American hog producers do," said Bradshaw. "We are prepared to help them with this problem, and we also plan to give them a list of names and addresses of leading Illinois hog breeders where they can buy top breeding stock."

SALES ARE NOT PARAMOUNT

Ropp cautioned that the results of the mission should not be judged solely on the amount of immediate sales contracts it may negotiate. One of the main purposes, he said, is to "acquaint the Russian people with the fact that we do have high quality merchandise in agricultural products and can deliver a long-lasting supply to meet their requirements."

Other mission members include Harold Kuehn, Du Quoin, president of the American Soybean Association; Robert Gilmore, De Kalb, a director of the National Livestock Feeders Association; Dwight Davis, director of foreign trade for the Illinois Agricultural Association, Bloomington; John P. Doherty, vice president of operations for Illinois Grain Corporation, an I. A. A. marketing affiliate; Prof. Richard Feltner, head of the University of Illinois department of agricultural economics; George Bicknell, executive vice president of Farmers' Export Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Ken Hartweg of Funk Seeds International, Inc., Bloomington; Jim Stewart, De Kalb, Inc., Statesville, N.C., poultry division of De Kalb Ag Research, Inc., De Kalb, Ill.; James F. Seeley, assistant to Ogilvie in the state's Washington office; Robert Osborn, export officer in the Illinois trade office in Brussells, Belgium; and James C. Tippett, I. A. A. news service director.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, September 25, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Jesus said:

I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.—John 8: 12.

O God, our Father, in whose spirit we live and move and have our being, we thank Thee for the arrival of a new day and for the awakening of mind that comes to us as we respond to the summons to be truehearted and wholehearted, faithful and loyal in our service to our country.

By the power of Thy spirit permeating our personalities help us to conquer all pettiness, all bitterness, all unworthy desires, and all unkind attitudes. Strengthen us to put first that which is first—Thy kingdom of justice, truth, and love. From the summit of this high endeavor, may we enter more fully into the life of our Nation and our world.

Lead us, our Father, in the paths of peace;
Without Thy guiding hand we go astray,
And doubts appall and sorrows still increase;
Lead us through Christ, the true and living way.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9032. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Havasupai Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 91, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9135. An act to amend the act of August 19, 1964, to remove the limitation on the maximum number of members of the board of trustees of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden;

H.R. 10486. An act to make the basic pay of the master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard comparable to the basic pay of the senior enlisted advisers of the other armed forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13697. An act to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the flag officer structure of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October of 1972 as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week."

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

H.R. 14424. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute of Aging, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14891. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize involuntary active duty for Coast Guard reservists for emergency augmentation of regular forces; and

H.J. Res. 1263. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 30, 1972, as "National Sokol U.S.A. Day."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3337) entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Payson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6797) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 316, 316–A, 317, 145, 193, and 318."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7742) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 332–A, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8694) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Yavapai Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 22–E and 22–F, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10243) entitled "An act to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10858) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pueblo de Acoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 266, and for other purposes."

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

S. 164. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to public museums;

S. 244. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation agencies;

S. 555. An act to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program;

S. 718. An act to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes;

S. 2280. An act to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such Act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances;

S. 2300. An act for the relief of J. B. Riddle.

S. 2567. An act to facilitate prosecutions for certain crimes and offenses committed aboard aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 3327. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, health care resources, and the establishment of a Quality Health Care Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 3716. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for continued assistance for health facilities, health manpower, and community mental health centers;

S. 3947. An act to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woodsy Owl," and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 236. Joint Resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week beginning October 15, 1972, as "National Drug Abuse Prevention Week";

S.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to designate the week which begins on the first Sunday in March of each year as "National Beta Club Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of Dickinson College.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84–689, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. STEVENS as delegates; and Mr. JACKSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. BELLMON, and Mr. COOK as alternate delegates, on the part of the Senate, to the North Atlantic Assembly to be held in Bonn, Germany, November 18–24, 1972.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONSIDER A CONTINUING RESOLUTION THIS WEEK

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on any day this week after Tuesday to bring in a continuing resolution for consideration.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when is it proposed to make a copy of this continuing resolution available?

Mr. MAHON. It is available now. It has just been introduced. It is precisely and identically the continuing resolution which we now have, extended to the 14th day of October.

That is the only thing involved; just a change of date from September 30 to October 14. It seems to be the most practical thing to do under the circumstances at this point.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me setting that firm date finalizes and crystallizes the fact that we are not likely to get out of here until the 14th of October.

Mr. MAHON. I believe it does indeed, probably. Certainly there is no hope we could finish this week, which is when the present resolution expires. Five of the regular annual appropriation bills for the current fiscal year 1973 remain to be finalized. And there are some supplemental items and items deferred from the regular bills that must be disposed of. Perhaps we could finish next week.

Mr. GROSS. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object. I do object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7742, JUDGMENT FUNDS OF YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7742) to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 332–A, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92–1430)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7742) to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 332–A, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "shall be used as follows: 75 per centum thereof shall be distributed in equal per capita shares to each person who is enrolled or entitled to be enrolled on the date of enactment; the remainder may be advanced, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purposes that are authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 7742, to provide for the disposition of funds to pay a judgment in favor of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 332–A, and for other purposes, submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment required 50% of the judgment to be distributed per capita, and permitted the balance to be used for any purpose authorized by the Tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The Tribe originally wanted 100% of the money to be so distributed, but agreed to a compromise of 75%, which was adopted by the Committee of Conference.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8694, JUDGMENT FUNDS OF YAVAPAI APACHE TRIBE

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8694) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Yavapai Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 22–E and 22–F, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92–1431)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8694) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Yavapai Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 22–E and 22–F, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
MANUEL LUJAN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 8694, to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Yavapai Apache Tribe in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 22–E and 22–F, and for other purposes, submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment authorizes the judgment money apportioned to the Payson Band to be used to purchase land in Coconino, Yavapai, Navajo, or Gila Counties, with the title taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Payson Band. The amendment is not needed because H.R. 3337, as recommended by the Committee of Conference, establishes a Reservation for the Payson Band, with a trust title to the land therein.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
MANUEL LUJAN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10858, JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE PUEBLO DE ACOMA

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10858) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pueblo de Acoma in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 266, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92–1432)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10858) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pueblo de Acoma in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 266, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
MANUEL LUJAN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 10858, to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Pueblo de Acoma in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 266, and for other purposes, submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendments prohibit a per capita distribution of any part of the judgment money. The amendments are unnecessary because the Tribe does not plan to make a per capita distribution. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed not to approve any change of plan with respect to a per capita distribution without first obtaining the concurrence of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
MANUEL LUJAN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6797, JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE KICKAPOO INDIANS OF KANSAS AND OKLAHOMA

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6797) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 316, 316–A, 317, 145, 193, and 318:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92–1433)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6797) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 316, 316–A, 317, 145, 193, and 318, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"(a) The funds divided and credited under section 1 of this Act, and the funds appropriated to pay a judgment recovered by the Kickapoo Indians of Oklahoma in docket numbered 318, including the interest thereon, after the payment of attorney fees and other litigation expenses, shall be used as follows: 75 per centum shall be distributed in equal per capita shares to each person whose name appears on or is entitled to appear on the membership roll of the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma and 90 per centum shall be distributed in equal per capita shares to each person whose name appears on or is entitled to appear on the membership roll of the Kickapoo Tribe of Kansas, if such person was born on or prior to and is living on the date of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 6797, to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Kickapoo Indians of Kansas and Oklahoma in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 316, 316–A, 317, 145, 193, and 318, submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendments provide for a per capita distribution of 75% of the judgment funds by both the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma and the Kickapoo Tribe of Kansas. The Committee of Conference retained the 75% provision for the Oklahoma Tribe, but provided for a 90% distribution by the Kansas Tribe. This corresponds to the wishes of the two Tribes.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3337, AUTHORIZING ACQUISITION OF VILLAGE SITE FOR PAYSON BAND OF YAVAPAI-APACHE INDIANS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3337) to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Payson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92–1434)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3337) to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Payson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

"That (a) a suitable site (or not to exceed eighty-five acres) for a village for the Payson Community of Yavapai-Apache Indians shall be selected in the Tonto National Forest within Gila County, Arizona, by the leaders of the community, subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. The site so selected is hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust as an Indian reservation for the use and benefit of the Payson Community of Yavapai-Apache Indians.

"(b) The Payson Community of Yavapai-Apache Indians shall be recognized as a tribe of Indians within the purview of the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (26 U.S.C. 461–479, relating to the protection of Indians and conservation of resources), and shall be subject to all of the provisions thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 3337, to authorize the acquisition of a village site for the Yayson Band of Yavapai-Apache Indians, and for other purposes, submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate amendment provides for the selection of a village site for the Payson Band by the leaders of the community "in cooperation with" the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than "subject to approval by" the two Secretaries, as provided in the House bill. The amendment recommended by the Committee of Conference restores the House language.

The Senate amendment provides that title to the village site will be held by the United States in trust for the Payson Community. The land is declared to be a new Indian Reservation, and the Payson Community is recognized as an Indian Tribe. The House bill provides for a conveyance in fee, rather than in trust, and does not recognize the Payson Band as a Tribe for the purposes of Federal Indian programs. The amendment recommended by the Committee of Conference accepts the Senate provisions, except for the Senate provision authorizing an appropriation to purchase lieu lands to replace national forest lands conveyed to the Indians.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
JAMES ABOUREZK,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
SAM STEIGER,
JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
PAUL J. FANNIN,
HENRY BELLMON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JUDGMENT FUNDS OF THE DELAWARE TRIBE OF INDIANS, ET AL.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14267) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Delaware Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 298, and the Absentee Delaware Tribe of Western Oklahoma, et al., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 72, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out "99" and insert "90".

Page 3, line 20, strike out "1" and insert "10".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 166, DESIGNATING STRATIFIED PRIMITIVE AREA A PART OF THE WASHAKIE WILDERNESS

Mr. JOHNSON of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 166) designating the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92-1435)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 166) to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the Stratified Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto and deletions therefrom, comprising an area of approximately two hundred and eight thousand acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Washakie Wilderness—Proposed," dated June 15, 1967, revised September 12, 1970, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated for addition to and as a part of the area heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, which is hereby renamed as the Washakie Wilderness.

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

SEC. 3. The Stratified Primitive Area addition to the Washakie Wilderness shall be administered as a part of the Washakie Wilderness by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 4. The previous classification of the Stratified Primitive Area is hereby abolished.

SEC. 5. (a) Within the area depicted as the Special Management Unit on the map referred to in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not permit harvesting of timber or public or private vehicular use of any existing road, and shall not construct or permit the construction or expansion of any road in said Special Management Unit. The Secretary shall administer said unit in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the national forests especially to provide for nonvehicular access recreation and may construct such facilities and take such measures as are necessary for the health and safety of visitors and to protect the resources of said unit: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not affect such vehicular use and maintenance of existing roads as may be necessary for the administration of said unit by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall initiate a continuing study of the Special Management Unit and at the end of the five-year period following the enactment of this act shall recommend to the President and the Congress what he considers to be the area's highest and best public use.

(c) As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and legal description of the area referred to in subsection (a) with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such description shall have the same force and effect as included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That corrections of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
MORRIS K. UDALL,
TENO RONCALIO,
JOHN KYL,
SHERMAN P. LLOYD,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
LEE METCALF,
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 166, to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes, submit this joint statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment consisted of striking all after the enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof new text which varies from the Senate bill in one significant way. The Senate version designates an area of approximately 35,000 acres, referred to as the DuNoir area, as a Special Management Unit and excludes this area from wilderness, but provides special language to guide its future management. The House amendment included this area as wilderness. The Department of Agriculture took the position that the DuNoir area should not be designated as part of the wilderness, and also opposed the special management provisions of the Senate bill.

Thus, the conferees faced two distinct issues. First, to determine whether the DuNoir unit qualifies as wilderness under section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act, and secondly, whether designation as wilderness is the most desirable disposition of this area.

Testimony given the House committee led to its conclusion that the DuNoir area is qualified and should be designated as wilderness. The presence of minor remnants of early human occupancy in the form of stub roads and remains of an old camp, and evidence of minor selective timber harvest in the area decades ago did not, in the opinion

of the House committee, disqualify the area. This evidence of past human activity in the area is minor and superficial, and is of a transitory nature, rapidly fading under the restorative powers of natural forces.

The conferees were unable, on the basis of information available at this time, to reach agreement on whether the DuNoir area should be included within the Washakie Wilderness. Hence, the conferees have agreed to accept the Senate's language on interim special management of this area until such time as the Congress, after further consideration, makes a final judgement on the ultimate disposition of this important area. In order to provide the information on which to base a final decision, the conferees have added language directing that the Secretary of Agriculture conduct further studies of the DuNoir and surrounding area and provide recommendations, at the end of five years, to the President and the Congress on the highest and best use of this area. This action provides the Forest Service the opportunity to study in detail all options, including wilderness, and make recommendations on the highest and best use of the area.

In conducting this study, the conferees intend that the agency provide for full public participation in accordance with section 3(c) of the Wilderness Act. Until Congress has acted further on the matter, the area is to be administered under the provisions of Section 5, which are intended to preserve the area in its present condition and provide for necessary protection and public use.

HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
MORRIS K. UDALL,
TENO RONCALIO,
JOHN KYL,
SHERMAN P. LLOYD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
LEE METCALF,
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

AIR TRAGEDY IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon in my district in the city of Sacramento a plane crashed on takeoff into an ice cream parlor full of small children who were there in most instances for the celebration of a birthday. Twenty-two persons were killed and numerous persons were injured.

The plane operating at that time was an F–86 Sabrejet, privately owned, operating under an experimental license issued by the Federal Aviation Administration.

I have called upon the FAA for an immediate justification for the issuance of this experimental license to operate a military-type aircraft by civilians.

I can conceive of no legitimate objective to be achieved through the issuance of that type of experimental certification.

I have, furthermore, called upon the Department of Defense to tell me how that particular plane, a type not normally available to civilians, was sold through Canada and became operational here in the United States. Unless I receive satisfactory responses, Mr. Speaker, I intend to seek the support of this House in having the appropriate committees undertake an immediate and thorough investigation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 10243, TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT ACT OF 1972

Mr. MILLER of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10243) to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92–1436)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10243) to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

That this Act may be cited as the "Technology Assessment Act of 1972".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that:

(a) As technology continues to change and expand rapidly, its applications are—

(1) large and growing in scale; and

(2) increasingly extensive, pervasive, and critical in their impact, beneficial and adverse, on the natural and social environment.

(b) Therefore, it is essential that, to the fullest extent possible, the consequences of technological applications be anticipated, understood, and considered in determination of public policy on existing and emerging national problems.

(c) The Congress further finds that:

(1) the Federal agencies presently responsible directly to the Congress are not designed to provide the legislative branch with adequate and timely information, independently developed, relating to the potential impact of technological applications, and

(2) the present mechanisms of the Congress do not and are not designed to provide the legislative branch with such information.

(d) Accordingly, it is necessary for the Congress to—

(1) equip itself with new and effective means for securing competent, unbiased information concerning the physical, biological, economic, social, and political effects of such applications; and

(2) utilize this information, whenever appropriate, as one factor in the legislative assessment of matters pending before the Congress, particularly in those instances where the Federal Government may be called upon to consider support for, or management or regulation of, technological applications.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SEC. 3. (a) In accordance with the findings and declaration of purpose in section 2, there is hereby created the Office of Technology Assessment (hereinafter referred to as the "Office") which shall be within and responsible to the legislative branch of the Government.

(b) The Office shall consist of a Technology Assessment Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") which shall formulate and promulgate the policies of the Office, and a Director who shall carry out such policies and administer the operations of the Office.

(c) The basic function of the Office shall be to provide early indications of the probable beneficial and adverse impacts of the applications of technology and to develop other coordinate information which may assist the Congress. In carrying out such function, the Office shall:

(1) identify existing or probable impacts of technology or technological programs;

(2) where possible, ascertain cause-and-effect relationships;

(3) identify alternative technological methods of implementing specific programs;

(4) identify alternative programs for achieving requisite goals;

(5) make estimates and comparisons of the impacts of alternative methods and programs;

(6) present findings of completed analyses to the appropriate legislative authorities;

(7) identify areas where additional research or data collection is required to provide adequate support for the assessments and estimates described in paragraph (1) through (5) of this subsection; and

(8) undertake such additional associated activities as the appropriate authorities specified under subsection (d) may direct.

(d) Assessment activities undertaken by the Office may be initiated upon the request of:

(1) the chairman of any standing, special, or select committee of either House of the Congress, or of any joint committee of the Congress, acting for himself or at the request of the ranking minority member or a majority of the committee members;

(2) the Board; or

(3) the Director, in consultation with the Board.

(e) Assessments made by the Office, including information, surveys, studies, reports, and findings related thereto, shall be made available to the initiating committee or other appropriate committees of the Congress. In addition, any such information, surveys, studies, reports, and findings produced by the Office may be made available to the public except where—

(1) to do so would violate security statutes; or

(2) the Board considers it necessary or advisable to withhold such information in accordance with one or more of the numbered paragraphs in section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall consist of thirteen members as follows:

(1) six Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, three from the majority party and three from the minority party;

(2) six Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party and three from the minority party; and

(3) the Director, who shall not be a voting member.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the Board shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Board and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

(c) The Board shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship and the vice chair-

manship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The chairman during each even-numbered Congress shall be selected by the Members of the House of Representatives on the Board from among their number. The vice chairman during each Congress shall be chosen in the same manner from that House of Congress other than the House of Congress of which the chairman is a Member.

(d) The Board is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of Congress, and upon a vote of a majority of its members, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and affirmations, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The Board may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary, except that no recommendation shall be reported from the Board unless a majority of the Board assent. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the Board or of any voting member designated by him or by the Board, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the Board or any voting member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. (a) The Director of the Office of Technology Assessment shall be appointed by the Board and shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the Board. He shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties vested in him by this Act, the Director shall exercise such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board.

(c) The Director may appoint with the approval of the Board, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director may prescribe and who shall be Acting Director during the absence or incapacity of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Director. The Deputy Director shall receive basic pay at the rate provided for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Board, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Office makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

AUTHORITY OF THE OFFICE

SEC. 6. (a) The Office shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, but without being limited to, the authority to—

(1) make full use of competent personnel and organizations outside the Office, public or private, and form special ad hoc task forces or make other arrangements when appropriate;

(2) enter into contracts or other arrangements as may be necessary for the conduct of the work of the Office with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, with any State, territory, or possession or any political subdivision thereof, or with any person, firm, association, corporation, or educational institution, with or without reimbursement, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5);

(3) make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to technology assessment without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(4) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel necessary for the conduct of the work of the Office and provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without compensation;

(5) acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for or resulting from the exercise of authority granted by this Act; and

(6) prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the operation and organization of the Office.

(b) Contractors and other parties entering into contracts and other arrangements under this section which involve costs to the Government shall maintain such books and related records as will facilitate an effective audit in such detail and in such manner as shall be prescribed by the Office, and such books and records (and related documents and papers) shall be available to the Office and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, for the purpose of audit and examination.

(c) The Office, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, shall not, itself, operate any laboratories, pilot plants, or test facilities.

(d) The Office is authorized to secure directly from any executive department or agency information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance for the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act. Each such executive department or agency shall furnish the information, suggestions, estimates, statistics, and technical assistance directly to the Office upon its request.

(e) On request of the Office, the head of any executive department or agency may detail, with or without reimbursement, any of its personnel to assist the Office in carrying out its functions under this Act.

(f) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Board shall prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 7. (a) The Office shall establish a Technology Assessment Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the following twelve members:

(1) ten members from the public, to be appointed by the Board, who shall be persons eminent in one or more fields of the physical, biological, or social sciences or engineering or experienced in the administration of technological activities, or who may be judged qualified on the basis of contributions made to educational or public activities;

(2) the Comptroller General; and

(3) the Director of the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress.

(b) The Council, upon request by the Board, shall—

(1) review and make recommendations to the Board on activities undertaken by the Office or on the initiation thereof in accordance with section 3(d);

(2) review and make recommendations to the Board on the findings of any assessment made by or for the Office; and

(3) undertake such additional related tasks as the Board may direct.

(c) The Council, by majority vote, shall elect from its members appointed under subsection (a)(1) of this section a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall serve for such time and under such conditions as the Council may prescribe. In the absence of the Chairman, or in the event of his incapacity, the Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman.

(d) The term of office of each member of the Council appointed under subsection (a)(1) shall be four years except that any such member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. No person shall be appointed a member of the Council under subsection (a)(1) more than twice. Terms of the members appointed under subsection (a)(1) shall be staggered so as to establish a rotating membership according to such method as the Board may devise.

(e)(1) The members of the Council other than those appointed under subsection (a)(1) shall receive no pay for their services as members of the Council, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses (or, in the alternative, mileage for use of privately owned vehicles and a per diem in lieu of subsistence at not to exceed the rate prescribed in sections 5702 and 5704 of title 5, United States Code), and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Council, without regard to the provisions of subchapter 1 of chapter 57 and section 5731 of title 5, United States Code, and regulations promulgated thereunder.

(2) The members of the Council appointed under subsection (a)(1) shall receive compensation for each day engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Council at rates of pay not in excess of the daily equivalent of the highest rate of basic pay set forth in the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code, and in addition shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses in the manner provided for other members of the Council under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

UTILIZATION OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SEC. 8. (a) To carry out the objectives of this Act, the Librarian of Congress is authorized to make available to the Office such services and assistance of the Congressional Research Service as may be appropriate and feasible.

(b) Such services and assistance made available to the Office shall include, but not be limited to, all of the services and assistance which the Congressional Research Service is otherwise authorized to provide to the Congress.

(c) Nothing in this section shall alter or modify any services or responsibilities, other than those performed for the Office, which the Congressional Research Service under law performs for or on behalf of the Congress. The Librarian is, however, authorized to establish within the Congressional Research Service such additional divisions, groups, or other organizational entities as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

(d) Services and assistance made available to the Office by the Congressional Research Service in accordance with this section may be provided with or without reimbursement from funds of the Office, as agreed upon by the Board and the Librarian of Congress.

UTILIZATION OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SEC. 9. (a) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) and such other services as may be appropriate shall be provided the Office by the General Accounting Office.

(b) Such services and assistance to the Office shall include, but not be limited to, all of the services and assistance which the General Accounting Office is otherwise authorized to provide to the Congress.

(c) Nothing in this section shall alter or modify any services or responsibilities, other than those performed for the Office, which the General Accounting Office under law performs for or on behalf of the Congress.

(d) Services and assistance made available to the Office by the General Accounting Office in accordance with this section may be provided with or without reimbursement from funds of the Office, as agreed upon by the Board and the Comptroller General.

COORDINATION WITH THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 10. (a) The Office shall maintain a continuing liaison with the National Science Foundation with respect to—

(1) grants and contracts formulated or activated by the Foundation which are for purposes of technology assessment; and

(2) the promotion of coordination in areas of technology assessment, and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication or overlapping of research activities in the development of technology assessment techniques and programs.

(b) Section 3(b) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Foundation is authorized to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation, national security, and the effects of scientific applications upon society by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such activities. When initiated or supported pursuant to requests made by any other Federal department or agency, including the Office of Technology Assessment, such activities shall be financed whenever feasible from funds transferred to the Foundation by the requesting official as provided in section 14 (g), and any such activities shall be unclassified and shall be identified by the Foundation as being undertaken at the request of the appropriate official."

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 11. The Office shall submit to the Congress an annual report which shall include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of technology assessment techniques and identification, insofar as may be feasible, of technological areas and programs requiring future analysis. Such report shall be submitted not later than March 15 of each year.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. (a) To enable the Office to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $5,000,000 in the aggregate for the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure for such period or periods as may be specified in the Act making such appropriations.

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
JOHN W. DAVIS,
EARLE CABELL,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOWARD W. CANNON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10243) to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted new language. The Committee of Conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain amendments and stipulations proposed by the conferees.

The substantive changes made by the Senate amendment, together with further amendments and modifications by the Committee of Conference, are as follows:

SECTION 2

Language in the Declaration of Purpose was altered slightly for clarification. No substantive changes were made.

SECTION 3

With regard to the initiation of assessment activities by the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), the House bill authorized such initiation (1) by the chairman of Congressional committees acting for themselves, the ranking minority member, or upon the request of a majority of the committee, or (2) by the Technology Assessment Board (The Board). The Senate amendment authorized the Director of the Office to take similar action, but only in consultation with the Board. In this, the Managers on the part of the House concurred, believing that the Director will be in a particularly favorable position to ascertain the need for certain assessments well in advance of the time when they become critical issues the Congress must face. This factor of timing was considered by the conferees to be of marked importance.

The House bill stipulated that all assessments and findings of the Office should eventually be made available to the public except where national security or the Freedom of Information Act might be violated. The Senate amendment placed this decision at the discretion of the Board on the grounds that the Congressional committees for whom the assessments were made conceivably would need the option of whether or not to publish. The House conferees concurred.

SECTION 4

The make-up of the Technology Assessment Board in the House bill consisted of 10 members of Congress, 5 from each House, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, 3 from the majority party and 2 from the minority party. The Senate amendment provided that the Board consist of 13 members, 6 from each House appointed as previously described, 3 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party. The Senate amendment also added the Director of the Office as a non-voting member of the Board. The House conferees agreed. Since the OTA is intended to be an independent office within the Legislative Branch designed to serve all committees and all members, the make-up of the policy-making board should be bipartisan. The addition of the Director will guarantee that he is privy to all Board actions without permitting him to share in the making of policy for the OTA.

The Senate amendment added a routine provision empowering the Board to sit and act at such places and times as are ordinarily authorized the various committees of the Congress. It also authorized the Board, but only the Board, to subpena witnesses and materials upon the approval of a majority of the Board members. House conferees recommended that subpenas should not be issued over the signature of anyone who is not a voting member of the Board. This action was designed to assure that the subpena power could not be transferred to the Director or any person not an elected member of Congress. The Senate conferees concurred in the House position.

SECTION 5

The House bill authorized the pay level for the Director of the Office at Level II of the Executive Schedule and the pay level of the Deputy Director at Level III of the Executive Schedule. The Senate amendment lowered these scales for the Director to Level III ($40,000) and for the Deputy Director to Level IV ($38,000). The Managers on the part of the House concurred with this amendment since the original levels would have placed the Director on the same pay scale as members of Congress, who are the employers of the Director and his staff.

SECTION 6

In the House bill, provisions concerning audit of parties entering into contracts with the Office and the securing of information from executive departments were described as functions of the Director. The Senate amendment placed these functions under the Office as a whole. The House conferees concurred in this change.

The Senate amendment added a clause authorizing the head of any executive department or agency to provide personnel assistance to the OTA in the event of such need. The House conferees concurred in this addition.

The House bill provided that OTA employees be subject to the provisions of Title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service, classification, and pay rates. The Senate amendment deleted this section on the grounds that these provisions of the Code do not apply to employees of the Congress. The House conferees concurred in this view. The intent of the conference is to have OTA staff considered as Congressional Staff.

SECTION 7

The Senate amendment established a new Technology Assessment Advisory Council in order to assist the Board. It was considered that such a Council, composed largely of members of the public, was essential since the bill as passed by the House had eliminated any public members from the Board itself. The Council, which is composed of 10 members from the public who are selected by the Board, plus the Comptroller General and the Director of the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, would undertake reviews and recommendations concerning OTA activities, under the Senate amendment.

The Managers on the part of the House concurred in the need for the Council, but recommended that the Council should also be empowered to undertake such additional related tasks as the Board might direct. In this, the Managers on the part of the Senate agreed.

SECTION 8

The Senate amendment eliminated a number of specific services to be provided by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress which the House bill had included. The Managers on the part of the House concurred in this change, since the language deleted imposed detailed functions on the Congressional Research Service which should be left to the discretion of the Board.

SECTION 9

The House Act specified that certain supporting services be provided to the OTA by the General Accounting Office upon agreement between the Comptroller General and the Board. The Senate amendment added a clause authorizing the Comptroller General to establish within GAO such additional administrative and organizational entities as

might be considered necessary in carrying out this function.

Managers on the part of the House recommended the deletion of this clause. While similar language had been approved by the House in regard to services to be provided by the Congressional Research Service, House conferees pointed out that the Congressional Research Service provides services exclusively to the Congress while the functions of the General Accounting Office are much broader. Therefore, the inclusion of the additional authority with regard to the General Accounting Office might go beyond the intent of the Act. The Managers on the part of the Senate concurred with the House view.

SECTION 10

No change was made in this section. However, the conferees emphasize that the language in this Act amending the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, which is designed to stimulate liaison between the OTA and the National Science Foundation, is not intended to restrict the discretion of the National Science Foundation in deciding whether or not to support programs requested by either the OTA or other agencies.

SECTION 11

No change other than minor rephrasing aimed at clarification.

SECTION 12

The House bill provided authorization for the OTA not to exceed $5 million in the aggregate for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The Senate amendment followed this provision but provided for continuing authorization after that time. The Managers on the part of the House concurred in the Senate Amendment.

House conferees considered that it would be unwise to require authorization each year for any entity within the Legislative Branch. To do so could mean a considerable delay in moving the annual Legislative Appropriation Act through the Congress. The imposition of such a burden, which does not presently exist, on the appropriation process for the Legislative Branch, has therefore been avoided.

SECTION 13

The House bill contained no specific provision for an effective date. The Senate amendment added a new section which would have made the Act effective and the appointment of members of the Board mandatory within 60 days of the final approval of the Act.

Managers on the part of the House disagreed with this section. Since it is anticipated that the passage of this Act will occur near the end of the 92nd Congress, deletion of this section provides for flexibility of timing in the appointment of Members to the Board by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate as provided in Section 4 of the Act. Managers on the part of the Senate concurred with the House position and this section was deleted.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
JOHN W. DAVIS,
EARLE CABELL,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HOWARD W. CANNON,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers have until midnight Monday, September 25, 1972, to file the conference report on S. 2770, the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight Monday, September 25, 1972, to file the report on H.R. 16656, the Federal-Aid Highway and Highway Safety Act Amendments of 1972.

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

There was no objection.

PRO- OR ANTI-CONSERVATION?

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am today extending my remarks in the body of the RECORD in an effort to clarify the confusion created by Field and Stream magazine when a recent issue of that publication purported to catalog Congressmen as being proconservation or anticonservation. The ratings given Members by Field and Stream contain so many surprises that it has been the subject of much comment—little of it favorable—on Capitol Hill. The measures on which Field and Stream based its ratings are even more surprising. They comprise measures which have little association with conservation and left out most of those which are considered by Members of Congress to be key conservation measures. I trust that my comments may help to bring this situation into truer perspective.

RELEASE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, three American prisoners of war hopefully will be leaving Hanoi very shortly. These are the first three prisoners of war to be released in over 3 years. These gentlemen have made it known in writing to the President that they desire to return immediately to their families and not to be recommitted to military authorities. I think this request is a reasonable one and should be granted.

Apparently the U.S. military authorities desire to assume total custody of these individuals for an unspecified period of time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President, in a spirit of bipartisanship, not to interpose military pressures on these men as they are being released. I also call upon the Secretary of Defense not to reiterate his claims about the alleged implications of the Geneva Convention concerning these prisoners of war. I request the Secretary to release these individuals through civilian channels.

These claims about the Geneva Convention are without merit as a matter of law, but more critically they will in all probability render it extremely difficult to have further efforts to release our prisoners of war from Hanoi.

SOVIET WHEAT DEAL

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's newspapers the American people got another glimpse of the "messy" Soviet wheat deal.

Four hundred million bushels of wheat were sold to the Soviets at about $1.63 per bushel—most of which was purchased by exporters at $1.25–$1.35 per bushel—a handy profit of about 33 cents per bushel times 400 million, or $132 million.

In addition, the exporters got an export subsidy of between 14 cents to 47 cents per bushel, averaging 31 cents per bushel the subsidy totals $124 million.

The combined profit on this deal could reach $256 million.

The grating insult occurs in the efforts of the exporters to qualify for treatment as DISC corporations and avoid income taxes on these fat profits.

This transaction and the manipulations which surround it are vivid evidence of the incredible degree of selfish influence on public decisions. Our task is to bring the details into the open—so that the taxpayers can estimate their cost.

COST OF FACELIFTING THE SPEAKER'S LOUNGE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when the fog lifted this morning and visibility became almost unlimited, lo and behold there were the cost figures for the facelifting that was recently given to the Speaker's lounge, otherwise known to some as the retiring room.

According to the Clerk's Office, the period furniture—what period is uncertain—cost $65,750, the window draperies $21,715, and the specially woven 75-by-9 rug, with its ankle deep tuft, cost $31,650.

According to the Architect's Office, the crystal chandeliers cost another $44,862 or a minimal grand total of $163,977.

Mr. Speaker, this should effectively doom for the foreseeable future any further conversation in the House of Representatives about a limitation on spending.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3507, DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES OF THE NATION'S COASTAL ZONES

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (S. 3507) to establish a national policy and develop a national program for the management, beneficial use, protection, and development of the land and water resources of the Nation's coastal zones, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARMATZ, LENNON, DOWNING, MOSHER, and PELLY.

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.,
September 22, 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 10:20 a.m. on Friday, September 22, 1972, and said to contain a message from the President transmitting to the Congress a proposal for participation by the United States Government in the 1974 International Exposition on Ecology and the Environment to be held in Spokane, Washington, in 1974.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

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

PARTICIPATION BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN THE 1974 INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION ON ECOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92–358)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Section 3 of Public Law 91–269, I am herewith transmitting to the Congress a proposal for participation by the United States Government in the 1974 International Exposition on Ecology and the Environment to be held at Spokane, Washington. This proposal includes a plan prepared by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other interested departments and agencies of the Federal Government, in accordance with Section 3(c) of the referenced law.

On October 15, 1971, I advised the Secretaries of State and Commerce that the Spokane exposition warranted Federal recognition in accordance with Section 2(a) of Public Law 91–269. On November 24, 1971, upon request of the United States, the Bureau of International Expositions in Paris, by unanimous vote, officially recognized the event as a Special Category exposition.

I have determined that Federal participation in this exposition is in the national interest and I fully support the Secretary's plan for such participation. In essence, this plan calls for the construction of a Federal pavilion. The pavilion has been conceived and developed with a view to maximizing residual use benefits to the Federal Government at the conclusion of the exposition.

Congressional authorization is required as a prerequisite to United States participation in a Federally recognized domestic-international exposition. Legislation is also required in order to establish the other authorities necessary to effect the proposed participation, as well as to authorize appropriations. The appropriations necessary to carry out this plan are estimated at $11.5 million.

I urge that the appropriate legislation, which I am transmitting herewith, be given prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 16754, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1132, Rept. No. 92–1437), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1132

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 6 of Rule XXI to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16754) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1132 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 1132?

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the House agreed to consider House Resolution 1132.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple resolution and I shall treat it as such.

The resolution makes in order the consideration of the military construction bill, H.R. 16754.

The rule would provide for the waiving of points of order, and particularly of the 3-day rule because of the lack of authorization.

The bill was passed by the House some time ago and was passed by the Senate subsequently and is now in conference.

This rule simply makes in order the consideration of that bill, clause 6, rule XXI, to the contrary notwithstanding and waives points of order against the bill because of lack of authorization.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) is recognized.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, once again the Committee on Rules is attempting to help the House expedite its work with the hope that we will finish up and be able to adjourn in the not too distant future.

This rule, House Resolution 1132, waives the 3-day rule which is clause 6 rule XXI, and also waives all points of order because, as stated by the gentleman from Mississippi, the authorization is not final. Both bodies have passed the bill, but it is still in conference.

It is my understanding from the testimony before the Committee on Rules this morning that the conferees have agreed on all items with the possible exception of one which is the Trident submarine.

I am also informed that there is no money in this bill over and above anything authorized and the Trident matter is not in it.

The only other matters that are in it are those that passed the House and Senate and are in agreement in the conference report which should reach us very shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1132 so that we may proceed with consideration of House Resolution 16754, the military construction bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, what the Committee on Rules might contemplate filing by midnight tonight? Does this include that which the Committee on Rules has acted, or plans to act on during this remaining day of their terminal activity, as announced by the gentleman?

Mr. COLMER. If I understood the first part of the gentleman's question which is—what bills we propose to file during the day? In response to that, the bills are: H.R. 16645, the so-called Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Center Civic Center, H.R. 1121—the Gateway National Seashore in the States of New York and New Jersey and House Joint Resolution 1227—the SALT agreement with the Senate amendments to be considered

hopefully today, if the two-thirds vote is obtained

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response. Let me phrase the latter part of my first question another way, in the hope that perhaps we can have a good meeting of the minds, as we so often do. Is it contemplated that the Committee on Rules would further meet today and possibly add to this list if your request for unanimous consent is granted?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry. There is conversation going on here, and I did not hear that question.

Does the gentleman want to know whether the committee proposes to meet further today? Was that his request?

Mr. HALL. And submit the results of their actions over this unanimous-consent request.

Mr. COLMER. It is not the purposes at least presently of the Committee on Rules to meet today. It meets tomorrow on certain other bills. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, that does answer my question, and I appreciate the position the gentleman is in with the leadership and with the pressure of the various committee chairmen, to say nothing of the various members pets. I would simply point out that it does no good to object to a unanimous-consent request to take up at any time the continuing appropriations bill, in one 5-minute period of our session, and then in the next grant authority to file any rule until midnight tonight that the committee might hear during the balance of the day. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. COLMER. Very well.

Mr. HALL. I would like to know this. Is it the purpose of the chairman of the Committee on Rules when he said they are going to meet tomorrow, which I believe is the regular meeting day, to take up any additional bills that have been filed by midnight tonight which he announced here last week is the cutoff date, except for rare emergencies?

Mr. COLMER. Let me say in response to the gentleman from Missouri that at the present moment I have not seen the additional bills that have been reported. There is no intention, therefore, to have such a hearing tomorrow on such bills. However, tentatively the program for the Committee on Rules tomorrow is to hear the housing bill on application for a rule, and also the potato bill that we have been hearing considerable about.

Mr. HALL. I am satirically glad that bill got in before the emergency clause was involved, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I know that potatoes are not an emergency except in time of famine. But anyway I am glad they are getting that bill in. I see no objection to the gentleman's request.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield further.

Mr. COLMER. There was one bill I did not mention, and that is a reclamation bill out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I do not have the number at the moment.

Mr. HALL. Is it listed on this week's program?

Mr. COLMER. I am having trouble hearing.

Mr. HALL. Is it listed on this week's intended program—the reclamation bill?

Mr. COLMER. I have no knowledge of its programing position on the floor; but it will be heard on application for a rule.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi to say that he is asking permission to have until midnight tonight to file a rule on a bill to provide for a $65 million convention center in the District of Columbia, when the District of Columbia does not even have the money to pay its school teachers any kind of salary increase and they are on strike?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, I would say that is one of the bills that was reported by the Rules Committee this morning and it is the intention to file that today under the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. I just say to the gentleman I find almost incredible that clearance would be given on a bill which would be offered to construct in the District of Columbia a $65 million convention center, with an initial $14 million in Federal funds, when on every hand this same District government pleads poverty. This tops them all.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object and in view of the statement of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, I shall not object, but I simply want to say that I hope after consultation we can bring up the continuing appropriations resolution, without adding to the gentleman's burdens, and in the interest of expediting the business of the Congress. This would be provisional of course upon the gentleman "holding the line" on a plethora of requests for rules to the best of his ability.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman moves the previous question, I yield myself such additional time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I think I made a misstatement in the presentation of this resolution when I said there was no money in this bill for the Trident. I believe there is some planning money in it for the Trident but I am advised now that it is dependent upon what the authorization conference comes out with.

I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) would make a statement which sets forth the correct situation.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is planning money, $13 million, carried in this bill for the Trident program. It is planning money and line item authorization for it is not required. Planning for military construction is permanently authorized under 31 U.S.C. 723. There is also in the bill $3.5 million for initial construction, primarily land acquisition. That is the item which according to our information is still in disagreement in the conference. It is my understanding that if it should not be authorized it could not be spent for the Trident program. It would be available for reprograming, for other action, if the Defense Department were to come back to the Congress for that.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. I would not in any way want to mislead the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield to me so there will not be any misunderstanding with respect to the reply of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL). There are bills, and as a matter of fact some of them are listed on the whip notice for this week, that are subject to rules being granted that are very important bills. I would not want the RECORD to indicate the gentleman's reply was an exclusive reply. For instance, the highway bill is considered a must bill. The debt ceiling limitation, of course, is a must bill, and there may very well be others. I would like for the RECORD to show that.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the majority leader, permit me to repeat I had some difficulty a moment ago because of colloquies around here in understanding the import of the gentleman's question, but certainly it was not my intention to answer and I do not think the RECORD will show that I said that was the exclusive calendar in any way. As a matter of fact if the majority leader and other interested Members will refer to the letter that the Rules Committee instructed me to send out to the chairmen of the various committees, there was a deadline set for tonight on the proposition of receiving applications for new legislation.

The only exception to that would be matters of great urgency and of genuine emergency nature. It is the purpose of the chairman of the Committee on Rules to follow that out in a faithful manner. That does not exclude the debt limit, which I understand is a matter of emergency. So far as the highway bill is concerned, I understand that we will receive that by midnight, and if not then, it is a question of whether or not that is an emergency.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the chairman and the members of the Rules Committee have been most cooperative with the leadership. I certainly do not want to give the impres-

sion of complaining. I want the RECORD to show that there are other bills which have to be considered. I would say further that I share the desire of a vast majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle to complete the work of this session as expeditiously as possible, so I am certainly not trying to delay the agenda of this Congress.

I would also like to add, however, that there may very well be situations that could arise that would require rules on certain conference reports that may come back from the other body.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, those are also provided for in the provisions made by the Committee on Rules and contained in the letter, a copy of which the gentleman has, I hope, received.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will permit me, he referred to getting the work of the Congress out and adjourned as expeditiously as possible. It is my understanding that it is the purpose of the leadership, including the gentleman from Louisiana, the majority leader; the Speaker; the minority leader; and leaders on the other wing of the Capitol, to get this Congress adjourned sine die by the 15th of October.

I want to repeat what I have said repeatedly, that I think that an early adjournment of this Congress is for the best interests of the membership and, God knows, to the best interests of the country.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. WYDLER. 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 276, nays 15, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

YEAS—276

Abbitt	Broomfield	Conover
Abernethy	Brotzman	Conte
Adams	Brown, Mich.	Corman
Alexander	Broyhill, N.C.	Crane
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, Va.	Culver
Andrews, Ala.	Burke, Fla.	Curlin
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burke, Mass.	Daniel, Va.
	Burleson, Tex.	Daniels, N.J.
Archer	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, S.C.
Arends	Burton	Davis, Wis.
Ashley	Byrne, Pa.	Dellenback
Aspin	Caffery	Denholm
Aspinall	Carey, N.Y.	Dent
Barrett	Carlson	Devine
Begich	Carney	Dickinson
Belcher	Carter	Donohue
Bennett	Casey, Tex.	Downing
Bergland	Cederberg	Duncan
Biester	Chamberlain	Eckhardt
Boggs	Clancy	Edwards, Ala.
Boland	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Bolling	Clausen, Don H.	Eilberg
Bow		Eshleman
Brademas	Cleveland	Evins, Tenn.
Brasco	Collier	Fascell
Bray	Collins, Tex.	Fisher
Brinkley	Colmer	Flood
Brooks	Conable	Foley
Forsythe	Mahon	Scherle
Fountain	Mallary	Scheuer
Frelinghuysen	Mann	Schneebeli
Frey	Martin	Schwengel
Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.	Sebelius
Gaydos	Mathis, Ga.	Shipley
Gibbons	Matsunaga	Shriver
Goldwater	Mayne	Sikes
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Sisk
Goodling	Meeds	Skubitz
Gray	Metcalfe	Slack
Green, Pa.	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Calif.
Griffin	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Iowa
Griffiths	Mills, Md.	Snyder
Grover	Minish	Springer
Gude	Mink	Staggers
Haley	Mitchell	Stanton, J. William
Hamilton	Mizell	
Hammer-schmidt	Mollohan	Stanton, James V.
	Montgomery	
Hanley	Morgan	Steed
Hansen, Wash.	Moss	Steiger, Ariz.
Harsha	Murphy, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Harvey	Myers	Stephens
Hathaway	Natcher	Stratton
Hays	Nedzi	Stubblefield
Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen	Stuckey
Henderson	O'Hara	Sullivan
Hicks, Mass.	O'Neill	Taylor
Hicks, Wash.	Passman	Teague, Calif.
Hogan	Patman	Terry
Holifield	Pelly	Thompson, N.J.
Horton	Pepper	Thone
Hull	Perkins	Tiernan
Hungate	Pettis	Udall
Hunt	Peyser	Ullman
Hutchinson	Pickle	Van Deerlin
Ichord	Pike	Vanik
Jarman	Poage	Vigorito
Johnson, Calif.	Podell	Waggonner
Johnson, Pa.	Powell	Waldie
Jonas	Preyer, N.C.	Wampler
Jones, N.C.	Price, Ill.	Ware
Karth	Purcell	Whalen
Kazen	Quie	Whalley
Keating	Quillen	White
King	Randall	Whitehurst
Kluczynski	Rarick	Whitten
Koch	Rees	Widnall
Kyl	Reuss	Williams
Kyros	Rhodes	Wilson, Charles H.
Landgrebe	Roberts	
Landrum	Robinson, Va.	Winn
Latta	Robison, N.Y.	Wright
Lennon	Rodino	Wyatt
Long, La.	Roe	Wydler
Long, Md.	Rogers	Wylie
McCollister	Rooney, Pa.	Wyman
McCulloch	Rosenthal	Yates
McDade	Rostenkowski	Yatron
McDonald, Mich.	Roush	Young, Fla.
	Rousselot	Young, Tex.
McFall	Roybal	Zablocki
McKay	Ruppe	Zion
McKevitt	Sandman	Zwach
McKinney	Sarbanes	
Madden	Satterfield	

NAYS—15

Abzug	Gross	Kastenmeier
Clay	Hall	Nix
Dellums	Harrington	Rangel
Diggs	Hawkins	Riegle
Drinan	Hechler, W. Va.	Stokes

NOT VOTING—139

Abourezk	Collins, Ill.	Frenzel
Addabbo	Conyers	Fulton
Anderson, Calif.	Cotter	Galifianakis
	Coughlin	Gallagher
Anderson, Tenn.	Danielson	Garmatz
	Davis, Ga.	Gettys
Annunzio	de la Garza	Giaimo
Ashbrook	Delaney	Grasso
Badillo	Dennis	Green, Oreg.
Baker	Derwinski	Gubser
Baring	Dingell	Hagan
Bell	Dorn	Halpern
Betts	Dow	Hanna
Bevill	Dowdy	Hansen, Idaho
Biaggi	Dulski	Hastings
Bingham	du Pont	Hébert
Blackburn	Dwyer	Heinz
Blanton	Edmondson	Helstoski
Blatnik	Erlenborn	Hillis
Brown, Ohio	Esch	Hosmer
Buchanan	Evans, Colo.	Howard
Byrnes, Wis.	Findley	Jacobs
Byron	Fish	Jones, Ala.
Cabell	Flowers	Jones, Tenn.
Camp	Flynt	Kee
Celler	Ford, Gerald R.	Keith
Chappell	Ford, William D.	Kemp
Chisholm		Kuykendall
Clawson, Del	Fraser	Leggett
Lent	Moorhead	Saylor
Link	Mosher	Schmitz
Lloyd	Murphy, N.Y.	Scott
Lujan	Nichols	Selberling
McClory	Obey	Shoup
McCloskey	O'Konski	Smith, N.Y.
McClure	Patten	Spence
McCormack	Pirnie	Steele
McEwen	Price, Tex.	Symington
McMillan	Pryor, Ark.	Talcott
Macdonald, Mass.	Pucinski	Teague, Tex.
	Railsback	Thompson, Ga.
Mailliard	Reid	Thomson, Wis.
Melcher	Roncalio	Vander Jagt
Michel	Rooney, N.Y.	Veysey
Mikva	Roy	Wiggins
Miller, Calif.	Runnels	Wilson, Bob
Minshall	Ruth	Wolff
Monagan	St Germain	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Derwinksi.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Spence.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Dennis.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Frenzel.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Steele.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Patten with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. du Pont.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Fish.

Mrs. Grasso with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Mikva with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Shoup.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Camp.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Roy with Mr. Mosher.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. McClory.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Heinz.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Veysey.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Link with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Symington with Mr. Ruth.

Mr. Hogan with Mr. Schmitz.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Melcher with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Hillis.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Byron with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Collins of Illinois.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Dowdy.

Messrs. STOKES, CLAY, and DELLUMS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order any day this week after Tuesday to consider a joint resolution for the continuing appropriations beyond September 30.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15883, EXPANDED PROTECTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15883) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for expanded protection of foreign officials, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I compliment my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts on due process in our legislative order procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hear none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, DONOHUE, and SMITH of New York.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16754) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16754, with Mr. ADAMS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, let me explain the circumstances under which the bill H.R. 16754 comes to you as the last of the regular appropriation bills. First, let me hasten to state that this is not the committee's desire. Our hearings were completed on April 27. We have been waiting for several months for an authorization which we do not yet have.

Both the House and Senate have passed the Military Construction Authorization Act for 1973. Conferees have been meeting for some time. It is my understanding that agreement has been reached on all but one item, the Trident program. We feel that we must get on with the military construction appropriation bill in order to minimize as much as possible delays in the construction program itself.

Fortunately, we have had the close cooperation of the members and staff of both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and I am glad to report that the chairmen of both committees have indicated they have no objection to the appropriation bill being reported to the House without further delays. The authorization action involves deletion or addition of approximately 90 individual items, and we have taken the tentative actions of the conference committee into account in the bill now before you.

Now let me attempt to clarify the funding picture. NOA recommended for the fiscal year 1973 program is $2,278,675,000. This compares with $2,145,335,000 provided in fiscal year 1972. The original fiscal year 1973 budget estimate requested $3,017,800,000 for military construction. A significant change was made in the original budget subsequent to the SALT talks agreement and a reduction of $356,416,000 was made, all of it in the Safeguard program.

The revised fiscal year 1973 budget estimate was then $2,661,384,000. The authorizing committees have deleted $135,649,000. This may be subject to a slight modification depending on their action on Trident. Your committee recommends a further deletion of $247,060,000.

Now let me move quickly to state that we are not cutting this bill by a quarter-billion dollars. We have been able to apply the savings in the Safeguard program from previously funded programs to the current budget. The Safeguard program in operation at the time of the SALT talks agreements involved previous appropriations of $805 million. Now work is to continue on only one base at Grand Forks, construction of which will be completed in July of next year at a cost of $283 million. There will be substantial costs to cancel out the project under construction at Malmstrom and some costs at other sites. All of this can be accomplished from previously appropriated funds and approximately $165 million is left over to be applied to the fiscal year 1973 construction program. In addition to this, there are other funds from prior year budgets, including family housing, which total about another $50 million. This also is applied to this year's funding program.

Now let me tell you exactly where we stand on each of the services. The revised fiscal year 1973 budget request for Army was $619,200,000. The authorization was cut $34,618,000. The net reduction in specific projects by the Appropriations Committee is $14,318,000. Provided in the bill for the Army after making adjustment for carryover funds which were allocated from Safeguard is $405,264,000.

The Navy revised budget is $554,200,000. The authorization was cut $23,673,000. We appropriated $29,656,000 less and there is recommended in the bill $500,871,000.

The revised request for Air Force is $357,200,000. This was reduced $57,435,000 through authorization processes. Your committee made additional cuts of $51,391,000, of which $19 million is the new defense office building at Bolling Field, a defense project rather than an Air Force project. The total recommended for the Air Force is $248,374,000.

In addition, of course, there are the defense agencies, the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, and the Air Force Reserve, all of which have been increased somewhat over previous budgets.

Family housing in the revised budget was $970,784,000. It was reduced $16,527,000 in authorization, and increased $13,305,000 by this committee. The total carried in the bill for family housing is $967,562,000.

Thus you will note that we are, in toto, $133,340,000 above last year's budget, but we are $382,709,000 below the revised fiscal year 1973 budget request.

The committee has provided no funds related to the war in Southeast Asia.

The committee has for a number of years sought to improve family housing facilities and bachelor housing for military personnel. These are very important to morale and retention. We have, in addition to the normal budget activities which are entrusted to us, explored the need for legislation which can provide better housing programs. The House Banking and Currency Committee has been cooperative in this regard and in housing bills from that committee there

has been language to insure the availability of section 236 housing for the families of lower income enlisted personnel. This has been an item of particular need because these young people, many of whom have families, are not eligible for on-base family housing. Serious hardship has resulted.

This emphasis on family housing has been a long time in coming but it now is here. More and more there is a realization that military families at all levels also have a right to live in acceptable, attractive, clean and modern housing. A happy family is important to a strong military organization and good housing helps to insure happy families.

In terms of the construction which this bill will allow in support of family housing, adequate bachelor quarters and facilities modernization, we feel another great step forward has been taken and that efficiency and morale will benefit accordingly.

Those of us who have a part to play in the appropriation of funds for family housing are pleased at the progress which has been made in recent years. In 1969, Department of Defense housing requests totaled only about 2,000. This year's requests total nearly 12,000 housing units.

Approximately $220 million of prior year money in military construction and family housing is applied to the fiscal year 1973 program. This helps to insure substantial increases in family housing construction, from 9,862 units approved in fiscal year 1972 to 11,938 in fiscal year 1973. Likewise, we have allowed increases requested for improvements and for maintenance of family housing. We have kept the level of family housing minor construction at that approved last year, which represents an increase over the budget.

For bachelor housing, there is an increase of $154 million over last year. Most of this is in the Army's program. The remainder of this increase is for the Marine Corps. The Army this year has initiated a very vigorous, and I think very much needed, program to update both its family housing and barracks facilities. I know that in the past they have recognized the need to replace their World War I barracks. They also have much the largest family housing shortage of any of three services.

In part, this is due to the great change in force levels to which the Army is subjected. In times of emergency it escalates more rapidly and to a higher level than any of the other services, but it also suffers percentagewise the greatest reductions when normal times approach. This makes it difficult to plan meaningful construction programs on installations which will be permanent.

The Secretary of the Army discussed at length with us the Army's needs for an adequate housing program and the difficulties of achieving it. Their most optimistic goal is to accomplish much of the needed replacement in the next 5 years to 10 years. In any case, there remains a requirement for substantial amounts to be spent in this area for many years.

There are substantial appropriations in the bill for pollution control—$155 million, an increase of $25 million over last year. This largely will bring the services into compliance with standards as they existed in 1970, as specified by Executive Order 11507. Obviously, there will be increasing requirements for expenditures as tighter standards are set.

There are sizable increases allowed for the Navy. Although the Navy does not have a big increase for bachelor housing or family housing this year—they have had substantial program increases in each of these areas for the last 2 years—there are a great many types of facilities for which they have requested and for which the committee is recommending increases. Some of these are in unglamorous areas such as updating water, electrical power, or steam utilities, things which must eventually be done.

Others are related to new morale programs such as the cold iron program which will allow more ships to shut off their powerplants while in port. This allows more efficient repair of the ships and allows the men more time with their families or for off-duty activities while the ships are in port. As I mentioned before, the Navy is hopeful of initiating first phases of construction in support of Trident—such as land acquisition. And as I stated, this will depend in part on the Senate conferees on the authorizing bill. In any case, we have included $13 million to allow planning which does not require authorization and $3.5 million for initial construction.

We have allowed increased funding which was authorized for Reserve facilities to allow the Reserves to better house and maintain their new equipment and their people. The status of the Reserves is quite critical at this time. Force levels are dropping. The pressure of the draft is off and this has removed one of the principal incentives for young men to enlist in the Reserve components. By upgrading facilities, we hope to improve the desirability of service in the Reserves.

For years the committee has been concerned with the overconcentration of defense activities in the Washington area. Understandably everyone wants to be as close to the throne as possible, so there is a strong trend to move commands and people into or near the Capital. The merchants like this. It gives them business. The news media enjoy additional advertising. Consequently our efforts to decentralize do not arouse enthusiasm.

However, it does not make sense to continue to add to the congestion which is becoming so very pronounced around the Nation's Capital. In these days of instant communication there is no requirement for various military activities to be side by side with the parent command. It should not be overlooked that this concentration of military activities in the Nation's Capital adds to its vulnerability as a target in the event of war.

The committee's efforts have been successful at least to the extent that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has said that no less than 2 million square feet of administrative space currently occupied in Washington will be relocated. The total of such administrative space in and around Washington is 23 million square feet. So this is only a beginning. The committee is disturbed by long delays in compiling lists for relocation. It was to be made public by mid-May of this year but it has not yet been annnounced. We expect more positive efforts in this area.

There continues to be speculation on base closures. This was discussed to some extent when the authorization bill for military construction was on the floor. Our subcommittee makes a very careful and studied effort to stay abreast of this situation. It is not possible to obtain actual lists of anticipated closures because such lists have not been compiled. Rumor not withstanding.

There is speculation that there will be base closures after the election and in my opinion this will happen. Mr. McGOVERN is basing his campaign in part on reductions in military strength. Mr. Nixon is under constant pressure to divert money for defense to domestic requirements. Base closures eliminate considerable costs. There will inevitably be screenings to determine if there are bases which can be eliminated.

The committee always queries service witnesses exhaustably in an effort to spot weak bases which are more likely to be on closure lists. We take into consideration all the facts that are given to us when we approve the listings of projects which are before you. Those included in this bill are at bases for which the committee has been assured there will be a long-time requirement and we are told by witnesses that there are no construction items in this bill at bases which are likely to be closed.

In summary, I believe the committee has done a prudent job in looking at the program this year. We have made cuts, but we have sought to avoid crippling the Services' construction programs or slowing their efforts to meet the challenges posed by the termination of induction.

Finally, let me express my very great appreciation to members of the subcommittee for their constant untiring efforts to develop a good bill. They have been loyal and hard working. I have never found a group that is more cooperative, more willing to devote full effort to the committee's responsibilities. My appreciation must also be extended to the staff members for they have done a very, very fine job, all of them.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding.

I note with interest the information contained in the report on pages 11, 12, and 13, concerning the closing—perhaps I should say "prospective" closing—of military installations.

I want to commend the committee for keeping a close eye on this and say that I would hope it will continue to do so. I think the gentleman knows that I have raised the question a number of times in the past few years and was somewhat disturbed by the statement made by Mr. Packard when he left the Department of Defense, his statement being to the effect

that it was one of the disappointments of his time in the Pentagon that he had not been able to bring about the closing of more unneeded military installations.

I certainly hope that by next year there will be more closings for obviously, in view of all the publicity that has been given and the statements made by Mr. Packard when he left the Pentagon, there is room for economy in this area in the military establishment.

Mr. SIKES. As my distinguished friend knows, there have been a substantial number of base closures over the past few years. As I stated in my own remarks, I anticipate that there may be additional closings after the coming election.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I heard the gentleman's remarks and I appreciated them. Will the gentleman indulge me for a moment on a question concerning community impact assistance as it is set forth on page 6 of the report? Does community impact assistance take into consideration so-called impacted school aid?

Mr. SIKES. Yes. If the gentleman will yield, it does take that money into consideration. The Safeguard impact needs for which we have previously appropriated funds in this bill are for communities which are seriously affected and for which there is no more money available under the regular programs. They are generally small communities which are greatly affected, by the Safeguard construction program. They have, very simply, been unable to cope with the requirements for additional community services. The appropriations provided by this committee heretofore have covered a rather broad spectrum of such help, not duplicating that which has already been taken care of in the HEW and other bills. Since there has been a significant change in the Safeguard program the community assistance funds appropriated for Grand Forks are substantially all that will be required. There can be some recoupment of funds which have been provided for other places and which will not be used because of the cutback in the Safeguard program at those locations.

Mr. GROSS. Then, the $17 million figure is the amount that was appropriated in prior years?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And covers only missile sites. Is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Now I understand.

Mr. SIKES. They are the ones that have the serious problems. No other sites are included.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been contacted by several organizations and individuals as it relates to the proposal affecting the depot aircraft overhaul facility at McClellan Air Force Base at Sacramento, Calif. There was an item in the budget for the depot overhaul facility calling for an amount of $7,798,000. As I understand it, that was deleted. I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee give me an explanation of the reasons why it was deleted and if it was merely set aside for consideration at a later date, because this general facility is the Air Force depot overhaul facility, and if we are going to stay abreast of the other four establishments throughout the United States, naturally we have to have an updated facility to meet the cost of our operations here if we are going to be competitive with the other bases.

Mr. SIKES. Let me commend my distinguished friend for his interest in this base. Of course, it is a very legitimate interest.

The committee did give very careful consideration to the project. It was not eliminated per se. We do not eliminate projects. We defer projects for which we feel there is not adequate support or justification. I assure him we went into this case very carefully. We realize it does have considerable support. Nevertheless, it is not, in our opinion, one that has had sufficient justification. The committee has an open mind. If additional more effective arguments are presented by the Air Force in connection with this and other items related to those of this bill, the committee will certainly take those into consideration at a later time.

I yield to my distinguished colleague on the subcommittee.

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to the explanation by the chairman relative to this question. In the committee's hearings on page 456, Mr. SIKES asked of Colonel Murrow:

Can you continue to operate in the existing facilities?

Colonel MURROW. Yes, sir. We can continue to operate in existing facilities but at a very inefficient and uneconomical level.

However, the committee found that this project would have added an additional 100,000 square feet of space above that currently in use. We could not justify that amount of additional space for maintenance.

They are able to operate and the savings that the Air Force had originally assumed were overstated. The investigation staff of the committee looked into this. The Air Force estimated a savings investment of ratio of 2.55 whereas the investigative staff noted that this was only 1.82. The investment would have been amortized over a 7-year period. We felt it was not warranted at this time in light of the fact that they could still use the existing facility.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is very helpful, and I appreciate his assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of this very important subcommittee for yielding me this time, and I wish to congratulate the gentleman and his colleagues for a very excellent job done under what I know to be adverse and difficult conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I merely rise to ask one simple question concerning the reduction or elimination of Safeguard, and we have been reading about the increased vulnerability with the Yankee-type Soviet submarines patroling the Atlantic coast. Does this in any way jeopardize our defense?

Mr. SIKES. The elimination of the Safeguard sites does add to the difficulty of defending our country, but this comes as a part of the SALT talks agreement, and we in the Committee on Appropriations had no choice but to conform to the agreements and to the action taken in the authorization bill.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would like to point out for the attention of my colleagues that the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) has been very outspoken and very clear in what he has said, and I regret very much that his voice, plus that of the late and lamented Mendel Rivers were not listened to as much as I wish they had been.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman has touched on something that is extremely important, and in the very limited time I have left let me remind my colleagues in the Committee of the Whole that it has been only a few short days since Russian planes were found to be patrolling our coast out of bases in Cuba. That is something which requires our careful thought. We know Russian submarines have been active in Caribbean waters. Now their airplanes are operating out of Cuba. Yes, there is danger to America's security in what is taking place—serious danger.

Let me spell out what actually happened in the recent incident of Russian aircraft flying in close proximity to the eastern coast of the United States. We have long known about the threat from Russian submarines off our coast. Now there are Russian aircraft which constitute a threat of danger to our cities and our defense establishments. This situation certainly should alert us to the continuing need for an adequate air defense force and to weaknesses which will result from the SALT talks limitations.

For the benefit of the House, let me relate the actual facts of the flights of Russian aircraft along our coast.

On 5 and 6 September 1972, four Soviet TU–95D—Bear—long-range reconnaissance aircraft arrived in Cuba.

This type aircraft is assigned to Soviet Naval Aviation and cannot carry weapons. Their mission is primarily reconnaissance but with a capability to pass targeting data.

They were picked up inbound by NORAD's Greenland, Iceland, United Kingdom radar link.

On 9 and 11 September 1972, two of these Bear D aircraft each flew round robin 12-hour reconnaissance missions from Jose Marti International Airport at Havana.

These aircraft were tracked by the radar site at Key West. Naval interceptors from the U.S.S. *Forrestal* intercepted and escorted them. Their prox-

imity to the Atlantic coast was about 160 nautical miles east of Cape Hatteras.

The aircraft undoubtedly made the long flight from Russian bases across the polar ice cap all the way to Cuba. Presumably without refueling. They have been serviced from a Cuban base and presumably this is the Jose Marti Air Base.

The significant thing is that the Soviets now are practicing worldwide deployment of military aircraft and that the Soviets are placing special emphasis on Cuba and their plans both for bases for aircraft and for submarines.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah, a very able member of our subcommittee.

Mr. McKAY. I thank my distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the military construction appropriations bill recommended by the committee represents a sound compromise. We have been responsive to the need to reduce spending. We have deferred construction projects about which there was any doubt in our minds as to their need or their long-term usefulness. I wish that all of the expenditures of the Federal Government received the same exhaustive review by the executive branch and the Congress which these projects do.

The appropriations bill recommends dollar reductions totaling $247,060,000. However, the committee was able to recapture $165,000,000 of the $805,000,000 appropriated for Safeguard in previous fiscal years. This allowed us to reduce the new money for military construction, Army, by that amount. So, our actual cut, with respect to individual projects, was $82,600,000. This is on top of the sizable cuts which the authorization act is expected to make in this year's program. We expect the reduction as a result of our action and that on the authorizing bill to be $382,709,000 or 14 percent of the revised budget request.

On the other hand, we must provide adequate facilities for military personnel even if money is tight. We must modernize much of our essential maintenance and operating plant if we expect the military services to operate in an efficient and effective manner in the coming years. So we have to balance the investment we make today against the savings we hope to make tomorrow. Incidentally, the committee's investigation staff did a series of excellent studies in this area. These are printed in our hearings. They should result in better cost analyses of construction projects by the military departments.

We have provided what we felt were the essential modernization projects and people oriented projects. We have allowed a substantial increase in construction over last year's level. The increase of $133,340,000 shown in the report table does not tell the whole story, because there are Safeguard funds and funds received from NATO and other balances from prior years which are available to help finance the fiscal year 1973 program. I feel that the program we have allowed for fiscal year 1973 is well justified, and we have looked at it project by project.

There is another aspect of construction and that is maintenance, which is of major concern to me. The costs of maintenance are going up. The dollars for maintenance are being spread thinner. In many places we may be wasting money by maintaining old World War II wooden barracks which should be torn down and replaced. Yet the people have to live in them and there is not enough money to replace them all soon. On the other hand, I have seen cement block buildings which were said to be unsuitable for laboratory space and in need of replacement. Why? Because the roof leaked. They were not getting enough maintenance money to fix the roof. So we get caught both ways. I am convinced that the answer is to keep working on an orderly program to replace and modernize military facilities. This is what we recommend in this bill and that is why I request your approval of it.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are here today considering this bill on military construction. As I see it, this bill has three objectives.

One is, you can ask the question: does it provide sufficient funds for the facilities that are necessary to carry on the training missions of our military establishment?

Second, does it carry within it sufficient funds to upgrade and provide proper facilities to assure combat readiness of our military forces?

And third, are we providing sufficient funds here to be sure that the personnel in our military services are provided with sufficient housing, sufficient barracks, and sufficient military hospitals, and so forth?

I think that we in the subcommittee do the best job we can in trying to make a positive determination in all of these areas because we believe very seriously it is necessary that we do have adequate facilities for our people.

Lest anyone feel that we are spending too much money, let me just say this—we are not providing in every area all of the funds that I believe could be adequately used for some of the services, but we do have a gradual upgrading of these facilities and I think we are making progress in the area of military housing. If we expect to have a military service that is going to be all-volunteer, then I believe the personnel of the services and their families are entitled to these kinds of facilities.

The gentleman from Florida who is the chairman of our subcommittee has gone into all of the details of this legislation and it really is not necessary to restate them.

I would just like to call to your attention one item here on which we may have some slight difference of opinion. That is the so-called defense office building which has been deleted again. I have been one who has felt for many years—ever since this was approved by the Committee on Armed Services many years ago when Mendel Rivers of South Carolina was the chairman—that we should have gone ahead with it. The cost was far less than it would be today. In addition to that, we have the facilities and the land available at the Bolling Air Force Base and I only regret that we did not use it.

I think the time is going to come when we may be required to look into the advisability of building this office building.

I will have to admit that the longer we delay, the less attractive it looks to us from the cost point of view.

The Department of Defense has now come to the conclusion that if this office building is built, the defense intelligence agency, which has been needing a building and has been wanting to move out of Arlington Hall for some time, will move into this installation, as will certain Marine installations and the Marine headquarters.

I think this is an attractive part of it in itself.

So I just want to say so far as I am concerned, I think we should have built this building and I think there are some legitimate grounds upon which we could build it today even though the cost is getting a little bit out of hand.

The gentleman from Florida has adequately talked about the reserve forces and the necessity to be sure that they are upgraded. If we are going to have an all-volunteer military service and if we are going to have to reduce the number of people in our military, we are going to have to have a better Ready Reserve—and this requires facilities and it requires the money to build them.

But, by and large, in looking over all of the requirements of the services, I think our subcommittee has done an adequate job to try to provide those things that are necessary and in the best interest of the country and in the best interest of the people who serve us in the military forces—and that is fundamentally the mission that we have.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, if he has any further requests for time?

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG) such time as he may require.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. It is a responsible bill. Increase is only about 6 percent above the previous year, a reasonable increase in view of the cost inflation and the pressure from our various defense agencies for more and imprint installation. I want to commend the chairman.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to page 20 of the committee report on this bill, and a line item indicating a transfer of Navy property ostensibly valued at $702,000 for property presently held by private owners, to assure a noise buffer zone adjoining Miramar Naval Air Station, in San Diego.

I judge from the tabulation on page 20 that the committee feels it is approving a land swap in which the parcels to be exchanged are of equal value. If so, I refer the committee to a colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FISHER) when the authorizing bill was before us several weeks ago.

I pointed out on that occasion that the prospective land deal was negotiated through the Naval Facilities Command in San Diego, rather than the Real Estate Division, as is normally done. It provides for exchange of 155 acres of Navy land for a total acreage of 230 owned by the Christiana Oil Corp., 138 acres; the San Diego Unified School District, 69 acres; and the city of San Diego, 23 acres.

Independent appraisals have shown the value of the private lands involved in the exchange to be about $760,000, rather than the $702,000 indicated in the committee report. Similar appraisal of the Navy land indicates a value of more than $2 million—triple the amount being traded for.

Clearly, if such a swap were consummated on a pretense of equal value, the Government would be dispensing windfall profits to commercial speculators. Christiana Oil Corp. is the owner of a housing development firm, Tierra Santa. A glance at maps of the area show that the developers would wind up owning all four corners of a future major freeway interchange less than 10 minutes from downtown San Diego.

Let me warn my colleagues—especially colleagues of the Appropriations Committee—that this intended land deal contains the makings of full-blown scandal. It will bear the closest watching.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to join in that surveillance.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) we have reported out a $2.3 billion military construction appropriation bill.

Highlights of the bill include: First, $155.3 million to combat air and water pollution; second, $121.8 million for Reserve component military construction—including $1.6 million for a six-unit Reserve center in Owings Mills, Md., and a $487,000 National Guard facility in the Gunpowder area of my district; and three, an increase of $119 million over the fiscal 1972 appropriation for family housing—which will provide 11,938 much needed housing units.

I am pleased to have participated in the development of this bill.

However, I want to reiterate my regret that we had to include in the bill $2,610,000 for 100 units of family housing at Fort Huachuca, Ariz. This expenditure would not have been necessary if the Army had not moved the U.S. Army Intelligence School from Fort Holabird, Md., to Fort Huachuca, Ariz. My 1970 investigation of this move brought out that the Army had failed to take into consideration the housing and water shortages, the high construction costs, and potential personnel recruitment problems.

This year a General Accounting Office report and a House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee confirmed the results of my investigation and brought out that the Army had concealed internal recommendations and reports adverse to the move and had failed to reveal the grand design for a massive Army intelligence center in the Arizona desert community.

If the information which I have detailed and the information contained in the General Accounting Office report had been available before the intelligence school opened in Arizona, Congress would have had a good chance of preventing this costly move. Instead, the taxpayers are stuck with the bill for an expensive transfer for which there was no real military justification.

The Armed Services Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) has directed the Secretary of the Army to—

Fix responsibility for the misleading information supplied to the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations concerning the Fort Huachuca water and housing resources.

And to—

Examine the Intelligence Center concept and determine whether, from the standpoint of economy and efficiency, it should be established at Fort Lewis, Wash., or some other suitable location.

However, the 100 units of family housing provided in this bill will reduce the Huachuca housing deficit from 669 to 569 units. In view of the recommendations stated above, I raised the issue of congressional approval of family housing at Fort Huachuca during the House debate on the fiscal year 1973 military construction authorization bill. In a colloquy with a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, I expressed my hope that—

The Armed Services Committee would in future years cast a very cold eye on any proposal to provide the 569 additional housing units there, in view of the tremendous housing shortage for the military which exists worldwide.

Mr. DANIEL responded in part that—

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

In closing, I want to call attention to the statement which appears in the Appropriations Committee report on the military construction bill, which says in part:

The committee reiterates its comments on the Army's poor management and lack of judgment in its handling of the decision to move certain intelligence activities to Fort Huachuca, Ariz. The activities which have relocated to Fort Huachuca, such as the Army Intelligence School, have added to an already serious housing shortage in that area, thereby causing hardship to the personnel involved. In addition, there is a potentially serious water shortage at Fort Huachuca. The committee expects the Army fully to explain its proposed solutions to these and related problems if additional construction is to be requested at Fort Huachuca.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for H.R. 16754. My actions since I came to the House of Representatives have consistently been in support of providing the best for our Military Establishments. We must keep our defenses in top shape. Having the muscle to deter aggression includes having modern equipment and facilities. As the committee report noted, this is even more important as the Nation moves toward an all-involuntary military and toward a reliance on our Reserve components.

It is pleasing to see that this bill has moneys for adequate housing—both bachelor and family. It is pleasing to see that moneys for adequate facilities for our strategic bomber forces are included in this bill. It is pleasing that many bases in Texas are due for needed construction, including a security police facility for Bergstrom Air Force Base located in my district in Austin, Tex.

I note that $155.3 million is included for pollution control. I agree that our military should be in the forefront of the fight for a clean environment. Bergstrom AFB has been allocated $254,000 for water pollution abatement. I know that the people of Travis County will commend this money for clean water.

I am not pleased, however, that there is no money in this bill for a new commissary at Bergstrom AFB. On May 31, 1972, I testified before the Armed Services Committee and pointed out the need for such a facility. Although there is no money for the commissary this year, I have been advised by members of the Armed Services Committee and staff that the commissary for Bergstrom AFB will probably be recommended in next year's budget. Furthermore, I have been advised that the need for a commissary at Bergstrom is so well-recognized that the project has been given a high priority number for next year.

I hope that this is true because the present commissary is housed in two old, dilapidated frame World War II warehouses. Not only is the persent facility unsatisfactory by initial design—it was designed to be a warehouse, not a store—it is also unsatisfactory in that it contains less than one-eighth the floor space required to accommodate the volume of sales and customers served. The design and condition of these buildings is such that they cannot be upgraded, they must be replaced. Replacement facilities would cost approximately $1.6 million. The present facility serves approximately 7,000 active duty military and over 2,000 retired military personnel who live in the Austin area. The total number of military personnel and their families using the commissary is estimated to be in excess of 17,000. Dollar volume of monthly sales is in excess of $1 million.

Under Air Force standards, a commissary should contain 72,048 square feet if it has the sales volume of Bersgtrom. However, the Bergstrom commissary only contains 9,000 square feet.

This is why I take this opportunity to note the need for a new commissary at Bergstrom, while commending the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee for a job well done on moneys for military construction in fiscal year 1973.

We have a first-class base at Berg-

strom. Year after year Bergstrom takes the lead in air and ground operations. Next year, let us replace Bergstrom's second-class commissary.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force as currently authorized in military public works or military construction Acts, and in sections 2673 and 2675 of title 10, United States Code, $248,374,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 2, line 24, under the heading "Military Construction, Air Force", strike out "$248,370,000" and insert "$250,483,000".

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the committee has taken a very hard look at all of the items for which appropriations were requested in this bill. As a result of our action and that of the authorizing committee, the Air Force budget request has been cut by more than $100 million if we include the Defense office building—and more than $80 million in strictly Air Forces projects. The Air Force has made a strong case for the restoration of some of these funds and has submitted evidence to show a more significant need for some of the projects than was available at the time of our mark up. Among the projects are two in particular which they consider to be of highest priority. These are navigator training aids facility for $815,000 at Mather Air Force Base, Calif., and airmen dormitories for 288 men at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz., at a cost of $1,294,000.

The first item is required to permit the design, fabrication, and maintenance of refined training devices at the Air Force Navigator Training Aids Center at Mather. At present this activity is being conducted in an old World War II wooden frame structure which is inadequate for the purpose.

At Davis-Monthan, the committee had deleted the airmen dormitories on the assumption that a Titan mission of the Strategic Air Command would be phasing out as a result of the strategic arms limitation agreement. The Air Force has informed us that their projections indicate long-term utilization of this facility in spite of the SALT limitation agreement. In view of the difficult housing situation in the Tucson area for military personnel, I feel that it is prudent to reinstate this project.

I therefore offer an amendment to increase the funds allowed for military construction, Air Force to accommodate these two items.

I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the minority is in agreement with this amendment, and we recognize the importance of these additions.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Acordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAMS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 16754) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. 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 292, nays 13, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

YEAS—292

Abbitt	Bergland	Broyhill, Va.
Abernethy	Biester	Burke, Fla.
Adams	Bingham	Burke, Mass.
Alexander	Boggs	Burleson, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Boland	Burlison, Mo.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bolling	Burton
Archer	Bow	Byrne, Pa.
Arends	Brademas	Caffery
Ashley	Brasco	Camp
Aspin	Bray	Carlson
Aspinall	Brinkley	Carney
Baring	Brooks	Carter
Barrett	Broomfield	Casey, Tex.
Begich	Brotzman	Cederberg
Belcher	Brown, Mich.	Chamberlain
Bennett	Brown, Ohio	Clancy
	Broyhill, N.C.	Clark
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes
Clay	Jonas	Riegle
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Roberts
Collier	Karth	Robinson, Va.
Collins, Ill.	Kazen	Robison, N.Y.
Collins, Tex.	Keating	Rodino
Colmer	Keith	Roe
Conable	King	Rogers
Conover	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Conte	Koch	Rostenkowski
Corman	Kyl	Roush
Crane	Kyros	Rousselot
Culver	Landgrebe	Roybal
Curlin	Landrum	Ruppe
Daniel, Va.	Latta	Sandman
Daniels, N.J.	Lennon	Sarbanes
Davis, S.C.	Lent	Satterfield
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Scherle
de la Garza	Long, Md.	Schneebeli
Dellenback	McCollister	Schwengel
Denholm	McCulloch	Sebelius
Dennis	McDade	Shipley
Dent	McDonald, Mich.	Shriver
Devine	McFall	Sikes
Dickinson	McKay	Sisk
Diggs	McKevitt	Skubitz
Donohue	McKinney	Slack
Downing	McMillan	Smith, Calif.
Duncan	Macdonald, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Eckhardt	Madden	Snyder
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Spence
Eilberg	Mallary	Springer
Eshleman	Mann	Staggers
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	Stanton, J. William
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton, James V.
Fisher	Mathis, Ga.	Steed
Flood	Matsunaga	Steele
Foley	Mayne	Steiger, Ariz.
Forsythe	Mazzoli	Steiger, Wis.
Fountain	Meeds	Stephens
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Ohio	Stokes
Frey	Mills, Ark.	Stratton
Fuqua	Mills, Md.	Stubblefield
Gaydos	Minish	Stuckey
Gibbons	Mink	Sullivan
Goldwater	Mizell	Taylor
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Teague, Calif.
Goodling	Montgomery	Terry
Gray	Morgan	Thompson, N.J.
Green, Pa.	Moss	Thone
Griffin	Murphy, Ill.	Tiernan
Griffiths	Myers	Udall
Gross	Natcher	Ullman
Grover	Nedzi	Van Deerlin
Gude	Nelsen	Vander Jagt
Haley	Nix	Vanik
Hall	O'Hara	Vigorito
Hamilton	O'Neill	Waldie
Hammer-schmidt	Passman	Wampler
Hanley	Patman	Ware
Hansen, Wash.	Pelly	Whalen
Harsha	Pepper	Whalley
Harvey	Perkins	White
Hastings	Pettis	Whitehurst
Hathaway	Peyser	Whitten
Hays	Pickle	Widnall
Heckler, Mass.	Pike	Williams
Heinz	Poage	Wilson, Charles H.
Henderson	Podell	Winn
Hicks, Mass.	Powell	Wright
Hicks, Wash.	Preyer, N.C.	Wyatt
Hogan	Price, Ill.	Wydler
Holifield	Pryor, Ark.	Wylie
Horton	Purcell	Wyman
Hull	Quie	Yates
Hungate	Quillen	Yatron
Hunt	Railsback	Young, Fla.
Hutchinson	Randall	Young, Tex.
Ichord	Rarick	Zablocki
Jarman	Rees	Zion
Johnson, Calif.	Reuss	

NAYS—13

Abzug	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Dellums	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Drinan	Metcalfe	Zwach
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell	
Harrington	Rangel	

NOT VOTING—125

Abourezk	Betts	Chappell
Addabbo	Bevill	Chisholm
Anderson, Calif.	Biaggi	Clawson, Del
Anderson, Ill.	Blackburn	Conyers
Anderson, Tenn.	Blanton	Cotter
Annunzio	Blatnik	Coughlin
Ashbrook	Buchanan	Danielson
Badillo	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Ga.
Baker	Byron	Delaney
Bell	Cabell	Derwinski
	Carey, N.Y.	Dingell
	Celler	Dorn

Dow	Hawkins	Nichols
Dowdy	Hébert	Obey
Dulski	Helstoski	O'Konski
du Pont	Hillis	Patten
Dwyer	Hosmer	Pirnie
Edmondson	Howard	Price, Tex.
Erlenborn	Jacobs	Pucinski
Esch	Jones, Ala.	Reid
Evans, Colo.	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio
Findley	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Fish	Kemp	Roy
Flowers	Kuykendall	Runnels
Flynt	Leggett	Ruth
Ford, Gerald R.	Link	St Germain
Ford, William D.	Lloyd	Saylor
	Lujan	Schmitz
Fraser	McClory	Scott
Frenzel	McCloskey	Seiberling
Fulton	McClure	Shoup
Galifianakis	McCormack	Smith, N.Y.
Gallagher	McEwen	Symington
Garmatz	Mailliard	Talcott
Gettys	Melcher	Teague, Tex.
Giaimo	Michel	Thompson, Ga.
Grasso	Mikva	Thomson, Wis.
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.	Veysey
Gubser	Minshall	Waggonner
Hagan	Monagan	Wiggins
Halpern	Moorhead	Wilson, Bob
Hanna	Mosher	Wolff
Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, N.Y.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Conyers.
Mrs. Grasso with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Mikva with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Hawkins with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Byron with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. du Pont.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Veysey.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Schmitz.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Kee with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Link with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Roy.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. SCHEUER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 382 I am recorded as absent. I was unavoidably detained, being on my way back from my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 382 I am recorded as absent. I, too, was on my way back from my district and was unavoidably detained. Had I been here, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR AGREEING TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1227, APPROVAL OF INTERIM AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1133, Report No. 92–1438) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1133

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1227) approval and authorization for the President of the United States to accept an Interim Agreement Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, together with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 1133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 1133?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 1133.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 10 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH). Pending that, I yield such time as I may consume to myself.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has for its purpose the expediting of the so-called SALT Agreement. The Senate added a certain amendment to the resolution which would permit the President to accept an interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and was a measure with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms.

The Senate placed an amendment on this resolution, which is generally referred to, as I understand, as the Jackson Amendment. That amendment requires equality in future agreements, especially on missiles.

The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House speaking for that committee advised your Committee on Rules that this amendment was acceptable to that committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid further delay and in order to avoid another long debate possibly in the other body, this resolution, if adopted, would take from the Speaker's table the House bill, together with the Senate amendment, pass it, and send it on to the President. It is just that simple.

I might add for emphasis this resolution is a little different from the ordinary resolution in that respect—and I say this for the benefit of such Members who have inquired about it—that once this resolution is adopted, that is the end of the ball game, as it were.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, once again the Rules Committee is attempting to cooperate with the work of the House of Representatives in expediting bills so that eventually we can adjourn. As stated by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules (Mr. COLMER) this is a rather unique procedure. It has happened on a few occasions before, but not very often. It is in accordance with the rules, but we do not do it very often. I think we did it on the civil rights bill.

In any event, on the adoption of House Resolution 1133, as Mr. COLMER stated, that is the end of the ball game. House Joint Resolution 1227, as amended by the Senate, will be taken from the Speaker's table, and the Senate amendments will be agreed to and that particular vote—yes or no—will depend upon the passage of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important resolution. There has been considerable delay on it up to date, and if we have to go to conference now, we could have much more delay.

According to the information before the Rules Committee, it is very important that we get this matter approved immediately.

Further, I understand the U.S.S.R. are unwilling to resume SALT negotiations until Congress has approved the interim agreement as provided for in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 1133.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, seeking peace through arms limitation talks may be the noblest of our undertakings. But an interim agreement between the parties—a benchmark of progress in negotiations, is not talks. It is a scorecard, and in this instance the grade shows we are losing the game. The agreement before us, seeking our approval, does not show we are winning or are even tied. It shows that we have lost even an equality of limitation with our adversary. By approval of this resolution we are asked to sanction our country as a second-rate world power. This is but a Gulf of Tonkin resolution in reverse.

Let me ask: "Is the agreement binding?" "Is it enforceable?" "What are the safeguards?" The answer to each is negative. We are asked to accept only the good faith of the party's signatories and the authority by which they act.

What is the record of faithful performance by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to its commitments?

According to the 1958 report of the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Treaties, of the 52 major treaties and agreements entered into, the Soviet Union has broken 50. Fifty broken promises out of 52. This is a bankrupt record of deceit and undependability.

A more recent report by the Senate Judiciary Committee reports that the Soviets have failed to honor 24 of the 25 summit agreements.

The people we represent are being asked to trust the Communist negotiators or their Secretary, Leonid Brezhnev, who signed the agreement not as an elected leader of the Russian people, but as General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Were President Nixon to have signed the agreement as head of the Republican Party of the United States, would all Americans feel bound?

Not one suggestion has been made as to enforcement—possibly because no provision can be negotiated for inspection. The Soviets refuse. Their refusal can only be interpreted as an indication that they intend good faith and compliance only so long as beneficial to their goals. There being no inspection, no enforcement mechanism, and no signature of a representative head of state, what we are asked to agree to is at most a unilateral agreement by which our country pledges not to constitute a threat to Soviet imperialism. The Soviets for 5 years can go about other business.

The Marcos government of the Philippines yesterday announced suspension of constitutional government and proclaimed martial law to protect that country from Communist terror and subversions. Who knows how serious the threat? Which of our allies will next fall victim to Communist aggression?

What power or respect in international politics can a nation maintain which voluntarily assigns its people to a second-rate position? And more importantly, what respect—what pride—can such a nation expect from its own people?

I, too, have heard the talk—that the Senate amendments improve the bill; that this is the best we can get out of a bad situation. I only ask that you do not be misled by the rhetoric. I am sure that Senator JACKSON did the best he could under the circumstances, but read the amendments, including Mr. JACKSON's. It does nothing—it has no teeth. At most, it is more quotable persuasion to disarm the unsuspecting American people.

Mr. JACKSON's amendment is not even applicable until after the end of the 5-year interim arms limitation moratorium, or until 1977. And even then, what does the Jackson amendment provide? It reads:

Urges and requests the President—

Whoever he may be in 1977—

to seek a future treaty that, inter alia, would not limit the U.S. to levels of international strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union.

The Senate passed the amendment and in so doing admitted that the agreement reduces our country to inferior status with the Soviets. Yet, while admitting the agreement was not fair nor equal to the American people, did not seek equal treatment until after 5 years—if we are still around.

The administration in agreeing to the admendment must have understood that they bought too quickly and got the short end of a one-sided bargain.

I cannot cast my people's vote for any agreement that is unfair and not at least equal to the treatment given their principal adversary—the Soviet Union.

I hope that the action taken by this body is right, because if not, it will be too late to correct it.

I urge defeat of the resolution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge concurrency by the House in the amendments adopted in the Senate to House Joint Resolution 1227, giving congressional approval to the agreement on strategic offensive arms signed in Moscow last May.

I do so in the interests of expediting the initiation of the second phase of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—SALT—between our Nation and the Soviet Union.

When the President sent his message asking for this congressional approval he expressed the hope that action could be completed by September 1 in order that the second round of talks could begin in October.

We are now 25 days beyond that deadline. As a result, there seems to be little prospect of talks beginning next month. If instead of accepting the Senate language, we were to go to conference, there would almost certainly be an additional delay, perhaps a protracted one.

The decision to accept the Senate language has not been an easy one. The bill was heavily amended on the Senate floor to include a great deal of additional language. Some of the Senate language is repetitious. Some of the Senate langauge lacks clarity. Some of the Senate language appears less than grammatical.

Ideally, of course, legislation of this importance should be marked by clear and concise expressions of congressional will. In order to recast the language, however, it would be necessary to go to conference with the Senate and thereby risk further delays.

On Thursday and Friday, the senior members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I made an attempt to achieve an informal understanding with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on language which might be acceptable to all concerned. When it was not possible to arrive at mutually agreeable language under informal conditions and an extended conference appeared likely, the decision reluctantly was made to accept the Senate version.

I know there are some who will object to this decision on the grounds that it seems to make this body a "rubber stamp" for the other body. You may be assured that this problem was given full and agonizing consideration.

When the institutional interests of this body were matched against the tremendous importance of achieving some measure of control over strategic offensive weapons, the choice seemed clear.

The interests of our national safety and security must come first.

A significant factor in international relations is momentum. Considerable momentum had been built up between the United States and the Soviet Union toward limiting strategic offensive weapons systems when the interim agreement was signed in May 1972.

That was 4 months ago. With each passing week, some of the dynamism has been lost, particularly as the interim agreement was being hotly debated in the other body.

Senior officials of our Government have viewed the situation in Congress with growing concern as the days have slipped away without any final on the interim SALT agreement. They fear that if further time is lost, it could seriously affect chances of achieving expeditiously a more permanent agreement with the Soviets.

Given this situation, it is my belief that our responsibilities demand swift action. That is why the House is being asked today to accept the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 1227.

Moreover, with the exception of section 2, none of the language added by the Senate has any legal effect.

Section 2 is the operative clause by which the Congress authorizes the President to approve on behalf of the United States the interim agreement on offensive strategic arms concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Senate language in section 2 is virtually identical to the operative clause in the House version of House Joint Resolution 1227.

The other sections added by the Senate merely express the "sense of Congress" on the subject of arms control and future negotiations.

Section 1 provides congressional endorsement of portions of the Declaration of Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed by the President and General Secretary Brezhnev in Moscow. Those portions relate to the dangers of military confrontation between our two nations and the responsibility of both to avoid attempting to gain unilateral advantage.

Section 4, added by the Senate, puts the Congress on record as not only favoring limitation of strategic weapons but eventual reduction of arms through Strategic Arms Reduction Talks—SART—with the Soviets and other nations.

Section 5, also added by the Senate, expressed the sense of Congress that the success of any comprehensive arms control agreement depends on preservation of U.S. policy that neither side should develop a first strike potential.

I deliberately have left discussion of section 3 of the amended bill until last since it has been the most controversial. That section embodies the amendment offered by the junior senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) which was the subject of extended debate in the Senate.

Within that section, the sentence which became the focal point of discussion was:

> The Congress recognizes the principle of United States-Soviet Union equality reflected in the anti-ballistic missile treaty, and urges and requests the President to seek a future treaty that, inter alia, would not limit the United States to levels of inter-continental strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union.

This language has been subject to varying interpretations. The author of the amendment has had his interpretation. Other Senators who supported it have theirs.

The administration has indicated its approval of the Jackson amendment, but not necessarily its endorsement of all the interpretations given to the amendment. In a press conference on September 16, Dr. Henry Kissinger said:

> We have no difficulty whatever, indeed we agree with the proposition, that any agreement that may be made in the field of strategic arms limitation must be based on the principle of equality, and indeed, I believe we will have no difficulty getting Soviet agreement to this as an abstract principle.

Dr. Kissinger continued by saying that the difficulty with such a proposition is to define equality:

> How do you relate various weapons systems to each other when the weapons on both sides have been developed, at least to some extent, according to different criteria and with a different mix? So this is a problem that will have to be carefully and thoughtfully addressed. Secondly, the first round of SALT concentrated primarily on quantitative limitations. It may well be that in some of the early phases of SALT II this will be the case.
>
> Yet, as one looks ahead in the more distant future, one has to recognize that the strategic balance now can be upset perhaps more decisively by qualitative changes than by quantitative changes.

There is no one in the Congress, I believe, who would argue that the United States should ever accept an "unequal" treaty to limit strategic arms with the Soviet Union. In order for any arms control treaty to be acceptable and successful, there must be equality on both sides of the strategic balance.

To narrow the concept of "equality" to include only numerical equality of launchers and warheads, however, is to oversimplify the complexities involved in achieving a stable nuclear balance and to overlook the problem of dealing with changes brought about by qualitative improvements in weaponry.

I also want to assert that in no sense does any of the language accepted by the House bind the hands of our negotiators at SALT II. Our negotiating team did an outstanding job in achieving the interim agreement; they now deserve a free hand from the Congress to achieve a more permanent agreement with the Soviets.

Once an agreement has been reached, it can be brought before the Congress for approval or disapproval. It is at that point that we properly may work our will.

In that regard, I wish to note that House acceptance of the word "treaty" in line 13 of the amended bill does not mean that our members believe that an agreement achieved at SALT II should be submitted to the Congress in the form of a treaty, which would be sent only to the Senate for approval.

Many in this body believe that the House must also have the opportunity to pass on any major arms limitation agreements to result from the SALT negotiations.

Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act requires that arms limitation actions must be approved by Congress, either through a treaty or "by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

That section would appear to give the President a choice of submitting an agreement on arms control either to the Senate as a treaty, or to both Houses for approval through passage of a joint resolution.

Although the choice lies with the President, it is to be hoped that he will recognize the legitimate interests of the House of Representatives in a future arms control agreement with the Soviet Union and submit any such accord to both Houses of the Congress.

In closing, let me remind the Members of this body about what we are voting on today.

We are not voting on the Jackson amendment or any other amendment which was added in the other body. We are voting on whether the President should acept the interim agreement on strategic offensive weapons.

A vote against House Joint Resolution 1227, as amended, is not a vote against the Jackson amendment, it is a vote against the interim agreement. It is a vote against the earnest attempt to gain some measure of control over weapons which could destroy this planet—and our Nation with it.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues—regardless of their feelings about any of the language added by the other body—to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 1227, as amended.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I, to, rise in support of this resolution.

I should like to point out to the House that over 5 weeks ago, on August 18, the House approved the interim agreement on strategic offensive arms, by a vote of 329 to 7. By today's vote on this resolution, we are simply accepting certain language that was added by the Senate to that approval.

Ideally I prefer the language of the resolution as it was approved by the House last month. Certainly there could have been some editing of the language added by the Senate. Had there been sufficient time for a leisurely conference, we might have come up with some minor modifications of langauge, but arguments over language could be as complex and lengthy as arguments over matters of principle.

I favor passage of this resolution because I am convinced that in no way does the language added by the Senate change the import of what the House has already done by our approval of the interim agreement. Nothing of consequence has been added, but the language might be considered as a clarification of the attitude of Congress towards the interim agreement, and toward future agreements which it is the hope we can reach with the Soviet Union.

I agree with the chairman of our full commitee that time is important. It is high time, at the end of this session, that we get this particular problem behind us, so I strongly urge support of this resolution.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, when the SALT agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms was first before the House I expressed my support, and coupled that expression with the statement that I favored the addition to the treaty of the amendment proposed by Senator JACKSON in the Senate.

I am pleased that by the action we take here in adopting the rule today we agree to and concur in the Senate version of this agreement which contains Senator JACKSON's amendment. The operative part of that amendment reads as follows:

> The Congress recognizes the principles of U.S.-Soviet Union equality reflected in the antiballistic missile treaty, and urges and requests the President to seek a future treaty that, that interalia, would not limit the U.S. to levels of inter-continental strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union; and the Congress considers that the success of these agreements and the attainment of more permanent and comprehensive agreements are dependent upon the main-

tenance under present world conditions of vigorous research and development and modernization program as required by a prudent strategic posture.

This is highy important and in my view, desirable language and I am very glad, as an American, that we accept and adopt this agreement with Senator JACKSON'S amendment as an integral part thereof.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. MORGAN, in commenting on House acceptance of House Joint Resolution 1227, as amended—legislation which gives congressional approval to the interim agreement on strategic offensive arms signed in Moscow last May.

The joint resolution which the House sent to the Senate was a precise and concise one-paragraph resolution which authorized and approved the President's acceptance of the agreement. The version as returned from the other body is loaded down with amendments.

Although none of the added amendments have the power of law, since they express only the sense of Congress, their total effect is a measure which lacks clarity, conciseness, and, indeed, the dignity befitting so important a subject as strategic arms control.

My first inclination was that the House should request a conference with the Senate in order to "clean up" the language of their bill. When informal efforts for that purpose with the Senate did not prove to be possible and the likelihood of a protracted conference increased, the prospect of further delay made today's acceptance of the Senate version seem a preferable course of action.

At the same time, House acceptance should not be taken as an indication that the House desires no further role in approving a permanent strategic arms limitation agreement.

I firmly believe that the President should submit any future agreement which may result from the SALT negotiations to both Houses of Congress for approval.

On September 14, I inserted into the RECORD a list of 20 important international accords which had been submitted to both Houses of Congress for approval. Those precedents went back only to 1934.

Since that time I have obtained additional material on precedents for House action from earlier periods in our Nation's history.

For example, the annexation of Texas in 1845 was accomplished by a joint resolution approved by both Houses. When the Senate failed to give its consent to the ratification of the treaty with Texas by which the latter had been annexed, President Tyler sent a special message to the House pointing out that:

> The power of Congress . . . is fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that a formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished.

The annexation of Hawaii in 1898, similarly was accomplished through the adoption of a joint resolution by both Houses.

Termination of World War I with Germany was also accomplished by action of both bodies. After the Senate rejected the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, joint resolutions declaring a state of peace were introduced in both Houses. Wilson vetoed one in May 1920 but Harding, his successor, called Congress into special session after his inauguration and invited Congress "to establish a state of technical peace without further delay" and promised his approval of "a declaratory resolution of Congress to that effect." Such a resolution was passed in June 1921, and signed by Harding on July 2, 1921.

Of particular interest in the present context is the Washington Arms Limitation Treaty of 1922. To carry out the terms of that treaty the Committee on Naval Affairs reported out a bill in 1922 which authorized the President "to make such disposition as in his judgment may be proper of any capital ship of the Navy." The floor debate turned on the necessity of this provision. It was argued by Mr. Tucker, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that the Constitution specifically grants to the whole Congress the power "to provide and maintain a navy" (art. I, sec. 8, c. 13) and "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States" (art. IV, sec. 3, c. 2). Since the treaty touched on the maintenance of the Navy—and Government property—the President was unable to carry out the treaty without the authorization of Congress, Tucker argued.

Both Houses apparently accepted that argument, as did the President, and the resolution became law on July 1, 1922.

While all these precedents help establish a role for Congress in approving any future SALT agreement, the last one appears particularly useful.

Since the Constitution provides for the Congress to "raise and support Armies" and "to provide and maintain a Navy" and to exercise authority over the disposition of property, there is a good case for asserting that the House must give its formal approval to any arms limitation or reduction agreement since any such agreement would affect one or more of those constitutionally given powers.

At the same time, however, I do not believe it is necessary to assert such a claim formally. Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act requires that arms limitation actions must be approved by Congress, either through use of the treaty power or "by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Thus, it would appear that the act gives the President a choice of submitting an agreement on arms control either to the Senate as a treaty, or to both Houses for approval.

When the President chose to send the interim agreement on offensive weapons to both Houses, he set a precedent of seeking authorization from this body.

That procedure I submit should be maintained in the future, even if a follow-on agreement is of more than an interim nature. It is difficult to conceive of a SALT agreement which would be truly "permanent" since our objective as stated in House Journal Resolution 1227, as amended, is to work toward strategic arms reduction talks—SART. Thus any strategic arms limitation agreement must be considered of a less-than-permanent nature.

These conditions bolster the position that, having given its approval to the present interim SALT I agreement, the House should have the opportunity to make its will known on a SALT II agreement.

It is my sincere hope that the President will take note of these sentiments—which I believe are shared by many in this body—if and when the time comes for further congressional action on strategic arms control.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. RARICK. 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 308, nays 4, answered "present" 2, not voting 116, as follows

[Roll No. 384]

YEAS—308

Abbitt	Burke, Fla.	Davis, S.C.
Abernethy	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Wis.
Abzug	Burleson, Tex.	Dellenback
Adams	Burlison, Mo.	Dellums
Alexander	Burton	Denholm
Anderson, Ill.	Byrne, Pa.	Dennis
Andrews, Ala.	Cabell	Dent
Andrews, N. Dak.	Caffery	Devine
Archer	Camp	Dickinson
Arends	Carey, N.Y.	Diggs
Ashley	Carlson	Donohue
Aspin	Carney	Downing
Asplnall	Carter	Drinan
Baring	Casey, Tex.	Duncan
Begich	Cederberg	Eckhardt
Belcher	Celler	Edwards, Ala.
Bennett	Chamberlain	Edwards, Calif.
Bergland	Clancy	Eilberg
Biester	Clark	Esch
Bingham	Clausen, Don H.	Eshleman
Boggs	Clay	Evins, Tenn.
Boland	Cleveland	Fascell
Bolling	Collier	Fish
Bow	Collins, Ill.	Fisher
Brasco	Collins, Tex.	Flood
Bray	Colmer	Foley
Brinkley	Conable	Forsythe
Brooks	Conover	Fountain
Broomfield	Conte	Frelinghuysen
Brotzman	Corman	Frey
Brown, Mich.	Culver	Fuqua
Brown, Ohio	Daniel, Va.	Gaydos
Broyhill, N.C.	Daniels, N.J.	Gibbons
Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Ga.	Goldwater
		Gonzalez

Goodling	Mahon	Satterfield
Gray	Mallary	Scherle
Green, Pa.	Mann	Scheuer
Griffin	Martin	Schneebeli
Griffiths	Mathis, Ga.	Schwengel
Gross	Matsunaga	Sebelius
Grover	Mayne	Shipley
Gude	Mazzoli	Shriver
Haley	Meeds	Sikes
Hall	Metcalfe	Sisk
Hamilton	Michel	Slack
Hammer-schmidt	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Calif.
	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Iowa
Hanley	Mills, Ark.	Snyder
Hanna	Mills, Md.	Spence
Hansen, Wash.	Minish	Springer
Harrington	Mink	Staggers
Harsha	Mitchell	Stanton,
Harvey	Mizell	J. William
Hastings	Mollohan	Stanton,
Hathaway	Montgomery	James V.
Hays	Morgan	Steed
Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher	Steele
Heckler, Mass.	Moss	Steiger, Ariz.
Heinz	Murphy, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Henderson	Myers	Stephens
Hicks, Mass.	Natcher	Stokes
Hicks, Wash.	Nedzi	Stratton
Hogan	Nelsen	Stubblefield
Holifield	Nix	Sullivan
Horton	O'Hara	Taylor
Hull	O'Neill	Teague, Calif.
Hungate	Passman	Teague, Tex.
Hunt	Patman	Terry
Hutchinson	Pelly	Thompson, N.J.
Ichord	Pepper	Thone
Jarman	Perkins	Tiernan
Johnson, Calif.	Pettis	Udall
Johnson, Pa.	Peyser	Ullman
Jonas	Pickle	Van Deerlin
Jones, Ala.	Pike	Vander Jagt
Jones, N.C.	Poage	Vanik
Karth	Podell	Vigorito
Kastenmeier	Powell	Waggonner
Kazen	Preyer, N.C.	Waldie
Keating	Price, Ill.	Wampler
Keith	Pryor, Ark.	Ware
King	Purcell	Whalen
Kluczynski	Quie	Whalley
Koch	Quillen	White
Kyl	Railsback	Whitehurst
Kyros	Randall	Whitten
Landrum	Rangel	Widnall
Latta	Rees	Williams
Lennon	Reuss	Wilson,
Lent	Rhodes	Charles H.
Long, La.	Riegle	Winn
Long, Md.	Roberts	Wright
McCollister	Robinson, Va.	Wyatt
McCulloch	Robison, N.Y.	Wydler
McDade	Rodino	Wylie
McDonald, Mich.	Roe	Wyman
	Rogers	Yates
McFall	Rooney, Pa.	Yatron
McKay	Rosenthal	Young, Fla.
McKevitt	Rostenkowski	Young, Tex.
McKinney	Roush	Zablocki
McMillan	Roybal	Zion
Macdonald, Mass.	Ruppe	Zwach
	Sandman	
Madden	Sarbanes	

NAYS—4

de la Garza	Rarick	Stuckey
Landgrebe		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Crane	Rousselot

NOT VOTING—116

Abourezk	Cotter	Gallagher
Addabbo	Coughlin	Garmatz
Anderson, Calif.	Curlin	Gettys
	Danielson	Giaimo
Anderson, Tenn.	Delaney	Grasso
	Derwinski	Green, Oreg.
Annunzio	Dingell	Gubser
Ashbrook	Dorn	Hagan
Badillo	Dow	Halpern
Baker	Dowdy	Hansen, Idaho
Barrett	Dulski	Hawkins
Bell	du Pont	Hébert
Betts	Dwyer	Helstoski
Bevill	Edmondson	Hillis
Biaggi	Erlenborn	Hosmer
Blackburn	Evans, Colo.	Howard
Blanton	Findley	Jacobs
Blatnik	Flowers	Jones, Tenn.
Brademas	Flynt	Kee
Buchanan	Ford, Gerald R.	Kemp
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford,	Kuykendall
Byron	William D.	Leggett
Chappell	Fraser	Link
Chisholm	Frenzel	Lloyd
Clawson, Del	Fulton	Lujan
Conyers	Galifianakis	McClory
McCloskey	O'Konski	Scott
McClure	Patten	Seiberling
McCormack	Pirnie	Shoup
McEwen	Price, Tex.	Skubitz
Mailliard	Pucinski	Smith, N.Y.
Mathias, Calif.	Reid	Symington
Melcher	Roncalio	Talcott
Mikva	Rooney, N.Y.	Thompson, Ga.
Minshall	Roy	Thomson, Wis.
Monagan	Runnels	Veysey
Moorhead	Ruth	Wiggins
Murphy, N.Y.	St Germain	Wilson, Bob
Nichols	Saylor	Wolff
Obey	Schmitz	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Crane against.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Senate amendment, concurred in, reads as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Congress hereby endorses those portions of the Declaration of Basic Principles of Mutual Relations Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed by President Nixon and General Secretary Brezhnev at Moscow on May 29, 1972, which relate to the dangers of military confrontation and which read as follows:

"The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics attach major importance to preventing the development of situations capable of causing a dangerous exacerbation of their relations . . ." and "will do their utmost to avoid military confrontations and to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war" and "will always exercise restraint in their mutual relations," and "on outstanding issues will conduct" their discussions and negotiations "in a spirit of reciprocity, mutual accommodation and mutual benefit," and

"Both sides recognize that efforts to obtain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other, directly or indirectly, are inconsistent with these objectives," and

"The prerequisites for maintaining and strengthening peaceful relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are the recognition of the security interests of the parties based on the principle of equality and the renunciation of the use or threat of force.".

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to approve on behalf of the United States the interim agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms, and the protocol related thereto, signed at Moscow on May 26, 1972, by Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, and Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

SEC. 3. The Government and the people of the United States ardently desire a stable international strategic balance that maintains peace and deters aggression. The Congress supports the stated policy of the United States that, were a more complete strategic offensive arms agreement not achieved within the five years of the interim agreement, and were the survivability of the strategic deterrent forces of the United States to be threatened as a result of such failure, this could jeopardize the supreme national interests of the United States; the Congress recognizes the difficulty of maintaining a stable strategic balance in a period of rapidly developing technology; the Congress recognizes the principle of United States-Soviet Union equality reflected in the antiballistic missile treaty, and urges and requests the President to seek a future treaty that, inter alia, would not limit the United States to levels of intercontinental strategic forces inferior to the limits provided for the Soviet Union; and the Congress considers that the success of these agreements and the attainment of more permanent and comprehensive agreements are dependent upon the maintenance under present world conditions of a vigorous research and development and modernization program as required by a prudent strategic posture.

SEC. 4. The Congress hereby commends the President for having successfully concluded agreements with the Soviet Union limiting the production and deployment of antiballistic missiles and certain strategic offensive armaments, and it supports the announced intention of the President to seek further limits on the production and deployment of strategic armaments at future Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. At the same time, the Senate takes cognizance of the fact that agreements to limit the further escalation of the arms race are only preliminary steps, however important, toward the attainment of world stability and national security. The Congress therefore urges the President to seek at the earliest practicable moment Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (SART) with the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and other countries, and simultaneously to work toward reductions in conventional armaments, in order to bring about agreements for mutual decreases in the production and development of weapons of mass destruction so as to eliminate the threat of large-scale devastation and the ever-mounting costs of arms production and weapons modernization, thereby freeing world resources for constructive, peaceful use.

SEC. 5. Pursuant to paragraph six of the Declaration of Principles of Nixon and Brezhnev on May 29, 1972, which states that the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: "will continue to make special efforts to limit strategic armaments. Whenever possible, they will conclude concrete agreements aimed at achieving these purposes"; Congress considers that the success of the interim agreement and the attainment of more permanent and comprehensive agreements are dependent upon the preservation of longstanding United States policy that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States should seek unilateral advantage by developing a first strike potential.

RESIGNATION OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 25, 1972.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On June 30, 1972, pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, (2 U.S.C. 75–1(a)), you appointed me to act and

to exercise temporarily the duties of Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, effective July 1, 1972.

Since the Democratic Caucus has nominated a candidate for the Office of Sergeant-at-Arms, I hereby tender my resignation effective midnight Sepetmber 30, 1972.

In my leave-taking, I want to thank you, Members of the House, and to say that words cannot adequately express my feelings of gratitude and fulfillment for the privilege that has been mine to serve the House of Representatives as Sergeant-at-Arms.

Sincerely,

ZEAKE W. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Sergeant-at-Arms.

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1134) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1134

Resolved, That Kenneth R. Harding of the Commonwealth of Virginia be, and he is hereby chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, effective on October 1, 1972.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

The SPEAKER. Will the Sergeant at Arms-elect present himself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office?

Mr. Kenneth R. Harding, the Sergeant at Arms-elect, presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SENATOR McGOVERN'S CREDIBILITY GAP

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the credibility gap which Senator McGOVERN has created for himself seems to grow ever wider as his campaign for the Presidency develops.

Recently one of my constituents forwarded to me a copy of a letter from Senator McGOVERN to Mr. Frank D. Register, executive director of the National Association of Retail Grocers. Mr. Register had previously written a letter to the Senator requesting that he reconsider his announced position endorsing Caesar Chavez and the lettuce boycotts.

Senator McGOVERN's reply demonstrates not only an incredible lack of knowledge as to the facts surrounding the lettuce boycott, but also a callousness and lack of concern for the problems which face the retail grocers in America.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Senator McGOVERN's response demonstrates the character of this man who would be President—this man who has been termed, perhaps quite erroneously, the most decent man in the Senate.

For the RECORD, I submit Mr. Register's letter and the reply from Senator McGOVERN and point out his ominous threat of a police state.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF RETAIL GROCERS
OF THE U.S., INC.,
Oak Brook, Ill., May 22, 1972.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: In yesterday's news telecasts, you were shown endorsing Caesar Chavez and the lettuce boycotts.

I would suggest that you consider this position carefully from a number of standpoints. Under existing law, such boycotts are clearly illegal. Secondly, the pattern established in the grape boycotts was one of damage and destruction to innocent third parties—in this instance, retailers who have no way of knowing who is right in a labor dispute many miles away. Thirdly, such tactics, if successful, result in increased costs which mean increased prices, a subject which I know is of concern to you.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. REGISTER,
Executive Director.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1972.

FRANK D. REGISTER,
Executive Director, National Association of Retail Grocers of the U.S., Inc., Oak Brook, Ill.

DEAR MR. REGISTER: Thank you very much for your recent letter.

You should know, Mr. Register, that I have competent legal advice and you need not worry about me on that score.

Your reference to innocent third parties was intriguing to say the least. If you are suggesting that retail grocers are under any definition of the term "innocent," I would be surprised. It may interest you to know that I am fully aware of the monopoly meat and other commodity pricing practices of the chain stores. I am also aware of rate of return on your investment.

You may be sure, Mr. Register, that when I am President suits will no longer be brought by stockmen, egg producers and others, but by the Attorney General of the United States.

With every good wish, I am

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

CLARENCE D. PALMBY, A TRUE PROFESSIONAL

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Clarence D. Palmby was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs and Commodity Programs for 3½ years from January 1969 to June 1972. He was uniquely qualified for this high post by reason of 8 years' service as Chief Executive Officer of the U.S. Feed Grains Council from 1961–69. He brought outstanding qualities of character, ability, and experience to Government service and made a tremendous contribution to the Department, the American farmer, and the American consumer during his very distinguished tenure of office. Among other achievements, he played a leading part in the development of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1970. He was a true professional in the finest sense of the word and used his intimate knowledge of all facets of the grain industry to our country's great advantage and with conspicuous national success.

Mr. Palmby elected to retire from public life and submitted his resignation to Secretary Butz on May 23.

Thereafter, he accepted a position as corporate vice president for market planning and development with the Continental Grain Co.

On September 19, 1972, Mr. Palmby readily and voluntarily appeared before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains to testify concerning his own activities before and after leaving Government service and Continental's role in the sale of grain to Russia. His testimony on that occasion was consistent with the high professional standards he has always set for himself and very much in keeping with what those who know him have come to expect from Clarence Palmby.

It is my opinion as one member of the subcommittee that he answered our questions fairly and fully, giving us much-needed information very few of us had previously possessed concerning the production, marketing, and distribution of grain in this country and abroad. This is an extremely complicated business about which there has been a good deal of irresponsible, uninformed writing and loose talk in recent weeks.

All members of the subcommittee, the Congress, and others who may be interested in the true facts of this historic transaction should read and carefully consider the testimony of Clarence D. Palmby, which will follow at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY CLARENCE D. PALMBY, CORPORATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR MARKET PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—CONTINENTAL GRAIN CO., NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND GRAINS ON THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON SEPTEMBER 19, 1972

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture. Accompanying me is Sheldon L. Berens, Vice President and General Counsel, Continental Grain Company.

To again appear before this Subcommittee, which has worked long and hard for the betterment of U.S. agriculture, reminds me of past appearances before the distinguished members of this committee. I recall vividly many painstaking hours I worked with the Committee as a government official in developing the Agriculture Act of 1970. Thus, it is a renewed thrill for me to again appear before the members of the Subcommittee in my new position as Vice President of Continental Grain Company, a position which I have held since June 8, 1972.

I also vividly recall testifying before this Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Department Operations of the House Committee on Agriculture on December 8, 1971, on what I then referred to as a history-making grain export sale by U.S. exporters to the Soviet Union. I mentioned at that time that the U.S. feed grain exports to Russia opened up a brand new market for U.S. grains, and at a time when Russia and many of the East European countries had established huge goals for increased livestock production.

I look upon my appearance before the Subcommittee today as an opportunity in the true American system to familiarize the Subcommittee with my own activities during the last few months I served as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and to further explain the role of Continental Grain in con-

summating additional grain sales to the Soviet Union. I also wish to describe my responsibilities in Continental Grain and to further illustrate the role of the private grain sector in selling grain to overseas buyers.

In order to best familiarize members of the Subcommittee of the history making developments in exporting grain, I wish to review in a concise manner some of my own personal thinking regarding the promotion of trade between the U.S. and countries that have been at least partially economically and politically isolated from the U.S. for the past twenty-five years.

As was related to the Subcommittee on December 8 when I explained the feed grain sale last Fall to the Soviet Union, I related that after having family involvement in the Vietnam tragedy in 1965 and 1966, that I was firmly convinced that nations with conflicting political goals have a greater chance to build a peaceful world through channels of trade than through confrontation. Perhaps because of this experience, I have been deeply dedicated to our Government doing everything possible to build improved trade channels with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. It is because of this firm conviction, that I was proud to have the opportunity to join Continental Grain on June 8, and I am particularly pleased to represent the company in these hearings. I am pleased because President Michel Fribourg, as well as key executives with Continental Grain, have had a long history of trade with East European countries, including the Soviet Union. Perhaps one thing that has impressed me above everything else since joining Continental Grain, is the great emphasis that has been placed upon proper execution of contract terms. I am convinced that proper execution on the part of Continental through the years has created a trustworthy reputation for Mr. Fribourg and Continental Grain, particularly in that area of the world. In order to best familiarize the members of the Subcommittee of my activities involving the Soviet Union during the last several weeks in my capacity as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, I will with your permission trace those activities in chronological order.

As has been related to you, I did accompany Secretary Butz to Moscow on April 8, 1972. As was announced at that time, Secretary Butz was traveling to the U.S.S.R. at the invitation of the Minister of Agriculture, Matskevich.

It is to be remembered that Minister Matskevich had viisited the U.S. in December of 1971 at the invitation of Secretary Butz. This matter was related to the members of the Subcommittee when I appeared before you on December 8, 1971. It was also announced prior to the departure of Secretary Butz to Moscow, that I would head a small negotiating team and would meet with representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Trade. Representatives of the U.S.D.A. had been invited by the Minister of Foreign Trade to describe the CCC Credit Program (GSM–4). Others from the U.S.D.A. and the Department of State accompanied Secretary Butz and myself, and this is matter of public record.

I spent a portion of my time while in the U.S.S.R. during this trip with Secretary Butz and Minister Matskevich. I accompanied them on a trip to the Crimea. At that time, we did visit the Ukraine and several farms in the area. It was quite apparent to us at that time that the area was badly in need of germination moisture. It was also obvious that some of the winter wheat stands were sparse, but it should be noted that Secretary Butz and I had never visited the Ukraine before. I, for one, was in no position to judge the degree of abnormality with the winter kill or the lack of germination moisture. It is worth repeating that Secretary Butz did state in his concluding press conference prior to his departure from Moscow, which received world-wide attention, that it was obvious to him that a sizable portion of the winter wheat crop in the Soviet Union was ruined and that germination moisture in the Ukraine was badly needed.

On April 11, Secretary Butz opened negotiations with the Senior Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Minister Kuz'min. I am referring to the negotiations which were later to be chaired by myself as U.S. delegate, having to do with the CCC Credit Program. Consequently, after the opening ceremonies, I, together with assistance from my colleagues from U.S.D.A. and the Department of State, described the CCC Credit Program and the manner in which it had been operated since 1948. We made particular mention that the CCC line of credit which we were prepared to offer to them against a commitment to buy grain, was a non-concessional type of credit line, in that the maximum credit period would be three years with interest at 6⅛% (somewhat higher than the cost of money to CCC at that time). The U.S. delegation offered to extend a line of credit with maximum exposure over a three year period (the $750 million credit over a three year period actually would provide for a purchase of about $250 million grain annually, provided purchases were made on a regular basis). The U.S. delegation further stated that they would expect repayments to be made annually on a twelve-month basis, together with accrued interest up to that date. While traditionally CCC has referred to this program as being a three year credit program, in actual practice with the demand for annual repayment schedule, it is an 18 month credit program. If my memory serves me correctly, and on this point I am a bit hazy, but I believe the U.S. delegation stated that at least $200 million of grain would need to be bought over the first twelve months to effectuate the line of credit.

The U.S. offer was refused outright. The Soviet delegation stated that the 6⅛% interest and the short period for credit exposure was nothing more than an offer of a commercial nature. The U.S. delegation agreed. The Soviets countered by saying they may be receptive to buying grain from the U.S., if the U.S. would be in a position to offer ten-year credits at a low rate of interest, such as 2%. I advised the Soviet group that no such authority existed, nor did I give the group any indication that the Executive Branch of the Government would be receptive to seek such authority from the Congress.

The U.S. and Soviet delegations met for the second time on April 12. The provisions as outlined earlier were again reviewed, and again the Soviets stated that the CCC Credit Program was completely unacceptable.

I, along with my colleagues from U.S. Government, returned to Washington on April 14.

I had no further conversation with any representatives of the Soviet Union on any subject whatsoever until May 9.

On May 9, with a few minutes notice, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Alkhimov, requested a meeting with me in the U.S.D.A. I was informed that he, along with other representatives of the Soviet Union, were in Washington meeting with representatives of the Department of Commerce on the subject of lend lease settlement and other matters. I, along with Deputy General Counsel from the U.S.D.A. and others, met for about one hour with Minister Alkhimov. The Minister opened the conversation by saying that he wanted to be sure he understood how the GSM–4 or CCC Credit Program operated. He made it specifically clear at several times during the conversation that the request for information should not be interpreted as reflecting interest on the part of the Soviets to purchase grain, or to purchase grain on credit from the U.S. He again repeated that the 6⅛% interest and the three year maximum period was completely unsatisfactory to the Soviets. He again asked whether longer terms, with lower interest rate financing from government could be made available. I queried the Minister and his colleagues as to whether the Soviets might buy grain from the U.S. sometime in the future. He stated that he had no idea. In that he was not a representative of the Ministry of Agriculture, he was not particularly familiar with the Soviet grain requirements and that undoubtedly future grain requirements in the Soviet would largely be determined by crop conditions as they developed during calendar year 1972. This was the last conversation I had with the Soviets regarding CCC credit, grain matters, or any other item.

On May 12, I informally advised Secretary Butz that I wished to resign from my official position to return to private life. Secretary Butz was scheduled to take a few days rest the week following, and I wanted him to be informed of my decision to ask to be relieved of my official responsibilies.

On May 23, I submitted my resignation to Secretary Butz, with the request that he forward my formal resignation to President Nixon with the further request that I be relieved of my duties before June 8.

On May 23 through 29, I was on vacation in Minnesota.

From May 30 through June 7, I was back on official duty in my office, and engaged only in clean-up work. I considered no policy matters.

On June 7, my resignation was accepted, effective immediately.

June 8, I joined Continental Grain Company. In Continental Grain Company, I have the title of Corporate Vice President for Market Planning and Development. I look upon my duties primarily as being of a longer term nature, than of one of being involved in day-to-day operations. It is to be recalled that I was Chief Executive Officer for eight years of the U.S. Feed Grains Council from 1961–69, during which time I did develop many contacts in many nations of the world and familiarized myself with the grain, feed, and livestock industries of many countries. In many ways, my work with Continental Grain at this time is not unlike the work performed in that former capacity.

It has been stated that I visited with the Russian delegation in Washington the weekend of July 1. Please keep in mind that Mrs. Palmby and I continued to reside in Arlington, Virginia until early August. Consequently, I was at home in Arlington on Sunday, July 2. During the noon and afternoon of July 2, I accompanied Mr. Ziv (who had arrived in Washington on July 2) of Continental's office in Paris to Alexandria, Virginia. Our guests were Mr. Kalitenko and Mr. Goldobenko, two members of the Russian buying mission. I had never met Mr. Kalitenko or Mr. Goldobenko until that day. In that Mr. Ziv, Continental's representative, had never visited Washington before, he and the Soviets requested me to give them a tour of historical spots. As stated, I took them to lunch in Alexandria and did show them historic spots of interest in Washington, D.C. I repeat that I had never met these gentlemen before that day, and at no time did we mention the agricultural situation in the Soviet Union or the U.S., nor the grain industry in either country, nor any other official subject. I would hasten to state that a Sunday spent in this manner was not untypical of my activities during eight years with the U.S. Feed Grains Council and during three and one half years as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs in the U.S. Government.

Much has been said about my involvement in this transaction between Continental

Grain and the Soviet Union. Many of the comments are completely untrue. I am referring particularly to the statements that an agreement had been reached in Moscow with the Soviets in April of 1972. Any such statement is an outright lie. I categorically state I took no active part in Continental's commercial negotiations with the Soviets.

Still other statements have been made that I somehow or other had prior knowledge of the Soviet's intention to purchase grain from the U.S., and promptly carried that information to my new employer. This also is an outright lie. Consistent with these positive assertions on my part, I wish to share with members of the Subcommittee an example of the comments I made during the Winter months of 1972.

March 31—Mason City, Iowa.

"Uncertain crop conditions exist this year not only in the U.S.S.R. but also in the East European countries. Virtually all countries in the area have been affected by similar freeze and snow-cover problems. Again, we do not know what the ultimate effect will be. But it appears that the U.S.S.R.-East European region could be a large net grain importer in 1972–1973 for the second consecutive year."

During several press briefings, I summarized my views regarding the possibility of the U.S. selling additional grain to the Soviet Union in 1972. As an example, at a question-answer period following an address to the New York Commodity Club on May 18, 1972, and during my well-covered final press conference in the U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C. on June 7, I stated that in my opinion the Soviet Government officials would sometime in the future, possibly August or September, make some policy decisions regarding their grain requirements. I stated that there were probably three general options that would receive consideration by the Soviet policy makers, the options being as follows:

1. The Soviets may decide to continue to maintain per capita caloric intake over the next twelve months for their people at about the present level without much regard to improved quality of diet. If this option were to become policy, grain import requirements would be X amount depending upon 1972 crop out-turn.

2. The Soviets may decide to continue to expand livestock, poultry, and dairy production as announced in their Five Year Plan commencing January 1, 1970. If this were to become policy, their grain requirements from outside sources would undoubtedly be X amount plus, again depending on 1972 crop out-turn.

3. The Soviets may decide to ask their citizens to go through a "belt tightening period". If this option were to become policy, the grain requirements from outside sources would naturally be quite a different figure.

Finally, if the members of the Subcommittee will bear with me, I wish to review the role of the U.S. Government in the wheat export business, as well as the role of the private exporter.

On many occasions, both as a public official and as an interested observer on the outside, I have fully realized that countries such as Canada and Australia who sell wheat to the outside world through wheat boards, can enter into long time commitments at fixed prices. In that there is no such central government or quasi-government entity in the U.S., for which I am eternally grateful, the same type of mechanism simply does not exist. Machinery to accomplish the same goal does exist, and in this most recent huge sale to the Soviet Union, the machinery was used. This recent 400 million bushel sale made by the exporters to the Soviet Union on general assurance from U.S.D.A. officials that a net export price would be maintained through the payment of equalization payments, is a forthright example of how the private sector and the U.S.D.A. can use the marketing machinery to accomplish the very thing that Canada and Australia has been doing for years.

THE ROLE OF CONTINENTAL GRAIN COMPANY

Now I turn to Continental Grain Company's role in the events in which this Subcommittee has expressed such understandable interest. Although, as I have said, I did not negotiate the commercial transaction, at the request of the President of our Company I have assembled the main facts from other officers who did. The basic facts are simple and involve no government secrets or conflicts of interest. So that the members of this Subcommittee may be informed of the manner in which Continental developed the contract to sell grain to the Soviet Union, I wish to explain the happenings in chronological order.

First, a reminder of the pertinent commercial background. Continental is an American company engaged in worldwide grain merchandising with private and governmental customers and suppliers in many countries. Over the past decade it has successfully developed marketing opportunities with the Soviet Union and has been the major supplier of U.S. grains to the Soviet Union.

Continental first learned of the presence in the United States of the Soviet grain purchasing representatives by a telephone call on Thursday, June 29, 1972, directly from officials of Exportkhleb, the Soviet state trading organization responsible for grain imports, requesting to see us.

The top executives of the Company were at a conference in Europe at this time, and returned immediately upon receipt of this news. A representative of Continental then met in Washington with the Soviet officials on Friday evening, June 30th. It was at this meeting on June 30th that Continental first learned of the interest on the part of the Soviet Union in purchasing grains. The Exportkhleb officials requested Continental to make appropriate offers on Monday, July 3rd.

These negotiations now shifted to New York City and took place intensively from the afternoon of July 3rd through the afternoon of July 5th, when Continental and the Soviets signed a contract in preliminary form. The total quantity of wheat we sold to Exportkhleb on July 5th was 4 million tons, subsequently increased by another 1 million tons, to a total of 5 million tons by July 11th, when definitive contracts were signed by the parties.

These sales concerned primarily hard winter wheat and also included durum wheat from any origin and white wheat and hard wheat from the Pacific Northwest.

In these negotiations, in addition to wheat, Continental sold to the Soviet Union 4½ million tons of feed grains, including some non-U.S. origin optional with the seller.

These contracts called for Soviet payment to be made to Continental in U.S. dollars, cash as shipped, and were in no way contingent on the Soviet's obtaining U.S. Government or other third party credit. The first indication that any officials of Continental had perceived that other Soviet officials in the U.S. were concurrently negotiating with the U.S. Government for establishment of a CCC line of credit, came from the Russians themselves at the conclusion of their purchasing negotiations with us. At their request, we made provision in the contract for the documentation and other mechanics of sale and payment in the event the buyer obtained financing.

It should be emphasized that whether or not payment was made through CCC credit lines arranged by the buyer, Continental's prices would have been the same as it receives cash against shipping documents in either case.

Because of the unusual interest surrounding these transactions, let me say that our contract prices for the wheat were *very close* to the then prevailing export prices for U.S. wheat as ascertained by U.S. Government officials responsible for administering the export marketing program. In response to our inquiry, they had advised us that for the foreseeable future they wished to stabilize world wheat prices in the $1.63 to $1.65 range prevailing over the past two years through the usual export equalization payment formula. In good faith reliance upon this established policy and government program, Continental had then entered into its 5 million ton wheat commitment to the Soviet Union.

To sum up, I wish to repeat that Continental had no advance knowledge of the proposed Government-to-Government credit agreement of July 8, either from me or from any other source, nor did Continental know until June 30th that the Soviet Union was interested in buying U.S grains. The Company's market conduct bears this out. We cite the fact that against wheat sales to various destinations made prior to July 1, 1972, Continental had already registered 11.5 million bushels for export equalization payments, the last quantities being taken during June at levels ranging from 5 to 8 cents per bushel, to cover sales of approximately similar amount. Further, against purchases of cash wheat and futures contracts made during July, Continental took further subsidies totaling 55 million bushels at 13 and 15 cents between the 12th and 20th of July. This was done in order to minimize the risks that the Company was taking from this large commitment.

The really sharp advance in domestic wheat prices occurred during the first part of August after it became generally known that representatives of Exportkhleb suddenly had returned to the U.S. and in more private transactions had made additional purchases. Continental continued to buy in the domestic market at advancing levels and also continued registering corresponding subsidy, as evidenced by the fact that the Company registered 50 million bushels between August 9 and 15 at levels ranging from 31 cents to 36 cents. During the week of August 24, the domestic market advanced to about $2.10—FOB Gulf, but CCC did not follow on the subsidy rate, keeping to a 38 cent subsidy, to yield a net export price of $1.72. There has been precedent for CCC not following daily fluctuations of the domestic markets with their subsidy levels, particularly when domestic markets are extremely volatile.

On Thursday, August 24, we received a call from Mr. Pence of the Department of Agriculture, inviting us to a meeting with other grain exporters to be held the next afternoon, Friday, August 25, for a briefing on new export wheat policy. He advised us that the net price of U.S. wheat exports would no longer be maintained at the old levels, but he gave no details of what the new policy would be. We had no knowledge at that time that the Department would announce the next day, August 25, an increase of its subsidy rate to 47 cents for export sales made prior to August 24. We made no wheat export sales on August 24, 1972.

When the details of the August 25th announcement became known, Continental was faced with a situation that certainly did not portend so-called "windfall profits", as Continental still did not own about 70 million bushels of domestic wheat needed to cover export commitments already made long before August 24. During the week of August 28, Continental purchased about 70 million bushels of wheat in the cash and futures markets at the prevailing price levels. The Company at the end of that week registered for the 47 cents subsidy on 71 million bushels. The cost of Continental's purchases

of the cash portion of this wheat will probably exceed $2.10 per bushel FOB Gulf ports. Since it took approximately the same quantity of hard wheat subsidy at 47 cents, resulting in a net export price of $1.63 or higher, any suggestion of excess profits is amply demonstrated to be totally *false* in the light of commercial reality.

Gentlemen, it is obvious to me from this recital of facts that only lack of understanding can explain the continuation of the wholly unjustified attacks which have been levied on these private grain sales to the Soviet Union. Reasonable men might differ on what *should* be government policy or programs in the agricultural field, but that is very different from the shameful defamation characteristic of the criticism to date.

Accordingly, for its leading role in this complex and historic billion dollar trade, for its taking large financial risks in the best tradition of American private enterprise, for its bringing huge amounts of foreign-owned dollars home to American to offset our national payments deficit, for its providing jobs and income for all sectors of the agricultural and transportation industries, and, most of all, for its enhancing prospects of world peace through world trade, I am proud to be associated with Continental Grain Company. Like other members of the agribusiness community, Continental Grain takes justifiable pride in this splendid achievement for American agriculture and commerce.

Again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman and honorable members of this Subcommittee, for this fair opportunity to tell my side and Continental's side of this wholly honorable story.

I welcome your questions.

CONVERTING THE NATION'S TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the National Science Policy and Priorities Act of 1972, which I introduced into the House of Representatives last week.

There has been enough talk and discussion about the need to alter America's priorities. This bill does something about it.

For too long we have directed many of the best minds in the Nation to develop weapons of war, while neglecting the problems of peace.

For too long we have considered the massive unemployment of our scientists and engineers caused by fluctuating Federal budgets to be unchangeable and irremediable.

For too long we have been forced to fund huge projects of limited practical value merely for fear of the unemployment which would result from cancellation.

We as a nation cannot afford to let America's technical and scientific expertise lie fallow, to force our scientists and engineers to leave their professions, and to discourage today's students from entering scientific careers. The Government's thoughtless and callous lack of planning has created the crisis we have today. It is now the Federal Government's responsibility to direct our scientific expertise and manpower into useful, productive, and responsible channels.

American society has always been technologically oriented. Yet the technological advances which have done the most for the United States and in which Americans take the greatest pride are not the Gattling gun nor the "smart" bomb; they are innovations which have improved the quality of our lives, such as the telephone and the automobile. We need a strong defense, certainly, but we need more than security if America is to continue to offer a life worthy of her heritage.

The bill I have introduced is designed to encourage the innovation of technologies addressed to the quality of our everyday lives. Projects would be funded for research and development in such areas as health care, transportation, housing, nutrition, education, public safety, and communications. And because American society is so technological, we must continue development of new methods to control the disadvantageous effects of existing technologies: The pollution of our air and water; the depletion of our energy resources; and the disintegration of our urban centers.

The need is seemingly infinite. If we can successfully accomplish this conversion of our technological resources, we will free ourselves of the patterns of thought which foster inaction in the change of the Nation's priorities, and we will free ourselves of the terrible waste of technological unemployment. There really can be no if about the enactment of this measure or its equivalent. The Congress must pass legislation and pass it soon, if we are to build both a healthier society and a sound economy based on the productive utilization of our scientific and technological resources.

Briefly, the National Science Policy and Priorities Act of 1972 creates a new agency, the Civil Science Systems Administration, within the National Science Foundation. The CSSA will perform research, design, testing, evaluation, and demonstration of civil science systems capable of providing improved public services in areas of direct benefit to all our citizens here and now. The program will be carried out through contracts and grants to industry, universities, nonprofit organizations, and other agencies. This concept is very similar to the modifications I proposed last year to H.R. 34. The current bill authorizes $795 million to fund these projects over the next 3 years.

Other titles in the bill provide for a definition of national science policy, pension plan reform, and funds for retraining programs and much-needed local government hiring of unemployed technicians. Yet the CSSA is the heart of this legislation, and should become a dramatic focus for applied science in the 1970's.

Under the leadership of Senator KENNEDY, the National Science Policy and Priorities Act of 1972 received an overwhelming bipartisan endorsement in the Senate. It deserves the support of every Member of this House.

A 92D CONGRESS REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress is now approaching adjournment. It has been my policy before the end of each session of Congress to give my constituents in the First Congressional District of Indiana a factual report of our legislative record.

In this session of Congress a great number of bills pertaining to our economy, social problems, environment, inflation, education, health, et cetera were greatly restricted due to our continued involvement in the Southeast Asia war. Almost 4 years ago at the beginning of the 91st Congress we had great hopes that with President Nixon's inauguration we were going to see the rapid termination of our involvement in that unfortunate embroilment in Southeast Asia, 10,000 miles away from our shores.

The Nation became entranced in the fall of 1968 when the President as a candidate based his platform on his "secret" plan to end the Vietnam war, if elected in November of that year.

Over the last 4 years, the Congress has made a remarkable record of progress in enacting domestic legislation. I wish to emphasize some of the more important accomplishments on legislation which the Congress has enacted.

EDUCATION

During the last 4 years the Congress enacted two major education bills which would have benefited millions of our American youth in providing school construction and educational expansion, so badly needed especially in highly congested urban areas. Legislation pertaining to our schools, and colleges, was enacted but far short of the Nation's needs.

The President vetoed the two major education bills which were enacted by the Congress although 4 years ago he said:

My economy program will not curtail educational expansion.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Congress enacted two major public works bills which would have greatly improved transportation facilities and traffic congestion in metropolitan areas and other needed transportation projects over the Nation. One of these bills was known as the emergency job public works legislation. These projects would have given employment to many of our idle workers. The President vetoed both major public works bills.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Legislation was also passed for additional hospital construction and expansion which was vetoed. A long-delayed bill to expand medical education to create more family doctors was vetoed by the President.

HOUSING

Four years ago the President promised to expand our housing program to accommodate millions of families in ghettos and in substandard homes. It is estimated that in 1969, the President's first year in office, approximately half a million less houses were constructed than the last year of the Johnson administration. The building of homes has been

greatly curtailed and unemployment increased in the building and construction trades.

NATIONAL DEBT

One of the President's outstanding criticisms of the previous administrations was our large national debt. Four years ago the President promised to decrease the national debt. In 3½ years the national debt has been increased over $86 billion. When the President took office in January 1969, our national debt was $364 billion. Today it has increased to $465 billion. There is now pending before the Congress a request by the President to increase the national debt another $15 billion which will total $465 billion. It is also estimated that the interest on this national debt is costing the American taxpayers approximately $21 billion annually.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The President's promise to expand employment proved to be a myth. Today over 2 million more are unemployed than in January 1969. It is also estimated that if the part-time workers over the Nation were included with the unemployed it would total approximately 8 million.

ANTIPOLLUTION

Many other popular legislative programs President Nixon campaigned for in 1968 were secretly opposed by the White House lobby when they were debated on the floor of Congress. As an example: In 1970 President Nixon recommended $214 million in his budget to combat air and water pollution. The Congress passed the antipollution bill in 1967. That law called for $1 billion to curb pollution in 1970. Against White House opposition, Congress increased the President's antipollution budget to $600 million for 1970.

The administration also refused to spend millions already authorized and appropriated for environmental protection. Congress appropriated three times more than the President requested for sewage treatment assistance alone. It opposed original pure drinking water legislation.

It opposed the goal of clean auto engines by 1975.

The administration has opposed new requirements for the FDA to monitor food against harmful pollutants.

In short, it is a record of out-and-out opposition—a refusal to make industry clean up the air we breathe and the water we drink.

HEALTH

As for health, the administration's record is equally indefensible. It has been written for posterity in President Nixon's veto of four major health bills over 3½ years—one for each year of the President's term. The utter neglect for health needs was demonstrated first by his veto of $1.26 billion in funds that were to be used in large measure for the Nation's health needs back in 1970. The major Hill-Burton hospital construction bill was next vetoed, and but for the willingness of Congress to override the President's rejection, millions more for health facilities would have been lost.

In December of 1970, the President again showed his opposition to health needs by vetoing the bill that would have provided $233 million for medical schools and hospitals—and most recently he vetoed this year's added appropriations for the entire HEW health program. It has been only in the face of total administration opposition that Congress has endeavored to provide for those needs.

TAX LOOPHOLES

As ranking majority member of the House Rules Committee, I have been fighting for tax reform over the last 10 years. The House of Representatives passed the first major tax reform legislation in 25 years. The House of Representatives reduced the 27½-percent tax bonanza, enjoyed by big oil companies, down to 20 percent. The House enacted a number of other sections in the tax reform bill which made reductions in fabulous tax loopholes. The powerful tax loophole lobby succeeded in curbing major reductions and the Congress must continue to fight to completely restore fairness and equity in our Federal tax laws.

In all, the 1969 Tax Reform Act implemented $6.6 billion in tax reforms and $9.1 billion in cuts, mostly for taxpayers in the lower and middle income brackets.

The law included a 5-percent reduction in all tax brackets, a low-income allowance to remove 21 million poor families from the tax rolls and an increase in the personal exemption to $750.

WELFARE PROGRAM FOR INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS

The President also insisted on a welfare program for big business and industry. He recommended a 10-percent tax credit for business and industry on the theory that it would help employment and restore prosperity. He succeeded in getting a 7-percent tax credit concession through the Congress to purchase equipment, machinery, and so forth, which was nothing more than another tax break for corporations that were reaping fabulous profits. It is estimated that this 7-percent tax credit bonanza was pushed through last year for new equipment when most companies were using only 75 percent of their present capacity.

Tax reform and a more equitable distribution of the tax burden is simply not the policy of the Nixon administration. Last spring the President and his tax advisers were very enthusiastic about inaugurating a value-added tax. This was nothing more than a super sales tax in disguise. The value-added tax would be an extra burden on the consumer because it would tax a product all the way from its origin and processing right down to the retail store and the purchaser.

CRIME AND DRUGS

Unfortunately, Attorney General John Mitchell, head of one of Wall Street's largest law firms and manager of the President's campaigns, was very lax in the enforcement of the epidemic of crime and drugs over the Nation. Besides his arduous duties as Attorney General it has been generally known that he is the real intellectual sparkplug behind all operations of the Federal Government, both when Attorney General and also since he relinquished the post. I do hope now Attorney General Kleindienst will devote all his time in enforcing the Federal crime and drug laws.

Considering the administration's failure to curb inflation, unemployment, and the rapid rise in the cost of living, it became necessary for the Congress to help our elder citizens, the unemployed, and part-time workers over the Nation.

This summer the Congress passed legislation which increased social security payments by 20 percent. The bill passed the Congress over the strenuous opposition of the powerful White House lobby.

INFLATION

During the first 11 months of the Nixon administration inflation rapidly increased. In December 1969 Congress passed a price control bill which gave the President absolute power to immediately curb the rise in living costs—including wages, prices, rents, interest, and so forth.

This anti-inflation bill was signed by the President and lay dormant in his office for 22 months. Almost 2 years later, in August 1971, the President announced his celebrated "90-day freeze" which proved to be a failure. He then substituted phase II and appointed a price control committee, the majority of which was composed of big business members. The failure of phase II to curb price rises is already familiar to the American buying public.

On September 18, 1972, the Hammond Times of Hammond, Ind., an administration-supporting newspaper, on its editorial page stated:

But it is a fact that Nixon avoided controls until late last year instead of invoking them the moment he moved into the White House. The buck still stops at the President's desk.

OLDER AMERICANS

In 1965 Congress finally won a long struggle to enact a program to provide medicare for the aged through the social security system. Two major increases in social security benefits were enacted between 1961 and 1968. Numerous revisions were made to expand coverage and liberalize eligibility requirements for the elder folks.

I have in this report mentioned housing, a 20-percent social security increase, hospital expansion, health legislation, and so forth, which includes provisions in addition to other special programs and legislative benefits for our 20 million pioneer citizens of the Nation.

VETERANS

The last two sessions of Congress have cooperated 100 percent in passing legislation benefiting veterans of all wars, most of these bills having been sponsored by its various veterans' organizations through the Nation. As a veteran and a member of the American Legion, I am proud of my record on supporting veterans' legislation.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME LAW

This session of Congress enacted the first major amendment to the Federal daylight saving time law which allowed

Lake County and five other northwest Indiana counties to turn their clocks to central daylight time each year. The opposition to this amendment to the daylight time law was powerful. With the aid of the entire Hoosier congressional delegation we amended the Federal time law and Lake County can enjoy similar time with the adjoining Chicago and Illinois cities 6 months of the year.

The progressive record of the 91st and 92d Congresses ranks far ahead of many former sessions in which I have served the First Congressional District of Indiana.

In this report I could mention several more long-delayed accomplishments of the Congress which I hope to convey to my constituents later. White House vetoes and opposition pressures prevented many legislative programs which could have restored employment, curbed inflation and prevented our economy from sinking further into a more serious depression.

CANAL ZONE SITUATION INVITES ANOTHER INVASION?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the latest significant reports from the Isthmus are that the newly elected 505 member Assembly of Community Representatives of Panama on September 11, adopted a resolution charging that the Canal Zone was being "occupied arbitrarily" by the United States and requesting the Executive Branch of the Panamanian Government to "reject" the $1,930,000 annuity now paid to it by the United States. The stated purpose of this resolution, which was adopted in the presence of Omar Torrijos, chief of government and Commandant of the National Guard, and his figurehead Provisional President Lakas, is to picture U.S. occupation of the Canal Zone to the "entire world" as "annoying to national dignity" of Panama. Unless explained with adequate historical background this Panamanian action can be misleading.

Under the 1903 Treaty with Panama the United States acquired the grant in perpetuity of all the rights, powers, and authority of full sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority

The purpose of the grant was to induce the United States to construct an Isthmian Canal at Panama instead of at Nicaragua and to enable its efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection. The purchase price for this territorial grant was $10,000,000, which was a greater sum than those for either the Florida or Alaska purchases.

In addition, to obtaining the grant of sovereignty en bloc over the Canal Zone, the United States secured title to all privately owned land and property in the Zone territory from individual property owners, making it our most costly territorial acquisition, estimated in 1964 to have cost $144,568,571. It is, in effect, a vital U.S. Government reservation. The total cost of the canal enterprise, including defense activities, from 1904 through June 30, 1971, was $5,695,745,000.

At the time of acquisition of the Canal Zone the plans of our Government called for the use of the Panama Railroad for the construction of the canal and its subsequent operations. One of the financial obligations of this railroad was an annual payment of $250,000 to Colombia. The United States undertook to acquire full control of the railroad and assumed the obligation in the 1903 Treaty to pay the annuity to Panama instead of Colombia. This payment is not a rental for the Zone, which was not a lease but a grant of sovereignty in perpetuity.

Because of the devaluation of the gold dollar in 1934, the original obligation of $250,000 was increased to $430,000—a justifiable adjustment payable from canal tolls.

In the 1955 Treaty, the annuity was increased by $1,500,000 to a total of $1,930,000 but the Congress required that this increase be borne by the State Department budget, which had sponsored it, and not from toll revenues. Now, as previously stated, the Panamanian Assembly of Community Representatives, which does not have legislative powers, has sought to have Panama reject this payment.

Some 14,000 non-U.S. citizens, largely Panamanians, are employed in the Canal Zone. The total annual income injected into Panamanian economy from these and other U.S. sources in 1971 was more than $168,092,000. Such income is never mentioned by Isthmian agitators who seem to think that if they continue their campaigns of vilification and intimidation long enough our Government will cede what they demand. Experience has shown that each concession has led to greater demands.

To illustrate, current treaty provisions authorize "expansion and new construction" for the existing canal but our present negotiators, on Panamanian demands, have included its major modernization in the current treaty proposals. This places the United States in the ridiculous situation of negotiating for rights already possessed and endangers the plans for such modernization for which legislation is now pending in both House and Senate.

Enactment of the proposed legislation will be an act of sovereignty that will revitalize the Isthmus, give much additional income to Panama, end agitation by Panamanian extremists, and serve notice on the world that the United States intends to meet its treaty obligations for the operation of an Isthmian canal.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on a number of occasions I predicted invasions of the Canal Zone, the illegal planting of Panama flags therein, and other acts of violence. Any satisfaction that I may have had because of having been right were sterile ones, but those predictions did serve to warn proper authorities of the dangers.

Commandante Torrijos on at least two occasions has threatened to stage another invasion of the Canal Zone unless major concessions are given to Panama. Because of weakness and timidity on the part of our officials, the situation on the Isthmus has not improved and radical leaders have been emboldened by their success in expropriating the Panama Light & Power Co., a U.S. owned property.

As is well known, Communist agents are already established in the Panama Goverment. Also known by informed Panamanians, Torrijos is being guided and advised by the Communist Party of Panama, which, as long ago as March 11, recommended that the Panamanian Government reject the annuity when the new "people's assembly" is installed. The assembly took that action on September 11.

Have our highest officials made public statements asserting our just rights, power and authority for which we have solemn treaty obligations? They have not; and the resulting situation invites what may be a massive silent invasion of the Canal Zone by Panamanian mobs in the early hours of some morning. Should such an operation be undertaken let us not be taken by surprise, but be prepared to meet it.

In these general connections, let us not forget that the U.S. Government official who first erroneously described the Canal Zone as "occupied territory" was Alger Hiss, an identified member of the Communist Party in the State Department. House Doc. No. 474, 89th Congress, p. 152.

As additional partial documentation for the foregoing remarks, I quote a recent editorial from The New York Times and a news story from the Star & Herald, a leading Panama newspaper.

[From The New York Times, Sept. 15, 1972]

PROTEST IN PANAMA

Panama's newly-elected Assembly has no genuine legislative power, and its demand that the Government spurn the $1.9 million paid annually by the United States for use of the Canal Zone is thus merely an expression of popular opinion. However, this is no reason to take lightly the resolution, which charges that the Canal Zone is being "occupied arbitrarily," particularly when this action is viewed in context with other recent events in Panama.

The 505-member Assembly had been chosen last month in Panama's first election in four years, ostensibly to revamp the Constitution and to elect a President and Vice President. There had been no indication that its first action would be to adopt the toughly-worded resolution, asking "the entire world" to note that the Canal Zone "has not been purchased or conquered or annexed or ceded or rented, or its sovereignty been transferred by the Republic of Panama to the United States . . ."

This sentiment is, however, in line with the increasingly nationalistic actions and statements of the Government, controlled since the ouster of President Arnulfo Arias in 1963 by Gen. Omar Torrijos, head of the National Guard. At least twice during four years in power, General Torrijos has threatened to march on the Canal Zone unless major United States concessions were forthcoming. His Government in June seized the Panama Power and Light Company, 90 per cent owned by an American firm.

Negotiations on a new treaty to replace the pact of 1903, under which the United States built the Canal, have been marking time for six months. Even when serious talks

resume, probably after the United States Presidential election, the American negotiators will be caught, as always, between two sets of pressures.

If they make concessions on sharing control of the Zone which the State Department and most Latin American governments deem reasonable, they will run into fierce opposition from a powerful bloc in Congress determined to retain exclusive United States jurisdiction in the Zone and the "perpetuity" provision of the 1903 treaty.

"In the modern world," Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert Hurwitch told a House subcommittee last year, "we can no longer look upon a sovereign enclave in the territory of another country in perpetuity as a secure environment in which to operate a canal." Until that basic fact makes greater headway with the latter-day "Manifest Destiny" men in Congress, United States troubles with Panama are certain to increase.

[From the Star & Herald, September 12, 1972]

NEW ASSEMBLY REJECTS PC ANNUITY—EXECUTIVE URGED TO TURN DOWN ANNUAL PAYMENT

The Assembly of Community Representatives convened yesterday and immediately approved a resolution calling for the rejection of the $1,930,000 annuity paid by the United States for the Panama Canal.

The resolution, in the form of a request to the executive branch, said the rejection of the annuity would make "the entire world aware that the strip of Panamanian soil known as the Panama Canal Zone, has not been purchased, nor conquered, nor annexed, nor ceded, nor leased, nor its sovereignty transferred by the Republic of Panama to the United States of America, but has been arbitrarily occupied as a result of the unilateral interpretation and application of the 1903 treaty which is offensive to national dignity."

It was approved by a standing vote applause by the 505-member assembly in the presence of President Demetrio B. Lakas and National Guard Chief Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos and other high government officials and invited dignitaries, including the Diplomatic Corps, U.S. Ambassador Robert M. Sayre was in the audience.

Panama and the United States are negotiating a new Panama Canal treaty. Gen. Torrijos, who is the top figure in the Revolutionary Government, has made recovery of Panamanian jurisdiction over the 647-square mile U.S. controlled Canal Zone the major Panamanian demand.

The resolution was introduced by Hermelinda Fuentes, one of two representatives ejected from the Canal Zone. For the Aug. 6 balloting for the new Assembly, the Canal Zone was divided by Panama's Electoral Tribunal into two "corregimientos" or communities, one the Pacific Side and the other the Atlantic Side.

Panamanian residents in the Zone—all employees of the Panama Canal organization and their dependents—voted in special precincts in the cities of Panama and Colon.

The resolution noted that "the fundamental objective of the Republic of Panama in the negotiations with the United States of America for a new canal treaty is to secure the end of the colonial status of the Canal Zone, so that that portion of our territory reverts to full Panamanian jurisdiction clearly and convincingly."

The Assembly's installation session was held in the Nuevo Panama Gymnasium, which has a seating capacity of about 10,000 persons. There were student delegations, some of which shouted slogans—a number of them anti-U.S.—read by leaders holding sheets of paper. The galleries for the public were nearly empty.

The first order of the business when the Assembly convened at 10 a.m. was the swearing in of the officers. At a preparatory meeting Sunday night, the Assemblymen elected Elias A. Castillo of Panama City's Chorrillo community, as Chairman. Castillo a law student in the University of Panama received 185 votes in secret balloting by the 470 members present. Five others were nominated for the chairmanship. Each provincial delegation elected a vice-chairman, as follows: Arsenio Trotman, Bocas del Toro; Cesar Pardo, Cocle; Anastasia Mitre Delgado, Colon; Juvencio Valdes, Chiriqui; Julio C. Quintana, Darien; Octavio Huertas, Herrera; Iturbide Gonzalez, Los Santos; Norberto Dominguez, Panama; Javier Herrera, Veraguas, and Arcadio Martinez, San Blas.

Castillo was sworn in by the Acting Chairman, Javier Herrera, and in turn took the oath from the vice-chairmen.

Castillo then called a recess while an Assembly commission formally notified President Lakas that the Assembly was in session. The Chief Executive, accompanied by his deputy, Arturo Sucre, Gen. Torrijos and his deputy, Col. Rodrigo Garcia, cabinet members and officers of the General Staff of the National Guard.

In a brief address, Chairman Castillo said the installation of the new Assembly meant the "definitive death of the enemies of the revolutionary process." He added.

"This National Assembly of Community Representatives recognizes, as all the people have done already, Gen. Omar Torrijos as its top leader. This post the General has earned for his continuous striving with the people, because he knows how to interpret their aspirations, for his patriotic position in the face of the existence of the colonial enclave known as the Canal Zone . . ."

President Lakas responded, stressing Gen. Torrijos' leadership and the unity that has developed between the National Guard and the people.

Noting that the Assembly's immediate task is to consider a proposed new Constitution for the nation, the President urged the members to discharge their duty "with a high sense of responsibility and patriotism."

The Assembly has 30 days in which to consider the new Constitution and on the final day it will elect the new President and Vice-President of the Republic.

President Lakas concluded saying: "I am not well known by you, because my oath of loyalty, work and honesty have limited my field of action to the capital and most of the time inside the Presidential Palace. I have God as witness that I have served my country in its internal and external interests. You will determine my legal destiny, but I decided my personal destiny four years ago when I made up my mind to take up arms with my brothers, these young military officers, for the good of our people."

Immediately after the Chief Executive spoke, Miss Fuentes asked for the floor, announcing she was introducing a resolution—the one urging the rejection of the Panama Canal annuity.

She called for a standing vote of approval, saying no Panamanian would remain seated once the text of the resolution was read.

As soon as the text was read, all the members of the Assembly stood up, applauding.

The session was then adjourned until 8 a.m. today.

The 505 desks for the members of the Assembly were arranged in the court of the gymnasium. Most of the Assemblymen were in shirtsleeves. Each represents a "corregimiento," the country's smallest political unit. The membership is made up principally of residents of rural areas, including representatives of Indian reservations. Some members are university students. There are 32 women in the Assembly.

ON REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed apprehension regarding the soundness of the bill throughout the consideration of the revenue sharing proposal. This apprehension is emphasized in the comments made by the Governor of Florida, the Honorable Reubin O'D. Askew in telegrams to me and other Members of the Florida delegation and in a letter to Chairman MILLS. Both of these I submit as a part of my remarks:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *Sept. 15, 1972.*

Congressman BOB SIKES,
Washington, D.C.:

It is crucial to Florida's program that following be added to social service provision in conference report: "All services provided directly by State welfare agencies according to their current social services State plan shall be excluded from the 90 percent current recipient limitation."

REUBIN ASKEW,
Governor of Florida.

SEPTEMBER, 14, 1972.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLS: Pursuant to our conversation today I understand that you will include in the Revenue Sharing Bill a provision that will insure that states, such as Florida, with coordinated, state administered social service systems will not have to fragment their statewide programs because of direct Federal funding to local governments for social services. The following is some proposed language for the bill which might be used to overcome the problem we discussed:

Add "All social service funds provided under this act shall be administered by the single state agency designated responsible for the administration of state plans under titles I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act. The local governmental utilization of these funds shall be pursuant to social security act provisions and regulations."

I agree that a specific appropriation is required for social service expenditures and I urge that you place this limitation at $3,500,000,000.

Sincerely,

REUBIN O'D. ASKEW,
Governor, State of Florida.

The Washington Evening Star of September 18, 1972, expressed the serious reservations of a great many sound thinking Americans in an editorial entitled "Sharing What Revenue?" I offer it also for printing in the RECORD:

SHARING WHAT REVENUE?

The federal budget is running so far in the red that, at present tax rates, it will be along about 1977 before the federal government has some disposable money to start new programs.

For all that, the Congress is well on its way to passing a revenue-sharing bill, one that will pass along more than $30 billion to state and local governments over the next five years. The money obviously will represent deficit spending, and it will increase the pressure for new federal taxes.

We won't belabor the point too much, for it looks as if nothing at this point can stop the revenue-sharing bill. It has the inevitability of a glacier on the move. President

Nixon long ago gave it his support, which he is not about to change in the middle of an election year. The House passed the bill in June. The Senate, by a vote of 63–20, passed a similar measure last week. How could they dare not to? With great expectations, governors, mayors and county commissioners have been waiting for the money so long they had begun to count the cash as already theirs. Some of them even had budgeted it for the current fiscal year.

Since the two versions of the bill differed on several important points, the opportunity was there for the House-Senate conference committee to make the legislation more palatable. On balance, the conferees fumbled the opportunity.

The Senate, moving to halt a runaway program for welfare-related social services, had attached the program to revenue sharing and had stipulated a $1 billion ceiling. Something like that was essential, for without it, the federal government would have been obligated to spend on social services alone nearly $5 billion this year. It also promised to ease the task of redrafting the big HEW–Labor appropriations bill, which President Nixon recently vetoed as too expensive, largely because it included the unchecked social-services subsidies. Conferees from the House, which did not address the problem in its own revenue-sharing measure, did go along with the Senate, as they should have. But then the conferees casually raised the subsidy limit from $1 billion to $2.5 billion, more than twice the amount the administration considers fiscally defensible.

On a second point of major difference, the Senate had changed the House-approved formula for distributing revenue-sharing money to favor rural states over large, industrialized states and, within the states, to favor central cities over suburbs.

Revenue sharing is certain to become a fixed part of government operations. But it remains a question as to where Uncle Sam will get the revenues to share with the states and cities.

We, in Florida, have yet another reason to be disturbed about revenue sharing. We cannot enjoy benefits comparable to those in some States because of the fact that we do not have a State income tax. For good reasons, Florida has avoided this form of taxation and our people would be very reluctant to accept it. Obviously if revenue sharing becomes an actuality there will be pressure on Florida to accept a State income tax so that we would not be discriminated against in revenue sharing. Very probably the cost to the people of Florida in direct taxes for a State income tax would exceed the amount to be derived from revenue sharing. It is a tricky and an unhappy situation. For all of these reasons I shall vote against revenue sharing.

CONSERVATION RATINGS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Field and Stream, Members of Congress were rated by that publication on their contributions to conservation. Through the years, Members of Congress become typed as proconservation or indifferent to conservation. However, this pattern is not apparent in Field and Stream's listing. In fact it contains so many surprises that it has been the subject of much comment—little of it favorable—on Capitol Hill. The ratings were surprisingly low for many Members of Congress who have given strong support to programs which generally have been considered important to conservation.

In an attempt to get a better feel for the organization which had issued harsh ratings on many Congressmen who have been considered friends of conservation, I examined the flyleaf of the publication. I found that Field and Stream is the property of Columbia Broadcasting System. This fact, I think, helps to show the lay of the land. For instance, CBS has taken hostile viewpoints to activities which many genuine conservationists support. CBS has in no sense been a friend of the Nation's sportsmen. CBS has also been a strong proponent of antigun legislation. This also helps us to understand the reason for editorial comments in Field and Stream which took an extreme view on some congressional actions which were intended to strengthen conservation programs and to help the sportsman. All of this despite the fact that Field and Stream labels itself America's No. 1 sportsmen's magazine.

Perhaps the biggest surprise is in the selection of bills on which Field and Stream rated Congressmen for their support of conservation. In the main, they are strange measures on which to evaluate interest in conservation.

First is the SST vote. It is a little hard to understand how a vote for or against the SST affects conservation and sportsmen's interests in America.

Then there is Cannikin—the Aleutian Islands atomic test. It was considered essential to the security of America. It provided information on atomic testing not available in any other way. There have been no indications of serious damage to the environment. Nevertheless, a vote for Cannikin is, according to Field and Stream, a vote against conservation.

There is the District of Columbia Metro amendment. Whatever in the world this could have to do with national conservation is a little hard to figure.

The Reuss water pollution amendment is included. It was substantially a rewrite of the Senate water pollution bill which the House considered unworkable and unrealistic and most of which was dropped in conference. Members who voted against this amendment were not voting against water pollution control. They were voting for what they believe is a sounder program.

There was a bill to permit AEC to issue temporary licenses. The House felt strongly enough about this to approve it 285 to 78. Field and Stream says all 285 were wrong.

In the Senate, of all things, a vote for confirmation of Secretary Butz is considered anticonservation. The defeat of an amendment deleting the alcohol tax provision from the Revenue Act is called anticonservation.

One interesting point in connection with Field and Stream's list of "conservation" measures is the fact that most of them were soundly defeated by the Congress. I question that the judgment of Field and Stream is better than that of a majority of the Members of Congress who must deal with facts, not fancies.

The measures which I have discussed are not all of those on which Members of Congress were scored, but they are typical of the ones used to provide a rating of perfect to near-perfect for most of the liberals of the House, and a very low rating for most of the moderates and conservatives. Could it be true that this points back to the ownership of Field and Stream?

In the same time frame, Congress had before it many bills which are considered important to conservation. Some of the Members who were given low scores by Field and Stream have been active in the passage of these needed and useful conservation measures which were not included in Field and Stream's listing.

A partial listing of these bills follow. In the minds of impartial conservationists they are sufficiently important to have been included in or used instead of Field and Stream's list.

The list follows:

FORESTRY

Cooperative forestry management, Public Law 92–288.

National forest reforestation fund, H.R. 13089, Conference report pending.

WATER QUALITY

Water pollution control, S. 2270, passed Senate.

Ocean dumping, H.R. 9727, in conference.

Saline water conversion program, Public Law 92–60.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

Marine Mammal Protection Act, H.R. 10420, in conference.

Bald eagle penalties, H.R. 12186, passed House.

Prohibition on shooting animals from aircraft, Public Law 92–159.

PESTICIDES

Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act, H.R. 10729, passed House.

Toxic Substances Control Act, S. 1478, passed Senate.

PUBLIC LANDS

Coastal zone management, S. 3507, in conference.

PARKS, MONUMENTS, RECREATION, AND WILDERNESS

Buffalo National River, Public Law 92–237.

Lincoln Home Historic Site, Public Law 92–127.

Oregon Dunes, Public Law 92–260.

Pine Mountain Wilderness, Public Law 92–230.

Cedar Keys Wilderness, Public Law 92–364.

South San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge, Public Law 92–330.

Tinicum Marsh Environmental Center, Public Law 92–336.

Sycamore Canyon Wilderness, Public Law 92–241.

Lincoln Back Country, Public Law 92–395.

Washakie Wilderness, S. 166, in conference.

Sawtooth National Recreation Area, Public Law 92–400.

MISCELLANEOUS

Interstate compacts, S. 907, passed Senate.

National environmental data bank, H.R. 56, in conference.

Volunteers in national forests, Public Law 92–300.

Why were measures like these excluded? They have much wider popular support than the list used by Field and Stream. Most observers would feel they should have been substituted for the Field and Stream selections. In any event, they are more logical contenders for the label of true conservation measures.

Let us be charitable and say Field and Stream just used poor judgment. I am reluctant to say they do not know any better. Congressmen are accustomed to harsh treatment from "experts" who preempt for themselves the exclusive right to judge performance. It is not new for us to be rated by handicappers who measure our work against their views and not in light of the interests of the public. Fortunately, campaigns are decided by separate constituencies who consider the issues in their entirety and who are not bound by the one-sided views of the handicappers.

After all, Congress has been around much longer than Field and Stream or CBS.

BICYCLES IN NEW YORK

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the State Department of Transportation in New York has developed a 60-page master plan for the State's transportation in the coming two decades. Unfortunately, the department in making its plans has overlooked one significant and increasingly popular form of transportation, the bicycle. Nowhere does the plan mention bicycles and consequently, no provisions are made for bicycle transportation development.

This year the country, including New York, has experienced a boom in bicycling. By the end of the year, an estimated 11.5 million bicycles will have been sold. Funding for the construction of bicycle paths and facilities has been included in the Senate Federal-Aid Highway Act, and in a number of States like California, Oregon, and Washington authorization has been given for using State highway funds for bikeways.

Last month Philip J. Burke, the director of public affairs of the Bicycle Institute of America, testified at a hearing on New York's transportation master plan. With more than 6 million bicycles in New York State he suggested that the omission of bicycles from the master plan was a "grave error." I agree with Mr. Burke that bicycles should be included in the plan. In the bicycle we have an important transportation resource—it is a cheap, healthful, nonpolluting alternative for short-distance transportation. Many people now ride bikes to and from work even under hazardous conditions; many more would do so if exclusive bike lanes were available. Last May I sent a questionnaire to my constituents in which a question concerning bicycling was included—49 percent of the respondents indicated that if exclusive bike lanes and parking facilities were provided, they would ride a bike to work; this compared to 7 percent of the respondents who said that they presently ride a bike to work.

Mr. Speaker, the public's enthusiasm for bicycles is clear. It is time for the Congress and for States like New York to give bicyclists their fair share of the road.

At this time I would like to insert for printing in the RECORD the text of Philip Burke's testimony of August 17, 1972 on New York's master transportation plan.

STATEWIDE MASTER PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION, WESTCHESTER COUNTY CENTER, N.Y., AUGUST 17, 1972

My name is Philip J. Burke and I am Director of Public Affairs of the Bicycle Institute of America. The Institute is a trade association which represents 85% of the American bicycle industry, including the principal manufacturers and distributors of bicycles.

It is a disappointment to us to note that no where in the Statewide Master Plan for Transportation is there a single mention of the bicycle or bikeways. This has to be a grave error. The Master Plan is being drawn up against the backdrop of an enormous boom in bicycles. America is the greatest producer of bicycles in the world. Official estimates call for sales of nearly 11.5 million this year. In New York State alone there are nearly 4 million bicycles and approximately 6 million cyclists. With adult sales expected to reach 50 percent of that 11.5 million this year, it is obvious that the number of bikes and cyclists in New York is going to continue to grow. Yet, no where in the Master Plan is the bicycle considered as a safe, clean, sensible means of transportation for young and old alike.

Right now in America, it is estimated that there are 73 million cyclists and they will be buying more bicycles than automobiles for the first time since before World War I.

New York State is apparently not unaware of the bicycle boom. Just this year in Albany, the legislature passed a bill into law, sponsored by Assemblyman Chester Hardt, authorizing the construction of bike and foot trails in conjunction with state- and federally-funded projects. Governor Rockefeller signed the law and said on doing so, "Bikes don't pollute, they are inexpensive to own and operate and they provide good exercise besides having the potential for saving the taxpayers of this state a great deal of money in highway maintenance and repair."

In the light of the Governor's words and the fact that there are more bicycles in New York State than in many foreign countries, it is almost impossible to understand how the cyclists of this great State can be ignored in the Master Plan.

We feel it is very important to note at this time that the federal government and various state governments are actively engaged in passing legislation supporting the national bikeway movement not to mention the eventual possibility of a national safety standard for the bicycle.

Right now, the Public Works Committee of the Senate is considering a proposal by Senator J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware to provide $10 million dollars from the highway trust fund for bicycle trails. Every state will be entitled to a share of these monies.

In California, Oregon and Washington and all over, individual states have authorized the use of federal Highway trust funds for bikeways and even cities are recognizing the necessity for bikeways and legislation is either passed or pending. But no where in the Statewide Master Plan is their a provision for bikeways.

With these staggering facts in mind, it is incredible that the four million New Yorkers currently enjoying the bicycle for recreation and transportation are to be left out. Our surveys reveal that millions of New Yorkers ride bicycles in commuting and shopping, not to mention for the obvious reasons of recreation and physical fitness.

Recently the State of California authorized $75,000 for a study of bikeways and I have the results here. I will leave with you a copy of *Bikeway Planning Criteria and Guidelines* which should become the bible for those interested in developing bikeways systems.

New York cyclists would love to support the Master Plan, but it is impossible when there isn't the slightest mention of the bicycle, although it is a viable means of transportation. In these times of rising air and sound pollution, the bicycle surpasses all known means of transportation for safe, quiet and clean travel. Obviously the bicycle is not a polluter and it provides its user with a quick, physically rewarding means of transportation.

It is incomprehensible to us how a Master Plan with a 20-year life span can ignore the bicycle when the federal government and many states are embracing the bicycle. Bicycle legislation is people legislation. It isn't designed for special interests. It is for citizens of all ages. Other states are saying Yes to bicycles and New York State, so often in the forefront of innovative action, is unfortunately dragging its heels in this case. Wisconsin has a 320-mile statewide bikeway which sees thousands of riders per year. Even in cities like Chicago there are full-fledged bicycle routes for commuting and pleasure and similar commuter cycling facilities have been provided in San Francisco and Milwaukee and many other cities, large and small. In Davis, California, 18,000 of the 24,000 residents use bicycles for daily transportation. And yet here in the Empire State the Master Plan for Transportation ignores the bicycle as if it were the plague. This is difficult to understand especially when Secretary of Transportation Volpe has so strongly urged inclusion of bicycles in all master plans.

I have attended other open hearings on this Master Plan and have heard many citizens and governmental officials, suggest that you go back to the drawing boards to amend this plan. Well right here in New York you have many members of the Bicycle Institute who can lend expert assistance in redrafting. In fact three major manufacturers in America, Chain Bike Corporation, Iverson Cycle Corporation, and H. P. Snyder Manufacturing Company, Inc., make their homes in the Empire State.

New York can be proud of the importance it plays in the production of the bicycle not to mention the many wholesalers and retailers who sell bicycles. All of these organizations are also prepared, along with the Bicycle Institute, to offer guidance in bikeways and provide any technical data that is required. In other states there are already in existence bicycle systems from which valuable information can be gleaned. The Federal Government seems to want a national trail system and naturally the legislation will provide funds which will be granted to individual states to build bikeways and as I noted earlier the Hardt bill makes this possible by law. In the light of these facts how can New York draft a Master Plan for transportation and leave out the bicycle.

We're sure the millions of New York cyclists could easily support a master plan which incorporates a sensible bikeway system. We further suggest, in the light of recent estimates which call for a 30 percent upsurge in sales after a 30 percent sales increase last year, that more and more adults will be riding a bike. They know a bike is not a toy. It is a safe, sensible means for transportation and they want safe, sensible routes over which to pedal. The bicycle is here to stay. It will not go away simply because you choose to ignore it. You must in-

clude provision for bicycle transportation in the Master Plan.

I am taking the liberty of leaving with you today recent bikeway material along with a copy of these remarks.

Thank you.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING BILL

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, when the House and Senate accepted President Nixon's veto of the public broadcasting bill not long ago, it was at least partly on the promise that Mr. Nixon, if returned to office, would have a long-range financing plan for public broadcasting on its way to Congress early in 1973.

Comes now the newly appointed president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Henry Loomis, with a statement which is at best equivocal and, at worst, evidence of still another broken promise.

In a report on events of Mr. Loomis' first 9 days in office, carried by the Washington Post of last Thursday, September 21, the corporation's new boss was quoted as saying that long-range financing for public broadcasting will not be pushed "for at least several years."

With a feeling of disbelief and mild shock, I obtained from CPB offices Mr. Loomis' precise answer to a question on this subject, as carried on a closed-circuit radio conference last Wednesday with public broadcasting stations across the country. Here is the unedited transcript:

Q. What would be your prediction for long-range financing legislation in 1973?

A. Honest answer is, damned if I know. My guess is that it is going to take a while to settle down before we can determine exactly what we want, what we mean by long term. Does long-term mean 2 years, does it mean 5 years? It certainly cannot mean permanent, nothing in this world is permanent. And my guess is that probably we will be concentrating on other things this first year and it would be better to try for that one a couple of years from now, but that is just a personal sort-of feeling, without knowing too much about it.

The promise of administration plans for permanent financing—or long-range financing, if Mr. Loomis strains at the word "permanent"—goes back more than 2 years, and has stemmed from a number of administration spokesmen.

Testifying before our House Commerce Committee in May of 1970, the newly appointed FCC Chairman, Dean Burch, said the plan would be ready for consideration by that 91st Congress.

President Nixon himself referred to the imminence of a financing plan in his budget message of January 1971, saying:

Legislation will be proposed to provide an improved financing arrangement for the Corporation.

He was talking about fiscal 1972, now 3 months behind us.

On May 13, 1971, in a written response to the House Appropriations Committee, the Director of the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, wrote:

As the President indicated in his budget last January, we will be submitting legislation for improved financing of public broadcasting this year. The drafting of the bill is now in its final stages, and I expect it will be referred to the Congress by July. It will be long-term financing.

Both Chairman Burch and Dr. Whitehead were before our House subcommittee last February 3. Mr. Burch said:

The Commission would like to stress . . . the importance of obtaining for the Corporation at the earliest possible time a permanent financial base not dependent upon the annual appropriations process.

And Dr. Whitehead affirmed the intent in these words:

We expect to solve this problem before the end of fiscal 1973.

Committee members were not pleased by these delays—but the promise of an administration bill by the end of the fiscal year next June seemed to offer a new deadline, if the present administration is still in power.

But even this promise apparently goes out the window, unless some White House spokesman undertakes to counter the impression Henry Loomis has left.

His views on corporation financing were not the only chilling points raised by Mr. Loomis during his first week on the job. It seems that for the top staff leadership in public broadcasting, the President has chosen a man who had not been interested enough before his appointment to watch a single program on an educational station. This strikes me about the same as selecting, to coach the Washington Redskins, someone who detests football. Let us hope for some avid on-the-job training.

By unanimous consent, I include John Carmody's full article on Mr. Loomis, from last Thursday's Washington Post:

PUBLIC BROADCASTING: NEW CHIEF, NEW POLICY

(By John Carmody)

After two days as chief of the nation's public broadcasting industry, Henry Loomis has announced a tough new policy toward programming, including the controversial area of public affairs.

The new president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, who lives in Middleburg, Va., said yesterday that he had "never seen a public TV show." But he laid it on the line: CPB, with its hands-off policy on programming, "had tried to duck its responsibility and it wasn't successful."

In a separate session before the PBS board of directors meeting here and in a half-hour, nationwide closed circuit broadcast with the network's 225 station managers, Loomis said:

The CPB, formerly only a management "umbrella" for public broadcasting, will take a strong role in determining daily program content over the nationwide PBS network.

"Instant analysis" and other public affairs programming techniques that mimic commercial TV practices probably will be dropped.

Long-range financing for public broadcasting will not be pushed for at least several years.

While it eventually should be "much more," funding is currently at a satisfactory level.

"The cultural field" and programs directed at a "specialized" audience, rather than mass audiences, should be stressed.

Loomis' views are virtually identical to those of the Nixon administration and congressional opponents of public TV over the last year. His appointment as CPB president has been expected by industry sources following the takeover of the 15-member CPB board this summer by an administration majority. Former Rep. Tom Curtis of Missouri, a longtime Republican, was named board chairman last month.

Public television programming, particularly in the area of public affairs, has brought criticism in the last year from the administration, Congress and some local station managers.

Loomis said the corporation would at present not actively seek long-range financing, which had been called essential to proper programming by its supporters in the industry and in Congress, where backers were mostly Democrats.

"We'll be trying for that one a couple of years from now," he told the station managers. President Nixon vetoed a two-year funding plan in June.

As Loomis sees it, the industry, founded in 1968, should be pleased with its present 30 per cent annual growth. (The funding is $45 million this year.) "It's possible to get too much too soon," while staff excellence and expertise lags, he told the PBS board.

Following Loomis' appearance yesterday, industry sources took a wait-and-see attitude. They suggested he had not had time to be properly briefed since accepting the $42,500-a-year job, which he starts officially on Oct. 1.

Loomis told a reporter later that when approached about the job following the resignation of John Macy Jr. as CPB president in August, he had asked, "What the hell is it?"

An independently wealthy man, Loomis said he had long regarded his previous service in important posts in the Departments of Defense, HEW, USIA and at the White House during the last 20 years as "nonpartisan."

"I always considered myself what the British call a 'permanent undersecretary,'" he said yesterday. "But four years ago (when Mr. Nixon appointed him to the USIA, where he is currently deputy director), I changed. Mr. Nixon was my guy in 1968 and I feel very strongly about it this election year."

In hinting that the "instant analysis" of major political events will be dropped, he said public affairs programming should only "supplement and enrich" what is offered by commercial networks. He later told a reporter that he was "concerned about the propriety of using public funds to be competitive with commercial networks" in any area of broadcasting.

Loomis asked PBS station managers to do "much more in the cultural field." The role of public broadcasting is to direct programming to a specialized, not a mass audience, he said. An example would be "a program of an excellent cultural nature that is too expensive for the commercial networks to do."

Loomis' remarks yesterday were in line with Nixon administration criticism of public television beginning last October with an attack by Dr. Clay T. Whitehead, director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy.

The CPB was formed in 1968, a year after President Lyndon Johnson successfully backed a public broadcasting bill. Under Macy, the new corporation took over what had been the loose-knit educational TV network and, as PBS, with federal equipment and programming money, grew to the present 225 TV stations and hundreds of public radio outlets.

Last fall, the political roof fell in on Macy. The PBS (and the Ford Foundation) pushed through a public affairs outlet in Washing-

ton. The National Public Affairs Center for Television promptly hired liberal correspondents Sander Vanocur and Robert MacNeil at high salaries, which drew even Democratic criticism in Congress.

A series of controversial network shows as well as a marked increase in the PBS national audience attracted further notice for the public network. In June, Mr. Nixon vetoed a two-year $65-million authorization for CPB. Macy, in ill health, subsequently resigned, along with other top CPB aides.

PROBLEMS OF SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to report to the Congress my findings on recent contacts I have had with over 10,000 senior citizens in my congressional district. I do so because of the interest the current 92d Congress has shown and the positive action it has initiated and taken on issues of vital importance to our maturing Americans.

While we can be proud of this record, I submit this report because it underscores the fact that our work is not finished and it will not be finished until every American has decent income, sound housing, and good medical care. We can learn from the experiences, unfortunately all too bitter in too many instances, of these fellow citizens of what remains to be done.

We should and we can act on their comments. To do otherwise ignores the commitment we have to these men and women who have contributed so much to this Nation.

The problems the senior citizens in the Madison-St. Clair County area have stressed in their responses are in the areas of incomes—which are too small—health care—which is too expensive and inadequate—and housing—which is either insufficient, deteriorating, or unfairly taxed. For those of us who have concerned ourselves with the problems of our senior citizens, these problems are not altogether surprising. I feel, however, that the direct comments of the elderly are instructive as to the scope of these problems.

A mood of loneliness and despair is all too pervasive in the senior citizen. A widow from Madison, Ill., writes:

Your letter was like a new lease on life. I had begun to think we older people were forgotten by everyone.

A retired Federal employee and World War I veteran expressing his feelings about how senior citizens are treated states:

You are old now—we don't need you.

Another widow from the area responds:

We sometimes wonder if our government really even cares about our welfare and our living conditions.

Surely we can do better than this. Surely our senior citizens are entitled to more than feelings of despair and hurt.

The most prevalent concern expressed is the lack of income, the high cost of living and the unfair tax burden on individuals with fixed incomes.

A widow comments:

We have been neglected and are very lonely. They expect us to be satisfied and happy on small incomes. We have needs of the same as they do of money to buy a place to live in and to eat in order to live.

Another elderly lady writes:

I have to buy at least 4 pounds of hamburger to get it for 79¢ a pound, but if I buy 1 pound I have to pay 98¢ a pound. That's almost 20¢ more a pound, and everything else the more you buy, the less you pay. With a limited budget most people cannot have the things they want.

A retired couple, commenting on the problem of limited income and inflation, noted:

We have worked for 50 years and when we were going to retire we started making plans and a budget of how much it would cost us to live. Well, we retired 5 years ago. We pay 3 times as much for food as we did the first year. Utilities, taxes, hospital insurance and everything else has gone up since we retired. You see it did not do much good to plan on our retirement.

A 73-year-old widow from St. Clair County observes:

I have been left alone since my husband passed away. I had to sell my home. I could not keep it up. I think they should put a stop to these hospitals and nursing homes raising their prices. All they want is the money; they don't care about the old people any more and you don't get the care for the money you are paying. We were raised to respect old people but they sure don't now days.

And in the most advanced technocratic society in the world, a retired couple from Freeburg writes:

When we moved into this house in 1927 our taxes were $59, now they are $290. We do not have or never did have a telephone or car and we never go anywhere.

Their plea about higher taxes is not unique. An 83-year-old man who had more than $6,000 in medical bills laments:

All we get is higher taxes.

A 78-year-old widow notes:

My greatest problem is that of property taxes. Why do I have to pay over $400 per year.

An 83-year-old retired railroader concerned about his pension and cost of living complains:

What hurts most is taxes and food prices. There shouldn't be a sales tax on groceries or things that you have to have to live.

Especially concerned about taxes are widows who depend on social security. Not only do they receive reduced benefits they also are denied head of household status for tax purposes. As a Granite City widow puts it:

Taxes are outrageous for widows.

Another aspect of this problem is the income limitation placed on social security recipients, many of whom need additional income to exist and many of whom do not receive dividends or other forms of financial support excluded from the income limitation. A working widow writes:

I am drawing my social security (deceased husband's). Since I've already earned $1680 this year, the balance of 1972, September thru December, I'll be paying back quite a sum—plus the fact that social security tax is being deducted from my salary. It doesn't seem quite fair.

A very disturbing problem which Congress has begun to consider in earnest, the issue of pension reform, has been brought to my attention several times in my contacts with the senior citizens. Unfortunately, congressional efforts have met with resistance.

A retired teamster shares his all too common experience with a private company pension. It is not unique. I have had many complaints about the lack of protection of workers' investments in company pension plans:

I really think these pension plans are misleading and very unfair. I took an early pension when I was 54. When I am 65 the pension will be cut from $125 to $80. That is just at an age when pensions should be increased instead of cut. These are set pensions. Wages and prices have doubled since I retired and are still going up but in the future I will get a big cut. Why?

A retired boilermaker writes:

I wanted to tell you for some time about protection of private pensions and unfair pension restrictions. The _____ company has an unfair rule in their pension that when you sign up for medicare they take $80 to $85 off your monthly pension. This is not fair after a man gave them the best years of his life.

As one possible pension reform, a retiree suggests:

Older people on pensions should not be obliged to pay income taxes on the annuity or pension plans that they earned and became participants of during their working years. Legislation is needed erasing our liability for income taxes insofar as and to the extent that our income is derived from pensions.

In the area of health care, the elderly are especially concerned about better coverage and lower costs. A 67-year-old pensioner recommends:

I think the medicare program should be reviewed, particularly in the case of extended illness where coverage is very limited and financial aid is sadly lacking and causes a burden for people on fixed incomes. Health programs should be carefully reviewed and changes made to benefit the aged. Another thing is the exorbitant cost of drugs, which the older are in greater need as sickness is more prevalent.

A retired minister, married 65 years, writes of his sad experience in trying to care for his wife:

I couldn't take care of my wife; she is in a nursing home. It costs me $600 a month. My finances are nearly exhausted. A law should be passed to have medicare pay the bill the same that is sent into them.

A retired teacher observes:

Health insurance premiums are becoming too high compared to benefits accrued and costs against benefits are out of proportion. Medicare policies need adjusting on benefits. One of the biggest needs for retired people is protection against fraud; false salesmen and taking unfair advantages of retired people.

A 78-year-old widow is concerned about the confusion over medicare regulations. As a result she loses needed protection.

I think medicare should be open so that people who did not understand it could get in on both A and B plans. The hospital part

was very beneficial to me. But sure could have used doctor coverage. I was told that I couldn't get into that part of medicare unless they would reopen it.

A senior citizen housing resident tells of her and her friends' experiences in purchasing medication:

We have drugstores within walking distance and all of us have different charges for the same medicine. Why can't medicare take care of dental work also.

Another elderly woman writes of her difficulty in meeting the medicare deductible:

I don't understand why we have to pay the first $50 for doctor or hospital fees, plus every month we pay a premium just like ordinary insurance. There just isn't enough money to go around.

Clearly the Congress must come up with a more efficient and expanded health care system. As one observer noted:

We can afford to go to the moon, but we can't afford to send an old man to the doctor.

The need for housing is cogently summed up by an elderly lady from St. Clair County:

I am very disappointed about the lack of senior citizen housing. The elderly people are deserving of some consideration. They have worked all their lives and they are deserving of some breaks. I think that people over 65 should have some tax breaks, especially real estate and personal.

Mr. Speaker, it concerns me gravely that today in America we have fellow citizens who do not have what is rightfully theirs: a life of fulfillment and freedom from want. As fellow human beings they deserve more than to be cast aside and put in the ash heap because of their age. Surely America can do better than this. If this is to be a nation of compassion and justice, life-giving and full of promise for all, then we must see to it that our elderly live their lives with the respect and opportunity they seek.

So that the senior citizens in the St. Clair-Madison County area know that their comments have been brought to the attention of the Congress I am sharing this report with them together with an undated report on congressional action on programs of vital interest to them.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that one mark of a nation's greatness is the well-being of her people. For America to lay claim to such greatness she must treat all her people with fairness and consideration. Our mature Americans are one of an important group that has been often neglected in the past by this Nation.

That neglect of these 20 million Americans who are 65 years of age or older and the fastest growing group in this country today is giving way, fortunately, to an increased awareness of the special needs and problems of these fellow citizens. But awareness is only part of the solution. We must continue to translate this awareness into action until our senior citizens live in the dignity and security they have earned and they deserve.

HOW IMPORTS STIFLE EMPLOYMENT

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, Mr. O. R. Strackbein, who has devoted a lifetime to the study of our trade with other nations, has delivered a speech in the last part of August which, in my opinion, will be interesting reading to all Members concerned about our import-export policy. His introductory remarks may prove cleverly enlightening as well as interesting:

HOW IMPORTS STIFLE EMPLOYMENT

(By O. R. Strackbein)

We as a country could produce a fifth or less of our total output of goods today and yet enjoy full employment: if our productive processes should revert suddenly to a much lower technological level. Several times as many workers would be required than now to produce each unit of output.

To be sure, we would have a lesser variety of goods and a very scanty quantity of the nonessential goods to which we have become accustomed. We would subsist on the necessities, perhaps wheat, corn, potatoes, a few vegetables, such as beans and cabbage. For meat we would rely on poultry, fish, and pork. A few rare milk cows would supply the favored few with milk. As for beef we could revert to a per capita consumption of a few pounds of lean meat per year, not marbled steaks cut from grain-fed steers.

For clothing each person would have one or two changes of simple and durable attire, mended and patched; and for housing we would revert to the ruder but perhaps more durable cabins and huts that were the mainstays of our pioneers. Oxen, horses, mules, boats and barges, slow railroads and a scattering of trucks and hardy automobiles would fill our transportation needs; and we could do without most telephones.

Our few dollars earned in return for ten hours of hard work per day, six days per week, would barely buy for us the necessities that would keep us alive. Yes, we could have full employment; in fact, everyone capable of turning a hand must toil long hours to avoid falling behind in filling our minimum needs. Unemployment, the plague of our system, would be banished.

We need not think of the luxuries that today many take for granted, the nonessentials that bring us ease and comfort, excess weight and often discontent. We could easily do without air-conditioning, for example and, of course, without refrigerators and bathtubs. We do not need mechanical dishwashers, nor driers, electric and gas ranges, washing and clothes-drying machines, nor electric irons and fans, carpeting and linoleum. Quite surely we could survive without radio, television, motion pictures, record players, recorders, wigs and guitars. Except for a desire for useless speed we could bypass the aeroplane, the automobile. Our children do not need to be smothered in toys, pacifiers and other distractions, nor need they be bundled in superwarm sweaters, jackets, galoshes. Only in cold weather do they need shoes or wraparounds. They can also do without candy. Our women could do with fewer gowns, as they now do without hats; fewer oddly turned and styled shoes. Perfumery, sprays and cosmetics are frills and mirrors of vanity, not necessities.

We could indeed survive without a clutter of newspapers, magazines and their advertisements that only stir up desires that could not, in any event be filled. If other peoples can be regarded as an example, we could revert to the scarcity level of per capita consumption that prevails for the hundreds of millions of people in Asia. There can be little doubt that we could make do with some 90% less of goods that merely cater to our secondary desires, comfort, convenience and ease, or to our sense of beauty or our craving for variety, new experiences and our dedication to movement, speed and excitement.

Biologically we do not need those goods and services that other people in much greater numbers than our 200 million, do not have the means to have and enjoy.

To repeat, we could conceivably revert to low enough a level of productivity to assure full employment even if our consumption of goods and services were slashed 90% from present levels. For such a negative miracle we need only roll back our technological advancement to the level of most of mankind. Our per capita gross national product in 1969, for example, was $4,600; that of India, $84.

Would we wish to take that course?

We, of course, may or may not be the happier for all our relative affluence. It is possible that we can also boast of more psychiatrists per capita than most of the rest of the world. Yet, on balance, it seems that the answer to the question might tip in our favor. A possible test, without an international poll, might hint at the answer. The peoples who live at or near the subsistence level might be asked whether, if they had the choice, they would elect to exchange their lot for ours. In turn we might be asked: if the reverse opportunity presented itself, would we elect to exchange our lot with those who dwell at the subsistence level.

Even in an uncertain world the answer seems quite certain.

Assuming that the preference would lean to our side, a more relevant question to the purpose of this analysis, would be what made the difference between our productive level and the retarded pace until recently of even the other more advanced industrial countries, not to mention the ⅔ of mankind who subsist at the level of bare essentials.

This difference may or may not have a meaning. There are those indeed who hold that the productive system we developed is not a blessing but a veritable curse upon man, and will sink mankind. They see this system as oppressing the human spirit and worthy of nothing so much as a complete overturn and redirection.

Whatever may be said of these bitter assessments, we do not find in them the explanation of the difference that in time sent the lagging countries in eager pursuit of our economic system, despised as it may be in some quarters.

First off, it must be said, the difference lay not simply in our rapid technological development. After all, the Industrial Revolution antedated our great industrial departure by a century or more. Moreover, some of our inventions and discoveries did not cause a sudden blooming of production. The steam engine, the telephone, electric lights, not even the automobile, although making important contributions, did not of themselves launch our unique system of production.

Indeed the system was never pre-blueprinted. There was no comprehensive vision before the fact. We did not know from decade to decade what our destination was to be; and of course, we do not yet know what lies in wait.

Nevertheless several attitudes and courses of action became accepted as guides as we moved "forward". Those who studied the trends and were affected by them, and who gained the ear of the public and of the national legislature pressed basic policies in particular fields, such as anti-monopolization of production and commercial enterprise. One early result was the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890.

This was a basic commitment of national policy, vital to the course we were to follow to mass production which was only in the bud.

Yet, the background of our canvas was much broader. We have to accept as given certain mental dispositions that guided us. By religion, by pragmatic observation, and by origin of our early European stock we were toil-willing, rough and ready. This disposition is now called the "work ethic"—held a blessing by many and a curse by some. We were little conscious of it at the time. We were what we were and we did what we did, no doubt with abundant deviation, what we were supposed to do, determined to an extent by a search for a better life than what we had left behind. In this framework private aspirations were free to seek far horizons.

Among other heritages were the profit motives and private ownership of the instruments of production. Individuals, depending on their endowments, vision and energy, could become veritable empire-builders in so richly endowed a land. The gateways were open wide and inviting to men of strength, ambition and, of course, greed. Great exertion could lead to great bonanzas.

However, invocation of another element, namely, the democratic form of government, insured the fashioning of restraints on the excesses that otherwise might have left the public interest destitute. The Sherman Act was followed within decades by the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission and Robinson-Patman Acts, all against monopoly.

These laws attested to the concern for preservation of our system for the greater benefits of all the people.

Yet, not all the components so far mentioned accounted for what was to follow. Many of these constituents were indeed indispensable to the new system. We may still add general commercial honesty, credit financing, education, administration of justice, as other ingredients. However, we had these in common with European and other countries. For differentiation from them we needed something yet more decisive.

This was discovered over a period of time, much as a slow dawn rising out of the dark. As we were making great strides toward mass output of goods, it became evident through the overcast as it were, that mass production needed *mass consumption* as a corollary if mass production was to survive.

An early token of recognition came from Henry Ford when he instituted the $5-per-day wage. Mass production could sharply reduce the cost of his product, but what would it avail him if he built hundreds of thousands of cars if only a few potential consumers could buy them?

Here was the real key to what was to unfold later. *Mass production must be matched by mass consumption.* In that equation lay the dreams of a new line of prospectors for bonanzas richer by far than the golden nuggets and silver lodes of the West! Great industries could be envisioned and brought into being!

Why was this formula not visible to the Europeans and the Orient? The Europeans were trussed in a traditional attitude toward wages, inherited from the feudalistic serf-philosophy of the ruling classes. Wages were to be kept as low as possible. This view long had the support of foremost British economists.

The recognition of the vital link between production and consumption did not, for all that, represent an instant awakening even in this country. Furious battles, principally verbal and political, raged over the issue in the United States; but in time the connection became all but self-evident.

Employee compensation became recognized in this country as the veritable embodiment of an expansive market for the goods and services that could aspire to fill it.

Technology assured more and more production at lower and lower costs. Higher wages, in keeping with higher productivity per man-hour, would assure absorption of the goods streaming from the production lines. Indeed the formula became quite simple: invent or discover a new product for which a potential demand exists because of human needs, desires or fancies; patent it, finance its development, test the market and move into mass production if the public response suggests it; bring down the cost within range of the mass pocketbook. The national market then becomes a reality. The patent-owner, however, knows that when his patent runs out other producers will enter the field. Since he cannot get a new monopoly he seeks to reach the mass market through cost reduction before the gates are flung open for competition. This is always a crucial stage.

The spectacle of a bonanza awaiting a successful pursuit of the formula became almost commonplace. Every human desire was assayed like so much raw ore to test the potential demand for some device or material that might gratify it. Human desires, it was surmised, were indefinitely expansible and therefore offered a national market for anything that had the credentials to cater to it. The surmise was ratified by successive experiences.

Yet a desire by itself was not sufficient. Two conditions must be conjoined to precipitate sales. The price must be low enough to meet the condition of the popular pocketbook and the thicker that pocketbook the brighter the outlook. While a mass of people is necessary for a great market the mass does not of itself make a good market unless it is backed by good income. Otherwise China should be the greatest market in the world.

Money-backed demand, in turn, comes from production. Mass production, backed by good wages, creates the necessary purchasing power to move the goods.

Yet, increased purchasing power does not greatly expand the demand for the *necessities*. As long as people are alive they already consume nearly all the necessities they can use. There is only one stomach per person and it is soon filled. It cannot hold several meals at the same time; but while there are only two feet, any number of shoes can be worn in sequence. Also, one body can wear an endless number of changes of dress, gowns, suits, ornaments and accessories. It is in this field of goods, consumable over and beyond the essential, that an economy flourishes, assuming that it is irrigated by adequate consumer income.

Here then lies the great difference that marked our departure from other industrial economies. By virtue of its discovery of the formula here described the United States became the unsung pioneer in the quest for material abundance in the world. Thus incidentally was Marxism outflanked.

After World War II the war-battered nations, weary, distracted and torn, sought means of recovery and rehabilitation. The United States loomed as the source of the productive power that had swung the tide of battle. Those of the leading industrial countries that were still capitalistic were impressed with our productive prowess, and moved to adopt our system. We extended a willing hand.

The Marshall Plan and its sequelae after a decade or two brought a veritable procession of nations toward mass production, and a dismantling of some national compartments that stood in the way of mass markets. Veritable miracles of rising productivity were performed in the next few decades.

Before long we were confronted with something we had not yet encountered at home in the ominous form it now loomed before us. Not only had the phoenix risen; it was about to overshadow us with its wings. Production expanded so greatly the industrial countries became hungry for foreign markets for their surplus output. They had not yet fully implemented the worker-payroll side of the equation.

With the third decade after World War II their goods invaded our market with a cost advantage that we could not overcome. Their higher productivity joined to still lagging wages pressed heavily on our market with a competitive bite for which, within the confines of our trade policy, we had no effective medication. We had all but dismantled our tariff. Many of our industries looked overseas seeking havens of cheaper production costs. If they could not export to many markets they could at least sell to them from within. The *multinational corporation* became a newcomer to our economic dictionary.

Now there loomed a real dilemma. To remain competitive in the domestic market against the eager imports we must refurbish out our own much vaunted efficiency. Apparently we were being badly outpaced, or at least undersold and therefore outpaced, if the wage-differential was left out of account. The pressure mounted. Yet there was really only one way to reduce costs substantially, and that was through labor displacement by ever more productive machinery. This follows from the widely unknown fact that in this country employee compensation plays a major role in corporate costs of production. The proportion is from 75%–80% (average). No substantial cost reductions can be made without reducing the payroll.

The dilemma is sharper and more intractable than is usually realized, ensconsing a veritable paradox. How, for example, achieve full employment through forced labor displacement?

We have before us the towering fact that we created the mass market precisely by the route of throwing people out of work through mechanization. Why can we then not meet import competition in the same way? A fair question, and it demands an answer.

While mechanization caused unemployment at home, the widened consumer acceptance of the product at the lower prices achieved led in a few years to more jobs. Fortunately the disruption through displacement was not simultaneous among the various industries. Different products were in different stages of development. Displacements in one industry were more than offset by expansion of others that had already met the market test and gained a national market.

Had our economy, however, been based simply on the production and consumption of necessities expansion could have found no footing. A reaper and threshing combine might displace workers, and thus reduce the cost of wheat flour, but the displaced workers would remain displaced because consumers would not eat more bread, cake or biscuits.

If ours were an economy based simply on the production of necessities the impact of imports could be measured quite readily. If we should produce 1½ billion bushels of wheat per year and imported 100 million bushels, the displacement could be determined without too much difficulty. Should imports, however, rise to ½ billion bushels or more our wheat farmers would become deeply alarmed. A third of our wheat farmers would face ruin and many farm workers would be displaced, just as surely as farm machinery displaced them; and with no more assurance of finding reemployment.

Nevertheless the harm would be small compared with the effects imports may produce in the area of *nonessential* goods. Wheat-growing has no growth potential to be snuffed out, remotely comparable to that attributable to the invention and develop-

ment of products that do have a great growth potential, such as had electric lights, telephones, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and scores of other products. Such products may indeed proliferate to an embarrassing degree, but meantime unlike wheat or corn, they may generate tens of millions of new jobs.

Import competition that simultaneously and on a wide front strikes an economy such as ours, which depends only slightly on the market for *necessities*, may produce a devastating effect, depending on the particular products, their stage of development in this country or their susceptibility to further development if already established, and, of course, on the price of the imported product.

Low-cost imports may indeed defuse one potential growth industry after another or drive them overseas if the imports are not impeded by patent protection or other form of restriction.

The job recoupment and augmentation that followed domestic cost reduction, as described above regarding the nonessentials, leading to greater employment, cannot occur if imports have the right of way, and can head off the patent owner here in his own market. To be sure, if the market is not yet saturated consumption will increase as cheaper imports can be bought, but the added employment that once occurred here now largely takes place abroad. Employment in the industry here either remains static or goes backward. Meantime more new workers come on the scene. The displaced workers as in the case of the farm workers remain displaced because little or no increase in consumption of the *domestically-produced* product occurs. Thus imports that hinder our own developmental progress as a job breeder through new products and new industries, repeat the job disaster of the great production miracle of our agriculture during the past generation. The seven or eight million farm workers who were displaced by farm technology remained unemployed because cost reductions did not beget greater per capita consumption for reasons already noted.

Not only were the farm workers evicted but our agriculture did not hire its share of the added workers coming from population growth. Had the remainder of our economy—the part devoted to the production of nonessentials—not boomed and so absorbed many of the displaced workers we would have been swamped by unemployment.

Whereas our economy was rescued from the ruin that would have been visited upon it by the "miracle" of agricultural productivity by our other economy, i.e., that devoted to the nonessentials, there is no such escape from the usurpation of our market for the nonessentials themselves by imports. We do not have a third world of production, much as some economists point to the service occupations as providing such a haven.

To be sure, patent-holders may save themselves by setting up production abroad or licensing foreign use of the patents; but that does not restore to the domestic front the benefits that accrued to it in terms of employment when the development of the product and its increasing production took place here. The lower costs achieved abroad and the importation of the cheaper goods will, of course, increase domestic consumption, as already noted but American labor is left behind, as are the prospects of full employment.

In this respect imports that head off the development of domestic growth industries, and innovations applied to established products, produce the same effect as the displacement of farm workers by technology. While in the case of imports domestic consumption may increase because of the lower prices and an elastic demand, the growth factor is skimmed of the top by imports, and the market potential for the *domestic* product is reduced to the same flat level as the market for essential agricultural products. The great employment potential of our patent system is thus vitiated. The employment value that resides in elasticity of demand for nonessential goods is transferred abroad. We have left to us the flat land of employment stagnation.

If we have no stomach for a retreat to the drab subsistence level of life or even very far from the present enjoyment of nonessential goods we must look to our home front and restore the conditions that led to the development of mass production and mass consumption. What other course will lead to jobs for millions of new workers? Retreat from foreign investment is not imperative nor a heavy rollback in imports; but until foreign wages catch up with the newly achieved foreign productivity, thus providing the basis for adequate mass consumption abroad, we will be outflanked by our own progeny—that is, unless we adjust to the new reality.

CONSUMERISM AS A CAMPAIGN ISSUE

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no other issue has more wide ranging appeal than that of consumerism. In the interest of aiding candidates who wish to discuss consumerism on a substantive rather than purely rhetorical basis the Congressional Action Fund has prepared the following fact paper on consumer hazards and major reform proposals. All those running for office would be wise to acquaint themselves with the facts on the problems facing the American consumer today and what remedies are in sight.

The paper follows:

CONSUMERISM

NOTE.—This chapter was prepared by Stephen D. Brown, a student at the University of Wisconsin (Madison) and staff assistant to Ralph Nader. Editorial assistance was provided by Ellie Stengel, a staff member with Consumer Union in Washington, D.C.

"Consumers, by definition, include us all. They are the largest economic group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. Two-thirds of all spending in the economy is by consumers. But they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized, whose views are often not heard." (President John F. Kennedy, *Special Message on Protecting the Consumer Interest*, March 15, 1962).

A candidate for public office will find consumerism an important campaign issue. If properly publicized and presented, it will evoke wide appeal, for there is general agreement on the need for safer automobiles, improved household appliances or higher quality food products. A strong voice representing consumer interests is a strong voice before any electoral group.

CONSUMER HAZARDS

The following statistics[1] relate to consumer products, defined by the National Commission on Product Safety (1970) as, "including all retail products used by consumers in or around the household, except foods, drugs, cosmetics, motor vehicles, insecticides, firearms, cigarettes, radiological hazards, and certain flammable fabrics."

Overview: Each year twenty million Americans are injured seriously enough to require medical treatment or be disabled for a day or more, in their homes, as a result of incidents connected with consumer products. Of the total, 110,000 are permanently disabled, 585,000 are hospitalized and 30,000 are killed. A significant number could be spared if more attention were paid to hazard reduction. The annual cost to the nation of product-related injuries exceeds $5.5 billion according to the NCPS study.

The role of specific products is, however, difficult to define. The estimated 6,200 killed by home fires and 1,300,000 injured by burns received at home leaves open the question of cause: matches, stoves, wiring, fabrics, or cigarettes? Home-falls kill about 12,000 a year and injure 6,900,000, but again the precise causes are uncertain: high heels, loose treads, rough floors, flimsy ladders, worn stairs, slippery floors, torn carpets, alcohol?

Every hour of the day, on the average, household hazards in America kill three victims. For every one they kill, more than 1,000 suffer injuries. The injuries restrict activities of about half of the victims and force a third of these to take to bed to recover. A tenth of the bedridden require hospital care. Injuries around schools and vacation homes or in recreational areas add to these numbers substantially.

Injuries at home account for more than half of the total that do not involve transportation. The total injured at home is more than four times as many as those injured on highways, more than twice as many as those injured at work. Deaths on highways, however, are double those at home.

The most dangerous years are below age 15. Approximately 7,000 children under 15 die each year in home accidents—a death toll higher than that of cancer and heart diseases combined. More than 2 million children every year are injured while using bicycles or playground equipment.

In the lowest income groups, household risks injure far more women than men, but above middle-income, men are injured more. About a third of the deaths from household hazards occur in kitchen and living-dining areas. Stairs account for about 1 in every 20 deaths from household hazards, and slightly fewer deaths occur in the bathroom. Falls figure in half of these deaths, fires or suffocation in a third, poisoning in about 1 in 20.

The following statistical summary of injuries associated with consumer products is based on HEW estimates:

INJURIES PER YEAR

Appliances (including burns from ranges, coffeepots, vaporizers, irons, sun and heat lamps and other sources, and injuries from wringer washers and other appliances), 500,000.

Cooking devices (including burns from skillets, pressure cookers, and injuries from other cooking devices), 150,000.

Kitchen gadgets and serving utensiles (including knives), 500,000.

Home furnishings (including beds, chairs, tables, stools, sofas, venetian blinds), 500,000.

Home fixtures (including windows, stairs, tubs and showers, doors—including glass doors, hot water in bathrooms), 2,500,000.

Yard and garden equipment (including mowers), 500,000.

Recreational equipment (including swings, slides, seesaws, stationary equipment, bicycles, tricycles, mobile equipment, skates, winter sports, baseballs, footballs, basketballs, other balls, camping, fishing, poisoning

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, these statistics were released by the NCPS under the title "Final Report of the National Commission on Product Safety," June 1970 (Gov't Printing Office).

from airplane glue, hobby equipment, toys), 8,000,000.

Incinerators: burns from, 50,000.

Flammable liquids (including gasoline, lighter fluid, poisoning from lighter fluid, kerosene, turpentine), 125,000.

Heating devices (including burns from furnaces, hot water heaters, room heaters, floor furnaces), 175,000.

Home workshops (including power saws, power drills), 125,000.

Home tools (including ladders, saws, hammers), 750,000.

Laundering, cleaning, polishing products (incl. poisonings from soaps, detergents, cleaners, bleach, disinfectants, deodorizers, furniture polish, lye and corrosives), 250,000.

Flame producing devices (burns), 75,000.

Clothing injuries other than burns, 200,000.

Cosmetics (incl. perfume, toilet water, lotions and creams), 60,000.

Personal use items (incl. shaving equipment), 50,000.

Pesticides (incl. poisoning from insecticides, rodenticides), 75,000.

Containers (incl. cans and jars, bottles), 250,000.

Total injuries, 14,985,000.

Statistics about selected consumer products (investigated by the NCPS):

Architectural Glass: The glass door is a classic example of a product which predictably will be "misused". Every year about 150,000 victims of broken windows, doors, or glass walls discover that what they can't see *can* hurt them. About 100,000 walked through glass doors last year, probably believing the space to be open. If the doors had been safety glazed (tempered glass, or molding on a wire mesh, or lamination on a plastic core), most of the serious injuries would not have occurred.

Color Television Sets: Among the 85 million TV sets in the United States in 1969, including about 20 million color sets, about 10,000 sets caught fire. Most of the fires were in color sets: the incident rate for color versus monochrome was found to be on the order of 40 to 1. The reason for the higher rate of fires in color sets is that they require up to and sometimes more than 25,000 volts. If conductors in the set are not well insulated, the high-voltage forces a short circuit. Resistance to this flow of current builds up temperature to the flaming point.

Fireworks: Fireworks each year cause from 5,000 to 15,000 injuries and some 25 deaths. About 90% of the injuries occur from personal-use fireworks; others result from public display and homemade fireworks. About 43% of the persons injured are said to be between the ages of 10 and 20.

Glass Bottles: Insurance companies reported more claims related to glass bottles than to any other consumer product. Some 5,000 to 7,000 injuries are reported annually. In 1968 bottlers filled more than 30 billion glass containers. (The figure is much higher in 1972.) Of the 430 closed cases on bottle injuries reported by insurers, 80% required medical treatment, many times involving loss of vision, disfigurement, or permanent disability.

High-Rise Bicycles: 70% of bicycles sold in 1968 were high-rise styles (*i.e.*, bikes with raised handlebars). Collisions between bicycles and automobiles alone caused 800 deaths and 38,000 injuries in 1968 (a significant increase from 1967). The Public Health Service estimates that bicycles are associated with approximately 1 million injuries each year, including 120,000 fractures and 60,000 concussions. High-rise styles, with only 45% of the total riders, accounted for 57% of the injuries. (National Safety Council.)

Household Chemicals: Because young children are curious, household chemicals pose a major hazard. Children may suffer chemical burns (from strong detergents) and furniture polish may produce chemical pneumonia if even a small quantity gets into the lungs. Based on tabulations of the Nat'l. Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers, ingestions of potentially harmful household substances range from 500,000 to 1 million a year.

Infant Furniture: In cribs and playpens, too much space between slats can be a death trap for children who catch their heads in the opening, which admits the body but not the skull. Most of the victims are less than 5 years old. 60% of the injuries were of the head or face (lacerations, contusions, and abrasions). Ill-designed highchairs, play chairs, or dressing tables increase an infant's chances for a bad fall. 1,750,000 infants, or just under half of all current births, will annually sustain at least one bad fall during their first year of life. Skull fracture, nerve damage, and permanent brain injuries have been observed. (Study by Dr. Harvey Kravitz, Northwestern University Medical School.)

Ladders: From 125,000 to 200,000 injuries and 400 to 600 deaths are caused annually by falls from ladders. A NCPS survey of closed insurance claims ranked ladders high among categories of hazardous products: stepladders were eighth, straight ladders 11th. Some studies show ladders accounting for as much as 12% of fatal falls in the house. (NCPS Hearing, Dr. Edward J. Fairchild testimony.)

Power Tools: 125,000 do-it-yourselfers are injured each year from power tool hazards. 75% of victims of powersaw accidents experience severe lacerations mostly to the hands and 11% amputations, usually fingers. In addition to the danger of lacerations is the hazard of severe shock from improper insulation within the tool or the wall socket (where a three-pronged plug with ground wire is needed for full safety).

Protective Headgear: 70% of the 1,359 motorcycle deaths in 1965 resulted from head injuries. Football players in the United States annually suffer from 250,000 to 500,000 brain concussions during play. Of these, 5,000 to 10,000 have serious effects at once. Approximately one player of every six suffers a concussion. Each year, head injuries kill about 15 players.

Rotary Lawn Mowers: Each year the estimated rate of injury is about 150,000 (HEW estimates). About 70% of the injuries from power mowers are lacerations, amputations, and fractures that result from the cutting and crushing action of the fast whirling blade. In addition, there are high-velocity ejections of wire, glass, stones, and debris that can puncture vital body parts.

Toys: U.S. Public Health Service estimates that toys injure 700,000 children each year; another 500,000 a year are injured on swings and 200,000 on slides. Injuries from toys often result from predictable misuse. But statutory law has been no more successful than common law in reducing undue risks in toys. The Federal Hazardous Substances Act doesn't provide for mandatory standards of safety for toys or for proscriptive restraint of hazards before the toys are marketed. Nor has the Act been vigourously enforced.

Other Categories:

Lead Paint: responsible for more than 100 deaths and substantial mental retardation every year among children who eat flakes of paint in old buildings.

Eyeglasses: safety glasses would prevent 90% of the eye injuries at home and at school. Of more than 160,000 school-children who suffer eye injuries each year, 20,000 are hurt wearing ordinary crown-glass lenses on the playground.

Swimming pools: Yearly drownings are approaching 1,000 in the home backyard swimming pools.

Boats: there are nearly 10 million recreational boats in the United States, and in 1967, 4,113 accidents took the lives of 1,312 users.

Cosmetics: injure 60,000 persons (mostly women) annually so seriously as to restrict activity for one day or require medical attention. Injuries include skin eruptions, loss of hair, severe allergic reactions, burns, itching, and lacerations.

There are also social costs of injuries, "including actual millions of dollars unrealized as income taxes as a result of preventable deaths and injuries: $446 million in public expenditures representing 1.7 percent of the current expenditures for health care. Injuries caused 2.1 percent of hospital admissions, filling 18,782 beds for acute care, a number equal to the annual construction of such beds at a capital expenditure of $600 million. The loss to society is tremendous." (Senator Percy in the *Congressional Record*, vol. 118, pt. 17, p. 21852.)

1. Senator Hart [2] talks about needless consumer spending:

At least 10%, and perhaps as much as 30% to 40% of all consumer spending is wasted on excessively priced and deceptively advertised products, and improperly performed and unneeded services.

Deceptive labeling costs an estimated $14 billion (11% of all grocery shopping) in overspending.

Monopolistic pricing costs consumer $45 billion a year.

Automobile repair and maintenance, improperly done, unneeded, or not done at all, costs the consumer $8 to $10 billion per year.

Oil import quotas have increased the cost of fuel oil by an estimated $5 to $8 billion.

Unnecessary insurance coverage (duplicated by more than one policy) costs the consumer an estimated $1 to $3 billion per year.

2. Senator Hart's subcommittee has estimated that 11% of total consumer spending represents overspending which does not include criminal price fixing, lack of product innovation and inflation.

3. $1 billion is spent annually on worthless or misrepresented medical devices and drugs. $300 million is spent annually on worthless arthritis remedies such as "alfalfa tea," "radiation" treatments, copper bracelets, etc. (Testimony of Virginia Knauer, Director, President's Office of Consumer Affairs; before Senate Commerce Committee, December 1969.)

4. The Office of Consumer Affairs [in the New Executive Office Building] receives over 2,000 complaints per month. The FTC receives 1,200 per month. But the White House has no authority to adjust complaints and the FTC may only issue cease and desist orders. (Senate Commerce Committee hearings on Consumer Protection Agency, December 1969 and February 1970.)

MAJOR PROPOSALS

The need to reverse this record of consumer neglect is clear. The Congress is currently considering four major proposals to safeguard consumer interests: the Consumer Product Safety Commission bill which establishes an independent federal agency to represent consumers; no fault legislation which would apply the requirements now in effect in Florida and Massachusetts to the nation as a whole; the Consumer Products Warranties and FTC Improvement Act designed to protect the buying consumer; and the Consumer advocate bill which would establish an ombudsman post within govern-

[2] Testimony before Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, March 7, 1970.

ment to represent consumer interests in all agencies and departments—much as the General Accounting Office does in matters of auditing.

A brief description of each proposal is presented below, with arguments pro and con:

Consumer product safety commission

Pressure is strong to create an independent Federal regulatory agency which would take the place of the Food and Drug Administration. A Senate bill, S. 3419, was approved by the Senate on June 21st by a vote of 69 to 10. Under Title 1, the bill creates an independent Food, Drug and Consumer Product Agency which would establish and enforce regulations to protect consumers against adulteration, misbranding and illegal distribution of food, drugs, devices and cosmetics and against injury from the use of hazardous consumer products when such hazards could be reasonably eliminated or minimized. The Agency would have the authority to set product safety standards with provision for public comment and judicial review, and independent testing labs would be able to contract with the Agency to conduct product safety studies.

Title II transfers all functions of the FDA to the Agency, thereby abolishing the FDA. Title III deals with product safety and authorizes the agency to ban products whose risks could not be made reasonable by establishing safety standards and having products taken off the market which do not conform to established standards. Private citizens would be allowed to bring suits in certain cases to seek injunctions against manufacturers not complying with established standards, or to recover damages. Civil and criminal penalties for violations of existing standards would be set. The importation of any product which does not meet standards comparable to those set for domestically produced consumer products is prohibited. Title VI requires labeling, including warnings, of cosmetics. Under Title V, manufacturers must conduct pre-marketing screening tests for all products that might contain toxic or corrosive substances, and established a registration mechanism for such products.

Under the House bill, H.R. 15003, which is similar to S. 3419, the independent agency would have jurisdiction over consumer products only, excluding food and drugs which are left within FDA. H.R. 15003 also has a somewhat broader definition of "trade secret", or that information protected from public scrutiny.

Opinion differs on a number of features of the legislation. Consumer advocates want an independent Federal regulatory agency while the Nixon Administration, business and industry groups want consumer protection programs to remain in HEW. They also want business to be guaranteed a voice and impact in setting safety standards, whereas consumer advocates would permit the commission to set standards and decide for itself whether or not to use industry standards. In the matter of enforcement, the Nixon Administration wants the Justice Dept. to handle all legal battles and wants no criminal penalty provisions. Consumer advocates want the Agency to be empowered to bring civil suit or criminal action against violators of its consumer product safety standards. The advocates are in favor of a broader scope of coverage for the agency than is the White House. The former want the commission to have control over food, drugs, and consumer products (as in S. 3419), while the latter wants its jurisdiction restricted to consumer products alone (as in H.R. 15003).

No fault

The rising cost of auto insurance has engendered wide-spread public support for reform of the fault-based system and no fault auto insurance is the leading approach being considered in state legislatures and in Congress. No fault has attracted the support of a variety of prominent consumer, labor, and business groups [list] and is being opposed primarily by [list].

Proponents believe that the existing system needs prompt overhauling, that no fault would provide the broadest coverage combined with lowest rates, and that the states have shown that they are unlikely to act. A large number of lawyers are in state legislatures, many of whom engage in, or are sympathetic to those who engage in accident litigation. Opponents argue that the subject is so complex that the states should test various solutions before a national plan is imposed. They challenge predictions of rate reductions and predict higher premiums instead. In addition they contend that the rights of automobile victims would be curtailed and that the proposal is designed to benefit stock insurance companies.

In the House, hearings were completed in 1971 before the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but the bill is given little chance of committee mark-up or floor passage this session of Congress.

In the Senate, S. 945 was reported by the Commerce Committee on June 20, 1972 but was indefinitely tabled by a vote on the floor. Under S. 945, benefits would be paid to automobile accident victims regardless of fault and lawsuits are preserved only in those situations producing serious injury. It would require states to adopt a no fault insurance plan meeting minimum federal standards and to put such a plan into effect within two years of enactment of the national bill. If a state refuses, the federal no fault requirements automatically would become effective. The state would, however, still regulate the federally established plan.

Consumer Product Warranties and FTC Improvement Act

S. 986, the Consumer Product Warranties and FTC Improvement Act, passed the Senate on November 8, 1971.

A large volume of consumer complaints deals with the problem of repairs and consumer dissatisfaction with coverage under warranty. Warranty legislation was introduced to meet four basic needs: 1) the need for consumer understanding of terms of warranties, 2) the need for minimum warranty protection, 3) the need for assurance of warranty performance, and 4) the need for better product reliability.

S. 986 provides for both full and partial warranties for a product as long as they are cleared independently. Products of $5.00 or more in value must carry an easily understandable warranty explaining the conditions and duration of its terms, and a disclaimer of implied warranties is prohibited. Suppliers offering full warranties must repair or replace malfunctioning or defective products within a reasonable time and without charge. Customers may bring suit in state courts, or in Federal courts if the total damages are $10,000 or more. Violation of the warranty law is a violation of the FTC Act. Therefore, regular FTC procedures (cease and desist orders) could be applied to violators. The bill also authorizes the FTC or the Justice Department to seek a permanent injunction to keep the warrantor from making a deceptive guarantee.

In the House, a bill similar to S. 986, H.R. 4809, has been introduced and is awaiting mark-up by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Proponents and opponents of the legislation argue about the breadth of warranty coverage. Consumer advocates say that it should cover all warranties, written and oral, regardless of the value of the product. The Nixon Administration says that only written warranties should be covered.

Included in this legislation are provisions which would broaden the powers of the FTC. The FTC jurisdiction would be expanded to cover all acts and practices "affecting interstate commerce", and the FTC would have the authority to seek preliminary injunctions to stop unfair or deceptive practices. In addition, the agency would be authorized to issue substantive rules that would have the force and effect of law, rather than serving merely as guidelines to industry. It would be allowed to initiate civil lawsuits to recover penalties from any firm knowingly engaged in unfair or deceptive practices, and to seek penalties up to $10,000 for violation of cease and desist orders, rather than referring cases to the Justice Department.

Consumer advocates and the White House differ on two central issues. Consumer advocates argue that the FTC should have rule-making powers and that the FTC should be empowered to go into court to enforce the FTC orders and subpoenas. The White House argues, with the agreement of business, that the FTC should not have rule-making powers, that each item should be handled on a case-by-case basis. The White House also wants the enforcement power to be in the hands of the Justice Department exclusively rather than in the hands of the FTC.

Consumer Protection Agency (or the consumer advocate bill)

This bill is often confused with the Consumer Product Safety Act. However, the provisions of this act are to empower a "roving" consumer ombudsman and advocate to represent consumer interests in *all* Federal departments and regulatory agencies. This is not to be confused with the Consumer Product Safety Act which sets up a *new* Federal regulatory agency, like the FTC, FCC, or ICC.

On November 14, 1971, the House passed H.R. 10835 which establishes a Consumer Protection Agency with an Administrator and Deputy-Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It authorizes the Agency to represent consumers in formal proceedings conducted in other Federal agencies, and provides for intervention as a party in any non-punitive adjudicative proceeding. In punitive proceedings, it may participate as *amicus curiae*. The agency may also intervene in or institute a court review of a proceeding by another Federal agency in which it had participated, and in certain instances, intervene in a situation in which it did not participate.

The Senate bill, S. 1177, reported by the Government Operations Committee, is much like the House bill with several exceptions. The Administrator has the right to participate in informal, as well as formal, hearings in Federal departments and agencies and all Federal agencies must give advance notice to the Administrator of informal hearings. In addition, the Administrator has the right to go to court to enforce his authority to intervene in informal proceedings. He also has independent discovery powers and may conduct his own investigations.

The issue of participataion in informal hearings is one on which opinion is sharply divided. Consumer advocates argue that this right is a necessity for adequate consumer representation. The White House says that the requirement is "superfluous" and "an unmanageable burden". Consumer advocates and the White House also differ on the issues of enforcement powers and discovery power. The former say that the Administrator must have the right to go to court to enforce his authority to intervene in informal hearings and that independent discovery power is necessary. The latter would withold the power to enforce and to make independent discovery investigations adding that such discovery power will encourage "free-wheeling investigations".

PROBLEMS OF WELFARE REFORM

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems facing the country today is welfare reform. Yet probably no other problem has been so obscured by self-serving rhetoric and conscious demagoguery.

There are two ways to approach the problem of welfare. One way is to assume that the cost of the welfare program is the main drain on the country's resources, and that the corruption caused by welfare is the main cause of the country's sickness. Many people who should know better have adopted this approach for reasons of their own.

The alternate approach is to accept the goal of caring for the old, the sick, and all our fellow citizens who through forces beyond their control are unable to compete in the fierce battle for survival that the rest of us are so proud of winning. We accept this goal not in the grudging spirit of patronizing charity, but to avoid the shame of indifference and denial.

This approach concentrates on the people that we do not want to lose. It is opposed to the approach of increasing people's sense of being cheated by those whom, outrageously, we think of as luckier than we are, because they do not have to work.

To those of my colleagues who still remember the original ideals of the welfare program and the hope that this Nation could be a real community, I offer the following analysis, prepared by staff members of the congressional action fund. It avoids rhetoric and concentrates on some of the hard questions of welfare reform. It is an important contribution to the job of creating a decent and humane system of welfare.

WELFARE REFORM

NOTE.—This chapter was assembled by CAF staff from materials supplied by Professor Lee Bawden of the University of Wisconsin (Who Are the Poor), by Henry Aaron of the Brookings Institution (Federal Welfare Programs), by Professor James Lyday of the University of Minnesota (Analysis of H.R. 1), and by Jodie Allen of the Urban Institute (Section IV).

WHO ARE THE POOR?

Each of us has in our mind a picture of "the poor". One may think of him as a Black in the ghetto of a big city, another may have the picture of a white alcoholic on Skid Row, and yet another may think of a mother left by her husband to raise a large brood of kids. But the poor cannot be stereotyped: poor people come in all sizes, shapes, and colors, and it is revealing and sometimes surprising to find out who they are.

While the percent of blacks who are poor is more than twice that of whites, three out of every four poor persons in the United States are white.[1]

Actually, the highest percent of "incidence" of poverty occurs among "the original Americans." A 1964 survey revealed that 74 percent of families living on Indian and Eskimo reservation had incomes under $3,000.

The aged make up a disproportionate share of the poor. The incidence of poverty among households headed by a person over 65 years of age is three times that of households headed by a person under 65. Also, persons living alone are three times more likely to be poor than those who are part of a family. It is an indictment against our old-age programs to find that every other person over 65 years of age and living alone is poor.

Households headed by a female are also more prone to be poor: nonwhite households are more than twice as likely—and white households more than three times as likely—to be poor than if headed by a man.

It is common belief that people in the central cities have the greatest likelihood of being poor, but evidence refutes this. In 1964 it was found that the incidence of poverty was 29 percent on farms, 23 percent in rural towns and small cities and only 17 percent in the central cities, and a low seven percent in the suburbs. Of all the people classified as poor in the United States in 1964, a surprising 40 percent of them lived in farm and rural nonfarm areas and only 30 percent resided in cities over 50,000.[2]

A study of the work habits of the poor is also quite revealing. In 1967, 29 percent of the poor were in households headed by an aged (over 65) or disabled person. As expected, this group had a low rate of labor force participation. Another 28 percent of the poor lived in households headed by a female younger than 65. Despite the fact that many had preschool children, that the AFDC program then discouraged working by imposing a 100 percent tax on earnings, and that in many areas full-time wages for untrained women are less than the AFDC payments, nearly one-fourth of the women held full-time jobs and over a third worked part of the time.[3] Thus, less than one half did not work at all.

The remaining 43 percent of the nation's poor in 1967 lived in households headed by an able-bodied male less than 65 years of age. It is surprising to find that over 60 percent of these lived in households in which the male worked full time, and another 35 percent were in households in which the head worked part of the time. This leaves only five percent of the poor but able-bodied male heads less than 65 years of age who did not work at all in 1967.[4]

While the poor can be found with all levels of education, they are in general less well educated than the nonpoor. In fact, two thirds of poor family heads have no more than eight grades of education, while in the general population only one-third have not advanced beyond the eighth grade.

Today the poor number 25.5 million. Together with middle and lower-middle income Americans they receive benefits from the four major federal welfare programs: cash assistance, housing subsidies, food stamps or agricultural goods, and Medicaid/Medicare. Last year 13.8 million people received cash assistance, 2.5 million housing subsidies, 10 million food or food stamps, 18.2 million Medicaid benefits, and 16.5 million Medicare.

FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS

Cash assistance

Public assistance, born in 1935 along with the social security system, was originally aimed at helping widowed mothers bring up their families during the Great Depression. But AFDC grew steadily during the post-war period and began serving families of a different sort: increasingly, the father was absent because of divorce, desertion, or separation. By 1971 only 14 percent of AFDC families were headed by widows or contained an incapacitated male; 76 percent were headed by women who had been divorced, deserted, separated, never married, or were otherwise living apart from their children's fathers. The remaining 10 percent were intact families.

Housing assistance

Since 1937 the United States has provided subsidized housing for low income families. The number of such families has always been vastly larger than the number of subsidized units. As late as 1970, 7.2 million families had incomes of $4000 per year or less, but only 695,515 low rent public housing units were available for occupancy, and only 69 percent were occupied by households with incomes below $4000.

Those welfare recipients who reside in federally assisted housing receive large additional subsidies. The average benefit under the homeownership and rental assistance programs is about $1000. The median rent supplement payment was $936 in 1969. The average benefit in low rent public housing was $803 in 1966.

Medical assistance

In 1971, 17 million people in 48 states and the District of Columbia were eligible for subsidized medical care under the Medicaid program. Most also receive cash public assistance. Under Medicaid, the federal government pays at least half and the states pay the rest of the cost of medical care for selected groups provided that the states offer certain basic medical services. These services must include inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home services for people 21 or older, home health services to those eligible for skilled nursing home services, and physician services.

Food assistance

Two federal programs provide low income families with free or subsidized food. Food stamps were available 10.5 million people in March, 1971; more than half also received public assistance; more than four million people eligible for food stamps because of low income were not receiving public assistance. Federal budget outlays for food stamps reached $1.6 billion in fiscal year 1971 and will reach $2.3 billion in 1973.

The older, but less important, commodity distribution program provides free food to many low income households in many areas not served by food stamps. Begun in 1935, commodity distribution served four million people in 36 states in March, 1971.

ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S WELFARE REFORM PROPOSAL: H.R. 1

Under H.R. 1, the Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled programs become one program to be paid for and operated by the federal government. Basic eligibility is not significantly altered under the new program. Individuals who are eligible will be guaranteed that their total income will not fall below $130 a month. (Increasing to $150 a month in two years.) Couples who are eligible will similarly be guaranteed a minimum income of $195 per month (rising to $200 the following year). Some positive incentives to secure earned income are provided by exempting from the base upon which benefits are computed the first $60 of earnings per month, and one third of any additional earnings. (Slightly larger incentives are provided the blind and disabled.) *There is little controversy surrounding these provisions of the bill.*

The remainder of the bill is dedicated to welfare reform and is specified in the bill as "family programs". Simply stated welfare assistance among the rest of the population is restricted to those families containing minor children (less than 18 years old or less than 22 if remaining in school) whose behavior and income fall within the limits perscribed by H.R. 1.

These potentially eligible families are divided into two groups. Workers (or potential workers) are provided assistance under a program administered by the Department of

Footnotes at end of article.

Labor. This program is called "Opportunities for Families". The second group of families where no family member is eligible for employment (at the present time) receives benefits under the title "Family Assistance Plan". The benefits and income eligibility conditions for both groups (Opportunities for Families and Family Assistance Plan) are identical. The only substantive difference is that the program administration is split between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and those who are enrolled under the Department of Labor are classified as potentially employable, while those paid by HEW supposedly should not or cannot find work.

Maximum family benefits under both Opportunities for Families and the Family Assistance Plan are specified as equal to $800 per year for the first two family members, $400 for the next three members, $300 for the next two members, and $200 for the next member. The maximum benefit for a family of eight or more persons would be $3600. Benefits would be paid monthly and would be reduced in accordance with the following schedule:

1. No family would be eligible for benefits if its assets exceeded $1500 plus a home and household goods and personal effects whose value did not exceed a "reasonable amount". (What a reasonable amount is, is of course anyone's guess.)

2. The first $60 per month ($720 per year) of earnings are exempt from computation.

3. Earnings in excess of the first $60 per month will reduce benefits by ⅔ of such earnings.

4. No benefits would be paid if the amount payable is less than $10 per month.

In addition to these requirements there are a large number of limiting provisos in the bill. These provisos relate to the earnings of children, benefits which may be paid by state agencies, definitions of earned as opposed to unearned income, etc. Many of these special provisions have a substantial impact on the distribution of benefits under the bill. The effects of five major provisions of the bill will be described in the next section "What is the matter with H.R. 1?"

What is wrong with H.R. 1?

1. H.R. 1 will reduce the incentive to work, and increase the reliance on investigation and compulsion rather than increasing the number of jobs and increasing the financial rewards for self-support.

After the first $720 of earnings, program benefits are reduced by 72¢ for each dollar of earnings. (67¢ as required by H.R. 1 and 5¢ Social Security tax.) As earnings rise, other taxes are included as well. At $3800 the family of four begins to pay income taxes—14¢ on the dollar. The tax on additional income is now 86¢ on the dollar (67¢ H.R. 1 plus 5¢ Social Security plus 14¢ income tax). Furthermore H.R. 1 allows the state to tax earnings above the federal break-even point at a 100 percent tax rate. If states do this then for each dollar of earnings the worker is now losing a dollar of assistance and is paying 5¢ to Social Security and 14¢ in income tax. Thus, for working more and making a dollar more the effect will be to reduce his take home pay by 19¢.

2. The basic payment level is not only substantially below the poverty level, but it is too low to permit the existing mess of welfare programs to be abolished without seriously reducing the incomes of many people.

The basic payment level for a family of four with no other income under H.R. 1 is $2400 a year. In 28 of the 50 states payment levels are higher than this amount. Therefore millions of people will be made worse off by the reform, or the existing system must be retained, or states must add on to the payments made under H.R. 1. (The payment in Connecticut is $4020 and New Jersey $4169. All other states have basic payment for a family of four of less than $3800.)

3. Single persons and couples are not covered by the bill. An effect of this exclusion is the provision of a "first baby" bonus.

The only groups excluded from the protection of H.R. 1 are single persons and couples not otherwise eligible for Social Security benefits. The reason such people were excluded was financial—including such persons would add to the cost of the program. One effect of this exclusion is that a couple with no income and no children gets no assistance, but if they have a baby, they will receive $2000 per year. The central point is that needy people are excluded from coverage and that such exclusion encourages poor people to have children.

4. The work requirements of H.R. 1 are financially meaningless, socially irresponsible, and economically dangerous.

The administration has estimated that at least one person in each of 2.6 million families will be required to register for employment and training under H.R. 1. Some families will have more than one registrant. The bill provides full funding for only 200,000 jobs for these registrants. In the second year the federal government will provide for only 75 percent of the cost of providing these jobs; after three years—50 percent and in the fourth year nothing. The bill contains only 400,000 training slots and the WIN program provides a good example of how effective the Labor Department is in training programs for people on welfare. As of December 31, 1970, of 511,000 AFDC recipients found appropriate for WIN training only five percent got jobs following completion of the WIN program. Even if the program of jobs and training was a great success, the bill requires over two million people to register with the Department of Labor for jobs, without even pretending to provide jobs or training for such persons.

Thus with an unemployment rate which continues to hover around six percent (and has continued to do so for nearly three years), the administration proposes that millions of persons be compelled to register for work—but has no plan to put them to work. The work compulsion segments of H.R. 1 are a fraud and the administration knows they are a fraud.

The work requirements are therefore meaningless because they will not increase employment—since jobs are not created by edicts which say that people must work. The work requirements are socially irresponsible because in talking about work requirements the general public will assume that something meaningful will be done to assure such employment. They are economically dangerous because such provisos are supported as is this one by guarantees that substandard wages (persons are required to accept jobs which pay 75 percent of the minimum wage—$1.20 an hour) are perfectly acceptable—even desirable. The key to economic adequacy for families as for nations does not lie in cutting the wages of those at the bottom. Currying to such sentiments is the mark of a contemptible program.

5. The administration's plan for operating H.R. 1, includes retention of state and local welfare programs, federalization of most of the local bureaucracy, (75,000 according to administration estimates given before the Senate Finance Committee), enlarging the existing iinvestigative and verification systems, dividing the administration of the program between HEW and the Labor Department, and retention of parts of the food stamp and commodity distribution program.

The effect of these and other similar administrative provisions of the bill guarantee that almost every repressive, inefficient, costly and bureaucratic part of the existing welfare structure will be retained in the new system. This is not reform. This is disease.

OTHER REFORM PROPOSALS: A $3,600 AND A $5,500 GUARANTEED INCOME

This section explores the extent to which negative income plans can be relied upon to solve the poverty problem in the United States. The redistributional implications of two alternative income maintenance plans, one with a poverty level guarantee and the other with a $5,500 guarantee, are considered. The distribution of benefits under each of these plans is compared against the incidence of new taxes required to finance them, and new transfer positions are computed by income class and family size. The magnitude of income redistribution in the middle and upper income ranges is shown to be substantial under both of the plans. (Under the $5,500 plan 52 percent of beneficiaries have current incomes of $6,000 or more and receive some 46 percent of total gross benefits; 44 percent of beneficiaries under the $3,600 plan have incomes above $6,000 and receive 25 percent of the benefits.) Comparing this distribution of benefits against the surtax distribution required to finance it, it is seen that, given the structure of the positive and negative tax system, a substantial amount (18 percent under the $5,500 plan and 15 percent under the $3,600 plan) of the redistribution implied is lateral, i.e., from small to large families with the same total income. The total amount of redistribution affected under either plan, however, is probably of far greater significance. The cost of the $5,500 plan would exceed current welfare costs by some $71 billion and would require imposition of a 78 percent surtax on federal personal income taxes to finance it. The $3,600 plan would cost $25 billion and require a 28 percent surtax.

The basic characteristics of the plans considered are shown in Table 1. For both plans benefits are reduced by 50¢ for each dollar of earnings above $720 (the "disregard" is assumed to cover unavoidable work-related expenses). The break-even point is thus $7920 for a family of four under the $3600 plan and $11,720 under the $5500 plan. Except for Public Assistance, benefits are reduced dollar for dollar for all sources of unearned income including unemployment compensation. Social Security, and veterans pensions as well as property income.[5] Current Public Assistance benefits are ignored in computing income maintenance entitlements for a given family. However, such benefits are then subtracted from the new transfer payments, which are computed so that only net costs of the income maintenance plan over and above current welfare costs are shown in the estimates.

The computations employ the provisions for personal exemption and minimum standard deductions effective under current law in 1971. Since the Current Population Survey does not require reporting of realized capital gains, an imputation of 15 percent of the sum of property and self-employment income is made in computing taxable income. A further and more important adjustment must be made to account for the fact that the income surveys conducted by the Bureau of the Census generally account for only about 89 percent of comparable total money incomes aggregates, such as those which can be derived from the personal income series prepared by the Office of Business Economics. However most of the underreporting is known to be property income (CPS estimates of wage and salary income are 97 percent of those computed by OBE). Since the "missing" property income can be assumed to be primarily concentrated in the upper income classes, its exclusion should not significantly affect net program costs. However, on the tax

Footnotes at end of article.

revenue side, the effect of the underreporting is to understate projected personal income tax revenues by almost $12 billion out of a total projected revenue figure of about $93 billion in 1971. Because of the difficulty of imputing the underreported income to families on the basis of their reported incomes and characteristics, adjustment has been made by simply reducing the program costs by the amount of surtaxes which the missing taxes would have generated had they been included in the computations.[6] The result of this procedure is that, even ignoring induced effects, the amount of net transfer implied by the $3600 plan is understated by about nine percent and by about 12 percent for the $5500 plan. Nonetheless the amount of the redistribution accounted for is still of sufficiently great magnitude to be of considerable interest.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—GUARANTEE LEVELS AND UPPER LIMITS OF COVERAGE ALTERNATIVE INCOME MAINTENANCE PLANS ($3,600 AND $5,500) [1]

Family size	$3,600 plan		$5,500 plan	
	Basic guarantee	Break-even income [2]	Basic guarantee	Break-even income [2]
1	$1,125	$2,970	$1,675	$4,070
2	2,250	5,220	3,350	7,420
3	2,925	6,570	4,425	9,570
4	3,600	7,920	5,500	11,720
5	4,275	9,270	6,575	13,870
6	4,950	10,620	7,650	16,020
7	5,625	11,970	8,725	18,170
8	$6,300	$13,320	$9,800	$20,320
9	6,975	14,670	10,875	22,470
10 plus	7,650	16,020	11,950	24,620

[1] Basic characteristics of plans: $3,600 plan—$1,125 basic payment for each of 1st 2 family members, $675 payment for incremental family members. $5,500 plan—$1,675 basic payment for each of 1st 2 family members, $1,075 payment for incremental family members.

Benefit reduction formulae (tax rates)—both plans. 50 percent on earned income above $720. 100 percent on all unearned income except current public assistance benefits. 0 percent on public assistance and the 1st $720 of earned income.

[2] Earned income above Federal income taxes paid. Families with total family income in excess of the break-even point may thus be eligible for some payment because of the income tax deduction. Families with total incomes in excess of the break-even point may also be eligible for benefits if they currently receive public assistance benefits superior to those provided under the plans considered.

As shown in Table 2 the cost of transfers unde the $5,500 plan would be some $70.7 billion exclusive of current welfare costs of almost $3 billion and estimated administrative costs of some $2 billion. The plan would distribute benefits to some 34 million recipient units comprising about half the population of the United States. This huge cost is, of course, hardly surprising because the basic guarantee is, as observed earlier, superior to the earnings of a large part of the labor force. Given the estimated federal personal income tax revenues of some $93 billion in 1971, a surtax of 78 percent would be required to finance the plan—so that, for example, a taxpayer now paying a marginal tax of 35 percent of income would instead pay 62 percent on his last dollar of income. Looking at the distribution of coverage and gross benefits (i.e., benefits before imposition of the surtax) across income class, it is seen that close to half of the recipient families are in income classes not commonly thought of as poor. Fifty-two percent of beneficiaries have incomes of $6,000 or more and these families receive 46 percent of the total gross benefits; 36 percent of beneficiary families have incomes of $8,000 or more and receive about 30 percent of the total transfers. The average benefit per family remains relatively constant across the middle income ranges because, given the structure of the plan, the incremental income is offset by the increasing density of large families in the covered population in higher income brackets.

Table 3 shows the distribution of gross benefits by family size. As would be expected, given that the benefit levels are adjusted for family size, a disproportionate amount of the gross benefits under the plan are received by relatively large families. Thus, while families of five or more account for only 30 percent of recipient families they receive 51 percent of total benefits. Families of seven or more, while only eight percent of the caseload, command 20 percent of the payments.

TABLE 2.—DISTRIBUTION OF COVERAGE AND GROSS BENEFITS AND AVERAGE FAMILY BENEFITS BY INCOME CLASS, $3,600 AND $5,500 INCOME MAINTENANCE PLANS

Total family income	$3,600 plan					$5,500 plan				
	Percent of families [1]	Cumulative percent of families	Percent of gross benefits	Cumulative percent of gross benefit	Average benefit per family	Percent of families [1]	Cumulative percent of families	Percent of gross benefits	Cumulative percent of gross benefit	Average benefit per family
	[2] 18,566		[2] 24,908,000			[2] 34,022		[2] 70,653,000		
Negligible or $0	3.2	3.2	5.1	5.1	$2,168	1.7	1.7	2.7	2.7	$3,273
$1 to $999	9.1	12.3	9.8	14.9	1,450	5.0	6.7	5.7	8.4	2,367
$1,000 to $1,999	13.6	25.8	13.7	28.6	1,358	11.0	17.7	9.1	17.5	1,725
$2,000 to $2,999	11.6	37.4	12.7	41.3	1,470	8.8	26.5	9.1	26.6	2,161
$3,000 to $3,999	9.2	46.6	12.6	53.9	1,835	8.1	34.5	9.1	35.7	2,339
$4,000 to $4,999	10.1	56.7	11.5	65.4	1,517	6.9	41.4	9.1	44.8	2,740
$5,000 to $5,999	9.6	66.3	9.7	75.1	1,350	7.0	48.4	8.9	53.7	2,627
$6,000 to $6,999	8.1	74.4	7.8	82.9	1,299	7.2	55.6	8.3	62.0	2,409
$7,000 to $7,999	7.7	82.1	5.9	88.8	1,022	8.4	64.0	8.0	70.0	1,985
$8,000 to $8,999	7.2	89.3	4.7	93.5	873	7.9	71.9	7.8	77.8	2,034
$9,000 to $9,999	4.5	93.8	2.9	96.4	858	6.6	78.5	6.2	84.0	1,968
$10,000 to $10,999	3.0	96.8	1.6	98.0	732	6.2	84.7	5.1	89.1	1,694
$11,000 to $11,999	1.7	98.5	1.1	99.1	843	5.0	89.7	4.1	93.2	1,715
$12,000 to $12,999	.6	99.1	.4	99.5	887	3.2	92.9	2.0	95.2	1,313
$13,000 to $13,999	.4	99.5	.2	99.7	800	2.5	95.4	1.8	97.0	1,470
$14,000 to $14,999	.3	99.8	.2	99.9	750	1.9	97.3	1.3	98.3	1,379
$15,000 to $19,999	.2	100.0	.1	100.0	1,125	2.5	99.8	1.6	99.9	1,313
$20,000 and over	0	100.0	0	100.0	973	.2	100.0	.1	100.0	1,438
Total families	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1,342	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1,077

[1] Unrelated individuals are counted as 1 person families. [2] In thousands.

TABLE 3.—DISTRIBUTION AND COVERAGE AND GROSS BENEFITS BY FAMILY SIZE $3,600 AND $5,500 INCOME MAINTENANCE PLANS

Family size	$3,600 plan				$5,500 plan			
	Percent of families [1]	Cumulative percent of families	Percent of gross benefits	Cumulative percent of gross benefits	Percent families [1]	Cumulative percent of families	Percent of gross benefits	Cumulative percent of gross benefits
	[2] 18,566		[2] 24,908,000		[2] 34,022		[2] 70,653,000	
1	14.2	14.2	6.0	6.0	13.4	13.4	4.9	4.9
2	21.8	36.0	15.0	21.0	23.3	36.7	14.1	19.0
3	15.1	51.1	13.4	34.4	16.3	53.0	13.3	32.3
4	15.0	66.1	14.4	48.8	17.2	70.2	16.6	48.9
5	13.5	79.6	14.9	63.7	13.2	83.4	16.8	65.7
6	9.4	89.0	12.5	76.2	8.4	91.8	13.5	79.2
7	5.2	94.2	9.1	85.3	4.2	96.0	8.6	87.8
8	2.7	96.9	5.7	91.0	2.0	98.0	5.0	92.8
9	1.5	97.4	3.7	94.7	1.0	99.0	3.0	95.8
10 plus	1.6	100.0	5.4	100.0	1.0	100.0	4.1	100.0
Total families	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	

[1] Unrelated individuals are counted as 1 person families. [2] In thousands.

The $3600 plan, while it provides a basic guarantee considerably inferior to current poverty standards, is still a program of imposing magnitude. Financing the plan from the current tax base would require the imposition of a 28 percent surtax to meet the estimated new transfer cost of $25 billion plus administrative overhead. Nonetheless, the amount of redistribution effected would still be less than that currently carried out through the Social Security program, which, in 1969, transferred some $27 billion from wage and salary earners to aged and disabled retirees and survivors of covered workers.

As shown in Table 2, even with the lower guarantee there is a considerable amount of benefit leakage into the middle income classes. Forty-four percent of beneficiary families have incomes of $6000 or better and receive about 25 percent of the benefits. Eighteen percent have incomes of $8000 or more and receive 11 percent of total benefits. It is, of course, fully realized that much of the leakage into higher income brackets is justified by the notion that larger families have greater needs than smaller ones and hence are deserving of transfer support even if their income substantially exceeds popular notions of poverty. Preservation of work incentives through the tapering of benefits explains the residual leakage. But this of course is merely to reiterate the premises upon which the income maintenance plans considered were constructed. There is still a question whether such redistributional plans, in operation, are consonant with popular notions of equity and how such plans might be integrated into a society in which wage income is related to productivity rather than to family need (i.e., size).

The problem is put into sharper focus when we consider both sides of the coin, i.e., the benefit distribution and the corresponding revenue raising. Table 4 shows the distribution of coverage and net benefits by income class when incremental benefits are reduced by the surtax required to finance them. The net benefits as well as the number of net beneficiaries have, of course, declined since, for many families, what the assistance office gives with one hand, the Internal Revenue Service will now take with another. The effect is most pronounced in the $5500 plan where recipient units drop 17 percent and benefits by 15 percent as the result of the larger number of positive taxpayers covered by the plan and their relatively larger positive tax payments.

TABLE 4.—DISTRIBUTION OF NET BENEFITS BY INCOME CLASS $3,600 AND $5,500 PLANS

Income class	$3,600 Plan					$5,500 Plan				
	Number of net benefits families[1]	Cumulative percent of net benefits families	Percent of net benefits	Cumulative percent of net benefits	Average net benefit families	Number of net beneficiary families[1]	Cumulative percent of net benefits families	Percent of net benefits	Cumulative percent of net benefits	Average net benefit per family
Number in thousands	[2] 17,196		[2] 23,688,000			[2] 28,231		[2] 59,845,000		
Negligible or more	3.4	3.4	5.4	5.4	$2,168	2.1	2.1	3.2	3.2	$3,272
$1 to $999	9.8	13.2	10.3	15.7	1,450	6.0	8.1	6.7	9.9	2,367
$1,000 to $1,999	14.6	27.8	14.5	30.2	1,359	13.2	21.3	10.7	20.6	1,725
$2,000 to $2,999	12.3	40.1	13.3	43.4	1,489	10.5	31.8	10.7	31.3	2,148
$3,000 to $3,999	9.8	49.9	13.1	56.5	1,832	9.1	40.9	10.4	41.7	2,420
$4,000 to $4,999	10.8	60.8	11.6	68.1	1,478	7.9	48.8	10.1	51.8	2,719
$5,000 to $5,999	9.5	70.3	9.5	77.7	1,386	8.2	57.0	9.4	61.2	2,445
$6,000 to $6,999	8.2	78.5	7.6	85.2	1,266	7.9	64.9	8.4	69.6	2,236
$7,000 to $7,999	7.0	85.5	5.4	90.6	1,059	7.1	72.0	7.5	77.1	2,256
$8,000 to $8,999	5.5	91.0	4.1	94.7	1,017	7.8	79.8	7.0	84.1	1,888
$9,000 to $9,999	4.1	95.1	2.4	97.1	794	5.5	85.3	5.2	89.3	1,973
$10,000 to $10,999	2.5	97.6	1.3	98.3	701	5.4	90.7	3.9	93.2	1,510
$11,000 to $11,999	1.2	98.8	.9	99.2	1,029	3.3	94.0	2.9	96.1	1,835
$12,000 to $12,999	.4	99.2	.3	99.6	1,039	2.0	96.0	1.3	97.4	1,358
$13,000 to $13,999	.3	99.5	.2	99.8	792	1.6	97.6	1.1	98.5	1,414
$14,000 to $14,999	.2	99.7	.1	99.9	824	1.1	98.7	.7	99.2	1,475
$15,000 to $20,000	.1	99.9	.1	100.0	1,208	1.1	99.8	.8	99.9	1,508
$20,000 and over	[3]	100.0	.0	100.0	760	.1	100.0	.1	100.0	1,241
Total families	100.0		100.0		1,378	100.0		100.0		2,120

[1] Unrelated Individuals are counted as 1 person families.
[2] In thousands.
[3] Less than 0.1 percent.

TABLE 5.—DISTRIBUTION OF NET BENEFITS AND LOSSES BY INCOME CLASS AND FAMILY SIZE

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Income class	Family size						Sum of net benefits	Sum of net losses	Ratio losses/ benefits
	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 and over	Total			
$3,600 plan:									
Negligible to $999	$1,957.23	$1,080.50	$474.08	$163.31	$46.12	$3,721.24	$3,721.24	0	0
$1,000 to $2,999	2,367.77	2,158.01	1,244.12	570.23	210.55	6,550.69	6,566.73	$16.05	[1]
$3,000 to $4,999	458.04	1,998.65	1,650.85	908.31	574.29	5,590.14	5,846.19	256.04	.04
$5,000 to $6,999	−619.10	1,023.80	1,562.24	834.51	561.95	3,363.39	4,048.08	684.69	.17
$7,000 to $8,999	−1,088.19	−263.51	1,136.31	608.98	309.66	703.26	2,244.10	1,540.83	.69
$9,000 to $10,999	−1,087.91	−884.82	113.23	348.24	244.22	−1,267.04	868.11	2,135.15	2.46
$11,000 to $12,999	−950.28	−1,023.25	−363.44	89.32	177.26	−2,069.38	292.51	2,362.89	8.08
$13,000 to $14,999	−839.42	−1,032.83	−465.18	−63.89	58.15	−2,343.14	70.61	2,413.75	34.18
$15,000 to $19,999	−1,421.83	−2,002.36	−832.58	−174.94	−1.05	−4,432.74	29.47	4,462.21	151.42
$20,000 to $24,999	−728.80	−1,142.00	−542.24	−110.77	−21.47	−2,545.28	.76	2,546 04	3,350.05
$25,000 and over	−1,550.91	−2,302.81	−1,291.10	−235.19	−59.34	−5,439.35	0	5,439.39	
Total	−3,503.38	−2,390.60	2,686.29	2,938.16	2,100.32	1,830.79	23,687.81	21,857.02	.92
$5,500 plan:									
Negligible to $999	3,205.17	1,665.57	738.50	256.41	72.13	5,937.79	5,937.79	0	0
$1,000 to $2,999	5,769.39	3,707,96	2,029.77	930.09	338.72	12,777.91	12,810.24	33.24	[1]
$3,000 to $4,999	1,743.30	4,340.09	3,106.37	1,586.10	972.01	11,747.89	12,305.11	557.23	0.05
$5,000 to $6,999	−556.28	3,679.63	3,567.22	1,688.25	1,031.24	9,410.04	10,643.36	1,233.32	0.12
$7,000 to $8,999	−2,645.73	2,506.27	3,900.37	1,475.11	657.13	5,893.15	8,671.44	2,778.30	0.32
$9,000 to $10,999	−2,985.05	−326.59	2,951.14	1,182.70	575.99	1,393.15	5,390.40	3,992.20	0.74
$11,000 to $12,999	−2,609.93	−2,211.56	1,111.64	810.40	529.18	−2,370.24	2,515.93	4,886.17	1.94
$13,000 to $14,999	−2,305.46	−2,829.43	−224.02	524.82	310.74	−4,523.35	1,075.97	5,599.33	5.20
$15,000 to $19,999	−3,905.01	−5,492.99	−2,076.65	34.01	269.48	−11,171.16	457.49	11,628.65	25.42
$20,000 to $24,999	−2,001.64	−3,136.47	−1,487.37	−283.18	17.22	−6,891.44	36.86	6,928.30	187.95
$25,000 and over	−4,259.55	−6,324.62	−3,545.98	−645.94	−160.85	−14,936.93	0	14,936.93	
Total	−10,550.77	−4,421.14	10,070.98	7,558.74	4,613.01	7,270.83	59,844.61	52,573.77	.88

[1] Number less than 0.01 percent.

Of most interest is Table 5 which show, by income class and family size, the distribution of both net losses and net benefits under each plan. As is immediately apparent there is a sizeable amount of redistribution going on under both plans not only downward across income classes but also horizontally within each income class from larger to smaller families. Furthermore, some of the net losers, even under the $5,500 plan, are far from wealthy (e.g., single persons earning between $3,000 and $4,000 and couples earning from $4,000 to $5,000) whereas families of size 10 or more remain net beneficiaries up to $25,000 of income. Looking at family size redistribution alone, it is seen that under both plans families of four or less lose disposable income in the aggregate while those with five or more members gain. The last three columns of Table 5 show the amount of such horizontal redistribution within income classes.[7] Thus under the $5,500 plan small sized families with incomes between $4,000 and $4,999 experienced net losses of some $432 million while larger sized families received net benefits of $6.1 billion. The loser families thus paid some seven percent of the costs of providing benefits to the gainer families. In the income class between $10,000 and $11,000 almost all (93 percent) of the income redistribution is horizontal. From this viewpoint, it is seen that only above that income level do net losers begin to contribute to downward redistribution. Thus computed, the total amount of horizontal redistribution occurring under each of the plans is $3.8 billion under the $3,600 plan or 15 percent of total transfers and $12.7 billion under the $5,500 plan or 18 percent of total transfers.[8] Although the overall pattern of redistribution is, as one would expect, predominantly downward in the income distribution, there are some interesting practical consequences of this horizontal shift.

Let us suppose that eventually, as logic might suggest, the two tax systems—positive and negative—are integrated so that for each pay period a worker receives a check which, depending upon his income class and family size, has either been reduced by his net positive tax liability or increased by his net negative tax entitlement. This situation would arise under the $5,500 plan where worker A earning about $7,000 a year and with a wife and no children would receive an annual pay check some $370 lower than he received before, while his coworker earning the same nominal wage for the same work would, if he had two children, receive in effect an annual net bonus of about $1,800 and, if he had three, of about $2,900. To the extent that some people such as worker A may, perhaps increasingly as time goes on, regard the number of children one has a discretionary matter, (not totally unlike other consumption choices such as how many cars to own) they may well feel not a small bit "cheated".

Of course opposition to this horizontal redistribution is not likely to compare in magnitude with that directed against the imposition of a 78 percent surtax on middle and upper income families. If one seriously considers the establishment of a minimum income guarantee even approaching the $5,500 level, clearly some method must be found to reduce the total magnitude of the redistribution. The following alternatives might be considered:

1. Restrict benefits for additional family members, at least above the lowest income levels. This would, of course, require careful attention to avoiding "notches," or income reversals, as the family member bonus is phased out.

2. Minimize interregational redistribution by retaining area differentials in welfare standards. A good deal of the redistribution impiled by a national income maintenance standard occurs between high wage regions, such as the North, and low wage areas, such as the South. For example, under Family Assistance about 43 percent of the families covered will live in the South. Most of this regional imbalance is, of course, due to the fact that persons in the South are, in a real sense, poorer. However, a single national guarantee level is still inequitable because it provides a superior standard of living to those living in areas where the real cost of living is lower. There are however, both practical and theoretical problems in defining geographic welfare differentials. The current welfare system makes a rough adjustment for such differences by allowing each state to develop its own needs standard. Furthermore each state is allowed to decide what proportion of that need standard it can afford to pay. The result is that, despite compensatory matching formulae for the poorer states, federal dollars distributed very unevenly among equally poor people, with a disproportionate amount going to the richer states which have, typically, not only higher needs standards but more resources to meet them. To the extent that variations in state standards exceed cost-of-living differentials, the current system provides at least a prima facie incentive for the poor to migrate to states—typically urban states—where welfare standards are higher. If they are unable to obtain jobs in these areas, their migration may not only aggravate urban congestion but, further, raise true welfare costs (over and above the previously unmet need) by the real increase in the cost of living in an urban situation. The establishment of a national welfare standard should reverse this incentive.

The actual and potential impact of income maintenance on migration is not well understood, however. But there are other reasons for arguing against geographic welfare differentials. The most important is that it is very difficult to establish needs standards which reflect true differences in the cost of living. For example, it may be argued that the most commonly used cost of living indices reflect primarily differences in average purchasing power and the quality of available goods (particularly housing) rather than true economies of location.[9] Furthermore, on the basis of the data we do have, it appears that there is at least as great variation in living costs within geographical areas as among them, so that the use of conventional state boundaries to demarcate welfare standards is not justifiable.[10] Nonetheless given the unlikelihood of reducing welfare standards in the present high-payment states, the pressure by these states for maintenance of federal sharing in these benefits, and the extremely high cost of providing comparable benefits nationwide, it seems realistic to assume that state-by-state welfare differentials will persist. However, an increasing proportion of the difference may be provided in the form of in-kind benefits and services tailored by states and localities to their varying needs, with cash benefits increasingly financed and administered from the federal levels.

3. Replace most if not all other government transfer programs by a single integrated income maintenance program. This result can be achieved indirectly by offsetting other transfer income dollar-for-dollar against the income maintenance benefit. The imposition of the "100 percent tax" on other transfer income, given an income maintenance program of substantial level and coverage, should severely diminish working class support for work-related transfer programs such as unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and even Social Security inasmuch as, within broad income ranges, there would be no net benefit accruing from the contributions of such programs. However, the net cost saving from such integration would not be as large as might be imagined because, for much of the population, we would simply be substituting one form of transfer for another. However, savings would result from minimizing the leakage of benefits to relatively affluent families, which occurs under programs which are not specifically tailored to total family need.

There is of course an appealing neatness about abolishing the current hodge-podge of income maintenance programs, with their varying types of inequity and inadequacy, and replacing them by a smoothly tapered, fully integrated system. There is also perhaps a danger in such a move. Most of our income maintenance systems—such as Social Security, Unemployment Insurance, and Workman's Compensation—are still clearly tied to the maintenance of work effort and productivity. For this very reason they in large part serve the working class. In fact, under these programs, this very restriction of benefits to persons with stable earning histories has given impetus to the broadening of the public assistance type of coverage to those who, for one reason or another, can't make it in the world of work.

There is simply no way of accurately measuring the economic and social effects of shifting the emphasis in income maintenance programs from the notion of self-protection to that of guaranteeing minimum need satisfaction. The issue will no doubt be debated for many years to come. In any case, it is unlikely that the problems of providing an adequate level of living for the nation's poor can be solved through a single structural reform of our income maintenance system. As the needs of the poor are diverse so must the tools to meet them be, and it is likely that, despite the realization of much-needed reform in national income maintenance programs, we will continue to place partial reliance on a variety of categorical and in-kind programs—including social services; housing, health, and day care subsidies; emergency and special needs cash assistance; and wage-related subsidy and manpower programs for the employable poor.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, data are for 1967. Many of the statistics in this section are taken from the 1969 *Economic Report of the President*, Chapter 5 of the Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisors, pp. 151–179.

[2] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *The People Left Behind*, U.S. Government Printing Office, May, 1968, p. 3.

[3] Worked "part of the time" means held a full-time job part of the year or a part-time job all or part of the year.

[4] Wilbur J. Cohen, "A Ten-Point Program to Abolish Poverty", *Social Security Bulletin*, December, 1968.

[5] The ultimate effect of this 100 percent tax on all sources of transfer income other than income maintenance would, given a relatively high benefit level, be to drive these other programs out of existence since few, if any of them, provide comparable benefits, especially for large families, and no net advantage would accrue to the majority of their recipients. However, taxing such benefits at 50 percent or zero percent would raise program costs by several billion dollars.

[6] Thus in the $5500 plan the net cost is some $70.7 billion in transfers plus an estimated $2.0 billion in administrative costs. Assuming tax revenues of $93 billion in 1971 the required surtax to meet this cost is 78 percent rather than the 89 percent surtax needed to generate the required revenues from the reported tax base.

[7] The first of the three columns is the sum, computed on a family by family basis, of the

benefits in excess of new taxes received by all families, within a given income class, whose benefits exceed their surtaxes. The "sum of net loss" column is similarly computed for all net loser families. The sums of the two columns are not equal because of the unreported income problem discussed earlier.

[8] The amount of horizontal transfer is computed as the sum of all net losses for income classes in which net benefits exceed net losses, plus the sum of all net benefits for income classes in which net losses exceed net benefits.

[9] See "Area Cost of Living Differentials" in The President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, Background Papers. pp. 87–93.

[10] *Ibid.*

NATIONAL CITIZEN DAY

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker on September 17 I was privileged to attend the 34th annual National Citizen Day Observance in Columbus, Ohio. This cooperative community program is sponsored by patriotic, civic, religious, education, and service organizations to honor our newly naturalized citizens. One of the new citizens, Mario Rolando Diaz, spoke simply, but eloquently, about what it was like to live in the Cuba he left and what he has come to feel about his new home in America. His words would give us pause to reflect upon a way of life and the freedoms we so often take for granted.

Fellow Americans.

It is indeed a great honor for me to give the response for the New Citizens.

My native land is Cuba and I was forced to leave it because there was no freedom there. Most of the Cuban believed in a man said he was a democrat and made many promises for better living and free elections in 18 months (he has almost 14 years). I am going to make everybody the same he said, and certainly he did it—he made everyone equal, but in the lowest level of poverty and hunger.

When my wife and I arrived in this great country, we had nothing but the clothes we were wearing. As you know, when you decide to abandon a communist country. You must leave them all your properties—your home, furniture, car, bank account, everything you own; the only thing you can take with you are your clothes because they can't send you here nude, and your brains, over which they have no control.

We started a new life here, with the generous help of the American people. That is why we have become citizens of the most generous nation of the world, "One Nation Under God, Indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for All."

We are able to appreciate all of this because of our sad experience of having lived in a communist system. Against our will.

We are proud to be American citizens. During the preparation period we learned many things, not only our rights, but also we learned our duties and responsibilities and we shall continue studying to learn more about our new country, its ideals, achievements and goals, and realize contributions we as new citizens can make toward all of this.

In that way we think we can repay your generous hospitality and the privilege of being an American and will be able to help to preserve the dreams of peace and security of our country.

God bless America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from Wednesday, September 20, through Friday, September 29, on account of official business (House delegation to Interparliamentary Union Conference).

Mr. HOSMER at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week of September 25, on account of attendance at the International Atomic Energy Conference at Mexico City.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. MCKAY to extend his remarks immediately following Mr. SIKES on the bill, H.R. 16754.

Mr. SIKES and to include extraneous matter and tabulations on the bill, H.R. 16754.

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $467.50.

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $722.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. CÓRDOVA.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. SPRINGER in two instances.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. KEATING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT.

Mr. BEGICH in two instances.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. MANN in six instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. HANNA in three instances.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 164. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to public museums; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 244. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus personal property to State fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 555. An act to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 718. An act to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2280. An act to amend sections 101 and 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to implement the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to amend title XI of such Act to authorize the President to suspend air service to any foreign nation which he determines is encouraging aircraft hijacking by acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2300. An act for the relief of J. B. Riddle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2567. An act to facilitate prosecutions for certain crimes and offenses committed aboard aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3327. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, health care resources, and the establishment of a Quality Health Care Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3716. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for continued assistance for health facilities, health manpower, and community mental health centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3947. An act to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woodsy Owl," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week beginning October 15, 1972, as "National Drug Abuse Prevention Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to designate the week which begins on the first Sunday in March of each year as "National Beta Club Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4383. An act to authorize the establishment of a system governing the creation and operation of advisory committees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7614. An act to amend titles 5, 10, and 32, United States Code, to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of certain erroneous payments, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9032. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Havasupai Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 91, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9135. An act to amend the Act of August 19, 1964, to remove the limitation on the maximum number of members of the board of trustees of the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden;

H.R. 10486. An act to make the basic pay of the master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard comparable to the basic pay of the senior enlisted advisers of the other Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13697. An act to amend the provisions of title 14, United States Code, relating to the flag officer structure of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week in November of 1972 which includes Thanksgiving Day as "National Family Week";

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October of 1972 as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week"; and

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution designating, and authorizing the President to proclaim, February 11, 1973, as "National Inventors' Day".

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 22, 1972, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6575. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma," approved October 31, 1967 (81 Stat. 337);

H.R. 7616. An act to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard;

H.R. 8215. An act to provide relief for certain prewar Japanese bank claimants;

H.R. 12207. An act to authorize a program for the development of tuna and other latent fisheries resources in the Central, Western, and South Pacific Ocean;

H.R. 14173. An act for the relief of Walter Eduard Koenig;

H.R. 15865. An act for the relief of Richard L. Krzyzanowski;

H.R. 15927. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 20 per centum increase in annuities, to simplify administration of the act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1193. A joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week which begins on September 24, 1972, as "National Microfilm Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 26, 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:

2354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2355. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the scope of tort liability of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2356. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Administration, transmitting the report for fiscal year 1972 on Commerce Department commissary activities outside the continental United States, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1514(b); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2357. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled, "Typical Electric Bills, 1971"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2358. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the creation of an international center to make sites available for chanceries of foreign embassies in Washington and for a new headquarters for the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Public Works.

2359. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 25, 1972, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Pascagoula River Basin, Miss. and Ala., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 14, 1961, and June 7, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 92–359); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2360. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 1, 1972, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Pearl River Basin, Miss. and La., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted June 6, 1939, and Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 92–282); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2361. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 11, 1972, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Missouri, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 92–360); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

2362. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 14, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Spring River and tributaries, Mo., Kans., and Okla., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 24, 1963, and May 8, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 92–361); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2363. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 30, 1972, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Little River Inlet, N.C. and S.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted September 23, 1965, and two resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted October 5, 1966, and October 19, 1967 (H. Doc. No. 92–362); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

2364. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 2, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Point Place, Toledo, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted October 5, 1966 (H. Doc. No. 92–363); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

2365. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 6, 1971, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Edwards Underground Reservoir, Guadalupe, San Antonio and Nueces Rivers and tributaries, Texas, authorized by section 209 of Public Law 86–645, approved July 14, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 92–364); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2366. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 1, 1972, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Virginia Beach, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 14, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 92–365); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2367. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting two reports of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1972 on programs for the sharing of medical facilities and for exchange of medical information, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 5057; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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 ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 7742 (Rept. No. 92–1430). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 8694 (Rept. No. 92–1431). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 10858 (Rept. No. 92–1432). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 6797 (Rept. No. 92–1433). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 3337 (Rept. No. 92–1434). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany S. 166 (Rept. 92–1435). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 10243 (Rept. No. 92–1436). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1132. A resolution waiving points of order against H.R. 16754. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92–1437). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1133. A resolution providing for agreeing to House Joint Resolution 1227. Joint resolution approving the acceptance by the President for the United States of the Interim Agreement Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (Rept. No. 92–1438). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1135. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1121. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Gateway National Seashore in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 92–1439). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1136. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16645. 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 (Rept. No. 92–1440). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12006. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92–1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1316. An act to amend section 301 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and section 5 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, so as to increase from 50 to 80 percent the amount that may be paid as the Federal Government's share of the costs of any cooperative meat or poultry inspection program carried out by any State under such sections; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 16656. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 92–1443). 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. BEGICH:

H.R. 16792. A bill to promote the development within the United States and foreign countries of American arts and handcrafts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16793. A bill to prohibit the use of certain small vessels in U.S. fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLANCY (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 16794. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 16795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the authorization of means other than stamps on containers of distilled spirits as evidence of taxpayment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 16796. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small nonindustrial private and non-Federal public forest land owners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 16797. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Exposition on the Environment to be held in Spokane, Wash., in 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16798. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the sale of livestock shall be treated as an involuntary conversion where the taxpayer sold such livestock solely on account of the destruction of the barn or other facility used to house such livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 16799. A bill to establish a program to assist individuals and State and local governments in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 16800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that taxpayers shall not be required to reduce the amount of casualty loss deductions by the amount of reimbursement anticipated from the cancellation of certain Federal loans made in the case of certain disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 16801. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide rules for the treatment of prisoners in Federal correctional institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H.R. 16802. A bill to strengthen and expand the Headstart program, with priority to the economically disadvantaged, to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of NEW JERSEY, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 16803. A bill to strengthen and expand the Headstart program, with priority to the economically disadvantaged, to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 16804. A bill to rename the Mineola dam and lake as the Carl L. Estes dam and lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 16805. A bill to amend Public Law 91–508 to limit the disclosure of bank records by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 16806. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that one-half of any social security benefit increases provided for by Public Law 92–336 be disregarded in determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16807. A bill to require States to pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits at least half of the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1306. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 1307. Joint resolution providing for a special deficiency payment to certain wheat farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H. Con. Res. 709. Concurrent resolution on the need for national commitment to find a system for settling international disputes without war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 16808. A bill for the relief of Howard Lindberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 16809. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Calvin O. Schofield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 710. Concurrent resolution extending the greetings and felicitations of Congress to the American Public Health Association on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

285. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Representatives, Dutchess County, N.Y., relative to legislation proposed by Hon. HAMILTON FISH, to amend the National Housing Act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.