts to help improve the lot of the poor. For all programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the bill authorizes \$840 million for fiscal year 1973 and \$870 million for fiscal year 1974, with not less than \$328,900,000 reserved for local initiative programs for each fiscal year and \$71,500,000 reserved for legal service programs for each fiscal year. In all, \$2.36 billion is authorized for fiscal year 1973.

Also provided are funds for alcoholic counseling and recovery, emergency food and medical services, comprehensive health, family planning, senior opportunities, drug rehabilitation, environmental action, rural housing, consumer action, design and planning, youth recreation and sports, training and technical assistance, migrant programs, administration and evaluation, and community economic development.

Of particular importance to me are the funds authorized for the Headstart program. Within the conference committee I offered a motion increasing the Headstart program by \$35 million to a total of \$485 million in the current fiscal year. I am happy that the conference agreed to this increase.

We must not permit a reduction in the support for Headstart, which has proven its value in helping to offset the educational disadvantage of children from low-income families. The great benefits of Headstart should be offered to more children, not less. The conference bill includes the House provision for the establishment of fee schedules for the

Headstart participation of non-low-income children. I hope that this can bring the child development benefits of Headstart to children not now eligible to participate.

Deleted from the legislation are provisions to establish a National Legal Services Corporation. Instead, the existing legal services program will be retained.

I urge the adoption of this greatly needed legislation.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Economic Opportunity Amendments, H.R. 12350, which represents a comprehensive legislative program to aid low-income groups in this country.

The number of economically disadvantaged people in the United States today is 25.9 million people or more than 12.8 percent of the country's population. The vast majority of people living in poverty are children, women, the elderly, and the minority groups.

I have consistently sponsored legislation of this type and supported the Equal Opportunity Act proposed during both sessions of this Congress. I would hope that this bill would now receive bipartisan support and that the President would reconsider his past vetoes of similar measures and sign this reasonable compromise into law.

This bill continues the Legal Services program which has provided low-income Americans with greater access to attorneys and appropriate institutions for the orderly resolutions of disputes within our system of justice. The passage of this act will help this country move away from a situation where the size of a person's pocketbook determines not only the quality of legal representation that a person receives but also whether he receives any at all.

This bill also calls for an expanded Headstart program for low- and middle-income children. This will help to promote social interaction between children of all economic backgrounds at a much earlier age.

Next, the passage of the bill will expand the drug rehabilitation program by setting up special programs to promote employment opportunities for rehabilitated addicts and to assist employers who hire former addicts in dealing with addiction and drug abuse among former hard core unemployed. This program gives special priority to veterans and those employers hiring a significant number of veterans.

The bill also provides for an environmental action program whereby persons of low income will be paid for work on projects designed to combat pollution and improve the environment.

Next the bill approves further funding for the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Vista program.

Last the bill starts an entirely new program known as rural housing development and rehabilitation. It is designed to assist low-income families in rural areas to construct and acquire ownership of adequate housing, to rehabilitate or repair substandard units, and to assist families in obtaining standard housing.

This bill represents a compendium of assistance to the low income and poor of our society and I urge its immediate passage.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the OEO conference report, which would extend for 2 years the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and initiate sorely needed improvements in the Headstart program.

It is unfortunate that we must consider this particular report today. A bill superior to this one, which provided for a far-reaching child development program and more substantial funding for OEO programs, was passed by the last session of Congress. As you all know, that bill was killed by a cruel and insensitive presidential veto. In its wake, we are left with the improved Headstart program contained in this bill.

The conference agreement before us authorizes appropriations of \$3.07 billion for the current fiscal year and \$2.9 billion for the coming fiscal year. These appropriations are barely adequate, compared to the original, vetoed funding—and especially compared to the amount of funding that OEO so desperately needs. According to Frank Carlucci, the former Director of OEO, the agency's programs reach only about 11 million of the 24 million Americans the administration admits live below the poverty line; even those who do receive assistance from already understaffed and underfunded OEO programs do not get adequate aid.

It is inconceivable that in the wealthiest nation in the world, with a defense budget in excess of \$73 billion, agencies designed to aid the poor should be so impoverished, crippled with a meager budget of \$3 billion. We have a responsibility to our forgotten poor, and especially to our children, in whom rest our hopes for a better future.

H.R. 12350 does not include a comprehensive child care program. I had hoped that the Headstart program, its weak substitute, would at least have received more funds. Once again we have a program that appears on paper to be more substantial than reduced funding suggests: Headstart appropriations have been cut from the \$1 billion in the House bill to \$700 million for the 1973 fiscal year. Reduction of funds means reduction of opportunity, and the end result will be the unrealized potential of many Americans.

I was astounded and dismayed at the action of the conferees in deleting the provisions of the bill providing for the establishment of a National Legal Services Corporation. Such an independent corporation would free legal services from the everyday pressures exerted by politicians and bureaucrats and allowed it to do its great work without such interference. The often-expressed hostility of Mr. Nixon and his friends to OEO legal services makes me fear for its future if it is left within his easy reach.

Other OEO services benefits somewhat from the conference report. The increase in authorized appropriations for VISTA, emergency food, and alcoholic counseling, for example, are welcome, even though they do not begin to approach

the amount of funding needed in order for them to be truly effective.

Despite the funding reductions in H.R. 12350, Mr. Chairman, OEO provides vital services to individuals and communities, and I see in the conference report the hope of sustaining financial support, for its programs. Despite President Nixon's veto of comprehensive child care and his harsh and ill-advised criticisms of appropriations basic to minimal maintenance of OEO programs, I urge the adoption of the report.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 97, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]
YEAS—223

Abzug	Denholm	Johnson, Pa.
Adams	Diggs	Karh
Anderson, Calif.	Donohue	Kastenmeier
Anderson, Ill.	Dow	Kazen
Anderson, Tenn.	Drinan	Keating
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dulski	Kee
Annunzio	du Pont	Keith
Arendt	Edmondson	Kemp
Aspin	Edwards, Calif.	Kling
Barrett	Ellberg	Kluczynski
Begich	Erlenborn	Koch
Bell	Esch	Kyl
Bennett	Evans, Colo.	Landrum
Bergland	Fascell	Lent
Biaggi	Findley	Link
Biester	Fish	McClory
Blanton	Flood	McCloskey
Boggs	Foley	McCulloch
Boland	Ford, Gerald R.	McDade
Brademas	Ford	McFall
Brasco	William D.	McKay
Brooks	Forsythe	McKevitt
Brotzman	Fraser	McKinney
Brown, Mich.	Frelighuysen	Macdonald, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Frenzel	Madden
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton	Mallory
Buchanan	Garmatz	Mann
Burke, Mass.	Gaydos	Mann
Burlison, Mo.	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Burton	Gonzalez	Mazzoli
Byrnes, Wis.	Grasso	Melcher
Carey, N.Y.	Griffiths	Metcalfe
Carlson	Gubser	Minish
Carter	Gude	Mitchell
Cederberg	Hamilton	Monagan
Chamberlain	Hammer-schmidt	Moorhead
Chisholm	Hanley	Morgan
Clark	Hanna	Murphy, Ill.
Clausen, Don H.	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.
Clay	Harrington	Natcher
Cleveland	Harsha	Nedzi
Collins, Ill.	Harvey	Nelsen
Conable	Hechler, W. Va.	Nix
Conte	Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara
Conyers	Heinz	O'Konski
Cotter	Helstoski	O'Neill
Coughlin	Hicks, Mass.	Passman
Culver	Hicks, Wash.	Patman
Curlin	Hogan	Patten
Daniels, N.J.	Holifield	Perkins
Davis, S.C.	Hosmer	Pettis
de la Garza	Howard	Peyser
Dellenback	Hungate	Pickle
	Jacobs	Podell
	Johnson, Calif.	Powell
		Pryor, Ark.

Quie	Smith, Iowa	Vanik
Railsback	Smith, N.Y.	Vigorito
Randall	Staggers	Waggonner
Rangel	Stanton	Waldie
Rees	J. William	Whalen
Rhodes	Steele	Whitehurst
Rodino	Steiger, Wis.	Wilson, Bob
Roe	Stephens	Wilson, Charles H.
Roncallo	Stratton	Wolff
Rooney, Pa.	Stubblefield	Wright
Rosenthal	Stuckey	Wyatt
Roush	Symington	Wydler
Roy	Taylor	Wylie
Roybal	Teague, Calif.	Wyman
Runnels	Terry	Yates
St Germain	Thompson, N.J.	Young, Tex.
Sarbanes	Thomson, Wis.	Zablocki
Scheuer	Tierman	Zwack
Shriver	Udall	
Skubitz	Ullman	
Slack	Vander Jagt	

NAYS—97

Abbt	Gettys	Myers
Abernethy	Gialmo	Pike
Andrews, Ala.	Goldwater	Poege
Archer	Goodling	Price, Tex.
Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Purcell
Belcher	Griffin	Quillen
Bevill	Gross	Farick
Blackburn	Grover	Roberts
Bray	Hagan	Robinson, Va.
Brinkley	Haley	Rogers
Broyhill, Va.	Hall	Roussetot
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Ruth
Burleson, Tex.	Hutchinson	Sandman
Byron	Ichord	Satterfield
Cabell	Jarman	Saylor
Casey, Tex.	Jonas	Scott
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Sebelius
Clancy	Landgrebe	Sikes
Clawson, Del.	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Lennon	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	Long, Md.	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	McClure	Sullivan
Daniel, Va.	McCollister	Talcott
Dennis	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	Martin	Thompson, Ga.
Diggs	Mathis, Ga.	Thone
Downing	Mayne	Ware
Duncan	Meeds	Whitten
Fisher	Miller, Ohio	Williams
Flowers	Mills, Md.	Young, Fla.
Flynt	Minshall	Zion
Fountain	Mizell	
Frey	Montgomery	

NOT VOTING—111

Abouzeck	Gallifanakis	Obey
Addabbo	Gallagher	Pelly
Alexander	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Ashley	Halpern	Pirnie
Aspinall	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Badillo	Hastings	Pucinski
Baker	Hathaway	Reid
Baring	Hawkins	Reuss
Betts	Hays	Riegle
Bingham	Hebert	Robison, N.Y.
Blatnik	Henderson	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Hillis	Rostenkowski
Bow	Horton	Ruppe
Broomfield	Hull	Ryan
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Scherie
Caffery	Jones, Tenn.	Schmitz
Camp	Kuykendall	Schneebeli
Carney	Kyros	Schwengel
Celler	Leggett	Seiberling
Colmer	Lloyd	Shipley
Conover	Long, La.	Shoup
Corman	Lujan	Sisk
Danielson	McCormack	Spence
Davis, Ga.	McDonald,	Springer
Davis, Wis.	Mich.	Stanton,
Delaney	McEwen	James V.
Dellums	McMillan	Steed
Dent	Mailliard	Stokes
Dickinson	Mathias, Calif.	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Michel	Vessey
Dorn	Mikva	Wampler
Dowdy	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Dwyer	Mills, Ark.	White
Eckhardt	Mink	Widnall
Edwards, Ala.	Molichan	Wiggins
Eshleman	Mosher	Winn
Evins, Tenn.	Moss	Yatron
Fuqua	Nichols	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Colmer against.
 Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hull against.
 Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Nichols against.
 Mr. Price of Illinois for, with Mr. Baring against.
 Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
 Mr. Reid for, with Mr. Fuqua against.
 Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Henderson against.
 Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Betts against.
 Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Camp against.
 Mr. Wampler for, with Mr. Dickinson against.
 Mr. Robison of New York for, with Mr. Eshleman against.
 Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.
 Mr. Hillis for, with Mr. Schmitz against.
 Mr. Schwengel for, with Mr. Veysey against.
 Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Spence against.
 Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Michel against.
 Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Scherle against.
 Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Schneebeli against.
 Mr. Yatron for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.
 Mr. Ruppe for, with Mr. McEwen against.
 Mr. Winn for, with Mr. Wiggins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Halpern.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Pirnie.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Stokes with Mr. Riegle.
 Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Shoup.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Lloyd.
 Mr. Dellums with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Hathaway.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Abourezk.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Carney with Mr. Caffery.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Corman.
 Mr. Danielson with Mr. Mikva.
 Mrs. Mink with Mr. Miller of California.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McMillan.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Ewins of Tennessee with Mr. Eckhardt.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Galifianakis.
 Mr. White with Mr. Seiberling.
 Mr. Aspinall with Mr. McCormack.
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Steed.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1972, I was detained on business and missed rollcall No. 346. In the announcement of my position on this vote at pages 29126-27 of that day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the printer inadvertently referred to it as rollcall No. 329.

To set the matter straight, I missed rollcall No. 346, on which I would have voted "yea" had I been present. I was present on rollcall No. 329 and am correctly recorded as having voted "nay" on that occasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the previous rollcall No. 350. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

BEVILL OPPOSES GRANTING AMNESTY TO DRAFT DODGERS

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a Subcommittee on Administration Practice and Procedure of the U.S. Senate has held hearings on granting amnesty to draft dodgers.

A few weeks ago I cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 543 which states in substance that no amnesty be enacted by the Congress or exercised by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to efforts being made to grant amnesty to draft evaders and deserters from our Armed Forces.

Such a move would be grossly unfair to the hundreds of thousands of young men who met their responsibilities and served their country with honor.

Granting amnesty would mean that the 70,000 young men who dodged the draft and are now living in exile in Canada, Sweden, and other foreign countries would be immune from prosecution. It would mean the release of more than 500 draft resisters now serving in Federal prisons. And it would mean releasing the 9,500 soldiers either serving sentences in military stockades or confined there awaiting trial for violation of the Military Code.

Many young men who served in Vietnam did not agree with our Government's decision to send them there. But they went anyway. Thousands of these men were wounded, many were killed, and some were taken prisoner. Granting amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters would be a grave injustice to those who made such great sacrifices.

It is foolish, in my estimation, to think that the majority of those who refused service did so, because of some high moral purpose. Rather, I believe it was a display of total irresponsibility and cowardice.

In my opinion, it is completely out of order to even consider granting amnesty to anyone while we still have men fighting and dying in Vietnam and while there

are men being held prisoner by the Communists.

To grant amnesty would set a dangerous precedent which could have grave consequences in future emergency situations which call for military mobilization.

It would also undermine our system of justice by rewarding those who violated our laws and shirked their duty.

Our Nation is a great nation. And one of the reasons it is great is because courageous men and women, down through the years, have taken up arms when it was necessary to fight for those basic rights which America stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time to reassess our values and restate our priorities. Let us turn our attention to those who have served; let us meet their needs and help them readjust to civilian life and stop giving so much time and attention to those who turned their back on their country when they were needed.

CONGRATULATIONS TO WINNERS OF OLYMPIC GAMES

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to congratulate all of our winners in the Olympic games. They have performed superbly and brought great honor to this country. However, I particularly wish to single out a winner from Bowling Green State University, David James Wottle, for special praise and commendation. This young man won the 800 meters in 1 minute and 49 seconds. He ran like the champion he is and was so taken in by his win—and rightly so—that he did not remember that he had his hat on when they played our national anthem. When this omission was later called to his attention by the media, he was noticeably shaken and publicly apologized to the people of the United States and further commented that this omission subtracted from the personal satisfaction of his win.

Mr. Speaker, this was an expression of the feelings of a truly great American as well as that of a truly great champion being expressed at the high point of his athletic career and I wish to say to David Wottle that he should not feel badly for his unintentional omission at a time like this. It is only human to forget and this young man may be longer remembered for his heartfelt spontaneous apology to the American people for his forgetfulness at the time of his greatest triumph than he will be for the triumph itself.

AMERICAN GRAIN SALES TO THE SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest a situation that has come into the news while the Congress was in recess for the Republican Convention. This

is the partially revealed situation regarding American grain sales to the Soviet Union and the resultant effects on the farmers in this country and the whole consumer population.

I was one of those strongly supporting the grain export to Russia when this was announced by the President. I felt that this would be of significant help to the farmer and the American economy given our grain surpluses. But since that time a number of revelations have been forthcoming regarding effects of the purchase, the way in which it has been handled, the kind of favoritism practiced, and the accompanying costs to the American farmer and consumer. These have made me very uncomfortable, and disappointed to say the least. Because I believe this trade could have been a total gain; instead it seems to have had some serious ill effects.

It seems now likely that certain large grain export companies have been privy to advance information concerning the extent of Government subsidy and credit arrangements on export sales of wheat—at least it seems that they have been privy to special and valuable information not given to others equally involved, such as the farmers who grow the crops. Accordingly these companies could purchase wheat before prices went up.

It is estimated that the Russian wheat deal has cost wheat farmers in early harvest areas an estimated \$100 million in Government wheat certificate payments. Largely because the rising wheat market could raise the average price to \$1.75 per bushel during the July to November marketing period. This will have the effect of reducing the Federal subsidy by approximately 40 cents a bushel. Farmers receive the difference between the average price during that 5-month marketing period and 100 percent of parity, now estimated at \$3.03 per bushel, on that portion of their wheat used in domestic markets. Those who sold in July receiving \$1.30 to \$1.35 per bushel, will find their wheat certificates amounting to only \$1.28 per bushel, if the average for the 5-month period is \$1.75—making their total return about 40 cents a bushel less than the full parity price. Had they known about the details of the trade expectations, which surely the Department of Agriculture had information on, this need not have happened.

Now, to make matters worse, the USDA has announced that subsidies are getting too high, but they at the same time raised the subsidy from 38 to 47 cents for a period ending 2 days before their announcement. Thus they protected the profits of traders who had been buying on a rising market, but they certainly did not have the farmer in mind.

Upon my return I found a news release from the USDA stating that—

Every farm region benefited from the record exports of \$8.05 billion in fiscal 1972.

The news release went on to say that the 1971-72 export market accounted for at least two-fifths of the U.S. production of wheat.

This is heartening, but I believe, given the story above, it is only a part of the

picture. I have some questions I would like the Department to answer about the sale of wheat to Russia:

How much wheat has been sold to Russia?

What price was paid?

Who received the export subsidy and in what amounts over what period of time?

What are the credit terms?

Who pays shipping charges and other costs incidental to the export of the wheat?

What amount of export subsidy is planned for the future? Will it fluctuate with domestic consumption or not?

How does this affect our domestic supply, including our surplus supply?

How much is wheat expected to rise in domestic prices as a result?

I would like to say finally, that I do not object to private corporations carrying out the trade negotiated by the Government. But I do object to their doing so at the expense of: The farmer-producer; of all those processors, such as millers and bakers who rely on wheat; and the American consumer who foots the bill for the subsidy given those selling on the cheaper world market; of the American consumer who suffers a higher cost for domestic wheat products while those buying enjoy a lower cost. So I would like these questions answered. I have today sent a letter to Secretary Butz asking these same questions, but if answers are not forthcoming, I would recommend a congressional investigation of this whole matter.

JACK KEMP PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE MOST REVEREND JAMES A. McNULTY, BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF BUFFALO

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the people of Western New York and our country have lost an outstanding spiritual leader as the result of the death Monday of the Most Reverend James A. McNulty, bishop of the eight-county Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo.

His death is a great personal loss not only to us in Western New York, but to mankind. He loved and served both with a total and tireless commitment. At the same time, however, we offer thanks for the great legacy this man of God left behind after his 72 years of life, 47 of them as an ordained servant of God and his fellow human beings.

Mr. Speaker, Bishop McNulty epitomized all that is good in America and those of the cloth who serve it, and his leadership will continue through his words and works.

Born in New York City and reared in modest circumstances in a family with six children, he was an outstanding student who graduated with honors from Seton Hall College in South Orange, N.J.

At the age of 25, he was ordained into priesthood at the University of Louvain in Belgium.

Even as an assistant pastor of St. Joseph's Church in Jersey City, his leadership, his gift as a speaker, and his concern for people, community and country quickly became evident.

A lifetime advocate of educational opportunity, he was the executive secretary for the Immaculate Conception Seminary fund drive in New Jersey in 1937. Years later, following his installation in 1963 as the 10th bishop of the Buffalo Diocese, he pioneered "Social Christianity," a project to instill a mature and modernized concept of the Christian faith among high school seniors attending public schools.

With other religious leaders, he endorsed a lecture series entitled "Your Neighbor's Faith" to educate the citizens of Western New York in the tenets of various religious beliefs.

In November 1969, he proclaimed that the first, new Roman Catholic Mass in 400 years would be held in the Buffalo Diocese, a year ahead of the national deadline in 1971.

His ecumenical leadership caused Terence Cardinal Cooke, archbishop of New York to observe in 1970 that Bishop McNulty "life is devoted to the cause of unity. His prayers and his works have for their purpose the strengthening of the unity of God's family on earth."

Throughout his career, Bishop McNulty showed compassion and worked for the downtrodden and oppressed.

He impressed upon his followers the urgency of providing opportunity and dignity to America's blacks and declared that the church is "the best friend of the entire Negro community in Buffalo."

When he was auxiliary bishop of Newark, N.J., he chose the poorest parish in that community among the blacks and other economically disadvantaged groups. He carried his concerns for the poor to Buffalo where, among other actions, he inaugurated drives for money and gifts and recruited for priests, nuns, and volunteers to minister to the people of Latin America.

As a result of his efforts, he was named vice chairman of the U.S. Bishops Committee for Latin America.

Bishop McNulty not only spread the word of God in his sermons, but was a leader in the art of religious communication.

In 1951, he founded the Advocate, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Newark. During his spiritual leadership of the Buffalo Diocese, the weekly diocesan newspaper, the Magnificat, became one of the leading religious journals in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Bishop McNulty was faithful to his God, his community, his country, and his fellow man.

We will miss him as a friend. But all of us are grateful for the time he was among us and for the contributions and inspiration he has left behind.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks by including tributes to the late Most Reverend James A. McNulty which were carried today in the Buffalo Courier-Express:

LEADERS IN MANY FIELDS PAY HOMAGE TO BISHOP McNULTY

The late Most Rev. A. McNulty, bishop of the eight-county Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo since 1963, was described as a deeply religious and dedicated prelate who had great warmth for his fellow man and outstanding qualities of leadership which inspired his diocese.

He was also called "a saint," and a bishop who will "best be remembered for his concern for the poor and needy."

These tributes were among the following eulogies issued in memory of Bishop McNulty:

The Rt. Rev. Harold R. Robinson, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York: "I wish to convey my sympathy to the family and friends of Bishop McNulty. He was a courteous and conscientious man, completely dedicated to his convictions and the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church."

"He was gracious in offering the use of St. Joseph's New Cathedral for my consecration in 1968. This, along with the other kindnesses he has shown to me and other members of the Episcopal Diocese, will not be forgotten. May God rest his soul and bestow abundant blessings upon him."

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, pastor of St. Andrew's Church, Town of Tonawanda.

"It has been my privilege to be a personal friend and confidant of Bishop McNulty's for close to 33 years. I have found him to be a brilliant scholar, a gentleman under all conditions, genteel, and a master in the practice of Christian charity. Forever dedicated to the teachings of Christ and the Catholic Church, his passing is a severe blow to me leaving a void in my priestly life."

Richard F. Torrey, president of the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce:

"Bishop McNulty's death leaves a deep void—a void which will be felt not only by the Catholic Diocese but by the entire Western New York community. He guided his own church during a demanding era of profound change, personally typifying the spirit of religious ecumenism."

"This outstanding spiritual leader brought to the secular community great wisdom, performing an extremely influential role in the field of business, labor and education. Citizens of all faiths mourn his passing."

George L. Wessel, president of the Buffalo AFL-CIO Council:

"I feel that the death of the Bishop is a great loss to the community and I feel that in the years that he has served here as our bishop he provided the spiritual leadership that is necessary in a community of our type with a predominantly Catholic population. I express my regrets and those of the labor movement to the bishop's family."

Sister Mary Charlotte Barton, GNSH, president of D'Youville College:

"The president, the sister and lay faculty members and the staff of D'Youville College join with the Diocese of Buffalo in expressing bereavement on the death of their spiritual leader, the Most Rev. James A. McNulty, bishop of Buffalo. During the period of his guardianship of the diocese, this dedicated prelate patiently and kindly fostered the church, earnestly serving God's people in one of the most trying eras in the development of the Catholic Church."

"Bishop McNulty strove to protect the best interests of the clergy and the people of Buffalo. Perhaps our deceased bishop will be best remembered for his concern for the poor and needy. He was ardent in promoting the annual charity drive which brought results comparable to his concern. We mourn our loss of his gentle leadership while we rejoice in the released and the reward he will receive from almighty God whom he faithfully served."

Dr. Charles A. Banda, Knight of St. Gregory, president-elect of National Federation of Catholic Physicians Guild:

"The Catholic community of Western New York has lost a great prelate. Bishop McNulty was a deeply religious man who worked diligently for the spiritual enlightenment for the members of his diocese."

Dr. Albert Semit, executive vice president of University of Buffalo, in the absence of Dr. Robert L. Ketter, the president:

"The community will mourn his passing. In passing, however, he has left substantial foundation on which a successor can build."

William G. Armstrong, supreme captain general, Ancient and Illustrious Order, Knights of Malta, and a retired Penn Central Railroad employee:

"It is a tragedy to lose such a great man. My prayers certainly go out to him."

Walter J. Thisegron, a Knight of St. Gregory, a trustee of Catholic Charities of Buffalo and member of the budget committee and retired Western Division public relations director, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.:

"In this age of changes, within and without the church, the role of the bishop in a diocese of the size and magnitude of Buffalo is a staggering one. Bishop McNulty fulfilled his role as ordinary of the diocese with courage, wisdom and dignity. He was truly a great shepherd of his flock."

John J. Conaiff, director of Catholic Charities:

"If I were asked to describe our beloved Bishop McNulty in one word, it would be 'charity'—the charity that Christ Himself spoke of. The lay people of this diocese have lost a noble leader, and I have lost a cherished friend."

Charles R. Turner, a Knight of St. Gregory, chairman of the Buffalo Board of Parking and former president of the Area Council on Alcoholism:

"Bishop McNulty was a saint. His knowledge of and dedication to community services was unfailing, especially in the alcoholic field."

Sister Alice Huber, SSJ, president of Medaille College:

"Bishop McNulty probably has lived through one of the most difficult times in the history of the church in America. The rapidly changing society together with the call for renewal in the Church since Vatican II demanded courage and adjustment of both the clergy and the laity. However, I knew him better in affairs of higher education. Bishop McNulty, like his deceased brother (Msgr. John L. McNulty) who had been president of Seton Hall University, was interested in the problems of higher education. Bishop McNulty was concerned for the need for co-operation among area colleges. He had the joy of seeing this dream fulfilled through the establishment of the Western New York Consortium of public and private colleges. My sympathy is extended to his family."

John G. Wick, Knights of St. Gregory, Knights of Holy Sepulchre, President of Merchants Mutual Insurance Co.:

"It is with a deep sense of personal loss that we mark the passing of Bishop McNulty. History will record his accomplishments in the Western New York diocese as one of the most outstanding of a long line of leading churchmen. He was a shepherd to all his flock in the truest sense, and we were most fortunate to have had his sturdy hand at the helm as he steered the Catholic Church through new and uncharted waters. We should all join in prayerful thanks to him for a job well done."

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Conaiff, director of the diocese's Catholic Charities:

"The death of Bishop McNulty is a great blow to thousands of workers and the clients of Catholic Charities. In every way, he was the bishop of charity and we will greatly miss

his support and counsel and encouragement." Sebastian J. Bellome, Chief Buffalo City Court Judge:

"The passing away of Bishop McNulty is a great loss not only to the Catholic diocese but to the entire community of Western New York. He was a humanitarian without equal and, as the administrator of the Catholic Church in the Buffalo area, his name will go down in history as among the very best. I will greatly miss him personally because he was a good and revered friend."

Rabbi Isaac Klein, Temple Shaarey Zedek:

"With the passing away of Bishop McNulty, the people of Greater Buffalo regardless of race, creed or color lost a friend and a great force for good. A saintly person with a face that radiated gentleness, wisdom and love, he was a source of blessing to the entire community that went beyond the boundaries of the church that he had served so faithfully. Because he was of great spiritual stature, he was respected and loved by all. We of the Jewish community share the sorrow with our Catholic brethren and wish to express to them our deepest sympathy for the loss of a prince of the Church."

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is with humility that I join my colleagues in saluting one of the outstanding Members of this body upon his retirement after more than 19 years of service.

This is a great loss for us all, because our good friend and colleague, the Honorable Richard H. Poff, is commonly admitted by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle as the outstanding expert on constitutional law in Congress.

Because of the exceptional background which Mr. Poff applies unswervingly to his voting participation here in the Congress, his voting pattern comes through as one of knowledge, principle, and integrity.

Some will probably say that we should have more like him—I can only say that there will never be another like him, who can combine all the manners and grace of a true Southern gentleman with a keen understanding of our most cherished living document—the Constitution—and be able to apply it consistently to his every action in this body of the people.

I salute my colleague, my mentor, and my friend, and Arlene joins me in wishing him and Jo Ann every happiness in the future as he takes up his position on the highest Court of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

A REPORT OF THE 92D CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is continuing strong and is becoming stronger. One year after the President exercised the economic stabilization measures given to him by Congress, it is obvious that they are working. Unemployment is currently 5.5 percent. This 5.5-percent unemployment is lower

than it was in the pre-Vietnam war years. As an example, the unemployment rate in 1961 was 6.7 percent.

The inflation rate, which was up to 6 percent annually when President Nixon took office has been reduced to an annual increase of 2.2 percent. It is inflation that steals from the income of everyone and jeopardizes the value of the U.S. dollar.

During the past year, total civilian employment has increased by 2.4 million people, one of the largest 4-quarter increases on record. The Department of Labor has reported that the output per man-hour has increased faster than pay per man-hour for the first time since 1965.

Today, there are 81.7 million people employed, an increase of 5 million over the 76.7 million people that were employed at the end of 1968. Since President Nixon took office, our total armed service personnel strength has been reduced by over 1,300,000, and virtually all of these veterans have been placed in civilian jobs. This rapid increase in civilian employment is higher than the largest increases recorded in the 1960's.

The improvement in our economy is enabling U.S. manufacturers to get back into the world market, and should eliminate the unfavorable balance of trade the United States had in 1971, for the first time in this century. President Nixon's power to impose wage and price controls expires on April 30, 1973, and it is hoped that it will not be necessary to renew this legislation.

Plans for a series of "An Evening With Your Congressman" are being made in an effort to keep me informed of the views of the people. I am planning to spend a series of evenings in the various municipalities of the district to meet with all interested citizens. The evenings will consist of a short talk on the current issues before the Congress, followed by an open question-and-answer period.

The number of U.S. troops in South Vietnam has now been reduced to under 40,000. This means that President Nixon has withdrawn 510,000 American ground troops since he took office, and over 180,500 U.S. ground troops have been withdrawn in the past year.

On August 10, 1972, the House passed a \$2.1 billion foreign military assistance bill, H.R. 16029. I voted for this bill to help maintain the military strength of our allies. However, I voted with the majority to strike one section of the bill which directed the President to withdraw all U.S. forces from Vietnam by October 1, 1972, subject to the release of the U.S. POW's held by North Vietnam, the accounting by Hanoi for those reported missing in action, and a cease-fire.

The language which was struck from H.R. 16029 was cruel and misleading to the American people. It held out false assurance of securing the safe return of our missing servicemen and indicated that a U.S. pullout would end the war in Southeast Asia. Neither assumption is reasonable. Any fixed withdrawal date only gives hope to the North Vietnamese, and hinders sensitive attempts at peace negotiations when there is evidence that

Moscow and Peking are reducing their aid to North Vietnam.

The language which was struck from H.R. 16029 does not guarantee the return of our missing men and would not end the war, only American involvement in it. President Nixon will have all U.S. ground troops out of South Vietnam this year. However, as long as Communist aggression continues against South Vietnam, we must be able to aid South Vietnam with naval and air support.

All of us desire peace and we want our prisoners released. Those advocating a fixed withdrawal date have no evidence to show that this will be successful. They ignore the past record of Communist aggression, with enslavement of the people of the countries they have taken over.

Early in 1972, Ralph Nader announced that he was going to undertake an investigation of Congress. Since developing some valuable information on automobile safety, Ralph Nader and his graduate students, known as "Nader's Raiders," seem to have become experts on every subject. Since almost everything relating to a Congressman is a matter of public record, most Congressmen assumed that Nader and his student volunteers would simply research the public record.

It was astonishing to learn that one of Nader's interviewers had come to my office to interview me without even making an appointment and at a time when the Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve, was working on the new housing bill and new disaster loan legislation. When the interviewer learned that I was not available, she left a huge questionnaire with 633 detailed questions to be filled out and stated she would return at a later date for a personal interview. I learned from other Congressman that these interviews took up to 3 hours.

Since I serve on the House Banking and Currency Committee, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the National Commission on Consumer Finance, and the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and usually work 7 days a week serving the needs of my constituents, I informed Mr. Nader that I did not have 3 hours to waste with his interviewer and that I was not going to take the time to answer a questionnaire with the asinine number of 633 questions.

If 15 or 20 individuals or groups decided to investigate the Congress, Congressmen would only have time to give interviews and fill out questionnaires. I believe that the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania want a working Congressman, not a time-waster.

I do meet with my constituents whenever they visit Washington and in my Delaware County office when I am home each weekened in an effort to solve their problems and keep them informed.

President Nixon has hailed "the best news yet on the crime front" the news that serious crime rose only 1 percent in the first quarter of this year—the lowest percentage gain in 11 years. "This represents truly significant progress in this administration's determination to roll back the wave of crime that swept our

Nation in the 1960's." In the years from 1961 to 1968, serious crime rose over 100 percent throughout the United States.

Congress has worked hard to provide the necessary tools and weapons for the war on crime. With my support, the Congress has passed a series of important acts including the Omnibus Crime Control Act which improved the organization and management of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the main vehicle for distributing Federal anticrime grants to State and local authorities, the Organized Crime Control Act and several important drug abuse control measures.

Figures showing that we are halting soaring crime rates have been released by Attorney General Kleindienst. A year ago, the rate of increase was 6 percent and in 1970, it was 13 percent. Kleindienst also reported that 80 of the Nation's largest cities report actual reductions in serious crime in the first quarter of 1972. I assure you that I will continue to strongly support all measures that come before the Congress which will help reduce criminal activity.

Effective September 1, 1972, a 20 percent increase in social security recently enacted by the Congress, H.R. 15390, will benefit some 28.7 million Americans. This increase means the social security benefits will have been increased by 58 percent since 1968.

On August 9, 1972, the House passed H.R. 15927, which increases railroad retirement benefits by 20 percent. Just as soon as this bill is passed by the Senate and signed into law by the President, it will mean an increase of 45 percent in railroad retirement since 1970.

Inflation is cruellest to those on fixed incomes, and these increased benefits are to offset the pressure of rising prices on those who are receiving benefits under social security and railroad retirement. While these increases of 20 percent in benefits may seem large, the benefits for an average retired couple will be increased from \$223 to \$270 monthly.

SOVIET EXTORTION FOR JEWS' EMIGRATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled to learn of a decision by the Government of the Soviet Union that citizens with higher educations who wish to emigrate must pay retroactively for the cost of their education. Reportedly, this amount will run between \$5,000 and \$25,000 for each such individual.

It is bad enough in any case for a nation to become a petty extortionist, but in light of the fact that the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the basic human right of emigration from one's country and article 121 of the Soviet Constitution purports to grant free education to all Soviet citizens, this action is nothing short of outrageous.

This is clearly an issue which belongs before the United Nations, and I have asked that organization's human rights

arm to investigate this matter and, if the reports of it are accurate, to condemn a policy that puts a price tag on so basic a right as the freedom of the individual to live where he or she chooses.

The people of the United States must join with the rest of civilized humanity in condemning this policy, and I call upon the President to express our disapproval in the strongest possible terms.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my letter to the United Nations and the text of a message I sent to a recent rally in New York on this issue at the conclusion of my remarks, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The articles follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1972.

Ambassador E. KULAGA,
Chairman, United Nations Human Rights
Commission, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I have been appalled to read of a reported decision by the government of the U.S.S.R. to require educated citizens, including Jews, to pay huge fees for exit visas ostensibly to reimburse the state for the cost of their education.

I trust that your Commission will investigate this report immediately and, if it is substantiated, issue a formal condemnation of a policy that puts a price tag on human freedom. The United Nations Charter recognizes the right of emigration from one's country as a basic human right. To require Soviet citizens to pay retroactively for their education makes a mockery of this right and clearly is designed to impose an impossible condition upon Jews and others who wish to emigrate.

The continued silence of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in the face of increasingly severe restrictions of political and religious freedom imposed upon Soviet Jews undermines confidence in the objectivity of our world organization. As one who has never hesitated to protest governmental and private discrimination against minorities and oppressed groups within my own country, I urge you to act immediately on an issue that is arousing anxiety among all those who cherish individual freedom.

Sincerely yours,

BELLA S. ABZUG,
Member of Congress.

MAILGRAM

Rabbi GILBERT KLAFERMAN,
Greater New York Conference on Soviet
Jewry, New York, N.Y.:

I regret that I cannot be present at the rally today. I would appreciate your reading the following message to the assembly: I join with you in protesting the USSR's appalling policy requiring educated Jews to pay ransom for the right to emigrate to Israel. I have called on the United Nations Human Rights Commission to condemn this latest and most shocking violation of individual rights and I pledge to raise this issue before Congress when it reconvenes next week. The American people and American government must join in condemning a policy that places a price tag on human freedom and formally demand that the Soviet government rescind its ransom decree and allow all those wishing to emigrate to do so without impediment and with full dignity and security.

Congresswoman BELLA S. ABZUG.

OUR DAILY BREAD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the sale of 400 million bushels of U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union was hailed at the time of its public announcement as a major breakthrough in the relation of the two countries and the first stage of a burgeoning trade between them.

It is hoped that this analysis and prediction both will prove to be true. Future world peace will depend in large part on the ability of the major military powers to become mutually benefiting trade partners. But, in the interests of truth, the wheat deal now needs an agonizing reappraisal. How well did we Americans make out?

Part of the answer has come now in the appeal of the American baking industry to the Cost of Living Council for approval of an immediate across-the-board increase in bread prices to cover its rising costs. The major cost hike to it is in flour which has jumped from \$5.40 to \$6.70 per hundredweight under the impact of the heavy Soviet wheat purchases.

Baking industry spokesmen contend that the higher flour cost has placed most breadmakers in a "deficit position" and that a 2- or 3-cent increase is mandatory in each pound loaf of bread sold in the retail bakeries and supermarkets. The result, of course, will be that the already price-harassed American housewife will find herself in the ironic position of taking money from her strained food budget to help feed those once difficult Russians.

Not only this, but the American people already are making tremendous donations to their former cold war opponents in other phases of the wheat deal. Government subsidies paid exporters to hold the U.S. export price at the world market level have climbed according to the Associated Press, from 11 cents a bushel a month ago to around 38 cents now. By rule of thumb, the 38-cent figure works out to \$152 million of our tax money in subsidies on the 400 million bushels which the Russians are buying, under terms of the agreement, at the world price which prevailed when the deal was made. We are locked in on this price while the world price currently is climbing rapidly in reaction to the Soviet purchases.

But this is not all by any means. Also to be considered is the fact that the bulk of the Soviet-bought wheat is coming out of storage here—storage for which our Government has paid private elevators 12 cents a bushel per year. Added to the 38-cent subsidy, this means the Russians are getting our wheat at 50 cents a bushel less than it cost us. And this does not include the Government paid interest through the Commodity Credit Corporation on its wheat investments. Some experts place this amount at around 6½ cents a bushel which is added, also would lift our loss per bushel to 56½ cents.

Did we sell our wheat too cheaply? If wheat were in long supply in today's world—if the big wheat producers all were hunting customers—then there could be an argument that any bargain-basement sale would be to our long-range

advantage, saving us further storage and interest costs. However, this is far from the case. Wheat is becoming a scarce commodity on the international market. Russia is facing a poor wheat crop this year and consequently needs our grain very badly to feed her people. A recent AP dispatch from Moscow tells of a drive underway there against wasting flour with the quaint slogan, "It is necessary to respect every piece of bread." Australia has had a disappointing harvest. Canada's below-average 1972 yield is sold out. It was necessary, therefore, for the Soviets to turn to us, the only Nation with a wheat surplus. Why then, in view of this, was it in our interest to give Russia a below-cost price?

The wheat deal can be looked at from another angle. By sparing Russia the necessity of paying the full costs of our wheat we have left her with funds for other purposes—funds which can continue to go for arms to North Vietnam, for Soviet missile development, and for Soviet adventures throughout the world—all expenditures to our disadvantage and, in the case of North Vietnam, to our great and tragic cost.

The hopes for a booming United States-Soviet trade to come need not obscure these matters to the American public, or excuse any further deals in which the U.S. housewife, to say nothing of the burdened taxpayer, finds herself shortchanged at the checkout counter. Neither should the wheat deal be sold to us as a diplomatic triumph when in reality it is nothing more than another attempt to use U.S. tax dollars to buy goodwill abroad, an illusionary effort which has cost us so dearly in other give-away programs.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to take this time to commend the gentleman for his well stated remarks concerning this grain sale to the Soviet Union. I join the gentleman and I would like to endorse his remarks.

I would also join with him in seeking some answers for these very difficult and very profound questions, because on the surface this appears to be an excellent, right and proper business arrangement.

But, as the gentleman so aptly pointed out, below the surface there is turbulence and I congratulate the gentleman for taking this time to advise the House and to advise the Nation of these very serious problems.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my friend for his interest and commend him for his support. We hope that the State Department will respond and analyze this entire situation, again keeping the interest of the American housewife and the purchaser who pays the 2 or 3 cents increase and keep their interest at heart and hopefully work this situation out and possibly remove the subsidy.

MAJ. GEN. LEO HENRY SCHWEITER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missis-

issippi (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay honor and tribute to a great patriot and soldier, Maj. Gen. Leo Henry Schweiter, who passed away August 23, 1972.

Hank Schweiter was a neighbor of mine in Arlington, Va., for several years where I got to know him as a brilliant man, devoted husband and father who had an intense pride in America and who was totally loyal to his country.

Hank Schweiter had an outstanding military career, and at the time of his forced retirement because of cancer, he served as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Vietnam.

Born in Wichita, Kans., on April 16, 1917, General Schweiter graduated from Kansas State College in 1939 with honors and with membership in the national honor society, Phi Kappa Phi. He entered the military service in 1941 after obtaining a master of arts degree and serving as an instructor at the University of Missouri. He was integrated into the Regular Army in 1946.

After his early service as an administrative and tactical officer at various Army Air Corps flying schools in California, he attended the Parachute School at Fort Benning, Ga., in November 1942. Subsequently he served with the 511th Parachute Infantry in the United States and then with the 101st Airborne Division in Europe. While a member of the 101st Airborne Division he made combat parachute jumps behind enemy lines in Normandy the night before D-day, and in Holland; additionally, he participated in the defense of Bastogne. At the end of the war in Europe, when the 101st Airborne Division was inactivated, he was Assistant Chief of Staff, G2.

Back in the United States in 1946 he served with the 82d Airborne Division until September 1947 when he was assigned to Headquarters, Army Ground Forces at Fort Monroe, Va. In 1949 he attended the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Upon graduation in July 1950 he was assigned to the staff of the X Corps in Korea. While in this assignment he participated in the amphibious landings at Inchon and Wonson and the subsequent evacuation from the Hamhung-Hungnam perimeter in North Korea in December 1950. Later, still in combat in Korea, he served as a battalion commander in the 32d Infantry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division. In October 1951 then Lieutenant Colonel Schweiter returned to Fort Bragg, N.C., where he was assigned to the Joint Airborne Troop Board and to the 82d Airborne Division. While in the 82d Airborne Division he commanded an airborne infantry battalion and the Provisional Reconnaissance Troop, Sky Cavalry, the first air cavalry unit of the U.S. Army.

In March 1956 he was assigned to the newly reactivated 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Ky. as Assistant chief of staff, G-3. He attended the Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., during the 1957-58 school year. Upon graduation he moved to Europe where he served as a staff officer in the G-3 Division.

Headquarters, USAREUR and as chief of staff of the 8th Infantry Division.

In 1959, he began a 3-year assignment at Fort Bragg, N.C., which successively included duties as G-2 of XVIII Airborne Corps and the Strategic Army Corps, commanding officer of the 2d Airborne Battle Group, 504th Infantry and the first commanding officer of the newly activated 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne).

In July of 1962, he was transferred to Washington, D.C., and served in the Office of the Special Assistant for Counterinsurgency and Special Activities, Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Two years later he was assigned to Headquarters, Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations, where he became Director of Special Operations.

In January 1967, he became assistant division commander of the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Ky.

In the Republic of Vietnam from August 1967 to March 1968 General Schweiter commanded the 173d Airborne Brigade. During November 1967, while under his command, the 173d Airborne Brigade was engaged in bitter fighting around Dak To. In March 1968, General Schweiter was assigned as chief of staff of XXIV Corps which directed U.S. military operations below the DMZ in the northern provinces of South Vietnam. Upon returning to the United States in December 1968 he became deputy commanding general of the U.S. Army Combat Developments Command at Fort Belvoir, Va., the position in which he served until his return to Vietnam for a second tour. General Schweiter's final active duty assignment was as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Vietnam, between September 1971 and April 1972.

During his distinguished military career, he won the following awards and decorations:

Distinguished Service Medal with one oak leaf cluster;

Silver Star Medal with one oak leaf cluster;

Legion of Merit with one oak leaf cluster;

Distinguished Flying Cross;

Bronze Star Medal with three oak leaf clusters;

Air Medal with "V" Device and 24 oak leaf clusters;

Army Commendation Medal;

Purple Heart with one oak leaf cluster;

Presidential Unit Citation with one oak leaf cluster;

Order of Orange Nassau, degree of officer, Netherlands;

National Order of Vietnam, Fifth degree;

Vietnamese Army Distinguished Service Order, First class;

Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with palm;

Vietnamese Chung My Medal, First class;

Presidential Unit Citation, Republic of Korea;

Orange Lanyard, Netherlands;

Fourragere, Belgium;

Fourragere, 1st ARVN Division;

Combat infantryman badge with star; and

Master parachutist badge.

General Schweiter is survived by his mother, Mrs. Bertha Schmid Schweiter, his wife, the former Virginia Pflaum of Wauwatosa, Wisc., and four children, Henry, Gail, Mary Jean, and Caroline.

To all of them, Mr. Speaker, I extend my deep sympathy.

As a part of my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on August 28, 1972:

EX-ARMY STAFF CHIEF IN VIETNAM

Retired Army Maj. Gen. Leo H. Schweiter, 55, who was chief of staff of the Army in Vietnam at the time of his retirement last May, died Wednesday in Dunham Army Hospital at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

Born in Wichita, Kan., Gen. Schweiter was a graduate of Kansas State College and held a master's degree from the University of Missouri.

He enlisted in the Army Air Corps in 1941 and served in the European theater with the 101st airborne division during World War II.

Gen. Schweiter was assigned to the 82d Airborne Division in 1945 and after combat during the Korean War was a member of the joint airborne troop board.

In 1959, after a tour of duty in Europe, he was named chief of staff of the 8th Infantry Division. He later was assistant chief of staff, G2, headquarters, XVII Airborne Corps.

In 1961, he was named commanding officer of the 5th Special Airborne Force group, 1st Special Forces.

Gen. Schweiter served in Washington from 1962 to 1964 in the office of special assistant for counterinsurgency and special activities for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. During the next two years, he was in the office of the deputy chief of staff for operations.

He later was at Ft. Campbell, Ky., then was sent to Vietnam. He returned to this country in 1969 to become deputy commanding general of the Army combat developments command at Ft. Belvoir, Va., before becoming chief of staff of the Army in Vietnam.

His many decorations included the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Bronze Star.

He is survived by his wife, Virginia, and four children, James, Gail, Mary Jean and Caroline, all of Carlisle, and his mother, Mrs. Otto Schweiter, of Wichita.

INTRODUCING AN AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which is important in each and every congressional district in the Nation. The bill, an amendment to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, is intended as a safeguard against future flood disasters where entire flood-prone communities have gone uninsured and have thus required huge expenditures of Federal energy and money for disaster relief which otherwise would not be spent. If adequate flood insurance under the federally subsidized program had been in effect in the areas stricken by Hurricane Agnes—I think we all know who she is by now—if such in-

insurance had been in effect, the savings to the Federal Government would be in millions of dollars and countless man-hours of time. Thus the aim of this bill—improve the attractiveness of the current Federal flood insurance program while at the same time encouraging local communities to utilize its provisions.

As I said before, this bill is important to us all. None of us are seers, no one can tell the future. As an example of this lack of foresight I present the city of Harrisburg, capital of the State of Pennsylvania. In the entire city, which lies upon the Susquehanna River Basin, nobody had flood insurance; 70 percent of the flood damage from Hurricane Agnes—need I repeat again, the greatest civil disaster in the history of the republic—70 percent of the damage was in Pennsylvania, and 70 percent of the damage in Pennsylvania was in the Wilkes-Barre and the Wyoming Valley. And in that entire valley, only two people had flood insurance.

This is not a condemnation of the program. This is not a condemnation of the communities who failed to take the necessary actions to qualify for such insurance, nor do I mean to condemn those individuals who were eligible, yet failed to take advantage of it. The problem this time is not in ourselves, but in the stars—no one had the foresight to imagine that they would be stricken. It was Sinclair Lewis who penned a novel in the thirties entitled "It Can't Happen Here", but it can, and it did, and it will. The disaster he was talking about was social and political, this one is natural—and remember this, it can happen to you, and it did happen to me, and it will happen to some of you in the years to come.

The bill I am introducing today would quadruple the statutory flood insurance coverage limits. It would quadruple both the subsidized limits on various types of buildings and their contents, as well as quadrupling the maximum limits of flood insurance coverage. Currently, the subsidized limits on single family residential units are inadequate at a figure of \$17,500—my bill raises that limit to \$70,000. The limits on other residential units, double blocks, et cetera, and nonresidential structures would be increased from \$30,000 to \$120,000. The coverage for the contents of a residence would be raised from a maximum of \$5,000 to the \$20,000 level. I am particularly distressed at the current limit for businesses struck by flooding, oftentimes a completely devastating experience.

The limit for the contents of a business at \$5,000 is totally unrealistic. Therefore, my legislation would increase that coverage to \$120,000. In each case listed above, nonsubsidized flood insurance could be obtained in an amount double that of the subsidized maximum, at actuarial rates.

To encourage individuals to purchase flood insurance when they reside in a flood-prone area, the bill requires that all individuals, as a condition precedent to receiving Farmers Home, VA, or FHA mortgage insurance, must purchase flood insurance under the Federal program. These flood-prone areas are currently defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as any area

which has a 1-percent annual chance of flooding.

As a further incentive—this time for the communities—the bill provides that those communities which have been identified as special flood zone areas would be required to participate in the national flood insurance program at the risk of penalty. The penalties are severe—future Federal financial assistance for construction programs such as urban renewal would be reduced, with increasing penalties as a community's failure to act continued.

Beginning July 1, 1976, the VA, Farmers Home Administration, and FHA mortgage insurance and new construction guarantee programs would be curtailed. By 1977, funds for programs such as open space, community facilities, community development, model cities, and so forth, would be reduced by 10 percent. By 1978, another 20-percent reduction would take place; with 30 percent in 1979, and in 1980, 40 percent. Thus, the total reduction amounts to 100 percent in 4 years.

These severe penalties are only, and strictly, for those cities, townships, and boroughs which fail to participate in the flood insurance program and which are located in flood hazard areas. It only makes sense, that if the Federal Government is going to provide Federal funds to build in flood-prone areas, the local communities should be required to take steps to reduce the impact of the flooding.

In addition, this bill broadens the availability of flood insurance to anyone who wishes to obtain it. At the same time, in order to encourage local communities to sign up for the flood insurance program and meet Federal land-use requirements, the premium rates on policies issued in communities which have not been approved for flood insurance would be 25 percent above the subsidized rate offered to residents of approved communities.

One last note, the bill I have introduced will expand the Federal flood insurance program. And you can be sure that in the wake of Hurricane Agnes, it would have expanded of its own accord. As a result, I feel that a \$20 billion statutory limit for total coverage in force under the national flood insurance program is an appropriate figure.

H.R. 16521

A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968

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 "National Flood Insurance Act Amendments of 1972".

INSURANCE LIMITS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1306(b)(1)(A) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "\$17,500", "\$30,000", and "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$70,000", "\$120,000", and "\$20,000", respectively.

(b) Section 1306(b)(1)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$30,000" (each place it appears) and "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$120,000" and "\$120,000", respectively.

(c) Section 1306(b)(1)(C) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$30,000" and "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$120,000", and "\$120,000", respectively.

PROGRAM LIMITATION

SEC. 3. Section 1319 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "\$2,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000,000".

SEC. 4. (a) Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"REQUIREMENT OF FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR FEDERALLY INSURED OR FEDERALLY GUARANTEED MORTGAGES"

"Sec. 1321. (a) No officer or agency of the United States shall insure or guarantee or enter into a contract or commitment for the insurance or guaranty of any mortgage or real estate loan if the property to which such mortgage or loan relates is situated in a flood-prone area as determined by the Secretary under section 1360, unless such property is covered by the flood insurance program under this title (to the extent that such program applies or has been extended to property of the type involved under section 1305 (a) and (b)).

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the terms 'insure or guarantee' and 'insurance or guaranty', with respect to mortgages or real estate loans, include or refer to the insurance of any mortgage (or financial institution) under the National Housing Act or title V of the Housing Act of 1949, the insurance or guaranty of any loan under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, and any other insurance or guaranty issued under Federal law with respect to a mortgage on real estate or with respect to a loan made to finance the purchase, acquisition, or rehabilitation of real property."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply with respect to mortgages executed and loans made on or after the first day of the seventh month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act (except that such amendment shall not apply with respect to any such mortgage or loan which is executed pursuant to a contract or commitment entered into before such first day).

PROVISION OF FLOOD INSURANCE IN CERTAIN AREAS NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS OF PROGRAM

SEC. 5. The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is amended—

(1) by striking out "The" in section 1305 (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 1322, the";

(2) by striking out "After" in section 1315 and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 1322, after"; and

(3) by inserting after section 1321 (added by section 4 of this Act) a new section as follows:

"FLOOD INSURANCE COVERAGE IN NONQUALIFYING AREAS"

"Sec. 1322. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act flood insurance coverage may be provided under this title in any State or area (or subdivision thereof) which has not complied with the requirements of section 1305(c) or 1315 if—

"(1) the property with respect to which the insurance is sought is eligible for coverage under section 1305 (a) or (b); and

"(2) the premium charged for the coverage provided is at a rate which exceeds by 25 percent the rate which would otherwise be chargeable on similar property in a State or area (or subdivision thereof) meeting the requirements of section 1305(c) and 1315."

REDUCTION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL BENEFITS IN THE CASE OF COMMUNITIES NOT PARTICIPATING IN THE FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of any unit of local

government which is determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to be located in an area which has special flood hazards, and which is not participating in the flood insurance program established under such Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reduce the aggregate Federal benefits for such unit of local government by 10 per centum on July 1, 1977, by an additional 20 per centum on July 1, 1978, by an additional 30 per centum on July 1, 1979, and by an additional 40 per centum on July 1, 1980.

(b) For the purpose of subsection (a), a reduction of the aggregate Federal benefits of a unit of local government shall be carried out by applying the percentages referred to in such subsection to each of the following:

(1) The aggregate dollar amount obligated or expended in connection with any contract or other agreement entered into by such unit under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, and title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 during the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1977;

(2) The number of dwelling units covered by mortgages insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act in the jurisdiction of such unit which were purchased during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977;

(3) The number of dwelling units with respect to which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs furnished financial assistance under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, which were purchased during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977; and

(4) The number of dwelling units with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture furnished financial assistance under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

POLITICAL PIOUSNESS?

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, piousness is depicted in this morning's Washington Post newspaper. I include the following editorial at this point in the Record for the edification of the Members of the House:

MR. NIXON'S SUNDAY ADDRESS

There is a great deal of talk about elitism in politics these days. In its most commonplace and superficial meaning the term has to do with social class and caste and who went to school where and who is urging whom to do what that he himself is exempted from as a matter of social or financial privilege. Another kind of elitism, however, seems to us to require at least as much attention, being both more pernicious and more easily disguised than the obvious kind that goes with being a "limousine liberal." It is the elitism of men in government who hold that you can do one thing and say another and that the people (ever manipulable) will never be the wiser, that what you confide to the Washington press and governmental elite is quite another matter from what you pitch to the public at large. It holds, in other words, that the people are in fact too dumb to recognize distortions of the truth and too mean-minded in any event to respond to anything but an appeal to prejudice.

Cynicism would be another name for this form of elitist thinking. For almost four years now it has run through Nixon admin-

istration attempts to explain to the Washington press corps (and to each other) how it is that you can only "sell" a worthwhile program by pretending that it is something quite different from what it is. We bring it up because it reached new heights in the President's address to the people on Sunday.

Thus, Mr. Nixon, who lists as his top legislative priority passage of a welfare reform bill that would at least double the number of persons receiving welfare benefits, inveighs against the "welfare ethic" and those who favor a policy of "income redistribution"—which is exactly what his welfare program is. Again, the man whose administration has, on alternate days of the week, worked to bring us many of the big busing cases before the courts, now demands new laws to turn them back, even laws that could have the side effect of undoing much of the orderly desegregation that occurred in the South before he came to office. Finally, the President whose Labor Department brought us the Philadelphia Plan for hiring fixed numbers of blacks, now calls such schemes "as artificial and unfair a yardstick as has ever been used to deny opportunity to anyone."

If Mr. Nixon really means to run against his own administration this way on the theory that no one will be bright enough to notice, we submit that he will be undertaking a perilous and boomerang-laden course. You can only sermonize for so long on the supposed collapse of the "work ethic," after all, before people start wondering what that has to do with the high rate of unemployment in this country that has been tolerated by the present administration—except, perhaps, as a rather crude diversion. And if you persist in alluding to something called the "welfare ethic" that is indulged by those who want something for nothing and who get it out of the working man's taxes, well the first thing you know there's going to be talk about Lockheed loans and rich farmers' subsidies and milk price supports that rise with campaign contributions and oil depletion allowances and God knows what all else—maybe even the fact that the administration has yet to come forward with any specific proposals of its own for tax reform. Indeed, it is not even inconceivable that what with the Watergate affair and all those hundreds of thousands of dollars shuffling around from bank to bank, the better part of valor might be for this administration not to introduce the subject of ethics at all—work, welfare or otherwise.

The pity of it is that, given the showing of current political polls and the failure of the McGovern campaign to get off to much of a start so far, Mr. Nixon has the luxury of pursuing a straight arrow, straight talk campaign if he wants to. That is, he can dispense with this elitist nonsense—and he should. It's not just that people aren't dumb. They don't like to be talked to as if they were.

VICIOUS ACTS BY ARAB TERRORISTS AT MUNICH, GERMANY

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am very hard put to find words to describe my shock and outrage at the vicious acts of terrorism perpetrated this morning by Arab terrorists at Munich, Germany.

I cannot recall any act so wanton and so devoid of decency, and one more certain to call down upon its perpetrators total condemnation from the world community.

Mr. Speaker, for too long a time Arab

terrorists have enjoyed sanctuary from nations whose borders are contiguous to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Nation, and all other nations in the world community, to take whatever action is necessary to see that the Israeli athletes now prisoners are freed and this contemptible act is never repeated.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Soviet Union which has lent aid and encouragement to the Arab bloc to use its influence in the Middle East to bring the terrorist campaign to a halt. For a long time, the Soviets have encouraged anti-Israel feelings and supplied men and munitions for still another aggression against Israel. In a large measure, their encouragement of Arab terror is at the root of the crisis. It is time for the Soviet Union to put all pressure upon its client states in the Middle East to end the reign of terror.

DISTRESS UPON MURDER AT OLYMPIC GAMES

(Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues here this afternoon in publicly expressing our deepest common distress and dismay upon the news of the almost unbelievable armed Arab guerrilla band's murderous invasion of the Israeli quarters of the Olympic Athletes' Village in Munich, Germany.

According to the reports, at least one member of the Israeli group has been killed, another has apparently been seriously wounded, and 13 other members of the Israeli athlete teams are being held as hostages with the threat of being killed outright unless certain demands of these terrorists are met.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult, indeed, to even try to find words to express the extent of our feeling of outrage in learning about this horrible incident and the circumstances of the place where an occasion upon which it has been committed make it unique in the world annals of criminal violence.

It is nearly impossible for any normal, ordinary, peaceful, law abiding person, anywhere on earth, to understand what these terrorists hope to gain by such an awful deed, but whatever it is, they have certainly made the worst possible approach toward achieving it.

The will and the conscience of all other people everywhere in the civilized world has been turned against them by this senseless barbarism and they are succeeding only in generating a tremendous and united international enmity against whatever cause they may think they are espousing.

Mr. Speaker, as our sense of outrage heightens at this atrocious action, I know we all join in our prayers that this horrendous experience being visited upon innocent Israeli athletes and their supervisors may very, very soon be ended with no further bloodshed, that the perpetrators of this terrible crime will be subdued

and properly punished and that appropriate steps will be taken to insure that the possibility of such uncivilized terror to recur again at Olympic games or any other peaceful international assembly will be eliminated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Tuesday, September 5, 1972, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today through September 22, on account of official business.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through September 14, on account of official business.

Mr. MATHIAS of California (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through September 11, on account of official business.

Mr. RYAN (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for this week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS, today, for 10 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS, to revise and extend his remarks and to appear after the calling up of the conference report on H.R. 12350 today.

Mr. QUIE and to include extraneous matter with his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 12350.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOLDWATER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in six instances.

Mr. CRANE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ROBINO.

Mrs. ABZUG in 10 instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in five instances.

Mr. CABELL.

Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 173. An act for the relief of Mrs. Naoyo Campbell, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2483. An act to provide a national program in order to make the international metric system the predominant but not exclusive system of measurement in the United States and to provide for converting to the general use of such system within 10 years; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

S. 2741. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, authorizing aircraft loan guarantees, in order to expand the program pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2816. An act for the relief of Mary Danos Nayak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3252. An act for the relief of Renato M. Dloquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3583. An act for the relief of Gerald Vincent Bull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3671. An act to amend the Administrative Conference Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3835. An act for the relief of Reynaldo Canlas Baecher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3858. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the program of medical assistance to areas with health manpower shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to express the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on the Handicapped be called by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 13089. An act to provide for acceleration of programs for the planting of trees on national forest lands in need of reforestation, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 18, 1972:

H.R. 755. An Act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to convert criminal penalties to civil penalties in certain instances, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2392. An act for the relief of Antonio Benavides;

H.R. 2703. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Balauro;

H.R. 5158. An act for the relief of Maria Rosa Martins;

H.R. 5814. An act to amend section 2735 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the finality of settlement effected under section 2733, 2734, 2734a, 2734b, or 2737;

H.R. 12392. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, section 1491, to authorize the Court of Claims to implement its judgments for compensation;

H.R. 12931. An act to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America; and

H.J. Res. 1278. A resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

On August 19, 1972:

H.R. 15580. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3413. An act for the relief of Dr. David G. Simons, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired);

H.R. 8549. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to broaden the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain admiralty claims administratively, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9256. An act for the relief of Kyong Ok Goodwin (Nee Won);

H.R. 10310. An act to establish the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 10713. An act for the relief of Wilma Busto Koch;

H.R. 11185. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with regard to the exempt status of veterans' organizations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15474. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, Cooley's anemia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 6, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2270. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of his intention to exercise the authority granted him under section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 to waive the requirements of section 514 of the act as it applies to our military assistance programs for fiscal year 1973 to two countries in east Asia, pursuant to section 652 of the act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2271. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting two reports of violation of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and

Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2272. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting reports showing the Laos assistance-related funds expended during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1972, revised figures for the first half-year estimates and for the third quarter, and the totals for the entire fiscal year, pursuant to section 505 of the act of November 17, 1971; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2273. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 100th quarterly report on export control, covering the second quarter of 1972, pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1969; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2274. A letter from the Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a copy of the notice of proposed rulemaking concerning black lung benefits published in the Federal Register on September 2, 1972; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2275. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting reports showing the Cambodian assistance-related funds obligated during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1972, and for the entire fiscal year, and on the value of Defense Department excess material transferred to Cambodia during the fiscal year, pursuant to section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2276. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the second annual report on the performance of functions and duties imposed on the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury by sections 201 and 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, pursuant to section 202(b) of the act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2277. A letter from the Deputy Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting an annual report for fiscal year 1972 on the Agency's disposal of excess foreign property, pursuant to section 404(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2278. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on prototype desalting plants, pursuant to the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1971; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2279. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting notice of the receipt of project proposals with applications for loans from the De Luz Heights Municipal Water District, Fallbrook, Calif., and the Farmington Area Pressurized Irrigation District, Farmington, Utah, pursuant to section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2280. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for the continued provision of overnight accommodations, food and beverages, and merchandising, marine, and automobile service station facilities and services for the public at the Temple Bar site within Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev., for a 15-year term ending December 31, 1986, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2281. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 275, *The Creek Nation, Plaintiff, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2282. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 342-E, *The Seneca Nation of Indians, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70(t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2283. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Railroad Retirement, transmitting the report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Laws 91-377 and 92-46 (H. Doc. No. 92-350); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2284. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to penalties and forfeitures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2285. A letter from the vice president for public affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corp., transmitting a financial report of the corporation covering the month of April 1972, pursuant to section 308(a)(1) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2286. A letter from the vice president for public affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corp., transmitting a financial report of the corporation covering the month of May 1972, pursuant to section 308(a)(1) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2287. 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.

2288. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2289. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2290. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2291. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2292. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, pur-

suant to section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2293. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report, together with legislative recommendations, reflecting the results of a study of ways and means to provide reasonable insurance rates for shippers and vessels engaged in waterborne commerce on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway beyond the present navigation season, pursuant to section 107(c) of Public Law 91-611; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2294. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to permit not more than 30 persons at a time from foreign countries to receive instructions at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2295. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to deduct from gross tonnage in determining net tonnage those spaces on board vessels used for waste materials; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2296. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a request for the withdrawal of approval of various postal construction projects previously approved by the Public Works Committees of Congress, since they will be financed and constructed by the Postal Service under its own authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

2297. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

2298. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the third annual report on the work incentive program (WIN), pursuant to section 440 of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2299. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems of the Atomic Energy Commission associated with the regulation of users of radioactive materials for industrial, commercial, medical, and related purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2300. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for impartial cost-effectiveness studies by the Department of Defense in selecting new weapons; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2301. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the U.S. system for appraising and evaluating Inter-American Development Bank projects and activities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2302. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunity for greater efficiency and savings through the use of evaluation techniques in the Federal Government's computer operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2303. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on economies available through increased use of the Federal Telecommunications System by military installations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2304. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for further improvements in Department of Defense controls over Government-owned plant equipment in the custody of contractors; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2305. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on achievements, administrative problems, and costs in paying black lung benefits to coal miners and their widows under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 801); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2327. A bill to authorize the sale and exchange of certain lands on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6067. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 359, 360, 361, 362, and 363, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6318. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Burns Indian Colony, Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8063. A bill to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9294. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey trust title of U.S. Government land within the Devils Lake Sioux Reservation to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10330. A bill to provide for the distribution of judgment funds to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10489. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, as representatives of the Lemhi Tribe, in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 326-I, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-1374). 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. ANNUNZIO (for himself and Mr. PUCINSKI):

H.R. 16516. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital and medical care to certain members of the armed forces of nations allied or asso-

ciated with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 16517. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 16518. A bill to provide for disciplined and responsible action in the consideration and execution of the Federal budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 16519. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in the amount of any old-age insurance benefit to which an individual is entitled if such individual has 120 quarters of coverage, and to provide that an individual with 120 quarters of coverage may become entitled to medicare benefits at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH (for himself and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 16520. A bill to provide that no State development agency shall be entitled to receive Federal financial assistance in any form unless it provides satisfactory assurance that it will take no action inconsistent with local zoning laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 16521. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. NIX, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. ROE, and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 16522. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for the construction of a civic center in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 16523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 16524. A bill to provide for the humane care, treatment, habilitation and protection of the mentally retarded in residential facilities through the establishment of strict quality operation and control standards and the support of the implementation of such standards by Federal assistance, to establish State plans which require a survey of need for assistance to residential facilities to enable them to be in compliance with such standards, seek to minimize inappropriate admissions to residential facilities and develop strategies which stimulate the development of regional and community programs for the mentally retarded which include the integration of such residential facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16525. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16526. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enable units of general local government to increase the numbers of police; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 16527. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 16528. A bill to clarify the meaning of section 357(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of certain unrealized receivables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.J. Res. 1294. Joint resolution condemning the actions of the Arab guerrillas at the Olympic Village on September 5, 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

421. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Maryland (House concurring), ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

422. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maryland, (Senate concurring), ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 16529. A bill for the relief John C. Mayors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 16530. A bill for the relief of Arturo Aguirre-Alvarado, his wife, Soledad Labra de Aguirre, and their children Graciela Aguirre Labra, Guadalupe Aguirre Labra, Alma Rosa Aguirre Labra, Arturo Aguirre Labra, Jr., Alberto Aguirre Labra, and Beatriz Aguirre Labra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

274. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ethel W. Satterthwait, Yardley, Pa., et al., relative to the agreements negotiated by the President in Moscow; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

275. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Amador County, Calif., relative to the service of Congressman HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON; to the Committee on House Administration.

276. Also, petition of the Committee To Save the People's Downtown, Washington, D.C., relative to the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act of 1972 (H.R. 10751); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

277. Also, petition of James L. Braley, Bell, Calif., relative to amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

278. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Milwaukee County, Wis., relative to welfare reforms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

279. Also, petition of the Board of Directors, Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, relative to trade restrictions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.