fense forces which has occurred in recent years. I support proposals for further drastic cuts with a great deal of caution. Although this Administration has made sizeable savings in our defense establishment, we have not and we will not increase strength for expediency or undermine our national security by trading substance for promise.

Because we have maintained adequate strength, we have been able to open avenues of negotiation that were not possible four years ago:

Who in 1968 could have confidently predicted that an American President would be in the position of considering and cooperating between these two adversary powers?

Or in American President in Moscow achieving significant agreements on a host of important issues—most significantly on the historic first agreement to limit strategic nuclear weapons?

Who in 1968 would have been confident that the four great powers would reach an agreement to reduce tension on Berlin, or that East and West Germany would begin to deal directly after more than 28 years of hostility?

Such negotiations represent a remarkable achievement, and I'm proud of the support that the Department of Defense has been able to give them.

In the future, under President Nixon's leadership, we will continue to build on this negotiating framework established in the past four years.

Along with our European allies, we will work to achieve an agreement with the Warsaw Pact nations for Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions. This is a feasible goal—an achievable goal, one that will enhance security in Europe, but we must maintain our strength. One fact is certain, we will not achieve any such objective if we cut our force in half, as some advocate, without receiving anything in return from the other side. That's a pure giveaway program.

We are preparing for further negotiation with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation. We can expect progress in this field of arms control, but not if we unilaterally cut our nuclear deterrent force.

I want to assure the people of this area, who are so sensitive to the welfare of those in Viet Nam, that in uniform, that we will continue to use every available approach to bring about the return of American prisoners of war and an accounting of prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. This we can and will achieve—but not if we supinely pull all our forces out and place our enemy's gain in the sun. I urge you to remind us that this is an enemy who continues to disregard the humanitarian provisions of the Geneva Convention.

The encouraging negotiations that go on today occur because our country, in partnership with our friends, is strong. Any undermining of this strength would diminish the prospects for negotiating solutions to the critical problems of the world.

In answering the question of providing adequate defense strength is one that will be decided by the American people and by your representatives in Congress. The power is with you and the many thousands of citizens like you to decide this issue.

It is encouraging to add that such a group such as the National Association of Supervisors of American Prisoners of War and of Civilian Employees can do the job—

Truly, in the hope that the all-volunteer force is providing an ever-growing number of motivated, capable young men and women, they will be better organized, better led, and more efficient than their predecessors.

Our civilian employees too will be fully capable of meeting this challenge. I'm encouraged by the growth of supervisory organizations such as the National Association of Supervisors and the leading role that such organizations have taken in defining the contribution of middle-management to the overall defense effort. We look to you for the vital leadership that will improve productivity and permit us to do the job more efficiently.

Civilian and military, we are working together to achieve a generation of peace. President Nixon has led us closer to this goal, with wise and strong leadership in the future, we will make this goal a reality.

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

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.—1 Thessalonians 5: 21.

O Thou holy and merciful God, who seeks us when we go astray and who redeems us warmly when we return with the coming of a new day we would quietly lift our hearts unto Thee in prayer. For this day of Thy grace grant unto us courage, faith, and good will that in meeting the needs of our Nation we may not fall man nor Thee.

Deliver us from bigotry and bitterness, from pettiness and prejudice. Keep us devoted to the higher values and greater virtues which give to life meaning and purpose and which hold us steadfast in the struggle for freedom, Justice, and peace in our world.
"God of justice, save our people
From the clash of race and creed.
From the skies of class and faction
Make our Nation free indeed.
Keep her faith in simple goodness,
Strong as when her life began;
Thy peace and Thy comfort abide
In all our hearts. Amen.
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The SPEAKER. On this rolcall 250 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1169) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 1169
Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members on the part of the House of the Committee to Notify the President, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we do not always show our appreciation for a job well done until someone makes the decision to move on and clear the way for the others to move to the scene. In this case, I am pleased, as so many of my colleagues have done in the past, to join in saying, "Thank you, "Doc" HALL, for the splendid and worthy service that you have performed in the House of Representatives in remembering the rules under which we are supposed to operate and, more important, acting as a watchful eye to make sure that we have not cut corners when it would have been very easy to do so.

Since we both arrived at this public body, the House of Representatives, together in January of 1961, I, along with many others, have admired your принцип stand and just plain courageous position of acting as the conscience of the House. Your contributions have been and are so just sure that we have not cut corners when it would have been very easy to do so.

There are so many things on which I could comment, but because I know you also are opposed to having our Reconsideration filled with reams of material, I will merely list a few of the more constructive achievements that your efforts have added to the House of Representatives.

You have worked long and hard to make sure that any so-called reform activity in the House would not run roughshod over principles of procedure that are needed to protect a minority group or a so-called unpopular position. Yet, you were in the forefront of those anxious to provide needed changes in the 1970 Reorganization Act which would contribute to sensible legislative process rather than legislation by whom unduly minority.

Your willingness to serve what in effect was the entire membership, together with our colleague H. R. GRoss, of Iowa, by being on the floor every day for the most every single moment of floor activity, was a service appreciated by even those temporary antagonists who might have become disgruntled because you raised appropriate points of order or even asked for a quorum call because not enough Members were willing to listen.

Thank you, "Doc" HALL, for all you have done to serve your country, your State of Missouri, your district, and especially the U.S. House of Representatives which you have tried valiantly to make a more responsible institution.

HON. WILLIAM McCULLOCH

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, une-
posts during his outstanding career in the legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have known Bill McCulloch have grown to respect him and to hold a great affection for him. We will miss Bill McCulloch greatly.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we will not only miss Bill McCulloch, but we will miss his wonderful wife Mabel and their daughter Nancy just as much.

I wish to both Bill and Mabel the very finest in health and happiness in their years ahead.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Albert, Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the two distinguished gentlemen, the Dean of the House and the minority leader, in this word of tribute to Bill McCulloch on his departure from this Chamber. He has been a leader in the field of civil rights, and in many other areas of legislation coming out of the great Committee on the Judiciary.

His wife, Mabel, and my wife, are very close personal friends. My wife considers her a dear friend, and I have known my good friend Bill McCulloch for many years. He is a man who has known my good friend Bill McCulloch for many years. He is a truly distinguished gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Rodino. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished Members of this great body and with the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the gentleman from Ohio in the House in this well-deserved tribute to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable William McCulloch.

Bill McCulloch has, with Mr. Celler, been the foremost in championing the rights of individuals. He, too, has established for himself a record in the field of human rights. For it was he, along with the chairman of our Judiciary Committee, who led the fight for the landmark civil rights legislation in the 1960's.

A compassionate and sensitive individual, Mr. McCulloch stood always firm in his insistence that the basic rights of all men, guaranteed in the Constitution, be dened to no one. And, through all my years of association with him as a member of the Judiciary Committee and as chairman for many years, I have found this great depth of understanding for the needs and rights of this fellow man to remain uppermost in his mind and to serve as the motivating factor in his leadership on the floor as well as in the great committee on the Judiciary. As a colleague, I salute him for his outstanding accomplishments and wish him and his gracious lady, Mabel, many more fruitful years.

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

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

Mr. Reid. Mr. Speaker, Bill McCulloch, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee is a Member of conviction and compassion. He is the great defender of courage in this House, and when the voting rights bill was under attack by this administration, he stood and stanch to ensure its passage, and we all know that that every man and woman would have the right to vote.

I wish Bill and Mabel the very best. Bill McCulloch has honored this House by his service.

Bill McCulloch ranks as one of the great members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and a man whose arm could never be twisted. He fought for the future of this Constitution and for all the American people. Courage shines out in Bill McCulloch, and again I wish him and his family many happy years back in his beloved Ohio.

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

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

Mr. Minshall. Mr. Speaker, I certainly join in all the fine things that have been said here today about my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Bill McCulloch. I have known my good friend Bill McCulloch for many years. These fine tributes to this great public servant are most fitting—for I have not only known of his distinguished service in the House but I have also had the privilege of serving with him when he was Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to advise the House that I have obtained a special order at the conclusion of today's business not only to yield to Bill McCulloch, our distinguished colleague, but to Frank Bow and Jack Betts who as you all know are retiring from the House but would also like to say that I ask unanimous consent that all Members will have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks in gratitude for the service rendered by Bill McCulloch in this House over so many years.

As a new Member I had an opportunity to observe him in the House and to work with him. I appreciate the great help and support he gave in helping me to come on the Committee for the Judiciary and to work with him in this way.

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

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

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

Mr. GUIDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as a junior Member of the House, I would like to join in these most eloquent words of praise by the chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Since his election to the House in 1947, Bill McCulloch has served his party, his constituents, and the Nation with the highest distinction and honor. As the ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee since 1959, he had played a major role in the passage of landmark legislation.

Bill McCulloch's leadership in the field of civil rights marks him as one of the greatest statesmen in the Republican Party and in the Nation. Civil rights bills in 1964, 1965, 1968, and 1970 might well have failed passage had it not been for Bill McCulloch's persuasive, determined efforts. School desegregation, public accommodation, voting rights, and employment safeguards were included in these bills and represented major progressive steps.

The Safe Streets Act amendments also bear the personal stamp of Bill McCulloch's subcommittee efforts. This legislation passed without amendments either in committee or on the floor.

As a ranking Congressman, Bill McCulloch has received many awards and honors. One of the most distinguished was from the American Bar Association for distinguished public service. The American Bar Association, the oldest bar association in this country and was the first time the ABA has made such an award.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the tribute to Bill McCulloch upon his retirement. His service in this body will be sorely missed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think this session of the Congress will witness in the departure of Bill McCulloch one of the real giants of this or any other Congress. He has written for himself, and I think more importantly for the entire country, the kind of imperishable record of public service that will stand forth from the Congress to the cause of civil rights a record that will be difficult for any Member of this body, or any Member of a future Congress to surpass.

Only very rarely does our Nation owe such a debt of gratitude to one man as they do to Bill McCulloch. Without his steadfast courage and inspiring leadership we would not pass some of the truly landmark civil rights legislation during that turbulent and difficult decade of the 1960's. Without rancor and with cool, calm reason he stood like a prophet of old in the well of this House and reminded all of us of our solemn duty and responsibility under the Constitution.

I had the opportunity on occasion to travel to his home district in the State of Ohio at his invitation and to speak at a dinner being held in his behalf. It gave me the opportunity to see the affection and respect in which he is held by the people whom he represents.

We will miss you, Bill McCulloch.
Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join with the others in paying my humble respects to two great men who are leaving the Committee on the Judiciary, its chairman and its ranking minority member BILL McCULLOCH.

It has been my privilege to have known these two men. Not being a lawyer, I do not know them; but as humanists it is unnecessary for us to have the respect of this House.

As far as BILL McCULLOCH is concerned, we became very friendly many years ago, and this friendship has deepened, and I revered him just as I reverence the chairman.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman in the well for giving me the privilege of joining him and others in the pleasues for a tribute to BILL McCULLOCH.

At a time when so many shafts of criticism are hurled at men and women in public service, it is a great privilege for me, a non-lawyer, and a man of conscience like BILL McCULLOCH, who has so long served this House and our country. Had I one tribute to pay to BILL McCULLOCH, I would say he was a man of conscience. He sought not to serve his party but his country. So many times have I heard him make his moving appeal to the Committee on Rules, and to this House. We knew when BILL McCULLOCH spoke he was speaking not only out of his great knowledge of our country’s history, out of his deep dedication to our country’s welfare, but he was speaking from a sensitive heart, a heart concerned about the well-being of his fellow citizens.

I join with all my heart in the accolades paid to BILL McCULLOCH and in revering his service here, wishing him and his wife and loved ones, many, many, many happy years hereafter.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, many fine statements have been made concerning the work and character of our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. McCULLOCH.

All words which have been spoken, however, do not suffice to describe the reality of the gentleman’s statesmanship or his service to our country.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a high personal pleasure and privilege for me to take up my colleagues here this afternoon in their absence and extend a hearty tribute to one of this country’s most distinguished national public servants, the Honorable William M. McCulloch, of Ohio, who is voluntarily retiring from the U.S. House of Representatives at the end of this session.

During the course of his continuing distinguished legislative service in this national legislature, over these past 24 years, years marked by an unexample of the highest personal character and integrity, his progressive accomplishments have been indelibly inscribed in the annals of our congressional history and they will continue to stand as an inspiring reflection of a quiet, but great man, serving his district, his State, and his country, in accord with the highest traditions of American patriotism, courage, and idealism. It has been by high honor to serve with him on the House Judiciary Committee, where he is the ranking minority member, and his impartial cooperation and leadership have resulted in the passage of landmark legislative achievements that will be of lasting benefit to all the people of this Nation.

Congressman BILL McCULLOCH’s legislative accomplishments and his contribution to the passage of innumerable measures in the national interest, without mention of his steady defense for the cause of women.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I must say I have endeared myself even more to his colleagues here and you, in the years he has been with us as one of the greatest leaders who have ever served in this body.

However, BILL McCULLOCH has endeared himself even more to his colleagues here and you, in the years he has been with us as one of the greatest leaders who have ever served in this body.

BILL McCULLOCH will always remain as an enlightening and guiding legend to every individual who will come after him to serve his district and his country in this national Chamber.

As he leaves this U.S. House of Representatives, at the end of this session, we assure him that he does so with the highest measure of esteem and gratitude from all his colleagues and I know we all join in wishing him continuing success and happiness in all his future endeavors.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend this tribute to the most distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch). He will take something quite substantial with him when he leaves.

He will take with him the expertise, wisdom, judgment, and leadership that have served him and us and the country well during his many years of dedicated work in this Congress. All of us will miss him all the more for that.

One of the many examples of his virtue of defending the rights of the underdog was when others were silent was his underdogging and advocacy of equal rights for women.

I daresay his bright and progressive wife and daughter had something to do with it.

But, Mr. Speaker, we honor a great man, which we can always afford to do. We lose a great man, and that we can never afford.

I join the gentleman every success.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and a next-door neighbor of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Bill McCulloch, I should like to associate
myself with all of the good things so
justly said about him here today.

Like our chairman, Mr. Celler, Mr. McCulloch, and the comparatively few Members of Congress whose presence here has made a difference in the life of the country, and has left its mark upon the laws and statutes of the United States.

I appreciate the opportunity I have had to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary with the gentleman from Ohio, and the distinguished member from California, and also the uniform courtesy and consideration which I have received at his hands.

In common with my colleagues I sincerely wish for Bill McCulloch, and for his gracious wife, many years of happy and useful life, in their beautiful home in Piqua, Ohio.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion as we sit together in legislative consideraciones, both of the last time, I want to pay tribute to one of the outstanding Members of this body for over 25 years. Nothing I can say would add measurably to the recognition and awards which have been bestowed upon him down through the years as result of his services to the country, and has left its mark upon the laws and statutes of the United States.

Bill has been an outstanding Member of the United States Congress, and an example to all the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, his voice was always listened to, because he spoke from a keen knowledge and appreciation of the law.

In the memories of our years in the House of Representatives are many instances when we have asked for the counsel of Bill McCulloch, and he has always given it. He will be sorely missed by Congressmen, both here in the House and the other States, and I am sure that we will continue to seek him out wherever he may be to ask his advice on the complex issues which confront us.

My respect and admiration. I wish him great happiness as he returns to his home in Piqua, Ohio, in retirement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 6 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of Representatives FRANK T. Bow, JACKSON E. BETTS, and William M. McCulloch, all of Ohio.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Senate of the United States:

The Senate have proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 2770) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it was agreed:

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972— VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate of the United States:

The pollution of our rivers, lakes and streams degrades the quality of America's waters. They have become increasingly polluted as we, through our lives, have engaged in activities that have detracted from their natural beauty. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which was enacted on Capitol Hill in 1972, has been a giant step in the fight against higher taxes. And some of the Members of this body have been lured to the wrong side of the issue. I am committed to the vital cause of environmental protection. The record speaks for itself. With the enactment of new legislation, our environmental agencies have been compelled to the President.

For this reason, I am compelled to withhold my approval from S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972—a bill whose laudable intent is outweighed by its unconscionable $24 billion price tag. My proposed legislation, as reflected in my budget, provided sufficient funds to fulfill that same intent in a less costly manner. Unfortunately the Congress ignored our other vital national concerns and broke the budget with this legislation.

Environmental protection has been my consistent theme in the Congress. Pending enactment of new legislation, our enforcement agencies have implemented new laws and regulations. As I have always done, I will continue to seek action on this bill, no matter how ill-advised, defies the President's authority.

The budget authority which I have requested for pollution control and abatement in fiscal year 1973 is more than four times the amount requested in 1969. Federal Government resources, which are already limited, cannot be used to finance this kind of program. This bill would have mandated that I have proposed, however, has been

within the strict discipline of a responsible fiscal policy—a policy which recognizes as the highest national priority the need to stabilize spending and to restrain Federal funds in the United States, 75 percent of which are used for the benefit of the people of America against tax increases and renewed inflation. Specifically, the water pollution control bill which I originally sent to the Congress last year was consistent with the long-range objective of a balanced, full-employment budget. It would have committed $6 billion in Federal funds over a three-year period, enough to continue and accelerate the movement toward a high standard of cleanliness which all of us want in America's waters.

The President's veto of the Senate's action as we sit together in legislative session is an indication that the time has come to turn our attention to the new legislative year. The process of reviewing the economy will be a matter of urgency. The record speaks for itself. With the enactment of new legislation, our environmental agencies have been compelled to the President.

For this reason, I am compelled to withhold my approval from S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972—a bill whose laudable intent is outweighed by its unconscionable $24 billion price tag. My proposed legislation, as reflected in my budget, provided sufficient funds to fulfill that same intent in a less costly manner. Unfortunately the Congress ignored our other vital national concerns and broke the budget with this legislation.

Environmental protection has been my consistent theme in the Congress. Pending enactment of new legislation, our enforcement agencies have implemented new laws and regulations. As I have always done, I will continue to seek action on this bill, no matter how ill-advised, defies the President's authority.

The budget authority which I have requested for pollution control and abatement in fiscal year 1973 is more than four times the amount requested in 1969. Federal Government resources, which are already limited, cannot be used to finance this kind of program. This bill would have mandated that

I am prepared for the possibility that the action on this bill will be overridden. The defeat of my proposal for a spending ceiling showed that many Senators and Congressmen are simply AWOL in our fight against higher taxes. And some of the Members of this body have been lured to the wrong side of the issue. I am committed to the vital cause of environmental protection. The record speaks for itself. With the enactment of new legislation, our enforcement agencies have implemented new laws and regulations. As I have always done, I will continue to seek action on this bill, no matter how ill-advised, defies the President's authority.

The budget authority which I have requested for pollution control and abatement in fiscal year 1973 is more than four times the amount requested in 1969. Federal Government resources, which are already limited, cannot be used to finance this kind of program. This bill would have mandated that I have proposed, however, has been

within the strict discipline of a responsible fiscal policy—a policy which recognizes as the highest national priority the need to stabilize spending and to restrain Federal funds in the United States, 75 percent of which are used for the benefit of the people of America against tax increases and renewed inflation. Specifically, the water pollution control bill which I originally sent to the Congress last year was consistent with the long-range objective of a balanced, full-employment budget. It would have committed $6 billion in Federal funds over a three-year period, enough to continue and accelerate the movement toward a high standard of cleanliness which all of us want in America's waters.

The President's veto of the Senate's action as we sit together in legislative session is an indication that the time has come to turn our attention to the new legislative year. The process of reviewing the economy will be a matter of urgency. The record speaks for itself. With the enactment of new legislation, our environmental agencies have been compelled to the President.

For this reason, I am compelled to withhold my approval from S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972—a bill whose laudable intent is outweighed by its unconscionable $24 billion price tag. My proposed legislation, as reflected in my budget, provided sufficient funds to fulfill that same intent in a less costly manner. Unfortunately the Congress ignored our other vital national concerns and broke the budget with this legislation.

Environmental protection has been my consistent theme in the Congress. Pending enactment of new legislation, our enforcement agencies have implemented new laws and regulations. As I have always done, I will continue to seek action on this bill, no matter how ill-advised, defies the President's authority.

The budget authority which I have requested for pollution control and abatement in fiscal year 1973 is more than four times the amount requested in 1969. Federal Government resources, which are already limited, cannot be used to finance this kind of program. This bill would have mandated that I have proposed, however, has been
Even if this bill is rammed into law over the better judgment of the Executive—even if the Congress deserts its obligation to the taxpayer—I shall not default mine. Certain provisions of S. 2770 confer a measure of spending discretion and flexibility upon the President, and if I choose to administer this legislation I mean to use those provisions to put the brakes on budget-wrecking expenditures as much as possible.

But the law would still exact an unfair and unwise penalty for the President’s veto message that the cost which Congress has placed on the survival of our environment—a cost arrived at after full and searching deliberation—is “unconscionable,” that America is not prepared to pay the price.

Mr. Speaker, this is a decisive hour in our Nation’s history. We have known for a long, long time, and the President has known for a long, long time, that this is a costly undertaking. But we know also that the people who are this greatest Nation on earth are prepared to pay the price of this undertaking, provided they are given a program that will restore and preserve the waters upon which our future depends.

We have produced such a program. We have set deadlines for our industries, and for our cities and towns, to clean up their waters, to make them fit for our children to swim in by 1983. We have set as a national goal the complete elimination of all pollution from our rivers, lakes, and streams by 1985. And we have authorized the President of the United States to use the money and the enforcement measures that are needed to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, just 1 day ago, this body approved that program by passing the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 by the overwhelming margins of 266 to 11.

Nothing has changed since that day. We knew then, and we know now, that the spending authorized in this legislation will have only minimal impact on the Federal budget until 1975, at the very earliest. And by that time, we have estimated, the tragic burden of Vietnam will have been lifted from America’s shoulders, that we shall once again be strong enough to meet our domestic responsibilities.

We cannot postpone action on our environmental crisis. The pollution that is fast destroying our waters will not go away by itself, nor can it be eliminated by halfway, bargain basement measures.

To those who say that we cannot afford to start now on the restoration of our waters, on the scale that Congress believes is essential, I say that we dare not postpone this undertaking. Every day of inaction most certainly will add to the ultimate cost; another year of inaction may well destroy all hope of saving our environment.

The price of action is high. But the price of inaction is a national disaster beyond all reckoning.

Mr. Speaker, this body must make its historic decision here and now, as the other body made its decision last night. To override a Presidential veto is a most serious and most unwelcome step that should be taken only on matters of overriding national interest. This is a matter of such outstanding national importance. I would recall to my colleagues these words, spoken at another time, in another place, on the very issue we face today:

...the 1970’s absolutely must be the year in which America brings to the public the story of the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its waters, and our living environment. It is literally now or never.

President Nixon made that statement on January 1, 1970. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the President’s call for action, and I call upon the House to overturn this veto.

Following the passage of the conference report, there has been an outpouring of support for this legislation just as there had been during its various stages of the legislative process. Although I could fill the record with hundreds of letters submitted to the President asking that he sign S. 2770, I would at this point present this letter from the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors exemplifying the kind of support this legislation has received.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing the needs and priorities of municipalities across the nation, strongly urge you to sign S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

We urge your signing of S. 2770 for the following reasons:

1. The magnitude of the problem and the need demands a major and continuing Federal commitment. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have estimated the total need of municipalities at approximately $35 billion between 1972 and 1977. This higher estimate than that submitted by EPA reflects demands for higher levels of treatment and also for the treatment of combined storm and sanitary flows. These considerations are omitted in the EPA needs studies, but are incorporated into the bill now before you.

2. The bill increases the Federal share to 75% of project costs. The budget request was based on the present lower, and variable, Federal share. Furthermore, S. 2770 provides practically $2 billion additional funds to reimburse municipalities for Federal shares owed, but for which adequate funds were not previously made available.

3. The budgetary impact of the expenditures authorized by S. 2770 will not be felt for several years because of the time-consuming capital construction process. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have urged the Congress to fund the grant program through an advanced commitment mechanism, as in the Federal Aid Highway program, to assure cities a long-term commitment of project funding throughout the length of the period needed to build treatment works.

4. Adequate means are available to the Administration to assure its debt discharge responsibility.

5. The fight to clean up the nation’s waterways has been led by the nation’s cities, by mayors, that level of government financially least well off. Cities have shown their commitment to financing treatment works at 70% of total costs, and consuming not only the local share, but paying the Federal share as well. Cities will not be able to continue to bear this burden alone and should be helped to this end by the time frames set out in the bill. It is time for the Federal govern-
ment to match the cities commitment to clean water. Unless realized that Federal commitment to spend the money to help build the treatment plants is made, we will have no alternative but to recognize that the time is up, for achieving the national goals of clean water will be postponed. There is no difference of opinion between the cities, the Congress and the Administration regarding the objectives. We stress, however, that the time schedules and fiscal resources are intrinsically related.

The money must be available to build the municipal treatment works. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, therefore, respectfully and most strongly urge you to sign S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

Sincerely,

John J. Gontier, Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors
Allen E. Peirce, Jr., Executive Vice President, National League of Cities.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has been so successful over the years in the leadership of the chief leaders in all of our efforts to hammer out a responsible program for this problem.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for those words.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is a city or community in America today which does not desperately require stronger water pollution control laws and methods now to clean it up or to keep it clean. The trouble is, we haven’t had until now the kind of laws or amount of money necessary to tackle this phenomenal job. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 would serve us greatly in this endeavor: In concept, in authorizations, and in the strength of its provision. The conference report on this problem was hammered out after an exhaustive debate with the other body, and I believe we can all be proud of the resulting proposal.

The fact that the President would veto this most important bill is most discourting. If it were a question of money, I fail to see the logic both legislatively and environmentally. The price tag is not small, but neither is the problem—and the bulk of this money, $18 billion goes for sewage treatment plants. It is perhaps the singlemost aspect of water pollution with which we can most readily deal and from which we can immediately benefit. It is the singlemost problem—inadequate municipal sewage treatment—which is the most widespread and acute. This cost is not only warranted but necessary.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have emphasized over and over again that if Federal spending must be curtailed, and if spending of the must affect water pollution control authorizations, the administration can impound the money.

I want to point out that the elimination of the word “all” before the word “sums” in section 205(a) and insertion of the phrase “not to exceed” in section 207 would enhance the President’s flexibility to control the rate of spending.

I might add, while this legislation does provide for contract authority, the presence of the so-called “buying power” contract authority in H.R. 18779, the bill I introduced in behalf of the administration some time ago.

Furthermore, if I may point out, the Committee on Public Works is acutely aware that moneys from the highway trust fund have been impounded by the Executive. Expenditures from the highway trust fund are made in accordance with similar contract authority provisions to those in this bill. Obviously, expenditures and appropriations in the water pollution control bill could also be controlled. However, there is even more flexibility in this water pollution control bill because we have added “not to exceed” in section 207, as I indicated before.

Surely, if the administration can impound moneys from the highway trust fund which does not have the flexibility of the language of the water pollution control bill, why can’t they control expenditures from the contract authority produced in this legislation by that same means?

Second, I would like to point out that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency must approve plans, specifications, and estimates. This is the pacing item in the expenditures of funds. It is one of the managers that under these circumstances the Executive can control the rate of expenditures.

Furthermore, I would like to call the attention of the Executive to the table on page 147 of House Report 92-911; the report of the Committee on Public Works on H.R. 11896. This table demonstrates the obligations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, is in fiscal year 1975. During that year the appropriations required for payment of obligations by this legislation would only be $2,450,000,000. The appropriations will be spread out over the period of construction of these waste treatment projects and would not be felt in any appreciable sum until fiscal year 1975, some 2 or 3 years hence.

As a matter of fact, for fiscal year 1973 if all the money were obligated and placed under contract, there would only be $20 million needed to meet the obligations and in fiscal year 1974 there would only be the necessity of appropriating $259 million. Obviously there is not a severe impact on the economy for the next 3 years under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the President was fully aware of the flexibility of this bill. In his veto message to the Senate, he states that if the measure is passed he would use the provisions in S. 2770 to curb the expenditures as much as possible.

Furthermore, the President also stated in his veto message that a veto would “by no means terminate the existing Federal water quality programs.” However, I must point out that the Refuse Act program is being held up in the courts and its effectiveness in the area of water pollution control has come to a grinding halt. Other than that, we had the 1965 Water Pollution Control Act, the enforcement provisions of which are so cumbersome they have proven to be ineffective—as even the administration itself has stated. It is the very amendments to that act we consider here today. If no new law is enacted, the water pollution control program dies, and with our rivers and lakes will continue to die.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point which I must raise. We have known all along that it would take a massive amount of money and time to reclaim and to protect our precious water resources. But, we dare not measure the cost of this water bill merely in terms of dollars alone. We cannot measure the wealth of our great natural resources in dollars alone—and if we wait too long, all the dollars on earth won’t buy back what we’ve lost. Under these circumstances, I am firmly convinced that the price of killing this water bill—of sustaining this Presidential veto—is far, far too costly.

I doubt there is one Member of the body who has not asked his constituents whether or not they were willing to pay the high price to achieve our national environmental goals. I don’t doubt that there is one Member of this body who could report years of legislative polling, his constituents objected. "Just get along on the legislation we need, before it gets any later," they told us. I believe the Congress of the United States has an overriding environmental commitment to the people of this Nation. We must keep it.

Furthermore, the President maintained that a veto to override the veto of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 was a vote to increase the likelihood of higher taxes. So far the public is prepared to pay for it. To say we can’t afford to support this action is to say we can’t afford to support life on earth.

When the administration is right, I will support the administration. However, when the administration is wrong, I will strongly oppose, and I do so today as I ask you to vote to override the President’s veto.

Mr. FEATHERSTONHAUGH, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has worked for 2 years on legislation which is vitally needed to undo the damage we have done to our Nation’s waters. Our country’s lakes and rivers are so badly polluted today. In 1970, the Public Health Service reported potentially harmful levels of chemicals in one-third of our drinking-water supplies. In 1971, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality reported that 90 percent of the watersheds in this country are polluted.

The Senate, by unanimous vote, and the House, by a 97 percent majority, have twice verified that they want this law to clean up our country’s waters. Rarely has the President shown poorer judgment—or a falsersense of economy—than in his decision to veto this measure.
Mr. O’NEILL. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has demonstrated his true commitment to the national commitment by vetoing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

In his veto message the President declared, "I can see no serious objection in the measure because he believed it would result in spiraling prices and increasingly onerous taxes."

By clinging to a concept of fiscal responsibility, the President hopes to conciliate both the American public and the Congress that he is concerned with environmental quality, and that it is Congress who must bear the ultimate blame for defeat for a far-reaching and drastically needed program to clean up the Nation’s waterways.

The President has used this ploy before, whether it be LAB’s HFW appropriations or the Child-Care Development Act. He is willing to pay lip service to the philosophy of ecological improvement and preservation, but he is unwilling to sign a bill that does the job.

I am sure that my colleagues in the House are aware of the importance of this measure. We must begin the important task of cleaning up our rivers, harbors, and lakes. Denying Minnesota, this program can only mean delay in our overall effort to meet the challenge of clean air and water.

If the President insists on hiding behind a false cloak of fiscal responsibility on this important issue, then the Congress must insure that the program passes over his objections.

Both in committee and in conference, I submit that it is a bill that we can all pride of. Therefore, let the President either sign the bill or sign the budget. I am confident that the American people will thank the Congress for enacting the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972. Should we fail to act, future generations of Americans living with dirty, unsafe rivers and lakes will know where to square fix the blame— with the Congress that refused to override the groundless objections of the President.

President Nixon stated in his veto message:

I have nailed my colors to the mast on this issue.

It is now up to Congress to nail our own colors to the mast on the issue of national water quality.
President Assistant John Ehrlichman stated at the White House press briefing yesterday that he had been instructed not to issue the veto unless the Senate rejected the conference report on the spending ceiling including the unconstitutional provision that the President may veto bills which are contrary to his special interest friends. By doing this the President is not facing the substantive issues that confront him and this Nation: the President is attempting to blackmail the Congress of the United States into making $24 billion in needed legislation even though he has vetoed over the 19 times the President has overridden the President's veto this year. It is appropriate to quote from Mr. Ehrlichman's own statement of October 17, 1972.

"I think Mr. Nixon has chosen the wrong time and the wrong issue to impose a veto. I believe he has failed all Americans, by proposing such a bill. Mr. Nixon has chosen the wrong time and the wrong issue to impose a veto. I believe he has failed all Americans, by proposing such a bill."
riding negative leadership on this vital matter. He has taken a dangerous position by suggesting we delay the beginning of a massive water pollution control program.

I am in total agreement with Senator Buckley's comments. Mr. Speaker, I think we all take this opportunity once again to comment on the provisions of the conference report (H. Rept. 92-1465, Sept. 18, 1972), on the Final Conference Amendments to section 128 of the Water Quality Amendments of 1972 (S. 2770) which we adopted on October 4, 1972, and which we are called upon to do again today in light of President Nixon's last minute veto yesterday, this important law.

At the outset, I want to reiterate my floor comments that appear in the October 4, 1972, Congressional Record at pages 33755 through 33759. As one of my colleagues later pointed out in his extension of remarks at page 33766 of the October 6, 1972, Congressional Record, I have participated fully in the House in the debate on this legislation, the final conference agreement of the House and Senate versions of the Reuss-Dingell clean water package of amendments which were offered during the March 1972 debate in the House floor comments that appear in the October 4, 1972, Congressional Record (S. 2770). Most of our amendments, or their substance, were adopted either during that debate or later by the House-Senate conferences. I hope, therefore, that my October 4th floor comments on this legislation as reported by the conferences will help the Environmental Protection Agency, the public, and the courts in the administration, enforcement, and interpretation of this bill.

Perhaps some of my comments may seem in conflict with those of the conference. That is simply because, in a few cases, the conferences' hurriedly drafted explanation of their language or state of the law or intention was not consistent with the statutory language itself. It is a fundamental rule of statutory construction that unambiguous statutory language controls the meaning, regardless of an explanation or intention. One example where my comments state, while the conferences' explanation is not consistent with, the statutory language, is as follows:

111(a)(2) of the law which defines the term "discharge" of oil and hazardous substances, page 33757.

Mr. Speaker, I once again draw attention to section 511(c) of the law which reads as follows:

"(c) (1) Except for the provision of Federal financial assistance for the purpose of assisting the construction of publicly owned treatment works as authorized by section 201 of this Act, and the issuance of a permit under section 402 of this Act for the discharge of any pollutant by a new source as defined in section 305 of this Act, no action of the Administrator taken pursuant to this Act shall be deemed to—"

(A) authorize any Federal agency to license or permit the conduct of any industry which may result in the discharge of a pollutant into the navigable waters to review any effluent limitation or other requirement established pursuant to this Act or the adequacy of any certification under section 401 of this Act; or

(B) authorize any action to impose, as a condition precedent to the issuance of any license or permit, any effluent limitation or other than the limitation established pursuant to this Act.

In my October 4, 1972, floor comments on this section, I stated (p. 33759):

The key words are in paragraph (1) of this section. They are: "A major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human or the environment is defined to mean words are found in section 102(2) (O) of NEPA which relates to the preparation and publication of environmental impact statements. Thus, under this provision, such statements will be required in the case of an application for a permit under section 402 for discharge of pollutants by a new source and in the case of publicly owned treatment works financed under this bill.

The other provisions of NEPA are, however, not affected by this language in paragraph (1) of section 511(c).

Section 511(c)(2) seeks to overcome that part of the Calverton section declaring AEC or any other licensing or permitting agency to make findings under NEPA where it deems matters. But it does not affect the obligations of those agencies to consider alternatives and other environmental factors such as the aesthetics, fish and wildlife, and so forth.

I am heartened to learn that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shares my view that the National Environmental Policy Act does not "re­tard" progress, but insures that progress be identified as the protection of the Nation's heritage in the broadest sense. Mr. Ruckelshaus made this statement in a letter to Congressmen Eckhardt and myself, dated October 3, 1972. He said:

"The National Environmental Policy Act provides an opportunity for Federal agencies to review and assess proposed Federal actions which have an impact on the environment. The Act clearly is not intended to retard progress but rather to insure that progress be identified as the protection of the Nation's heritage in the broadest sense."

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the distinguished Member from Alabama (Mr. Jones) and I appeared before the conferees' hurriedly drafted conference report on October 4, 1972, and discussed the meaning of NEPA as it was passed in 1969. In an apparent attempt to create post-legislative history, they both stated that NEPA does not apply to the "environmental protective regulatory activities of EPA," and that the intent of Congress was clear on this point at the time NEPA was enacted in 1969. In support of this statement, they both quote from a colloquy between the then chairman of the House Public Works Committee, Mr. Fallon, and myself, the then floor manager of NEPA, as follows:

Mr. Fallon. What would be the effect of the provisions on the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency?

Mr. Dingell. Many existing agencies such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency are charged with the responsibility of environmental control. The provisions of sections 102 and 103 are not designed to result in any changes in the manner in which they carry out their environmental protection authority. This provision is primarily designed to assure consideration of environmental matters by agencies in their planning and decision-making—but most especially those agencies which now have little or no legislative authorization to take environmental considerations into account.

Mr. Speaker, I totally disagree that this colloquy between Mr. Fallon and myself supports the contentions made by Congressmen Jones and Senator Muskie as I stated in 1969:

The provisions of NEPA are "primarily designed to assure consideration of environmental matters by agencies in their planning and decision-making—but most especially those agencies which now have little or no legislative authority to take environmental considerations into account."

I emphasize the words "most especially." In no way did I intend then or
now that NEPA was only to apply to agencies that have "little or no legislative authority to take environmental considerations into account." It clearly applies to EPA and all Federal agencies, as the courts have clearly stated.

As I stated in my colloquy, "the provisions of sections 101 and 103 are not designed to result in any changes in the manner in which EPA carries out its "environmental protective authority." I did not mean then, nor can anyone imply from this statement, that the full dis­
courts have clearly stated.

icy of EPA's closure provisions of the Environmental Protection Agency. That the closure provisions of NEPA did not mean then, nor can anyone imply that the Federal Government of printing a "monitor" issued by the Council on Environ­
nmental Quality.

Because of the increased cost to the Federal Government of printing this document, I have not had it published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the months of July and August. Since I have received very few inquiries as to why this document has not been printed, I can only assume that it is more readily available from the Council on Environmental Quality than it was originally or there is not the demand for it that there once was.

Therefore, I have decided to suspend the publishing of this document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pending a determina­tion to do so. In the meantime, I need to continue this method of distribu­tion.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of S. 2770. We can provide the necessary tools to bring about the level of water quality our Nation needs and deserves by this action.

This bill was developed after 38 days of hearings by the House Committee on Public Works where I am a member and extensive hearings by the Committee on Public Works in the other body. After the 1972 amendments to the Federal Wa­ter Pollution Control Act were passed in each House, it required 39 meetings of the House. It is frustrating and discouraging. It was abundantly clear in its legislative history the same spirit, comments and substance of the House legislative history, left ambiguities as to legislative intent. The Senate's unwrittenness to support the de­sire of the House and the President to establish an expenditure ceiling was the prime factor leading to the veto in my judgment. This Olympian neglect after nearly 15 months of long and tedious work by our committees to say the least, it is frustrating and discouraging. It would have been abundantly clear that the President has no authority to control the rate of spending. This was the clear intent of the managers.

I urge you to vote aye and override by an overwhelming majority. The waters of our Nation need this bill.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the clean water bill now before the Congress is the most far-reaching environmental im­provement bill in history. This is biparti­san legislation. It has the support of a strong body of people. Our efforts to support this legislation is the result of our efforts. The bill authorizes the greatest cleanup program in world history. Mr. Speaker I shall vote to override the veto, and I urge my col­leagues to give final approval by a tre­mendous margin to this clean water legis­lation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 23, answered "present" 1, not voting 160, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]
So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Annunzio and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Montgomery against.

Mr. Wolff and Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Biegel and Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Rousselet against.

Mr. Forysthe and Mr. Robison of New York for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin and Mr. Shoup for, with Mr. Crane against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Bow.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. St. German with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Shoup with Mr. Clapp.

Mr. Moose with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Annonzio and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Montgomery against.

Mr. Wolff and Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Biegel and Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Rousselet against.

Mr. Forysthe and Mr. Robison of New York for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin and Mr. Shoup for, with Mr. Crane against.

Not further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. St. German with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Shoup with Mr. Clapp.

Mr. Moose with Mr. Kuykendall.
The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1171
Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (21 U.S.C. 31 et seq.) shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the Ninety-second Congress.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISIRED EDITION OF RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 93D CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1170) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1170
Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Ninety-third Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AS HOUSE DOCUMENTS OF 92D CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1171) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1171
Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (21 U.S.C. 31 et seq.) shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the Ninety-second Congress.

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

There was no objection.
Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 92d Congress.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS UNTIL PUBLICATION OF LAST EDITION OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House may have the privilege of extending their remarks up to and including the publication of the last Recess and to include a summary of the work of the Congress. The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO EXTEND REMARKS AND INCLUDE SUMMARIES OF WORK OF COMMITTEES UNTIL PUBLICATION OF LAST RECORD

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the Congressional Record on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this consent shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it understood that this would be subject to the usual estimate of expense by the Public Printer and not in excess thereof?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND TO MAJORITY LEADER AND SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader and the Speaker of the House may have the privilege of extending their remarks up to and including the publication of the last Recess and to include a summary of the work of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on rollover No. 459, to override the President's veto on the Water Pollution Act, I was delayed by circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on rollover No. 460, the vote to override President Nixon's veto of the Water Pollution Act, I was unavoidably detained at the back of the chamber. Had I been here in time to vote, I would have voted to override the President's veto.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, on rollover No. 460, just concluded, I was on my way to the well. I was not recognized. Had I been recognized, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND CONFERENCE REPORTS SAME DAY REPORTED

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1168

Resolved, That on Wednesday, October 18, 1972, it shall be in order (1) to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause 23, rule XI, except that the provisions requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports on the same day reported are hereby suspended, and (2) to consider conference reports the same day reported notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, which I assure the House shall be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, as the rule reflects, it is very short and very simple. It simply provides that for the rest of this day the 3-day rule shall be waived on the conference reports and that rules from the Committee on Rules will not have to lie over a day. It is just that simple. The sine die resolution already having been passed by the House, it would seem that this would be highly in order and that we can wind up the business of this Congress in short order today.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met yesterday at 3 o'clock, after a rather extended discussion here in the well of the House, where the Speaker and the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), and myself and other Members were present. We were concerned about the debt ceiling conference report and about the continuing resolution and about the possibility of the highway conference report. We agreed at that time we would go to the Rules Committee and report out a resolution, which is before us now, House Resolution 1168, and although, Mr. Speaker, it says all conference reports, my understanding, and I want the Record to show very clearly, is that it referred only to those three conference reports; that is, the debt ceiling, the continuing resolution, and the highway conference report if we obtained it, and I understand we will not have such a report before us.

The continuing resolution was taken care of in the Senate, so now we are faced simply with the debt resolution. The sine die resolution having been offered by the House, whether or not that will permit any other conference report to be brought up to the third reading, we do not know. If it is not, but there may be one or two that will be brought up. That can be done by unanimous consent or by Rules Committee action. We had a discussion in the Rules Committee about the possibility of permitting the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, and at my request it was decided that we would not add that, because I am satisfied nobody on my side of the aisle will in any case make an objection to a reasonable request for a recess today if we need it.

Mr. Speaker, this will waive the two-thirds rule requirement, so we can possibly conclude the debt matter when it is brought before the House and can adjourn, I hope, within the next hour or so.

That is my understanding of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under the resolution just agreed to, would it be in order for the House to consider the conference report when it is ready on S. 2087, Omnibus Crime Control and Safe
Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary for me to comment on this matter, but I feel constrained, under the circumstances, to make the observation that the statement of the Speaker and of the minority leader is that which was said in the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon, which resulted in the reporting of this resolution.

I am sure that the Speaker would, as is his usual manner and manner about these matters, like to recognize the gentleman, but under the circumstances I think the Speaker's ruling is that the gentleman is not of the Committee, did discuss this matter in some detail on the floor of the House. Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House, when they voted on this resolution, were not privy to the understanding arrived at in the Committee on Rules; is that not correct?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I must say that that was exactly correct. I was not following it too closely, but my recollection is that the gentleman from California (Mr. Smyr), the minority ranking member of the Committee, did discuss this matter in some detail on the floor of the House.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, referring again to the rule adopted, was not the language strictly stated, and this is the language that I heard stated, the language referred to in the course of debate notwithstanding legislative history of yesterday, to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is referring to three conference reports which precipitated the action which brought into existence this resolution.

The Chair would like to recognize the gentleman, but the Chair feels constrained to hold that the legislative history restricts all action under House Resolution 1168 to three measures, the highway bill, the debt ceiling bill, and the continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, referring again to the rule adopted, was not the language strictly stated, and this is the language that I heard stated, the language referred to in the course of debate notwithstanding legislative history of yesterday, to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is referring to three conference reports which precipitated the action which brought into existence this resolution.

The Chair would like to recognize the gentleman, but the Chair feels that its own promise is at stake here. The Chair will try to find some other means of the gentleman's request.

The Chair does not feel that in good faith or in good conscience it can recognize the gentleman under the circumstances.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that, in my judgment, the Speaker is 100-per cent correct in the observation and the decision he has made. That was the agreement at the time, and any contrary interpretation would not be acceptable.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is so strongly in favor of the conference report; the Chair must point out that it is not a personal decision, but this was a necessary arrangement the Chair made yesterday in order to get this resolution agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary for me to comment on this matter, but I feel constrained, under the circumstances, to make the observation that the statement of the Speaker and of the minority leader is that which was said in the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon, which resulted in the reporting of this resolution.

I am sure that the Speaker would, as is his usual manner and manner about these matters, like to recognize the gentleman, but under the circumstances I think the Speaker's ruling is that the gentleman is not of the Committee, did discuss this matter in some detail on the floor of the House. Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last night or late afternoon when this agreement was reached, there must have been a member of the Committee of the House. All those who were here, who were privy to the agreement or understanding, agree the understanding was as indicated.

So, there was no effort on the part of anybody to mislead anyone. This was an agreement, and even though I am for this bill, I do not think we should violate that understanding.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, as I recall it, the Speaker announced yesterday afternoon that the authority granted in the resolution would be confined to these three conference reports.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON POLICE AND FIREMAN ANNUITIES

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that while I certainly understand the agreement between the Speaker and the leadership to consider those three pieces of legislation, which undoubtedly are within the purview of that resolution, nonetheless I must state that the matter which we have been trying to get before the floor is a matter of great urgency. Each day that we delay, another police officer may be slain and his family may become dependent for support upon charity, or other public-spirited citizens.

The legislation provides a lump sum payment to the dependent survivors of policemen, firemen, and other law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty as the result of a criminal act. This bill is the product of detailed discussions, first, in my subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee, and finally in the House-Senate conference committee.

This legislation has been sponsored by many, many Members of Congress. It is long overdue and I think it should not become the "unfinished business" of the 92d Congress.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman ask unanimous consent? If he cannot obtain consideration under this method, perhaps it can be brought up under some other method.

The Chair feels constrained to say—and the Chair hates to make a statement from the chair on issues like this—it was suggested these three bills which the Chair has mentioned be listed in the resolution. The Chair said that was not necessary; that was the understanding, and it would simply complicate the resolution by naming the three bills. That is what happened.

The Chair recognizes that had it not been for that understanding and legislative history, which is in the Record, this would have been eligible under the clear language of the resolution.

The Chair would like to recognize the gentleman for a unanimous-consent request to bring it up now.

FEDERAL MINIMUM DEATH AND DISMEMBERMENT BENEFIT TO PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS OR SURVIVING DEPENDENTS

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

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Pennsylvania a State trooper was slain. He went into a bathroom to arrest an individual who had escaped from prison. He had on a bulletproof vest. He was shot to death by the escaped prisoner. He had three children. The benefits they would be entitled to from the State of Pennsylvania are negligible. The need is great. We wonder how many cases of this kind we need?

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the colloquy which has just taken place, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the bill S. 2087 be considered at this time.

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman ask unanimous consent to call up the bill discussed previously?

The SPEAKER. It is a conference report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:
Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty.

The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress, other than to send to them his best wishes that they all have a happy vacation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16810, PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 16810) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limitation, and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. Rept. No. 92-1614)

The committee of conference on the disagreement of the houses on the amendments to the Senate of the bill (H.R. 16810) is reported to them as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to the enactment of this Act and no action taken before such day under such provisions shall have any force or effect on or after such day."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 8: That the Senate recede from its amendment, as follows:

The Senate recede from its amendment to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and agree to the same. Amendment number 9: That the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, 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:

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 10: That the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendments of the House to amendment number 10 and agree to the amendments of the House to amendment number 10.

Mr. W. D. MILLS, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.
the membership of the joint committee to 370 members, and provides that in addition to the 7 members of the House chosen from the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations, the 4 members of the Senate chosen from the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations, the 7 members of the House chosen from the Committee on Appropriations and the 7 members of the Senate chosen from the Committee on Finance, shall be entitled to serve as members of the joint committee, one from the majority party and one from the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker and the President pro tempore, respectively.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 4: Senate amendment numbered 4 provides that no person appointed by reason of his membership on the House and Senate committees representing 32 members, one from the majority and one from the minority, may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

Section 3 added by amendment 4: Senate amendment numbered 4 also provides that a vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to continue to exercise the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 5: Senate amendment numbered 5 provides that the expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the joint and the Speaker’s and the President pro tempore’s receipts approved by the chairman of the joint committee, and authorizes expenditures of $100,000 through February 28, 1973. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 6: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 7: Senate amendment numbered 7 provides that, for purposes of paragraph (6) of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (which limits the number of committee assignments and committee chairmanships of Senators), the Senate shall not be counted as a member of the joint committee, or as chairman of the joint committee, shall not be taken into account. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 8: Senate amendment numbered 8 adds a new title IV to the joint budget, and provides for the joint budgeting procedures set forth in title III of the Act. The Chair recedes.

Amendment numbered 9: Senate amendment numbered 9 adds a new title V to the joint budget, and the joint budgeting procedures set forth in title III of the Act, and provides that the joint budget be approved by the Senate and the House without regard to the 120-percent requirement contained in section 203(b)(1)(A) of the Act.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 10: This amendment added a new title VI to the joint budget, and provides that, effective with respect to the joint budgetary period for weeks of unemployment beginning before July 1, 1973, the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State "on" indicator or a State "off" indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period is to be determined without regard to the 120-percent requirement contained in section 203(b)(1)(A) of such Act and without regard to the requirement of a 13-week waiting period between extended benefit periods contained in section 203(b)(1)(B) of such Act.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 11: Senate amendment numbered 11 adds a new title VII to the joint budget, and provides that the joint budgeting procedures set forth in title III of the Act shall not be included in the joint budget, but that the joint budget shall be subject to the same rules of budgetary control.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLIS, A. C. ULLMAN, J. H. BURKE, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, JOHN W. BYRNES, JACKSON BETTS, H. T. SCHNETZERL, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

RUSSELL B. LONG, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, WALLACE F. BENNETT, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rather unusual conference report to bring back to the House. It appears that both sides have won a great deal with respect to the limitations on spending. The Senate would not take our language, as Members know, and the House would not recede from its language, so with the enactment of this conference report there will be a ceiling on spending of $25 billion for 1 day.

At the end of that 1 day, the Senate language will prevail and that provision will become a law. In fact, any action taken under it will have no effect.

That was the only way, in fact, we could get the matter out of the two bodies, because the Senate had directed the President not to do anything in the bill that he had directed him to do; namely, to hold the rate of spending to $250 billion, but in the process they refused to implement that directive by allowing the limits expired to become law.

The Secretary of the Treasury came to the meeting of the conference at 1 o'clock and told us that the President, himself, would rather not have any provision in the bill relating to the income tax treatment of unmarried individuals, in general, this language, individual other than married individuals filing separate returns, would be subject to the same rates of tax on their taxable incomes.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLIS, A. C. ULLMAN, J. H. BURKE, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, JOHN W. BYRNES, JACKSON BETTS, H. T. SCHNETZERL, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

RUSSELL B. LONG, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, WALLACE F. BENNETT, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rather unusual proposal to bring back to the House. It appears that both sides have won a great deal with respect to the limits on spending. The Senate would not take our language, as Members know, and the House would not recede from its language, so with the enactment of this conference report there will be a ceiling on spending of $25 billion for 1 day.

At the end of that 1 day, the Senate language will prevail and that provision will become a law. In fact, any action taken under it will have no effect.

That was the only way, in fact, we could get the matter out of the two bodies, because the Senate had directed the President not to do anything in the bill that he had directed him to do; namely, to hold the rate of spending to $250 billion, but in the process they refused to implement that directive by allowing the limits expired to become law.

The Secretary of the Treasury came to the meeting of the conference at 1 o'clock and told us that the President, himself, would rather not have any provision in the bill relating to the income tax treatment of unmarried individuals, in general, this language, individual other than married individuals filing separate returns, would be subject to the same rates of tax on their taxable incomes.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLIS, A. C. ULLMAN, J. H. BURKE, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, JOHN W. BYRNES, JACKSON BETTS, H. T. SCHNETZERL, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

RUSSELL B. LONG, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, WALLACE F. BENNETT, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rather unusual conference report to bring back to the House. It appears that both sides have won a great deal with respect to the limits on spending. The Senate would not take our language, as Members know, and the House would not recede from its language, so with the enactment of this conference report there will be a ceiling on spending of $25 billion for 1 day.

At the end of that 1 day, the Senate language will prevail and that provision will become a law. In fact, any action taken under it will have no effect.

That was the only way, in fact, we could get the matter out of the two bodies, because the Senate had directed the President not to do anything in the bill that he had directed him to do; namely, to hold the rate of spending to $250 billion, but in the process they refused to implement that directive by allowing the limits expired to become law.

The Secretary of the Treasury came to the meeting of the conference at 1 o'clock and told us that the President, himself, would rather not have any provision in the bill relating to the income tax treatment of unmarried individuals, in general, this language, individual other than married individuals filing separate returns, would be subject to the same rates of tax on their taxable incomes.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLIS, A. C. ULLMAN, J. H. BURKE, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, JOHN W. BYRNES, JACKSON BETTS, H. T. SCHNETZERL, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE.

RUSSELL B. LONG, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, WALLACE F. BENNETT, MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rather unusual conference report to bring back to the House. It appears that both sides have won a great deal with respect to the limits on spending. The Senate would not take our language, as Members know, and the House would not recede from its language, so with the enactment of this conference report there will be a ceiling on spending of $25 billion for 1 day.
Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means saying that by approving this bill, we have discussed, to veto line items in the conference report here on the floor. It is identical to a bill which was ordered reported by the Ways and Means Committee some weeks ago.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I was off the floor when this bill was first brought up, after waiting an hour.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me tell the gentleman about it, if he wanted to make a point.

Mr. PICKLE. I wanted to ask that question of the Speaker.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I was off the floor when this bill was first brought up, after waiting an hour.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me tell the gentleman about it, if he wanted to make a point.

Mr. PICKLE. I wanted to ask that question of the Speaker.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman from Texas be permitted to make the point of order that the title in this conference report pertaining to the unemployment benefits program is not germane under this conference report?

The Speaker. That point of order would come up too late now.

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, just for the purpose of clarification, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The Speaker. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Since the House did approve the nongermane proposal with an amendment, that then becomes, when the conference committee submits a final agreement, germane to the bill, and can be included in the conference report, can it not?

The Speaker. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield further.

Mr. PICKLE. This is the second or perhaps the third time that in the closing day or days of the session we have come here by an extended benefit program for some 5 to 10 million people.

The Speaker. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman could yield 4 or 5 minutes. How much time does the gentleman have?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me control the time, if I may. I have yielded to the gentleman. If we need more than a minute I will yield myself another minute.

Mr. PICKLE. The measure which the House passed is considerably better than that from the Senate side, because the cost of the Senate version would have been somewhere around $450 million. As it is under the House version, perhaps it will be about $100 million we are perhaps going to be extending out of the Treasury to the same States, year after year.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. We really do not have the money to do that. This is merely a temporary provision. It will have no effect after June 30, 1973.

Mr. PICKLE. Still, the money comes out of the unemployment benefits program. It is already $75 million in the red.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell the Members of the House what was in the Magnuson bill, that went to the President, that had to be cut. I think it is already $575 million in the red.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. We agreed to that. Earlier this year we extended the Magnuson program of temporary emergency benefits. This is an extension of a previous program, which did not have a permanent extended benefits program in those States that maintain a 4 percent unemployment rate. There is a provision in the bill which set a 120 percent requirement.

The Speaker. pro tempore (Mr. Pickers of Illinois). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute. What we have done in this proposal of ours that we offer, that we agreed to in the conference report, is to disregard the 120 percent factor in the off indicator only. Let me explain the situation in detail.

The House conference did not accept the Senate amendment because it would have been too extreme a departure from the original concept of the original program. It contains the "off" triggers contained in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Act. The amendment which the House has already agreed to is limited to limiting the Senate provision to disregard the 120 percent factor in the "off" indicator only. This is merely a temporary provision and not a permanent solution to the problem we face. It will, however, permit the extended benefits program to be kept in operation in those States that have had continued high unemployment. It is designed to prevent the extended unemployment compensation program from triggering "off" in a State merely because the insured unemployment rate, however high it may be, has not continued to increase. This is the problem with the 120 percent requirement. It leads to the extended benefits program triggering "off" whenever the insured unemployment rate has remained at a continuously high level for 1 or 2 years or more.

The Senate amendment, on the other hand, would have permitted the States to disregard the 120 percent factor in both the State "on" and "off" indicators. In addition, it would have suspended the operation of a requirement in the law that there be a 13-week waiting period...
after the termination of an extended benefit period before another such period may begin. This amendment would have affected some 25 or 26 States as opposed to the 10 States that are estimated to be affected by the conference agreement. The additional States affected by the original Senate amendment are those in which the insured unemployment rate has either already dropped below 4 percent or is expected to drop below 4 percent during the period the conference machinery would operate. In the opinion of the House conferees, this was too great a departure from the original purposes of the State trigger mechanisms that were enacted in 1970. Unlike the provision agreed to by the conferences, it would not have been limited to correcting a problem which has resulted from the faulty operation of the 120-percent requirement, but would have amounted to a change in the basic philosophy of the extended benefits program.

Mr. Speaker, I will point this out. Do not overlook this: We have some long-time unemployed people in certain areas of unemployment in the United States. In the State of Washington that situation exists in and around Seattle, and I know the Senator from Washington to be concerned with the problem of these people. I think it is a national problem and that the effort he can make to see to it that his people are taken care of under unemployment and Welfare.

The Speaker pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Arkansas: After looking at the record, do you have any States, or have you got any States covered under the protective program, and among those States not covered are three States, namely, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. California and New York are not included within this amendment that is in the conference. The States not included in the original Senate amendment.

Mr. PICKLE. Could they become eligible within the next 30 days?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, there is no way they could become eligible now since they have already fallen below 4 percent in their insured unemployment rates.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the gentleman that I was not on the floor and I will say further that this is the last time this kind of bill is going to come in and get by with unamended votes. We have set up the machinery to try to take care of an extended benefits program; we have passed the Magnuson Act.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I assume that happens that this is not the proper way to do it. I do think we will have to come back next year and make a further analysis of this 120 percent parameter and the extended benefits program, because what it means is this: That it triggers on if you have 120 percent of the unemployment that you had in the past 3 years. You can have a high rate of unemployment in the past 3 years, and 9 percent in a State for as long as 3 or 4 years, and at the end of the second year you trigger off, and you can go another 1 or 2 years without any relief from that heavy unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must find a different formula than that which we have in the law to take care of this extended benefits program. I do agree with the gentleman that we must seek a permanent solution rather than a solution on a piecemeal basis.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, of course, this means that some 43 States, a figure that is in my neighborhood, are going to have to help finance 50 percent of the extended benefits for these seven or eight States that may be drawing continued benefits. Under the unemployment insurance program, we have set up machinery to try to take care of the States of the States where they do need to be given extended benefits. As a former member of the Texas Employment Commission, I would like to suggest that the extended benefits program, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies has also taken a different view about the 120 percent as being a set figure. I think that the bill in this body has, at least those I have talked to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the previous colloquy has been very helpful, and, as pointed out, it has been stated that this percentage is not a ceiling figure; but, because we may make permanent that which is supposed to be on an extended basis. Mr. Speaker, we must make positive changes in the extended benefits program in the near future.
available. In other words, he could re- serve funds.

Mr. RHODES. If the gentleman will yield further, most of the money in that bill, as I understand it, is distributed in accordance with the formula.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether those of us who have consistently through the years voted to keep spending far below what the Presi dent's requests have been are not warranted in voting against this increase in the debt ceiling, especially since the President has pushed the revenue-sharing program.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I grant that my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, is one of the most highly educated men in this body, and that he has a Ph. D. degree, and I have always bowed to the gentleman's knowledge in this field, but any economist who would argue for voting against a debt ceiling after the debts have always been made, I cannot understand. I feel sure the gentleman does not want to put himself in that class, and hence I yield myself as an economist in advocating that.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe we generally agree that all these things are a matter of individual conscience, but what I view with alarm is that all through the year the President's follow­ ers over on the Republican side have been following the President down the aisle and voting against his spending requests, and if anyone has they are the ones who have gotten us into this jam, and now we have to bail them out.

Mr. ZION, Mr. Speaker, will the gen­ tleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the gentle­ man will wait one moment, let me point out that we have been in session for almost 2 years, and let us not adjourn this Congress sine die on the 21st of December.

Mr. ZION, Mr. Speaker, will the gen­ tleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will be glad to yield, Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Indiana, Mr. ZION.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I am getting sick of the gentleman from Maryland bragging about his conservative voting record. That statement makes him the prime paragon of political demagogy.

According to impartial rating services, the Americans for Constitutional Action and the National Assessed Business­ man, the gentleman from Maryland has voted for spending in approximately 70 percent of his chances. His economy rat­ ing of about 30 percent is hardly worth bragging about.

Incidently, his main economy action seems to come at the expense of our na tional security. His "stand up for Amer­ ica" rating is a very modest 22 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

ECONOMY VOTES IN THE 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his re marks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I include the following:

ECONOMY VOTES IN THE 92D CONGRESS (1971— 73)

Mr. RHODES, DEMOCRAT, SECOND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

1. In four instances, I voted against funds for the SST program, totaling $489.9 million. (March, May, and July of 1971)

2. Voted against providing $3 million for counselling services for the Federal Housing Administration. (June, 1971)

3. Voted to limit crop subsidies to $20,000 to any person. During 1971, the Federal Gov­ ernment paid almost 14,000 farmers over $20, 000 each in crop subsidies. A California com­ pany received $696,801, a Texas farmer re­ ceived $117,012, and a California farmer received $129,263 in crop subsidies for 1971 alone. (June, 1971)

4. Voted against the so-called Welfare Re­ form Bill, or guaranteed annual income, which would have cost about $13 billion in the first year of operation, because it did not provide incentives for people to work. (June, 1971)

5. Voted against a $250 million give-away to Lockheed Corporation. (July, 1971)


7. Voted against providing $2 billion for the U.S. contribution to the U.N. Develop­ ment Program, because of mismanagement of the UNDP, $100 million was granted to countries which did not need aid. (December, 1971)

8. Voted against a $725.5 million appro priation for the D.O. subsidy on the ground that the nation's highest-income city should fi­ nance its own rapid transit. (December, 1971)

9. Voted against the Red Team against the public debt limit to $450 billion. (March, 1972)

10. Voted against the NASA authorization for over $3.4 billion, a $49.8 million increase over the Administration's request. (April, 1972)

11. Voted against providing $8 million in public assistance to rapid transit bus com­ panies in D.C. (May, 1972)

12. Voted against a $868 million increase in funds for education because the figure in the bill was inadequate in view of our huge national debt. (June, 1972)

13. Voted against the Revenue Sharing Bill, which would cost $80 billion, because, among other things, we have no revenue to share. (June, 1972)

14. Voted to reduce the funds for the Office of Telecommunications Policy in the House from $1,023,000 to $300,000. (June, 1972)

15. Voted against the $1.2 billion Federal guarantee of obligations issued by the Metro­ politan Area Transit Authority for the D.C. subway. (June, 1972)

16. Co-sponsored an amendment to limit the number of ungraded employees to 5% and the amount of money for salaries to $23.7 million in the Executive Office of the Presi­ dent. (June, 1972)

17. Voted against providing a four-month extension of the temporary level of $450 billion of the public debt limit. (June, 1972)

18. Voted against providing reimburs ement-funds to states affected by the ban on cyclamates. Conservative esti­ mates placed the cost of this legislation at over $190 million. (July, 1972)

19. Voted against increasing the annuities for Supreme Court Justices' widows, which cost as much as $3,800 annually. (August, 1972)

20. Voted to eliminate aid to Brazil be-
cause that nation has wasted our aid or di-
verted it to the wrong purposes. The aid is 
over $46 million. (August, 1972)

23. Voted against the Public Works-Eco-

onomic Development Bill, which authorised 
$30 billion. (August, 1972)

24. Voted against extending the programs 
under the Office of Economic Opportunity 
Act. This bill authorised $47 billion over the 
next two years. (September, 1972)

25. Voted against allowing the military to 
hire civilians to do KP work, because the 
work should continue to be done by enlisted 
personnel rather than asking the taxpayers 
to pay an additional $350-500 million an-
nually (and more later on) for the hiring of 
civilians. (September, 1972)

26. Offered six amendments to the 1973 
Foreign Assistance Appropriation Bill to re-
duce funds by approximately $1 billion, to 
the 1972 appropriation levels, because of our 
huge national debt. (September, 1972)

27. Voted against authorizing $14 million in 
“start-up” monies for the Eisenhower 
Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center because 
the Congress should not have to pay for civic 
center for Washingtonians. (Oct-

28. Voted against increasing the temporary 
public debt limit from $450 billion to $465 
billion. (October, 1972)

29. Voted against ascending the taxpayers’ 
money to take over the bus companies in the 
D.C. metropolitan area. 3/4 of the funds for 
the take-over would be Federal grants. (Oct-

30. Voted against the Conference Report on 
the Pesticide Control Act because it con-
tains provisions to indemnify pesticide 
producers. This could cost the taxpayers 
$100 million to $500 million. (October, 1972)

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16810, 
PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin. Mr. Speak-
er, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I will speak only about the conference 
report, and about the situation in which we 
find ourselves.

I am not going to belabor the spending 
ceiling issue. That was before us when 
this conference report was before the House. It 
was before us again last evening. I do not 
think anything need be added at this 
point except to say that it has become 
amply clear that the other body is 
adament. In the face of that adamently, 
we have no alternative. As your conferees 
we have done the only thing we could do, 
we have come back here with something 
on which we could get agreement from the 
Senate.

It is interesting to note from the his-
tory of spending ceilings that when Presidents do not want a ceiling, then 
the Congress pays. This was before the House. It 
was before us again last evening. I do not 
think anything need be added at this 
point except to say that it has become 
amply clear that the other body is 
adament. In the face of that adamently, 
we have no alternative. As your conferees 
we have done the only thing we could do, 
we have come back here with something 
on which we could get agreement from the 
Senate.

Now let us consider exactly what this 
vote means. Let no one make any mistake 
about it. If you vote against this confer-
ence report—if you are in the majority in 
that position—you are voting to come 
back in special session by the 8th of No-

30, Voted against spending the taxpayers’ 
$100 million to pay for the take-over. (Oct-

October, 1972
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ceiling because that nation 
will be unable to pay its bills. No administration 
will be used, and the Congress would be 
unable to pay its bills. No administration 
could live with that situation.

So if you vote against giving the Pres-
ident this ceiling of $465 billion, you are 
telling the President you want him to call 
you back here in special session.

28. Voted against increasing the temporary 
public debt limit from $450 billion to $465 
billion. (October, 1972)

30. Voted against spending the taxpayers’ 
$100 million to pay for the take-over. (Oct-

29. Voted against increasing the temporary 
public debt limit from $450 billion to $465 
billion. (October, 1972)

30. Voted against spending the taxpayers’ 
$100 million to pay for the take-over. (Oct-

October, 1972
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public debt limit from $450 billion to $465 
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percent higher over a 1- or 2-year period. The mere fact of a high unemployment rate should be sufficient to render a State eligible for this kind of assistance. The provision offered by the Senate, which was similar to legislation introduced by me many months ago, would have permitted any State to waive the 20-percent income requirement with respect only to its going off the program, but also with respect to going on or going back on it.

The unemployment provision included in this conference report will benefit a few workers, but it will leave many, many more out in the cold. These are the people who build our great Nation and keep it going through thick and thin. They deserve better than this measure gives them.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks two tables which show the States affected by the Senate amendment and those affected by the language in this conference report.

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

There was no objection.

The tables referred to follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.—STATES AFFECTED BY THE PROVISION IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal share</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.—STATES AFFECTED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal share</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The principal reason for these deficits is the President's espousal of new—and in his own view—popular expenditure programs, such as revenue sharing and unprecedented defense budgets, while at the same time he successfully urges the Congress to cut taxes—this in the face of record unemployment and inflation. A simple but typical example was the President's successful effort to eliminate the automobile excise tax—a Federal revenue loss of $3 billion annually. The argument was that at least 100,000 new jobs would be created, a big increase in the unemployment figure of 5 million, but hopefully a step in the right direction.

The actual result, as best as we can ascertain, has been 10,000 new jobs—for $3 billion of lost revenue.

One of the last witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee was again an administration spokesman urging—would you believe—another billion dollars in defense taxes alone.

This is the administration's view of fiscal responsibility. It is not my own.

Mr. HEBCKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, our debate on the spending ceiling has centered primarily on the question of an abdication of congressional authority and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the President to cut funds is an abdication of congressional power; there is no doubt that the Constitution mandates this body to raise revenues and allocate them. Unfortunately, it is a power that is utilized inadequately. The Congress is a sleeping giant, and if the President is the only one who is awake to the situation, then he should be allowed to spend and tax accordingly. The public will not stand for more taxes and more inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is losing its credibility with the people. The public is demanding tax reform and an end to Government waste. We are not answering them. I am a strong supporter of necessary social programs—education, environment, social security. I am also committed to getting value for the taxpayers' dollar.

I would never vote to give the President this kind of power for an unlimited period of time. This legislation was provided for only an 8-month period, however. What I hope this crisis has shown us is that there is a tremendous need for reform.

Tax reform is always a topic of interest, and when we speak of reform, we must often think of the seniority system. But our most pressing need at this point in time is reform of our budgeting process.

The process of enacting a Federal budget into law is an exhausting one, and our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations spend long weeks and months attempting to rationally order our national priorities. But the fragmented system under which they must work prevents such a rational ordering. The Congress considers 13 separate appropriation measures, exclusive of supplemental and continuing appropriations, and we provide adequately for a careful weighing of alternative programs and priorities. This is the Congress needs.

In addition, the fiscal year has become the same as the calendar year. Not only are appropriations enacted into law after July 1, but often programs for defense and foreign aid are not even authorized by that date.

The budget process has two facets—spending and receiving. If we consider spending alone, we ignore the fact that our allocations must be made in light of our available resources.

Last, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has demanded that the elderly of this Nation skimp and save their pennies in order to sustain the most basic existence. We have asked the States and the Federal Government to operate on shoestring budgets; that they go hat in hand to the electorate in order to keep their schools open and their policemen paid.

In view of the attitudes on fiscal restraint which we preach to our neighbors, I believe that it is time for the Congress to "do as we say" and practice that same restraint and oversight with the Federal tax dollars of the American people.

To do less is to deny our responsibility to our constituencies and our country.

Mr. MADDEN, Mr. Speaker, I do want to commended the Senate for modifying the actions of the House in endorsing the President's unprecedented demand to usurp the power of the Congress in designating funds to be distributed among programs, which have been enacted by the Congress over the years.

During my visits back in Indiana over the past several weekends there have been great amounts of work done against the Congress retiring from its constitutional rights in controlling Federal expenditures.

Today, I received a letter from the American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association, setting out their opposition to the President's request on controlling spending limitations and also designating various programs which should not be dependent on the decision of one person as to the function of various programs involved.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following letter from Mr. Cyril F. Brickfield, legislative counsel, American Association of Retired Persons, National Retired Teachers Association:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 18, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons, with a combined membership of 4,500 million older persons, wish to express our views with respect to H.R. 16810, the public debt limitation bill.

Our Associations appreciate the current need for better coordination of the spending and taxing aspects of fiscal policy to avoid recurring deficits. We recognize the lack of coordination among the 83rd Congress with the unacceptable alternatives of increasing Federal revenue through further taxation or of acquiescing in further deficits and inflation. However, we feel that the spending limitation provisions of the debt limit bill, while representing a simple measure providing a de facto automatic limitation, are an unsatisfying remedy, the future ramifications of which may adversely affect the ability of Congress to defray its obligations and balances on which our Government is based.

We fear that enactment of the principle contained in this legislation, despite any restrictions placed therein, may amount to an unconstitutional delegation of authority to the Executive Department and a dilution of the prerogatives of the Congress.

The exercise of uncontrolled discretion by a chief executive over spending, even a limited number of congressionally approved programs, may frustrate not only the will of Congress with respect to such programs, but our own efforts as well; the dignity of the health, education, Administration on Aging and other programs for which we have so diligently worked during the past year could be jeopardized.

Our Associations, therefore, urge the members of the House to reject the Senate's recommendation to the House and the Senate's version of H.R. 16810. If any spending limitation is to be enacted into law, the Associations believe that the executive's power to control spending would be circumscribed so as to exempt from such power Social Security and Medicare benefits, veterans' pensions, retirement, civil service and railroad retirement benefits, judicial salaries, interest on the national debt and older persons' services and so as to limit, to a maximum of ten per cent, the amount by which the budget for any one program in any one department may be reduced. In the light of the foregoing, we would further urge the members of the House to instruct their conferees on H.R. 16810 to agree to the Senate-passed version of a spending limitation.

Sincerely,

Cyril F. Brickfield, Legislative Counsel.

Mr. DORN, Mr. Speaker, this is no time for fault-finding or finger-pointing. The President has asked for this public debt increase, and I shall support his request wholeheartedly. This letter is from Mr. DORN, Mr. Speaker. It is a worn out record. We increase the debt ceiling virtually every year, although we do so with misgivings. The solution is the balanced budget. If the money is not there, do not spend it. Inflation is the greatest danger to national security. It strikes at the housewife and at the elderly. Regardless of who is President, inflation must be brought under control and the great chairman, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas in supporting the President's request for an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. VANK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the grant of unnecessary expenditure controls to the Executive. The President has all the power he needs to control and limit Federal expenditures. He has already demonstrated his power in "freezing" billions of dollars in Federal programs. He has already demonstrated his capacity to "redtape" and extinguish any program which he dislikes. If there is one dollar of waste or error in Federal contracts—and there are bil-
I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I was going to make that announcement, that the conference Act of 1970 (S. 3707) upon which they are working on the conference report and that will be before the House soon; but they are not ready yet.

RECESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until the hour of 5 p.m.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a time certain set when we may return or I will find it necessary to object.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until the hour of 5 p.m.

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

There was no objection.

Accordingly, at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m. the House stood in recess until 5 o'clock p.m.

I believe I have the unanimous consent of the House to recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Speaker then announced the time of adjournment.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 16, 1972.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 301 of Public Law 89- 368, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on October 12, 1972, adopted Committee resolutions authorizing the following water resources development projects:

Beals Creek, Big Spring, Texas.
Muskogee, Okla.
Mesaloking, Mont., Wash.
De Mesolles River at Ottumwa, Iowa.
Honah Harbor, Alaska.
North Shore of Long Island, Suffolk County, N.Y.
Texas City Channel, Texas.
Feyton Creek, Texas.
Ferry County Drainage and Levee District.

NOS 1, 2, and 3, Mo.
Little River Inlet, N. Carolina and S. Carolina.
Point Place, Toledo, Ohio.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS

(MR. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the membership ought to know that the conference has agreed on a conference report for the highway bill and there is a possibility that there will be a rollcall on that legislation.
by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS UNDERTaken DIRECTLY BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS"

"Sec. 222. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever a program or project to be undertaken (A) by a person, other than an individual, furnished Federal financial assistance for such program or project under section 202 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 291), under section 201 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201), under section 208 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 305), or under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1966 (20 U.S.C. 701), or (B) by a State agency furnished Federal financial assistance for such program or project under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1401) for the rehabilitation or modernization of public housing, and the Federal financial assistance is furnished by a Federal agency pursuant to a grant, contract, or agreement, or such program or project will result in the forced displacement of any person, the head of the Federal agency furnishing such assistance shall insure that the following payments and services be provided:

(1) fair and reasonable relocation payments and assistance to or for such displaced persons, as are required to be provided by law in accordance with sections 202, 203, and 204 of this title;

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

(3) prior to the approval of the grant, contract, or agreement by the head of the Federal agency furnishing such assistance, alternative housing, if necessary, shall be available to such displaced persons within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement in accordance with section 206 of this title.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of law, whenever a program or project to be undertaken by any person furnished Federal financial assistance for such program or project under section 235 (j) or section 236 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1745z(j), 1718z-1), or under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 2951a-1), furnished by a Federal agency pursuant to a grant, contract, or agreement, or such program or project will result in the forced displacement of any person, the head of the Federal agency furnishing such assistance shall require the provision of and provide full payment for:

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

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

(3) within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, alternative housing, if necessary, shall be available to such displaced persons in accordance with section 205 (e) (3)."
The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The conference report limits eligibility of a displaced person who can receive benefits under the Act to those who are forced to relinquish their occupancy of the real property from which they are displaced, but puts the burden of proving unlawful occupancy on the party alleging unlawful occupancy. It is the intent of this section to prohibit unlawful squatters from receiving the benefits of this Act.

The Senate bill added a new section 223 to the 1970 Act that insured that the payments and other benefits of the Act would be provided by the Federal Government when a program or project would be required to take reasonable and necessary steps to provide payments and other benefits to persons displaced by January 3, 1971 (the effective date of the 1970 Act) and the date of enactment of S. 1819.

The House amendment provided that persons displaced by five programs identified in the bill on or after the date of enactment of S. 1819 would be eligible for the payments and other benefits under the Act. In the case of all programs identified in the House and Senate provisions, the Federal Government would be required to take reasonable and necessary steps to provide payments and other benefits to persons displaced by January 3, 1971, and the date of enactment of S. 1819.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate accepted the House language.

MOVING AND RELATED EXPENSES

Section 2 of the House amendment removed the existing limitation of section 202 (a) (3) that payment of actual direct losses of tangible personal property incurred as the result of moving or discontinuing a business or family operation, in any case where it is not practicable to determine the reasonable expenses of relocating such personal property. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate accepted the House language.

DONATIONS

Section 3 of the Senate amendment added a section 207 to the 1970 Act to provide that nothing in the land acquisition title of the Act shall be construed to prevent a person, after he has received an estimate of the full amount of just compensation for the property, from making a donation of the property or any part of the property to a Federal agency, a State, or a State agency for the purposes of this Act.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate accepted the House language. The conferences agreed that any such donation be considered as an acquisition for purposes of the 1970 Act.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11021) to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

"Section 401. This Act, including the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Environmental Noise Control Act."

"TABLE OF CONTENTS"

"Sec. 401. Short title; table of contents.
"Sec. 402. Finding and policy.
"Sec. 403. Office of Noise Abatement and Control.
"Sec. 404. Definitions.
"Sec. 405. Research, investigation, training, and other activities.
"Sec. 406. Federal programs.
"Sec. 407. Noise criteria and control technology.
"Sec. 408. Noise emission standards for new products.
"Sec. 409. Labeling.
"Sec. 410. Imports.
"Sec. 411. Prohibited acts.
"Sec. 412. Enforcement.
"Sec. 413. Citizen suits.
"Sec. 414. Emergency situations.
"Sec. 415. Judicial review.
"Sec. 416. Records, reports, and information.
"Sec. 417. Federal procurement.
"Sec. 418. Grants for environmental noise planning and control programs.
"Sec. 419. Development of low-noise-emission products.
"Sec. 420. Authorization of appropriations.
"Sec. 421. Findings and policy.
"Sec. 422. (a) The Congress finds—
"(1) that environmental noise presents a growing danger to the health and welfare of the Nation's population, particularly in urban areas;
"(2) that the major sources of noise emissions include aircraft, vehicles, machinery, industrial and other products in commerce; and
"(3) that, while primary responsibility for control of environmental noise rests with State and local governments, Federal regulatory action is essential to deal with major noise emission sources, and Federal assistance is necessary to encourage and support programs for the control of environmental noise.

(b) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes their public health or welfare. To that end, this Act to establish a means for effective coordination of Federal research and activities in environmental noise control, to authorize the establishment of Federal test and evaluation standards for new products, to provide information to the public on the control of environmental noise through regulation of use of products and other methods and procedures to reduce environmental noise.

(c) In public participation in the development, revision, and enforcement of any regulation, noise emission standard, program or plan designated by the Administrator or any State or municipality under this Act shall be provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator, the States and municipalities. The Administrator, in cooperation with the States and municipalities, within ninety days after enactment of this section shall develop and submit to the States and municipalities standards, or guidelines, or both, for public participation in such processes.

OFFICE OF NOISE ABATEMENT AND CONTROL

"Sec. 403. (a) The Administrator shall establish within the Environmental Protection Agency an Office of Noise Abatement and Control, and shall carry out through such
Office a full and complete investigation and study of noise and its effect on the public health and welfare and administer the provisions of this Act. "(a) The administrator is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his function under this Act. The administrator may delegate to any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient. "(c) Upon the request of an environmental protection agency or personnel of the Environmental Protection Agency, may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. "(d) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the administrator. "DEFINITIONS "Sec. 404. For purposes of this title and title V of this Act, a person is "(a) any aircraft, engine, propeller, or appliance, as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended (44 U.S.C. 1401); or "(b) any company, corporation, agency, instrumentality of the United States, a city, county, or other political subdivision of a State, "(c) the term "product" means any manufactured article or goods or component thereof; except that such term does not include- "(1) any aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance, as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended (44 U.S.C. 1401); or "(2) any company, corporation, agency, instrumentality of the United States, a city, county, or other political subdivision of the State, "(e) The term "new product" means any product manufactured or made available for sale or lease. "(f) The term "person" means an individual, corporation, partnership, or association, and includes "(1) any person to whom a contract or order for the performance of procurements is awarded; "(2) any person engaged in the conduct of such activities: "(a) The Administrator shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of environmental noise and as part of such program shall- "(1) conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, prevention, and control of environmental noise; "(2) conduct and finance research by contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 1502, 1503, and 1506 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5); "(3) provide training (without fee) for those personnel engaged in or performing work on environmental noise control or related research, and other persons with suitable qualifications; "(b) The Administrator shall carry out the programs within their control and other activities, including technical assistance; "(c) The Administrator shall make available to Federal, State, and local governments, agencies, organizations, and institutions, and with individuals, without regard to sections 1502, 1503, and 1506 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529, 41 U.S.C. 5), \n\n"(d) conduct research on the short- and long-term effects of varying levels of noise and other information pertaining to noise and the prevention and control of environmental noise; "(e) develop effective and practical procedures, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of environmental noise; "(f) carry out the programs within their control and other activities, including technical assistance; "Sec. 406. (a) The Congress authorizes and directs that Federal agencies shall, to the extent practicable, cooperate with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, in the planning and execution of such activities, for the prevention and control of environmental noise; "(b) Each department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the Federal Government having authority under Federal laws administered by them, carry out the programs within their control and other activities, including technical assistance; "Sec. 407. (a) The Congress authorizes and directs that Federal agencies shall, to the extent practicable, cooperate with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, in the planning and execution of such activities, for the prevention and control of environmental noise; "(b) Each department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the Federal Government having authority under Federal laws administered by them, carry out the programs within their control and other activities, including technical assistance;
mental noise to the same extent that any person is subject to such requirements. The President may exempt any single activity or facility, including noise emission sources or classes thereof, of any department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch, from compliance with any such requirement if he believes that such an exemption is in the national interest of the United States to do so; except that no exemption, other than for those products specified pursuant to section 407, may be granted due to lack of appropriation unless the President shall have specifically requested such appropriation. Any exemption shall be for a period not in excess of one year, but additional exemptions may be granted for periods of not to exceed one year upon the President's making a new determination.

The President shall report each January to the Congress all exemptions from the requirements of this section granted during the previous calendar year with his reason for granting such exemption.

(c) (1) The Administrator shall coordinate and direct the Federal agencies engaged in environmental noise research and environmental noise control. Each Federal agency shall compile and provide information on the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency to the Administrator in the manner he deems appropriate to make plans and methods of controlling environmental noise available to him to appear to be major sources of noise, and (2) giving information on the processes, procedures, or operating methods which result in the control of the emission of noise, to implement noise emission control standards under sections 408, 501, 503, 511, and 561 of this Act, which such information shall include technical and other data, including costs, as are available on alternative methods of noise control.

(c) The Administrator, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and municipal agencies, and other appropriate persons, shall within fifteen months after date of enactment of this Act publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which cause such emissions and shall furnish to the Administrator such statements of the findings and conclusions of the agency as he may reasonably require, to determine, as provided under section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the nature, scope, and results of the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency are consistent with the purposes of this Act, (2) Any regulation prescribed under this Act after publication of the first report under section 407(b)(1) of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register of the request. The publication or revision of any criteria or information on control techniques under this section shall be announced in the Federal Register, and copies shall be made available to the general public.

NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW PRODUCTS

Sec. 406. (a) (1) The Administrator shall publish proposed regulations establishing noise emission standards for new products or classes of products—

(A) identified in any report published under section 407 (b) (1) of this Act as a major source of noise, and

(B) which falls in one of the following categories:

(i) Construction equipment.

(ii) Transportation equipment (including equipment requiring more than 100 horsepower and industrial vehicles and related equipment).

(iii) Any motor or engine (excluding any equipment of which an engine or motor is an integral part).

(iv) Turbines and compressors.

(v) Electrical and electronic equipment, except those products which are designed for the production or reproduction of music or sound (to the extent such reproduction is identical, except in amplitude, to the source), or apparatus for the maintenance or use of such apparatus.

(b) Except in the case of any new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as a major source of noise, and shall apply to any appropriate new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as having an average margin of safety.

(b) The Administrator, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and municipal agencies, and other appropriate persons, shall within fifteen months after date of enactment of this Act publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which cause such emissions and shall furnish to the Administrator such statements of the findings and conclusions of the agency as he may reasonably require, to determine, as provided under section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the nature, scope, and results of the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency are consistent with the purposes of this Act, (2) Any regulation prescribed under this Act after publication of the first report under section 407(b)(1) of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register of the request. The publication or revision of any criteria or information on control techniques under this section shall be announced in the Federal Register, and copies shall be made available to the general public.

NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW PRODUCTS

Sec. 406. (a) (1) The Administrator shall publish proposed regulations establishing noise emission standards for new products or classes of products—

(A) identified in any report published under section 407 (b) (1) of this Act as a major source of noise, and

(B) which falls in one of the following categories:

(i) Construction equipment.

(ii) Transportation equipment (including equipment requiring more than 100 horsepower and industrial vehicles and related equipment).

(iii) Any motor or engine (excluding any equipment of which an engine or motor is an integral part).

(iv) Turbines and compressors.

(v) Electrical and electronic equipment, except those products which are designed for the production or reproduction of music or sound (to the extent such reproduction is identical, except in amplitude, to the source), or apparatus for the maintenance or use of such apparatus.

(b) Except in the case of any new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as a major source of noise, and shall apply to any appropriate new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as having an average margin of safety.

(b) The Administrator, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and municipal agencies, and other appropriate persons, shall within fifteen months after date of enactment of this Act publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which cause such emissions and shall furnish to the Administrator such statements of the findings and conclusions of the agency as he may reasonably require, to determine, as provided under section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the nature, scope, and results of the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency are consistent with the purposes of this Act, (2) Any regulation prescribed under this Act after publication of the first report under section 407(b)(1) of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register of the request. The publication or revision of any criteria or information on control techniques under this section shall be announced in the Federal Register, and copies shall be made available to the general public.

NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW PRODUCTS

Sec. 406. (a) (1) The Administrator shall publish proposed regulations establishing noise emission standards for new products or classes of products—

(A) identified in any report published under section 407 (b) (1) of this Act as a major source of noise, and

(B) which falls in one of the following categories:

(i) Construction equipment.

(ii) Transportation equipment (including equipment requiring more than 100 horsepower and industrial vehicles and related equipment).

(iii) Any motor or engine (excluding any equipment of which an engine or motor is an integral part).

(iv) Turbines and compressors.

(v) Electrical and electronic equipment, except those products which are designed for the production or reproduction of music or sound (to the extent such reproduction is identical, except in amplitude, to the source), or apparatus for the maintenance or use of such apparatus.

(b) Except in the case of any new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as a major source of noise, and shall apply to any appropriate new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as having an average margin of safety.

(b) The President shall report each January to the Congress all exemptions from the requirements of this section granted during the previous calendar year with his reason for granting such exemption.

(c) (1) The Administrator shall coordinate and direct the Federal agencies engaged in environmental noise research and environmental noise control. Each Federal agency shall compile and provide information on the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency to the Administrator in the manner he deems appropriate to make plans and methods of controlling environmental noise available to him to appear to be major sources of noise, and (2) giving information on the processes, procedures, or operating methods which result in the control of the emission of noise, to implement noise emission control standards under sections 408, 501, 503, 511, and 561 of this Act, which such information shall include technical and other data, including costs, as are available on alternative methods of noise control.

(c) The Administrator, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and municipal agencies, and other appropriate persons, shall within fifteen months after date of enactment of this Act publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which cause such emissions and shall furnish to the Administrator such statements of the findings and conclusions of the agency as he may reasonably require, to determine, as provided under section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the nature, scope, and results of the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency are consistent with the purposes of this Act, (2) Any regulation prescribed under this Act after publication of the first report under section 407(b)(1) of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register of the request. The publication or revision of any criteria or information on control techniques under this section shall be announced in the Federal Register, and copies shall be made available to the general public.

NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW PRODUCTS

Sec. 406. (a) (1) The Administrator shall publish proposed regulations establishing noise emission standards for new products or classes of products—

(A) identified in any report published under section 407 (b) (1) of this Act as a major source of noise, and

(B) which falls in one of the following categories:

(i) Construction equipment.

(ii) Transportation equipment (including equipment requiring more than 100 horsepower and industrial vehicles and related equipment).

(iii) Any motor or engine (excluding any equipment of which an engine or motor is an integral part).

(iv) Turbines and compressors.

(v) Electrical and electronic equipment, except those products which are designed for the production or reproduction of music or sound (to the extent such reproduction is identical, except in amplitude, to the source), or apparatus for the maintenance or use of such apparatus.

(b) Except in the case of any new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as a major source of noise, and shall apply to any appropriate new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) as having an average margin of safety.

(b) The Administrator, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and municipal agencies, and other appropriate persons, shall within fifteen months after date of enactment of this Act publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which cause such emissions and shall furnish to the Administrator such statements of the findings and conclusions of the agency as he may reasonably require, to determine, as provided under section 309 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the nature, scope, and results of the noise research and environmental noise control programs of the agency are consistent with the purposes of this Act, (2) Any regulation prescribed under this Act after publication of the first report under section 407(b)(1) of this Act shall be published in the Federal Register of the request. The publication or revision of any criteria or information on control techniques under this section shall be announced in the Federal Register, and copies shall be made available to the general public.
taking into account the range of uses for such product. Any cause of action for violation of any such product, cost obligation of any dealer incurred as a result of any requirement imposed by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be enforced in the United States district court of the district in which such product was manufactured or imported, or in which such dealer transacts business, or in which such defendant resides.

(3) If a manufacturer includes in any advertisement a statement respecting the cost of such product, cost obligation of any such product, any limitation on the use, or any requirement imposed by paragraph (1) of this subsection, said consignee shall forfeit the amount of the full invoice value of such product, or in lieu of such payment, imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both in the discretion of the court.

"PROHIBITED ACTS"

"SEC. 411. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, the following acts or the causing thereof are prohibited.

(1) In the case of a manufacturer, the sale in, the offering for sale in, or the introduction into commerce of any new product, aircraft, or aircraft engine manufactured after the effective date of regulations promulgated under section 408 of this Act, the sale of such product to any person engaged in interstate commerce by railroad, unless it is in conformity with such regulations.

(2) A removal or rendering inoperative by any person, other than for purposes of maintenance, testing, repair, or replacement, of any device or element of design incorporated into any product, aircraft, or aircraft engine in compliance with noise emission standards promulgated under sections 408, 501, 503, 511, and 521 of this Act which are applicable to such product, or to cause such product to be removed or rendered inoperative.

(3) In the case of a manufacturer, the sale in, the offering for sale in, or the introduction into commerce of any new product manufactured after the effective date of regulations promulgated under section 408 of this Act (requiring information respecting noise) which are applicable to such product, unless it is in conformity with such regulations.

(4) A removal by any person of any marking, identification, or name affixed to any new product or container pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 408(a) of this Act prior to the sale of such product or container to any person, or (B) the sale of such product or container from which such notice has been removed.

(5) The importation into the United States by any person of any new product in violation of regulations promulgated under section 410 of this Act that are applicable to such product.

(6) The failure of any person to comply with any order issued under section 412(d) or 414 of this Act.

(7) For the purpose of this section, each day of violation of section 411(a) of this Act shall constitute a separate violation of that section.

(8) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any violations of section 411(a) of this Act, or to restrain such violations by such proceedings as the court deems necessary to protect the public health and safety.

(9) (d) Whenever any person is in violation of section 411(a) of this Act, the Administrator may issue an order specifying such relief as he determines is necessary to protect the public health and safety. Such relief may include an order requiring such person to cease or to take such action as is necessary to prevent the sale of any such products to any user, or to prevent the sale of any such products to any user, or to the violation of paragraph (2) of this subsection or the furnishing of information with respect to the violation of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"IMPOR

"SEC. 410. Any product offered for entry into the United States for which a standard or regulation for any component incorporated into such product is mandated under section 408(a) of this Act and prior to the sale of such product to any person engaged in interstate commerce by railroad, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $5,000, or both in the discretion of the court.

"PROHIBITED ACTS"

"SEC. 411. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, the following acts or the causing thereof are prohibited.

(1) In the case of a manufacturer, the sale in, the offering for sale in, or the introduction into commerce of any new product, aircraft, or aircraft engine manufactured after the effective date of regulations promulgated under section 408 of this Act, the sale of such product to any person engaged in interstate commerce by railroad, unless it is in conformity with such regulations.

(2) A removal or rendering inoperative by any person, other than for purposes of maintenance, testing, repair, or replacement, of any device or element of design incorporated into any product, aircraft, or aircraft engine in compliance with noise emission standards promulgated under sections 408, 501, 503, 511, and 521 of this Act which are applicable to such product, or to cause such product to be removed or rendered inoperative.

(3) In the case of a manufacturer, the sale in, the offering for sale in, or the introduction into commerce of any new product manufactured after the effective date of regulations promulgated under section 408 of this Act (requiring information respecting noise) which are applicable to such product, unless it is in conformity with such regulations.

(4) A removal by any person of any marking, identification, or name affixed to any new product or container pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 408(a) of this Act prior to the sale of such product or container to any person, or (B) the sale of such product or container from which such notice has been removed.

(5) The importation into the United States by any person of any new product in violation of regulations promulgated under section 410 of this Act that are applicable to such product.

(6) The failure of any person to comply with any order issued under section 412(d) or 414 of this Act.

(7) For the purpose of this section, each day of violation of section 411(a) of this Act shall constitute a separate violation of that section.

(8) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enjoin any violations of section 411(a) of this Act, or to restrain such violations by such proceedings as the court deems necessary to protect the public health and safety.

(9) (d) Whenever any person is in violation of section 411(a) of this Act, the Administrator may issue an order specifying such relief as he determines is necessary to protect the public health and safety. Such relief may include an order requiring such person to cease or to take such action as is necessary to prevent the sale of any such products to any user, or to prevent the sale of any such products to any user, or to the violation of paragraph (2) of this subsection or the furnishing of information with respect to the violation of paragraph (2) of this subsection.
for a hearing in accordance with section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(c) by State law—

"(1) The Administrator may, by agreement with any environmental noise control agency in a State where there is a need for prompt regulation of an aircraft noise control problem within the hands of the Alaska or other State authority to which such authority is referred, on such terms and conditions as the Administrator may determine, authorize law enforcement officers or other officers or employees of such environmental noise control agency to bring actions in the appropriate State courts to restrain any person from violating section 411(a).

"(2) Nothing in this section shall authorize any civil action under section 413 of this Act.

"CITIZEN SUITS

Sec. 413. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, any person may commence a civil action on his own behalf—

"(1) against any person (including (A) the United States, and (B) any other governmental instrumentality or agency to the extent permitted by the eleventh amendment to the Constitution) who is alleged to be in violation of any noise control requirement (as defined in subsection (f) of this section), or

"(2) against—

"(A) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or, if appropriate, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall pre­

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration or, if appropriate, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, and

"(a) a matter of right; or

"(b) in the case of a failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administration in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to an aircraft) promulgated under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

"(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in a case where there is an alleged failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator.
tion in any application, report, record, plan, or report, or required to be maintained under this Act or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or apparatus, or who who has been convicted of a criminal offense under section 412(a) of this Act and, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both.

FEDERAL PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 417. (a) No Federal agency may enter into any contract for the procurement of goods or services with any person who who has been convicted of a criminal offense under section 412(a) of this Act and who, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both.

"(b) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(d) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(e) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE PLANNING AND CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 418. (a) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(b) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(d) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(e) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(f) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(g) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(h) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(i) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(j) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(k) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(l) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(m) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(n) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(o) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(p) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(q) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(r) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(s) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(t) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(u) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(v) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(w) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(x) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(y) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(z) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(aa) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(bb) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(cc) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(dd) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(ee) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(ff) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(gg) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(hh) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(ii) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(jj) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

"(kk) In order to implement the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, by regulation, require any contract, loan, or grant to be subject to the provisions of this section, in which case the Administrator determines that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.
such product is a low-noise-emission product for purposes of this section. If the Administrator determines that such product is a low-noise-emission product, then within one hundred and eighty days of such determination the Administrator shall reach a decision as to whether such product is a suitable replacement for any product presently being purchased by the Federal Government for use by its agencies.

(2) If the Administrator makes a finding of no decision under subparagraph (F), the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register notice of such determination and the reasons therefor.

(c) (1) Certified low-noise-emission products shall be acquired by purchase or lease by the Federal Government for use by the Federal Government in lieu of other products if the Administrator of General Services determines that such certified products have procurement costs which are no more than 125 per centum of the retail price of the least expensive type of product for which they are certified substitutes.

(2) Data relied upon by the Administrator in determining that a product is a certified low-noise-emission product shall be incorporated in any contract for the procurement of such product.

(2) The procuring agency shall be required to purchase available certified low-noise-emission products which are eligible for purchase under this section prior to purchasing any other products for which any low-noise-emission product is a certified substitute. In making purchasing selections between competing eligible certified low-noise-emission products, the procuring agency shall give priority to any class or model which does not require extensive periodic maintenance to retain its low-noise-emission qualities or which does not involve operating costs significantly in excess of those products for which it is a certified substitute.

(e) For the purpose of procuring certified low-noise-emission products any statutory price limitations shall be waived.

(4) The Administrator shall, from time to time as he deems appropriate, test the emissions of noise from certified low-noise-emission products purchased by the Federal Government. If at the time of purchase he finds that the noise-emission levels exceed the levels on which certification under this section was based, he shall give the supplier of such product written notice of this finding, issue public notice of it, and give the supplier an opportunity to make necessary modifications or replacements. If no such repairs, adjustments, or replacements are made within a period to be set by the Administrator, he may order the supplier to show cause why the product involved should be eligible for recertification.

(3) All standards, rules, and regulations prescribed under this section shall be consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce and that any proposed standard, rule, or regulation has been demonstrated to be technologically available for application to types of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply.

(2) All standards, rules, and regulations prescribed under this section shall be consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce and that any proposed standard, rule, or regulation has been demonstrated to be technologically available for application to types of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply.

(3) All standards, rules, and regulations prescribed under this section shall be consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce and that any proposed standard, rule, or regulation has been demonstrated to be technologically available for application to types of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply.

(4) Each Federal agency with regulatory authority over air commerce, aircraft or airport operations, or aircraft noise emissions shall exercise such regulatory authority so as to reduce noise in airport environments and surrounding areas.

(5) The Administrator shall promulgate the procedures required to implement this section within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this section.

(6) The Director shall promulgate the procedures required to implement this section within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this section.

“AUSTRALIAN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 420. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $3,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested individuals, shall conduct a study of the means of financing the retrofitting of existing jet aircraft (excluding aircraft owned or operated by any military agency) in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall make recommendations, taking into consideration what is economically reasonable, technically practical, and appropriate for the types of aircraft and aircraft engines to which the recommendations will apply.

(b) The Secretary of Transportation shall publish such recommendations on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Finance, and Public Works of the Senate by July 1, 1973, together with his recommendations for whatever legislation may be required.

“SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall promulgate regulations to insure compliance with all standards promulgated by the Administrator under section 501 of this Act. The regulations of the Secretary of Transportation shall include provisions making such standards respecting noise emissions applicable to any type of aircraft for purposes of this section. The issuance, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of any certificate or authorization for the type or types of aircraft of aircraft engines, shall reflect the degree of noise reduction achieved through the application of the best available demonstrated technology, the acceptable cost of compliance and the demonstrable public benefit that will result, determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency after consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration has determined that such regulations are consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce and that any proposed standard, rule, or regulation has been demonstrated to be technologically available for application to types of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply.

(b) In any section to amend, modify, suspend, or revoke any such certificate, or any provision thereof, to which the recommendations will apply.

(c) The Administrator shall have the same notice and appeal rights as are contained in section 609 of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended, except that in any appeal to the National Transportation Safety Board, the Board may amend, modify, or revoke the order of the Secretary of Transportation only if it finds no violation of such standards, rules, or regulations. Such amendment, modification, or revocation of any certificate or authorization for the type or types of aircraft of aircraft engines, shall reflect the degree of noise reduction achieved through the application of the best available demonstrated technology, the acceptable cost of compliance and the demonstrable public benefit that will result, determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency after consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Aviation Administration has determined that such regulations are consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce and that any proposed standard, rule, or regulation has been demonstrated to be technologically available for application to types of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply.

(d) Each Federal agency with regulatory authority over air commerce, aircraft or airport operations, or aircraft noise emissions shall exercise such regulatory authority so as to reduce noise in airport environments and surrounding areas.

(e) The Administrator shall promulgate the procedures required to implement this section within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this section.

“TITLE V—MAJOR MOVING SOURCES

“PART A—CONTROL AND ABATEMENT OF AIRCRAFT NOISE AND SONIC BOOM

“SEC. 501. (a) In order to afford present and future relief and provide protection to the public health and welfare from aircraft noise and sonic boom—

(1) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, shall promulgate and amend regulations respecting noise emission standards for aircraft and aircraft engines necessary and adequate to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety.

(2) (1) Any regulations under this section or amendments thereof, with respect to noise emissions from types of aircraft or aircraft engines, shall reflect the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available demonstrated technology, the acceptable cost of compliance and the demonstrable public benefit that will result, determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency after consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(c) (1) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall promulgate and amend regulations with respect to noise emission standards for aircraft and aircraft engines consistent with and that are necessary and adequate to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety.

“SEC. 502. (a) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested persons, shall conduct a study of the (a) adequacy of Federal, State, and local aircraft and operational noise controls; (b) adequacy of noise emission standards for new and existing aircraft, and the level of noise on board the aircraft for purposes of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce and Public Works of the Senate within one year after enactment of this title.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested individuals, shall conduct a study of the means of financing the retrofitting of existing jet aircraft (excluding aircraft owned or operated by any military agency) in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall make recommendations, taking into consideration what is economically reasonable, technically practical, and appropriate for the types of aircraft and aircraft engines to which the recommendations will apply.

(f) No person shall, unless otherwise provided by law, operate any aircraft or engine which, as a result of operations, produces noise emissions which are greater than the noise or sonic boom characteristics of any aircraft, unless such type certificates and specifications are filed with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(2) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested persons, shall conduct a study of the means of financing the retrofitting of existing jet aircraft (excluding aircraft owned or operated by any military agency) in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall make recommendations, taking into consideration what is economically reasonable, technically practical, and appropriate for the types of aircraft and aircraft engines to which the recommendations will apply.

(3) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested persons, shall conduct a study of the means of financing the retrofitting of existing jet aircraft (excluding aircraft owned or operated by any military agency) in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall make recommendations, taking into consideration what is economically reasonable, technically practical, and appropriate for the types of aircraft and aircraft engines to which the recommendations will apply.

(4) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested persons, shall conduct a study of the means of financing the retrofitting of existing jet aircraft (excluding aircraft owned or operated by any military agency) in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, and shall make recommendations, taking into consideration what is economically reasonable, technically practical, and appropriate for the types of aircraft and aircraft engines to which the recommendations will apply.
or the waters of the contiguous zone (as defined under Article 94 of the Convention of the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone) at a true flight mach number greater than 1, the Administrator shall make the conditions and limitations in an authorization to exceed mach 1 issued to the operator under this section.

(b) For research and development flight in a designated flight test area an authorization to exceed mach 1 may be issued if the administrator finds that the following conditions and limitations in an authorization to exceed mach 1 issued to the operator under this section.

(1) The flight is necessary to show compliance with an airworthiness regulation or a noise-emission regulation under subsection (a) of this section, and shall be terminated by the Administrator under section 611 of this Act. The Administrator shall promulgate regulations to insurance compliance with all standards promulgated by the Administrator under section 611 of this Act. The Secretary of Transportation, to permit the development and application of the requisite technology, giving appropriate consideration to the cost of compliance within such period.

(2) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(3) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(4) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(5) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(6) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(7) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(8) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(9) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(10) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(11) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(12) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(13) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(14) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(15) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(16) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(17) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(18) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(19) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(20) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(21) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(22) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(23) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(24) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(25) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(26) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(27) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(28) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(29) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(30) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(31) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(32) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(33) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(34) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(35) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(36) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(37) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(38) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(39) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(40) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(41) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.

(42) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(43) The flight is necessary to determine the sonic boom characteristics of the airplane, or is necessary to establish means of reducing or eliminating the effects of sonic boom.

(44) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and shall contain the information specified by the Administrator.

(45) The flight is necessary to demonstrate the conditions and limitations under which speeds greater than a true flight mach number of 1 will not cause a sonic boom to reach the land or water surface of the earth.
$15 million, but we would go back to the original amounts which we had when we passed it originally.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, is it the gentleman's intention to move that this sliding scale, which I think is much too much, as voted for, is to be increased as is the case of the years 1973, 1974, and 1975, with the $3 million, $12 million, and $6 million respectively, inasmuch as 1972 has now expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if this will be included in his amendment to the Senate amendment to the House-passed bill, as passed on February 29, 1972?

Mr. STAGGERS. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. HALL. Is it the gentleman's intention to include the corrected dates and the amounts, the amounts the gentleman now proposes to offer to the Senate amendments to the House-passed bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. Before I grant unanimous consent I want to be convinced and I was certain the gentleman said he was "pretty sure."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to be assured the proper officer of the FAA to regulate safety and noise-producing air transportation devices is maintained, rather than granted, and the other body would have done, to the Environmental Protection Agency. There has been a difference being I have had a chance to restudy the bill since the objections of yesterday.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir, if the gentleman will yield. I can assure the gentleman beyond any shadow of a doubt that the safety of our airlines still remains and will remain with FAA. This is the intention of the House. The reason why I objected to the Senate amendment is that they would give the noise-regulation authority to the EPA. I can assure the gentleman beyond any shadow of a doubt the safety will remain with FAA.

Mr. HALL. Are the three amendments the same as the gentleman has provided me with the authorized appropriations at the bottom?

Mr. STAGGERS. They are.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I further query the gentleman as to whether or not this is a device to which under Federal action is essential that, while primary responsibility for control of noise rests with the States, I recognize the Federal Government in trying to get this bill passed.

Mr. STAGGERS. That does not. There is certainly all the recourse in the world for anyone to go to court as a result of a civil suit, he would have appellate rights and judicial review right up the line as in any other case.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, all the way, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I still think the penalties are too severe for the time being I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLS). Is there objection to the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia that the reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment: In section 2(b), the words inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Noise Control Act of 1972".

FININGS AND POLICY

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that inadequately controlled noise presents a serious threat to health and welfare of the Nation's population, publically in urban areas;

(2) that major sources of noise include transportation vehicles and equipment, machinery, appliances, and other products in commerce;

(3) that, while primary responsibility for control of noise rests with State and local governments, Federal action is essential to deal with major noise sources in commerce; and

(b) the Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes their health or welfare. To that end, it is the purpose of this Act to establish a means for effective control administration of Federal and research and activities in noise control, to authorize the establishment of Federal noise emission standards for products distributed in commerce, and to provide information to the public respecting the noise emission and noise reduction characteristics of such products.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. For purposes of this Act:

(1) the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) the term "person" means an individual, corporation, partnership, or association, and (except as provided in sections 11(e) and 12(a)) includes any officer, employee, department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, a State, or any political subdivision of a State.

The term "product," as used in this Act means any manufactured article or goods or components thereof. Except that such term does not include—

(A) any aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance, as such terms are defined in section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; or

(B) (1) any military weapons or equipment when designed for, or developed for, use by the United States Armed Forces, or (2) any rockets or equipment which are designed for research, experimental, or developmental work to be performed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(C) to the extent provided by regulations of the Administrator, any other machinery or equipment designed or used for space research or work done by or for the Federal Government.

The term "ultimate purchaser" means the person who in good faith purchases a product for purposes other than resale.

The term "new product" means (A) a product which has never been transferred to an ultimate purchaser, or (B) a product which is imported or offered for importation into the United States and which has not been used after the effective date of a regulation under section 6 or section 8 which would have been applicable to such product if it had been manufactured in the United States.

The term "manufacturer" means any person engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of new products, or the importing of new products for resale, or who acts for, and is controlled by, any such person in connection with the distribution of such products.

The term "distribute in commerce" means sell in, or offer for sale in, or introduce or deliver for introduction into, commerce.

The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The term "environmental noise" means the intensity, duration, and the character of sounds from all sources.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Sec. 4. (a) The Congress authorizes and directs that Federal agencies shall, to the fullest extent consistent with their authority under Federal laws administered by them, carry out the programs within their control in such a manner as to reflect the further the policy declared in section 2(b).

(b) Each department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government—

(1) having jurisdiction over any property or facility, or

(2) engaged in any activity resulting, or which may result, in the emission of noise, may provide information, in any manner, to the public respecting the impact of noise on the environment, and may take such action as the Administrator deems necessary to abate or control such activities.
referred to in section 3(3)(B) of this Act, may exempt machinery, equipment, or processes (including the manufacture, disposal, or use of products) which in his judgment are major sources of noise, and (2) giving information necessary for control of noise from such products, including data on the technology, costs, and alternative methods of noise control. The first such report shall be published not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) The Administrator shall from time to time review and, as appropriate, revise or supplement any criteria or reports published under this section. The publication or revision thereof may contain testing procedures necessary to assure compliance with the emission standard in such regulation, and shall contain provisions respecting instructions of the manufacturer for the maintenance, use, or repair of the product.

(d) Any report (or revision thereof) under subsection (b)(1) identifying major noise sources shall be published in the Federal Register. The publication or revision thereof may contain testing procedures necessary to assure compliance with the emission standard in such regulation, and shall contain provisions respecting instructions of the manufacturer for the maintenance, use, or repair of the product.

(e) No State or political subdivision of any kind may adopt or enforce, any rule or regulation which shall set limits on noise emissions from such product and shall be a standard which in the judgment of the Administrator, based on criteria published under subsection (b) or (c), protects the public health and welfare, taking into account the magnitude and conditions of use of such product (alone or in combination with other noise sources) the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology, and the cost of compliance. In establishing such a standard for any product, the Administrator shall apply to such standard to standards under other laws designed to safeguard the health and welfare of persons, including any standards under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Clean Air Act, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Any such noise emission standards, however, shall be consistent with any applicable Federal or State law.

(f) The Administrator shall report his findings to the President and the Congress, with appropriate Federal agencies, the progress of Federal activities relating to noise research and noise control. Each report shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Administrator with respect to the noise sources identified.

Sec. 6. (a) (1) The Administrator shall publish proposed regulations, meeting the requirements of subsection (c), for each product:

(A) which is identified (or is part of a class identified) in any report published under section 5(b)(1) as a major source of noise;

(B) for which, in his judgment, noise emission standards are feasible, and

(C) which fall in one of the following categories:

(i) Construction equipment.

(ii) Any motor or engine (including recreational vehicles and related equipment).

(iii) Electrical or electronic equipment.

(2) Any regulations under paragraph (1) which do not involve noise problems in a report published under section 5(b)(1) as identified (or is a part of a class identified) in any report published under section 5(b)(1) of this Act, and copies shall be made available to the Administrator such information as he may reasonably require to determine the nature, scope, or regulations respecting noise. The Administrator shall consult with the Administrator of the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Administrator with respect to the noise sources identified.

(a) The Administrator shall consult with the Administrator of the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Administrator with respect to the noise sources identified.

(b) The Administrator shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, the Administrator shall consult with the Administrator of the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Administrator with respect to the noise sources identified.

(2) The Administrator shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and the Administrator of the Federal Register, determine from the requirements of subsection (c), for such product:

(A) not earlier than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of a product subject to proposed regulations published under paragraph (2)(A), or

(B) not later than six months after the date of publication of such proposed regulations, and

(c) After proposed regulations respecting a product have been published under paragraph (2), the Administrator shall, unless in his judgment noise emission standards are not feasible for such product, prescribe regulations meeting the requirements of subsection (c), for such product:

(D) not earlier than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of a product subject to proposed regulations published under paragraph (2)(A), or

(E) not later than six months after the date of publication of such proposed regulations, and

(F) not later than six months after the date of publication of such proposed regulations, and

(G) not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Any cost obligation of any dealer incurred as a result of any requirement imposed by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be borne by the manufacturer. The transfer of any such cost obligation from a manufacturer to any dealer through franchise or other arrangement is prohibited.
(A) with respect to any new product for which a regulation has been prescribed by the Administrator under this section, any law or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof to the extent that such law or regulation is not identical to such regulation of the Administrator.

(2) with respect to any component incorporated into such new product by the manufacturer of such product, any law or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof to the extent that such law or regulation is not identical to such regulation of the Administrator.

(c) (1) Not earlier than the date of submission of the report required by section 7 (a) of the Noise Control Act of 1972, EPA shall prescribe regulations to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom (including control and abatement through the exercise of administrative authority over the use of aircraft in air commerce or air transportation or over aircraft or airport operations) as EPA determines is necessary to protect the public health and welfare. The FAA shall consider such proposed regulations submitted by EPA to the Administrator and may, within thirty days of the date of its submission to the FAA, publish the proposed regulations in a notice of proposed rulemaking. Within thirty days after the date of publication of such notice, the FAA shall commence a hearing at which interested persons shall be afforded an opportunity to present data, views, and arguments. Within a reasonable time after the conclusion of such hearing and after consultation with EPA, the FAA shall publish a final rule.

(A) In accordance with subsection (b), prescribe regulations (1) substantially as they may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the provisions of this section, and (2) such other regulations as the FAA finds consistent with safety in air commerce or air transportation in the public interest, which shall, in the opinion of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, exercise the highest degree of safety in air commerce or air transportation in the public interest; (B) with respect to any component incorporated into such new product by the manufacturer of such product, any law or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof to the extent that such law or regulation is economically reasonable, technologically practicable, and appropriate for the particular type of aircraft, aircraft engine, appliance, or certificate to which it will apply; and (C) with respect to the extent to which such standard or regulation will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this section.

(2) In any action to amend, modify, suspend, or revoke a certificate in which such proposed regulations are involved, the court shall have the power to stay such proposed regulations as are involved in the case in which such certificate is involved, and to make such order in relation to such proposed regulations as shall be consistent with this Act.

Sec. 7. (a) The Administrator, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and interested persons, shall conduct a study of the (1) adequacy of Federal Aviation Administration flight and operational noise controls; (2) adequacy of noise standards and regulations applicable to aircraft, together with recommendations on the retrofitting and phaseout of existing aircraft; (3) effects on health and welfare of noise and sonic boom around airports; and (4) additional measures available to airport operators and local government units for reduction of noise and sonic boom around airports; (b) to the extent that the Administrator deems appropriate, shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and interstate agencies as he deems appropriate; (c) with respect to any component incorporated into such new product by the manufacturer of such product, any law or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof to the extent that such law or regulation is not identical to such regulation of the Administrator.

AIRCRAFT NOISE STANDARDS

Sec. 611. (a) For purposes of this section:

(1) the term "FAA" means Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(2) the term "EPA" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) (1) In order to afford present and future relief and protection to the public health and welfare from aircraft noise and sonic boom, together with recommendations on the control and abatement of such noise and sonic boom, the FAA shall prescribe and amend such regulations as the FAA finds are necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Act.

(2) Subject to sections 17 and 18, nothing in this section precludes or denies the right of any State or political subdivision thereof to establish and enforce controls on environmental effects (including those which affect the public health and welfare) which do not prescribe or require that any statement filed pursuant to section 101 (2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 be filed in the case in which such State or political subdivision thereof from regulating such effects.

(c) (1) The term "controller" means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(2) The term "labeling or information" means the labeling, labeling or information of any product, the product or the certificate to which it will apply.

(3) If, in the case of a matter described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with respect to which no statement is required to be filed under section 101 (2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the FAA may require the FAA to file a supplemental report, which shall be published in the Federal Register, except in any case in which the Administrator determines that the statement is not required to be filed under section 101 (2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the FAA may require the FAA to file a supplemental report, which shall be published in the Federal Register.

(4) In prescribing and amending standards and regulations under this section, the FAA shall:

(1) consider relevant available data relating to aircraft noise and sonic boom, including the results of research, development, and testing, and evaluation of data prescribed pursuant to this Act and the Department of Transportation Act;

(2) consult with such Federal, State, and interstate agencies as he deems appropriate;

(3) consider whether any proposed standard or regulation is consistent with the highest degree of safety in air commerce or air transportation in the public interest; (c) with respect to any component incorporated into such new product by the manufacturer of such product, any law or regulation of any State or political subdivision thereof to the extent that such law or regulation is not identical to such regulation of the Administrator.

Sec. 8. (a) The Administrator shall by regulation designate any product (or class thereof)

(1) which emits noise capable of adversely affecting the public health or welfare; or

(2) which is sold wholly or in part on the basis of its effectiveness in reducing noise, as the case may be.

(b) For each product (or class thereof) designated under subsection (a) the Administrator shall by regulation require that notice be given to the prospective user if the level of the noise the product emits, or of its effectiveness in reducing noise, as the case may be, is such that the user may not be aware of such information.

(c) This section does not prevent any State or political subdivision thereof from regulating the labeling or information of any product in any way not in conflict with regulations prescribed by the Administrator under this section.
regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, and new products imported or offered for importation.

**PROHIBITED ACTS**

Sec. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), any of the following acts or the manufacture thereof are prohibited:

(1) In the case of a manufacturer, to distribute in commerce any new product manufactured for an excessive period of time prior to a regulation prescribed under section 6 which is applicable to such product, except in conformity with such regulation.

(2) The removal or rendering inoperative by any person, other than for purpose of maintenance or replacement of a device or element of design incorporated into any product in compliance with regulations under section 6, prior to its sale or delivery to the ultimate purchaser or while it is in use, or (B) the use of a product after such device or element of design has been removed or rendered inoperative.

(3) In the case of a manufacturer, to distribute in commerce any new product manufactured after the effective date of a regulation prescribed under section 8(b) (requiring information respecting noise) which is applicable to such product, except in conformity with such regulation.

(4) The removal by any person of any notice affixed to a product or container pursuant to section 8(b), prior to sale of the product to the ultimate purchaser.

(5) The importation into the United States by any person of any new product in violation of a regulation prescribed under section 9 which is applicable to such product.

(6) The failure or refusal by any person to comply with any requirement of section 11(d) or 13(a) or regulations prescribed under section 13.

(b) (1) For the purpose of research, investigations, studies, demonstrations, or training, for reasons of national security, the Administrator may exempt for a specified period of time any product, or class thereof, from paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), upon such terms and conditions as he may find necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

(2) Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any product which is manufactured solely for the Armed Forces of the United States, or a container of which is labeled or otherwise marked to show that it is manufactured solely for the Armed Forces of the United States; except that such paragraphs shall apply to such product if it is in fact distributed in commerce for use in any State.

**ENFORCEMENT**

Sec. 11. (a) Any person who willfully or knowingly violates paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (6) of subsection (a) of section 10 of this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $25,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both.

(b) For the purpose of this section, each day during which any paragraph of section 10(a) is in violation of section 10(a) of this Act shall constitute a separate violation of that section.

(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought in the name of the United States to restrained any violation of section 10(a) of this Act.

(d) (1) Whenever any person is in violation of section 10(a) of this Act, the Administrator may issue an order specifying such relief as he determines is necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

(2) Any order under this subsection shall be issued only after notice and opportunity for a hearing in accordance with section 556 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) The term ‘person,” as used in this section, does not include a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

**CITIZEN SUITS**

Sec. 12. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any person (other than the United States) may commence a civil action on his own behalf—

(1) against any person (including (A) the United States, and (B) any other governmental instrumentality or agency to the extent permitted by the eleventh amendment to the Constitution). The suit shall be in violation of any noise control requirement (as defined in subsection (e)), or

(2) against the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency where there is alleged a failure of such Administrator to perform an act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator, or

(3) against the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, where there is alleged a failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which is not discretionary with such Administrator.

The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy, to restrain such person from violating such noise control requirement or to compel such Administrator to perform such act or duty, as the case may be.

(b) No action may be commenced—

(1) under subsection (a)(1)—

(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administrator in the case of a violation of a noise control requirement under such section 611) and (ii) to any alleged violator of such requirement,

(B) if an Administrator has commenced and is diligently prosecuting a civil action to require compliance with the noise control requirement, but in any such action in a court of the United States or a court of the District of Columbia, the person may intervene as a matter of right, or

(2) under subsection (a)(2) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice to the defendant that he will commence such action.

Notice under this subsection shall be given in such manner as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall prescribe by regulation.

(c) In an action under this section, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, if not a party, may intervene as a matter of right. In an action under this section respecting a noise control requirement under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration is not a party, may intervene as a matter of right.

(d) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such an award is appropriate.

(e) Nothing in this section shall restrict any right which any person (or class of persons) may have under any statute or common law to seek enforcement of any noise control requirement, or to seek any civil or administrative relief (including relief against an Administrator).

(2) For purposes of this section, the term “noise control requirement” means paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 10(a), or a standard, rule, or regulation issued under section 17 or 18 of this Act or under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

**RECORDS, REPORTS, AND INFORMATION**

Sec. 13. (a) Each manufacturer of a product to which regulations under section 6 or section 8 apply shall—

(1) establish and maintain such records, make such reports, prepare such plans, and make such tests, as the Administrator may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has followed the requirements of this Act or is acting in compliance with this Act,

(2) upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Administrator, permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to such information and make such tests and to copy such records, and

(3) to the extent required by regulations of the Administrator, make products coming off the assembly line or otherwise in the hands of the manufacturer available for testing by the Administrator.

(b) All information obtained by the Administrator or his representatives pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which in the opinion of the Administrator should not be disclosed to the public or any other person, or that is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, shall be kept confidential and shall be available only to officers and employees of the Administrator, or to their duly designated representatives, or to their duly designated plenipotentiaries, pursuant to the freedom of information Act.

(2) Any person who knowingly makes a false statement, representation, or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained under this Act or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any recording device or method required to be maintained under this Act, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.

**RESEARCH, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND PUBLIC INFORMATION**

Sec. 14. In furtherance of his responsibilities under this Act and to complement, the Administrator, in consultation with other Federal agencies, is authorized to:

(1) Conduct research, and finance research by contract with any person, on the effects, measurement, and control of noise, including but not limited to—

(A) investigations of the psychological and physiological effects of noise on humans and the effects of noise on domestic animals, and the identification of acceptable levels of noise on the basis of such effects;

(B) the development of improved methods and standards for measurement and monitoring of noise, in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, and other Federal agencies.

(2) To determine the most effective and practicable means of controlling noise emissions.
from interested persons in support of, or in opposition to, certification of the class or model of product under consideration.

(2) The Administrator shall make determinations for the purpose of this section in accordance with procedures prescribed by him by regulation.

(3) The Administrator shall conduct whatever investigations in his discretion, including actual inspection of the product at a place designated in regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A),

(4) The Administrator shall receive and evaluate written comments and documents

DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-NOISE-EMISSION PRODUCTS

Sec. 15. (a) For the purpose of this section:

(1) The term "Committee" means the Low-Noise-Emission Product Advisory Committee.


(3) The term "low-noise-emission product" means any product which emits noise in amounts significantly below the levels specified in noise emission standards under regulations applicable under section 6 at the time of procurement to that type of product.

(4) The term "retail price" means (A) the maximum statutory price applicable to any type of product; or, (B) in any case where there is no applicable maximum statutory price, the most recent procurement price paid for any type of product.

(b) (1) The Administrator shall determine which products shall be certified as low-noise-emission products in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(2) The Administrator shall certify any product—

(A) for which a certification application has been filed in accordance with paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of this section;

(B) which is a low-noise-emission product as determined by the Administrator; and

(C) which he determines is suitable for use as a substitute for a type of product at that time in use by agencies of the Federal Government.

(3) The Administrator may establish a Low-Noise-Emission Product Advisory Committee to assist him in determining which products qualify as low-noise-emission products for purposes of this section. The Committee shall include the Administrator or his designee, a representative of the National Bureau of Standards, and representatives of such other Federal agencies and private individuals as the Administrator may deem necessary from time to time. Any member of the Committee not employed by a full-time Federal Government agency shall receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule on the day such member is engaged upon work of the Committee. Each member of the Committee shall be reimbursed for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5705 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(4) Certification under this section shall be effective for a period of one year from the date of certification.

(e) (5) Any person seeking to have a class or model of product certified under this section shall file an application with the Administrator in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

(c) (1) The Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of each application received.

(2) The Administrator shall make determinations for the purpose of this section in accordance with procedures prescribed by him by regulation.

(3) The Administrator shall conduct whatever investigations in his discretion, including actual inspection of the product at a place designated in regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A),

(4) The Administrator shall receive and evaluate written comments and documents

Sec. 16. (a) A petition for review of action of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to any standard or regulation under section 6, 17, or 18 of this Act or any labeling regulation under section 5 of this Act is subject to the provisions of section 16 of this Act.
Act, the Administrator shall promulgate final regulations. Such regulations may be revised, from time to time, in accordance with this subsection.

(3) Any standard or regulation, or revision thereof, proposed under this subsection shall be promulgated only after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, in order to assure appropriate consideration for safety and technological availability.

(4) Any standard or regulation, or revision thereof, promulgated under this subsection shall take effect after such period as the Administrator finds necessary, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, to permit the development and application of the requisite technology, giving appropriate consideration to the cost of compliance within such period.

(b) The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Administrator, shall promulgate regulations to insure compliance with all standards promulgated by the Administrator under this section. The Secretary of Transportation shall carry out such regulations through the use of his powers and duties of enforcement and inspection authorized by the Safety Appliance Acts, the Interstate Commerce Act, and the Department of Transportation Act. Regulations promulgated under this section shall be subject to the provisions of sections 10, 11, 12, and 16 of this Act.

(6) (c) (1) Subject to paragraph (2) but notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an effective date of a regulation under this section applicable to noise emissions resulting from the operation of any motor carrier engaged in interstate commerce by railroad, a public transportation system, or any political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any standard applicable to noise emissions resulting from such operation prescribed by any regulation under this section.

(2) Nothing in this section shall diminish or enhance the rights of any State or political subdivision thereof to establish and enforce standards or controls on levels of environmental noise, or to control, license, regulate, or restrict the use, operation, or movement of any motor carrier, unless such standard is identical to a standard applicable to the same operation of such motor carrier, unless such standard is identical to a standard applicable to noise emissions resulting from such operation prescribed by any regulation under this section.

(4) For purposes of this section, the term "motor carrier" includes a common carrier by motor vehicle, a contract carrier by motor vehicle, and a person or entity that operates a motor vehicle in the course of their business that is subject to the jurisdiction of the Administrator under section 1540 of title 49, United States Code.

CONTROL OF NOISE EMISSIONS

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 11021, which has an [H. Rept. 93-1262] role includes the requirement that EPA play a significant role in the development of aircraft noise standards. This role includes the requirement that EPA propose to FA a broad and
comprehensive range of regulations designed to abate aircraft noise. The FAA, in its proposal to correspond to the EPA proposal quickly and substantively.

Mr. Speaker, many people feel that noise pollution is the last remaining gap in environmental law. The Congress for some years has been confronted with our multifaceted environmental problems with legislation to all known forms of environmental pollution do not become so prevalent as to constitute a comprehensive range of regulations designed to protect the finest friends of the Constitution and laws of the United States, and the consent of Congress is hereby given, for the filling or erection of permanent structures in the above-described area which shall be for the public interest and the impact of the proposed work on the environment.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM McCULLOCH, THE HONORABLE FRANK BOW, AND THE HONORABLE JACKSON BETTS

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to pay tribute to three of the finest friends I have ever had. The three are retiring from the Congress this year. They are all from Ohio as you will note. Bill McCulloch, Frank Bow, and Jackson Betts.

I am not going to take the time now to sing all the praises that are due to them, because that in itself would take much more than the 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do want the House to know that I have asked for 5 days in which all Members may make remarks about Bill McCulloch, Jackson Betts, and Frank Bow.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to revise and extend my remarks and ask unanimous consent that all my colleagues may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am deeply grateful that the gentleman from Ohio has taken the time to make some observations about several of our close and dear friends who are voluntarily leaving the Congress at this time.

HON. JACKSON BETTS

Mr. Speaker, the great State of Ohio is losing a number of its most distinguished Members through retirement at the end of this Congress and the loss seems to hit most heavily on our side of the aisle. I would like at this time to pay tribute to one of the ablest Members of the House, the Honorable Jackson Betts, with whom I have enjoyed a fine friendship and close cooperation over the past 22 years.
BILL McCULLOCH, during his quarter-century of service in this House, ranks as one of the truly outstanding members of the Judiciary Committee. He earned the admiration of the country for his stanch support of the great civil rights legislation enacted in the 1960's. But he had our admiration, and certainly that of his constituents in Ohio, who have served their districts, their State, and their Nation for a total of 48 years. Their retirement will be Ohio's loss—it will be a loss to the House—and to each of us who have had the privilege of working with these two gentlemen. BILL McCULLOCH has been one of the warmest, most compassionate legislators in this Chamber. As the ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee has been distinguished; his efforts have helped bring about some of the most important legislation of the past 48 years. He has been an engineer. He was the head of the Fish and Game Commission of California. He served in the State Assembly of California for many years. The State of California has lost a worthy son.

He has served on many committees. He started on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and then he went to the Committee on Armed Services. When the Committee on Armed Services was formed he went on that committee. Certain events transpired, and he became the chairman of that committee. He has had an illustrious career. He is the man, in my opinion, most responsible for the success of our space program. He is the man who has engineered the authorizations and helped to get the appropriations to make this Nation outstanding in the field of space.

We have had the most illustrious accomplishments as the result of his leadership on that committee. We have seen the space program garner worldwide preeminence. The achievements we have made in space, of course, are important. They will go down in history as among the glorius exploits of man, among the glorious accomplishments of man in the field of exploration.

As we look back over the course of history and we think of the men who have discovered new islands, new continents, new mountains, and so forth, we come to this discovery of another planet and the exploration of another planet almost 300,000 miles away from this earth.

Some of us who have been so interested in science and technology think about the difficulties that were involved and the tremendous accomplishments our scientists have made in achieving this great accomplishment. We can remember very well that young man in the White House, who was a former colleague of ours, John F. Kennedy, who said:

I will put a man on the moon and we will bring him back safely in ten years.

Now, the tragedy of the assassination of our President, our fourth President to have been assassinated, occurred, and he did not live to see that accomplished, but he started in motion the program, and GEORGE MILLER and his companions on the Committee on Science and Astronautics carried out that program. Since the time Mr. Speaker, we have not only put a man on the moon and brought him back, but we have done this a number of times; we have put automotive type vehicles on the moon and we have secured specimens of the substances of which the moon is made, and this has given us tremendous scientific knowledge; we have learned to put vehicles into space and to control those vehicles through the science of computers, and it is our engineering technology that has accomplished this.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the moon accomplishment that I speak of today, but the technology that was developed, the technology that enables us to keep vehicles circulating around the earth.
permanently in our communications system. It has advanced that area of communication and the possibilities of communication between nations and peoples. It is such a step forward, a quantum step forward, that few of us even realize, but these satellites have become the old cables and the old wireless, and other methods that have been used in the past. We have become able to pick up pictures that formerly we could see only in Japan, in Europe, in other nations in the world, and now we can see them on our screens, on our television screens at night.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the wonders that have been made possible by the work of the Committee on Science and Astronautics under the able leadership of GEORGE MILLER of Oakland, Calif. The technology, the technological discoveries and advances that we have made have opened up new fields of endeavor, fields that no one ever expected would be opened up, and it is that kind of leadership that is unknown at this time, from which we are going to receive benefits and blessings far beyond our own capacity to predict at this time.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to say to my colleagues here—and I wish to place this upon the permanent Record of the Congressional Record for all time—that we have had the leadership of a man, the extraordinary leadership of a man who has been the lodestone and the impetus that has enabled us to develop this technology, with all of the benefits which we have already received, and all the potential benefits, going far beyond the capacity of the mind of man to comprehend.

Mr. Speaker, he has not only done all that, but he has been a good Congressman. He has been interested in many things. He has advanced the decimal system for currency and for our mathematical computations, and although this has not yet been accomplished, he has been in the forefront of the advancement of this particular system. This is a system which has to come, because we have to stand the needs and relationships of our changing civilization.

GEORGE MILLER has been a welcome and competent influence in every area and on every endeavor with which he has been associated. And there are many of those.

Before he came to Congress following his early career as a civil engineer, GEORGE MILLER was instrumental in bringing about much needed new programs into the West as a member of the California State legislature. This Millennial Committee, which I was chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, who is closing out his service with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I must also point out that the recent international agreements which have been reached with the Soviet Union with regard to science and space were largely made possible by these achievements which GEORGE MILLER did there many years ago.

When GEORGE MILLER did there many years ago.

When GEORGE, with the aid and assistance of that extraordinary woman, Esther Miller, came to the Congress 28 years ago, he was not stranger to the legislative process. Yet, characteristically, GEORGE never threw his weight around and worked diligently as a Freshman Congressman to learn the parliamentary works of Washington. He was a highly effective member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, a highly regarded member of the Armed Services Committee, a highly regarded member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It was under the direction of GEORGE MILLER that oceanography became known for what it is and a familiar word in the lexicon of modern government.

When GEORGE took over as chairman of the subcommittee on Science and Astronautics in 1961, he was faced with a program about which there was much enthusiasm, but also about which little was known and much had yet to be invented. The task which faced the committee in drawing up the legislation to meet the goals which the Nation had set for itself in space exploration was extremely complex—but GEORGE MILLER knew how to go about it. In the process he endeared himself not only to his constituents but to this Nation, and to his peers and the other committees. This is, indeed, a high tribute.

The space program, to a great extent depending upon the diligent hard work of GEORGE MILLER'S committee, succeeded—doing what was thought war was absolutely impossible. It has, indeed, put men on the moon and returned them safely—and in the process has produced priceless scientific information which will probably not be realized for many, many years. That program also produced the technological marvel known as the communication satellite, which permits us to view events on the other side of the world at the time they are happening and which we now almost take for granted. It has produced the earth resources satellites and other, and I am finding out much we did not know about our planet and the natural resources which may or may not be available to us. It has produced the wide variety of technological innovations which have revolutionized many aspects of the world we live in—industrial, geographical, medical, social, and otherwise.

It is with much sadness and regret that the recent international agreements which have been reached with the Soviet Union with regard to science and space were largely made possible by these achievements which GEORGE MILLER did there many years ago.

It is with Mr. MILLER'S enthusiastic support that his committee reviewed the long-stagnant charter of the National Science Foundation, overhauled it, and succeeded in getting its approval as a matter of public law—so that today the Science Foundation is able to assist the Nation not only in the continuous development of basic research, which we so badly need, but also in bringing the results of that research to the social needs facing our country.

And, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress who have been concerned about the proper balance of power between the legislative and executive branches owe a particular debt of thanks to GEORGE MILLER, whose committee was responsible for the development of the Office of Technology Assessment. That concept is now crystallized. The President signed the OTA bill into law last Friday, and for only the third time in its entire history the Congress has thus created for itself a new and sorely-needed independent service institution within the legislative branch.

It is a fitting tribute to GEORGE MILLER, a man who has wanted to see things for himself and who has traveled to all parts of the world, working hard to understand the needs and relationships of his country in comparison with those of other nations—that the National Commission on Geographical Names just this past month designated an extensive range of high plateau in Antarctica as Miller Bluffs. And so it should, for it was GEORGE, who, at what for him was the ripe young age of 80, made a special trip to the South Pole at the invitation of the President of the Congress of the United States to make his continuing quest for new scientific knowledge.

The Congress is going to miss GEORGE MILLER, a man who has wanted to see things for himself and who has traveled to all parts of the world, working hard to understand the needs and relationships of his country in comparison with those of other nations—that the National Commission on Geographical Names just this past month designated an extensive range of high plateau in Antarctica as Miller Bluffs. And so it should, for it was GEORGE, who, at what for him was the ripe young age of 80, made a special trip to the South Pole at the invitation of the President of the Congress of the United States to make his continuing quest for new scientific knowledge.

The Congress is going to miss GEORGE MILLER, a man who has wanted to see things for himself and who has traveled to all parts of the world, working hard to understand the needs and relationships of his country in comparison with those of other nations—that the National Commission on Geographical Names just this past month designated an extensive range of high plateau in Antarctica as Miller Bluffs. And so it should, for it was GEORGE, who, at what for him was the ripe young age of 80, made a special trip to the South Pole at the invitation of the President of the Congress of the United States to make his continuing quest for new scientific knowledge.
I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished colleague from California, Mr. McFALL.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, George Miller's accomplishments as a Member of the Congress are on the record for all to see. As the chairman of the Committee on Science and Aeronautics, as others have mentioned, he has received many awards and medals from all over the world. Certainly the giant steps that we have made in space have been during the time that he has been the chairman of this important committee of the House of Representatives. Perhaps even more important, I think, has been the friendship that he has given to all of us. Certainly for this Member something that he did many years ago, back in 1939 or 1938, when as an active member of the American Legion in California, was more important than his many other great accomplishments in the field of science and aeronautics in this Congress.

It was back then that he and other members of the American Legion sponsored legislation providing for educational benefits for the children of deceased veterans of World War I. It was through those programs that I was able to get through school and probably laid the basis for my membership in this body. So I personally think that having a great belief in humanity and real desire to help his fellowman, not only by virtue of his record in Congress but because of his acts over 40 years or so ago, when he helped that program, and his help certainly we will miss him and his wonderful, helpfulmate Esther, Mrs. Miller, and we wish them the best kind of retirement possible.

Mr. HOFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HOFIELD. I yield to the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I join in everything that has been said by the gentleman from California, Congressman HOFIELD, and other Members here in regard to my friend Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

He came to the Congress, in January 1948, 3 years after I came, which was in the 78th Congress. I can truthfully state in observing the long service of GEORGE MILLER that I do not know a Member of Congress who can leave this body after 28 years with a record that will benefit humanity and our Nation more than the one that is standing here on this floor many times that his record scientifically and otherwise, through his work on the Committee on Science and Aeronautics is unparalleled. He devoted hours and hours and hours day after day, and week after week—work in scientific study that the ordinary Member of Congress does not realize. The honor, I think, is he has helped this Nation achieve.
on the Federal statute books, and the great results that will come scientifically in the hereafter will be reviewed by colleges for future years.

I am not familiar with the university George attended, but I do not believe there were two men anywhere in this country or abroad who has left their name on legislation particularly and as to accomplishments in scientific exploratory and space than GEORGE MILLER. Like many of us, some of the older Members here, I am fearful that George Miller devoted so much time here in Washington and during all his travels in behalf of space and science that he failed to go back and tell the people in his district about his magnificent record—and maybe some of his colleagues are at fault—that they did not go back to his district and inform them about his legislative achievements. If the majority of voters knew as his colleagues do—he could serve the Congress and the Nation for years to come.

But it may be that the voters of his district are certainly going to regret it, because it will not be long until the record of Congressman George Miller's service in Congress will be inculcated into the minds of the American public and the schoolchildren over the Nation for generations.

Congressman Miller's work toward science and space expansion is recognized by our nation's colleges, and nations throughout the world.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman in the well for allowing me to join our colleagues in expressing our appreciation to George Miller.

On my office wall I have an autographed photograph of the first airplane flight by Orville Wright as he lay prone on that frail craft and soared a few feet for a few seconds in the air.

That was in my lifetime. Largely due to the fact, dedication, and persistence of George Miller, also in my lifetime, I believe now 12 men have risen from my State of Florida and ascended some 300,000 miles to the moon and have safely returned.

What a magnificent achievement to have been recorded in relatively so short a time.

Some State is grateful to George Miller for what he has done, of which we have been a part. All of the scientific world—all of the world—that knows about science and astronautics also honor and consider him a leader of his day. He was a man who was the master of his subject. How many times I recall his coming before the Committee on Rules and sitting there without notes and discussing these scientific subjects in such a masterful way, revealing that he was thoroughly abreast of all the scientific knowledge that was involved in this very difficult field in which he was such a leader.

I remember also when he used to come as one of my colleagues, as he said, and talk about the metric system, and how our beloved late friend who was with us, Judge Smith, used to call it the "meas­ure" system, when George would present it in his committee, he almost got it adopted, and he has laid the predi­cate, probably, for the adoption by Con­gress and the country on what would be a forward step in the technology of our Nation's advancement.

Mr. Speaker, we shall remember George Miller for what he has done here in those 28 meaningful years, but the fact that will linger longest in the hearts and minds of many of us is the man, George Miller, the modest man, the gracious, gallant gentleman, the kindly human being, the man who looked upon the world with kindness, the man who looked upon his fellow men with affection, who looked toward the future with confidence, respecting always the great past, because he had made such a large contribution.

When that distant day may come, George Miller shall pass not only from this House, but into still another chamber where, too, he will be revered. Some members here will know of the man the gladiators fought on the field at Philippi over the body of Brutus: His life was gentle, and the elements so mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up And call him Man. "This was a man!"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent description of the Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the dean of the California delegation.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I rise to bid goodbye to our friend, George Miller, upon his retirement from the House after 28 years of dedicated service. Ten years ago when I came here, inexperienced in politics, from the newly created Ninth District in California, I leaned on him for advice and counsel. One half the district consisted of an area that he had represented for many years and he generously provided me with assistance on an almost daily basis.

Whatever no question of problem, I was never disappointed. His advice was sound and experienced; his friendship sincere and supportive. It made the first few months, indeed the first few years, of my work here in the House of Repre­sentatives much easier and much more productive.

In addition, I have the pleasure of being a member of the northern California delegation of which George Miller has been dean. As the dean of the largest delegation in the House, including San Francisco, San Jose and the great East Bay area, he has consistently provided an imaginative, creative, aggressive, and dealing with many difficult problems.

His contribution, year after year, to his native Alameda County has been huge. He is especially beloved in the city of Alameda where he has his charming and lovely wife, Esther, live.

But George Miller's contributions have reached far beyond his district and the State of California. As chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, he has been a foremost champion of the Nation's space program. Under his careful and dedicated direction, the space program has grown from a small organization involving a few rockets and the imaginative dream, to a large, techni­
cally sophisticated Agency which leads the world in aeronautical achievements and which has succeeded in sending men to and returning them from the moon.

For his sustained leadership in the formulation and execution of national policy contrib­uting measurably to the remark­able accomplishments of the U.S. space effort. As the recipient of this award, he joined the ranks of such distin­guished men as Werner von Braun, John Glenn, President Johnson and Astronauts Armstrong, Collins, and Aldrin, the first men to land on the moon. He has also been honored by being chosen to serve as Special Adviser to the U.S. Ambassa­dor to the United Nations for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, as a member of the Select Committee on Government Research, and as a member of the Na­tion al Historical Publications Commit­tee.

Mr. Speaker, I will sorely miss this fine gentleman and legislator. I know that my colleagues will miss him, too, and that the House of Representatives will not be the same without him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me at this time.

I want to join with the gentleman from California (Mr. Holifield) and all of my colleagues who have paid the deserved tributes that have been paid to George Miller, the gentleman from California, this evening. Among all the scientific things which have been said, I would like to add another element, and that is a knowing mind and an understanding heart. He will be missed not only for his scientific leadership, but he will be missed also for all those approaches he has made for so many of us for all these years. I wish for him and his good wife everything that is good and just for as long as they wish it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch).

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me at this time.

I want to join with the gentleman from California (Mr. Holifield) and all of my colleagues who have paid the deserved tributes that have been paid to George Miller, the gentleman from California, this evening. Among all the scientific things which have been said, I would like to add another element, and that is a knowing mind and an understanding heart. He will be missed not only for his scientific leadership, but he will be missed also for all those approaches he has made for so many of us for all these years. I wish for him and his good wife everything that is good and just for as long as they wish it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the distinguished dean of the California delegation is taking this oppor­tunity to give us a chance to say a word about one of our really, great Members. I have known George Miller ever since the first day I came to the Congress. I served on two committees with him. I served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and I was a tech­

freshman in this House and I served under his chairmanship as a junior mem­
ber of the Committee on Science and Astronautics when I was the majority leader. He has been a great chairman and he has been a great man.

I have had the honor of knowing George Miller for many years. He and his wife I have known most Members of this House. We were on the same floor for a long time, the fifth floor of what we now call the Cannon Building. I know his family and his daughter, and I knew his daughter long before she was grown and married. I am very happy she went to Stillwater and married a boy who was attending the University of Oklahoma.

George Miller has truly had an illustrious career. He spanned an epoch in his service on the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the great epoch which covered the years between the time the United States entered the space race and the day when the world by launching the first spuntuk to the moon, as John F. Kennedy had promised when he became President of the United States. We did it on time. He was the leading figure in the Congress of the United States in that great feat. Of course that was only the most dramatic of the things for which he can claim credit.

His work on the committee covered many phases of science. Every year for many years he has conducted scientific panels and has made it possible for interested congressmen to meet the most outstanding men of science from the world over. I suppose he has had more contact with the most eminent scientists of this world of any man who ever served in the House of Representatives.

He has been not only a great chairman, but also an outstanding Congressman and a great American. He is my friend. I am proud to know him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the distinguished Speaker for those remarks.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the whole world knows that George Miller is one of the most distinguished men of our Congress. The Members of Congress know that he is one of the most capable and well-informed men of any Congress. Those of us who served with him also know that mixed with all those great attributes is the fact that he is a good and kindly gentleman.

I have not been privileged to serve with him as many years as many of the Members here, but I can say that no one conducts himself with more pleasantness or graciousness than does George Miller.

I think I always will see George Miller and Mr. Miller there in your eating room eating together; complete devotion to each other, and as a team, devoted to the Congress.

I think it is also perhaps time that we say to the people of his district, "We thank you for sending us George Miller for all these years." He has made us one of the world's finest statesmen. We thank them and we thank their respect to this man who led us in scientific endeavor.

As you look at him, he does not look like any scientist at all. He might be more properly referred to as a man who looks like a Methodist preacher.

The truth of the matter is that he is a great Congressman and a great statesman. We all miss him very much.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to pay my respects to my good friend, George Miller. I have not known George for long. Those 4 years have been full of good knowledge, and I have learned from him and from the activities in which he and I have been involved.

Not too long ago we were at the South Pole together, at Antarctica, and because of our age—that was the reason they gave us—we were not able to go to Vladivostok and Byrd's Station at the South Pole, but we had an opportunity to go up to Beardsmore Glacier.

While we were there, the scientists brought forth the second set of fossils, and George Miller, in the spirit of looking to see the little pictures of fish and small invertebrates, happened to be a recipient of a rock that has the perfect leaf in it, the same thing they found in Africa.

George, to me, is one of the most knowledgeable men I have ever met in my life. He is very considerate of the members of his committee. He always was willing to take them into his consideration as far as his thinking and activity within the committee itself.

We in Congress are losing one of the most knowledgeable men who has ever had the privilege to be in this body.

I would like to say to my good friend, George, that we hope that somewhere down the road we will have an opportunity to put our hands together and to see the little pictures of fish and small invertebrates that we found in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Miller of Ohio would like to convey his respects to Miller from California. I feel very strongly that this Congress, this country, and our world is better off because George Miller came our way.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to take this opportunity to join in this well-deserved tribute to a distinguished gentleman and good friend.

Since President Kennedy died and the space age began, we might as well span the continent and go to the State of New York to speak of our distinguished Congressman from California. George Miller has devoted himself to your oceanography, and he has chaired this important committee during the momentous period in the history of this Nation. I trust that the great memories which this experience has provided will give him happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

I welcome this opportunity to extend to him and to his fine wife every good wish for health and happiness in the years ahead. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to George Miller as well, as those who have been before me have done before. I particularly want to emphasize his service on the House Armed Services Committee, which has not been mentioned here very much. I used to sit next to him on that committee. I noticed that he was always dedicated to the idea of seeing that our country remained strong so that world peace would be maintained. I also noticed he understood outside the idea that a man who fought for our country, whether on the sea, in the air, or on the land, should have his problems considered carefully by Congress. He did that. He always inquired as to the care of the enlisted men and other people who served with the Armed Forces, to see that their living conditions were adequate and proper, in conformity with the life of this great country of ours.

As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not for the young man who has the ability of this great country of ours.

He has chaired this important committee during the momentous period in the history of this Nation. I trust that the great memories which this experience has provided will give him happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

I welcome this opportunity to extend to him and to his fine wife every good wish for health and happiness in the years ahead. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to George Miller as well, as those who have been before me have done before. I particularly want to emphasize his service on the House Armed Services Committee, which has not been mentioned here very much. I used to sit next to him on that committee. I noticed that he was always dedicated to the idea of seeing that our country remained strong so that world peace would be maintained. I also noticed he understood outside the idea that a man who fought for our country, whether on the sea, in the air, or on the land, should have his problems considered carefully by Congress. He did that. He always inquired as to the care of the enlisted men and other people who served with the Armed Forces, to see that their living conditions were adequate and proper, in conformity with the life of this great country of ours.

As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.

One of the things we treasure very much in the Congress is the brotherhood of Members of Congress. It probably is not truly understood. I think of this great country of ours. As I close I should like to point out one particular characteristic which I have always greatly admired in this Congressman; his willingness to be a member of a team, and not the type requiring that he be the captain of the team. He has been extremely helpful to me in counseling with me and giving me advice and helping me in things I was interested in. I am deeply grateful.
Members, a very fine and very warm friend and guide. He is a man of the greatest integrity and honesty, and is also very wise, good, and generous.

I pride myself on having been able to serve the same body with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). As chairman of the Science and Aeronautics Committee he has helped guide the Nation to some of its greatest scientific achievements. That and the fact that he has been a pioneer in the space effort hinge. And in this respect, George, as your friend and colleague, I salute you and wish you and Mrs. MILLER great abundance of happiness in the coming years.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to George MILLER, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Aeronautics.

George MILLER has been a pioneer in the space effort of this century. Others have spoken at length of his outstanding career and I shall not extend my remarks except to say that in my judgment the man and the public servant he is have made an imprint on the history of our country which will endure for generations.

George MILLER has served in the House for more than a quarter of a century and, during this time, has continually proven himself a loyal and dedicated representative both for the interests of his own constituency and the Nation as a whole.

His experience and expertise as chairman of the Science and Aeronautics Committee has been instrumental to—and integral to—the formulation of legislation upon which the numerous accomplishments of the United States space effort hinge. And in this respect, George has himself contributed significantly to the various historic moments he has witnessed during his extensive career in Congress.

I know that he carries back many memories of his time in California and, for one, will, of course, always be remembered here.

Mr. BIAOGLI. Mr. Speaker, after having served the Congress for nearly 30 years, Congressman GEORGE MILLER of California—a good friend of mine and a trusted colleague—is leaving us shortly. For—after having completed his 14th consecutive term to this body, he has not sought re-election this time. And I especially know George MILLER from having worked with him during my first term 22 years ago on the House Science and Aeronautics Committee, of which he was then, and is now the chairman. Particularly from my dealings with him then—but on all other occasions as well—I can say, most forthrightly, that he has always been of tremendous counsel and assistance to me.

And his record of public service is to be commended as well. Indeed, before he was elected to the Congress, he had served for two terms in the California State Assembly—from 1937 to 1941—and then as the executive secretary of California's Fish and Game Division—from 1941 to 1944 He is also a World War I veteran, having served at that time in the field artillery as a lieutenant.

And he has since become a Member of Congress in 1944. George MILLER has served not only the constituents of his own district in California, but of course, has served the Nation as a whole. He has done so in his capacity as chairman of the House Science and Aeronautics Committee as well as in the role he has played on the Special Select Committee on Governmental Activities in the Executive Branch and on the Congressional Ad viser to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. For such activities as these, he has been the recipient in 1967 of the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Trophy—an award which in part noted:

His sustained leadership in the formulation and execution of national policy concerning the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. And the numerous accomplishments of the United States space effort.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE MILLER—after so many years of distinguished service to the Congress of the Nation—will clearly be missed when he leaves us after his current term in January. But—in whatever GEORGE MILLER decides to do in his future activities—I certainly wish both him and his family well.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we say our goodbyes to those of our colleagues who will not be with us next Congress and who will not be with us in January, I note with a very deep sense of personal regret that my distinguished fellow Californian, the Honorable George P. MILLER, will not be with us.

For 28 years George MILLER has devoted his energies, loyalties, and his enormous capabilities to serving not only his own constituents, but also the people of California and the Nation. His tireless efforts and expert leadership as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Aeronautics have advanced our space program to heights beyond the imagination of any man. More than any other single person in the Congress, he is responsible for the greatness America has achieved thus far in the space program brought us nearer to the ultimate “giant step for mankind.”

George MILLER’s name is on a plaque on the moon. George MILLER’s name is in the hearts of all of us who have worked with him.

Mr. VANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues here today in saluting the work of Chairman Graces MILLER on the most important things that have been done in the space program. The last day of Congress is that there are so many friends one has to say goodbye to—yet I hope that in the years to come we will have the opportunity to visit and meet again with these retiring colleagues.

Until such time, I simply want to say that it was a privilege and honor to serve the same body with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

As chairman of the Science and Aeronautics Committee he has helped guide the Nation to some of its greatest scientific achievements. That and the fact that he has been a pioneer in the space effort hinge. In this respect, George, as your friend and colleague, I salute you and wish you and your family the best in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we all salute you and wish you and your family the best in the years ahead.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this time has been made available because of the closing hectic days of the Congress to plan ahead for a time and to notify the Members of our delegation that there will be a time for these tributes. We spoke of it, but we could not fix just when it would be.

We have seized upon this opportunity, because there was no other business before the House. We have been very fortunate to have the time we have been using here, which we would not have been used otherwise. I know there will be a great abundance of happiness in the hearts of all of us who have worked with him in the years ahead.

In closing these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that in my 28 years of association with George MILLER in the House, I have never known a man and a woman who are respected more. I have never known a person I liked better. I have never known a man who lived by Christian principles and deep love of his fellow man and adherence to his concept of what was good for the people of his district and Nation more.

I am proud to have had this experience with him. The California delegation is proud we have had a man of such tremendous accomplishments.

We are sad, of course, that he is leaving, but we know that there are still a lot of things George MILLER will be able to do. I have heard him talk about some of the things he wants to do. I believe if he did just what he wants to do, it would be one of the richest experiences in literature any man could read.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want George MILLER to wish one more happy and prosperous day to the other members of your family great happiness and good health in the years that lie ahead. Thank you for being with us. Thank you for being the grand human being you are.
Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4678) to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara, with Senate amendments thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this amendment has to do with the production of nylon, and the name of which is awfully hard to pronounce, caprolactam monomer, which is used in the production of nylon.

Mr. Speaker, we have examined this amendment, and I propose to offer an amendment to concur in the Senate amendment, fixing the date of this suspension of the duty as of December 31, 1972 in the following new item:

```
907.50 Caprolactam monomer, which is used in the production of nylon,. . . . .
```
yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman if we can expect the Committee on Ways and Means to consider this matter after the first of the year.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Certainly. Whenever we get to consider trade legislation it will be a part of that committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 3 and concur with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

TITLE II—REGULATION OF IMPORTATION OF PRE-COLUMBIAN MONUMENTAL OR ARCHITECTURAL SCULPTURE OR MURALS

Sec. 201. The Secretary, after consultation with the Senate Committee on the Arts and Humanities and the Committee on Ways and Means shall promulgate, and thereafter when appropriate shall revise, a list of stone carvings and wall art which are pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural which is exported from the United States. Such list shall be revised at least every 5 years.

Sec. 202. (a) No pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural which is exported (whether or not such exportation is to the United States) from the country of origin after the effective date of this title is to be imported into the United States unless the Secretary shall promulgate a list of such sculpture or mural pursuant to section 202 may be imported into the United States unless the government of the country of origin of such sculpture or mural issues a certificate, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, which certifies that it was not in violation of the laws of that country.

(b) If the consignee of any pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural is unable to present the customs officer concerned at the time of making entry of such sculpture or mural a copy of such certificate, the Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. RHODES. By approximation, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rather odd situation here. In the first place, there is no controversy whatever about the pre-Columbian art legislation. We have to do something about it, and everybody agrees this is what has to be done.

The situation is that a narrow class of very valuable archeological objects from the pre-Columbian period in South America are being taken out of that country illegally, and being brought into this country.

There is no prohibition in this country about bringing in these articles, the prohibition is against taking these articles out of the country in which they are found, and this is an attempt to cooperate with the countries to avoid this exploitation that is taking place.

The pre-Columbian art bill is unquestionably a good bill. It passed the House by unanimous consent; it has passed the Senate. The Senate added some amendments on it, and the bill went to conference. In conference we accepted an amendment that was offered by Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, with custom port security control on which there is general agreement, and is very much needed. But there was one other item that we modified in conference which has to do with judicial review. It may have imperfections in it, and cause some problems.

Frankly, my own view is that this pre-Columbian art problem should be cured by calling up the conference report which is sitting up on the desk, but because of the objection that has been raised, by the Treasury the conference report is not being called up.

In view of this, the needed pre-Columbian legislation passed by both Houses is just languishing.

This is a way to avoid bringing up the conference report that is sitting up on the desk, but still to obtain the passage of the pre-Columbian art legislation.

I am most opposed to these procedures, but I certainly support the amendment that is before the House at this time. I would not suggest that anyone object to what is proposed.

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

Mr. BYRNEs of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. The countervailing tariff measure that the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned was adopted in the
Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I think it is more a question of timing in doing this than anything else.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The point is—this is something the gentleman and the committee would give attention to in the next Congress.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Oh, yes—and Secretary Connally was for it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying I just raise this point because I think the history is of some interest to the Members and also because of the fact I want to make it absolutely clear that there should be no objection to the pre-Columbian amendment which the chairman is now proposing. The House and the Senate passed it and it is absolutely noncontroversial and essential.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this House has worked long and hard for many weeks and many months, and I wonder whether at the time of night when pre-Columbian art is taken up and seems to me to be a subject of this nature could have been taken up weeks and weeks before.

I am interested in art, and I visit art galleries. I have visited them almost all over the world, and I enjoy art. I do not know that I would oppose importation of pre-Columbian art. Aztec art, or Mayan art, and the like, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been brought up at this time when other matters of much more import confront this House. It just simply is not the time for us to consider these things.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first let me make it clear the pre-Columbian art is where legislative deals with items stolen in the country of origin. If it is stolen it cannot be brought in.

Mr. CARTER. I would generally agree with that. I do not want to oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been taken up weeks and weeks before.

I am interested in art and I visit art galleries. I have visited them almost all over the world, and I enjoy art. I do not know that I would oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, and the like, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been brought up at this time when other matters of much more import confront this House. It just simply is not the time for us to consider these things.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first let me make it clear the pre-Columbian art is where legislative deals with items stolen in the country of origin. If it is stolen it cannot be brought in.

Mr. CARTER. I would generally agree with that. I do not want to oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been taken up weeks and weeks before.

I am interested in art and I visit art galleries. I have visited them almost all over the world, and I enjoy art. I do not know that I would oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, and the like, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been brought up at this time when other matters of much more import confront this House. It just simply is not the time for us to consider these things.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first let me make it clear the pre-Columbian art is where legislative deals with items stolen in the country of origin. If it is stolen it cannot be brought in.

Mr. CARTER. I would generally agree with that. I do not want to oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been taken up weeks and weeks before.

I am interested in art and I visit art galleries. I have visited them almost all over the world, and I enjoy art. I do not know that I would oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, and the like, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been brought up at this time when other matters of much more import confront this House. It just simply is not the time for us to consider these things.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first let me make it clear the pre-Columbian art is where legislative deals with items stolen in the country of origin. If it is stolen it cannot be brought in.

Mr. CARTER. I would generally agree with that. I do not want to oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been taken up weeks and weeks before.

I am interested in art and I visit art galleries. I have visited them almost all over the world, and I enjoy art. I do not know that I would oppose importation of pre-Columbian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, and the like, but I do think it seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been brought up at this time when other matters of much more import confront this House. It just simply is not the time for us to consider these things.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first let me make it clear the pre-Columbian art is where legislative deals with items stolen in the country of origin. If it is stolen it cannot be brought in.
been I would have objected to the manner in which it was presented.

I will say to the gentleman, since I see two of our distinguished colleagues in the other body here in the Chamber, I want the gentleman from Arkansas to know if the bill, H.R. 16810, comes back in a different form from what it was when I passed this House, I will make it quite plain I will object.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I understand the gentleman’s position. He has made it clear before. I am not talking about the gentleman’s position. He has made it clear before. I am not talking about the situation in which it was presented.

Mr. PICKLE. Yes. The present Magna

nuson bill for States with chronic unem-

ployment will not expire until actually the end of the year, and with the benefits we have been able to give they will go to early spring. But unless we include some other States, some 15 more than we did this afternoon, I will object.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. What we are talking about is the situation the Ways and Means Committee will look into and try to provide a remedy that will take care of that, and I am satisfied my friend, the gentleman from Texas, would want to do that next year if this develops.

I am sorry my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, will not be here with us, but what we are talking about is exactly in line with what he suggested earlier in the day: Let us go back and review the formula we have and make it work more satisfactorily than the present formula works.

REVIEW OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker,

I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. One point which I overlooked in my objection with my statement a few moments ago: It is not 4 percent within the State that I am suggesting the change in, but 4 percent of covered employees made unemployed if that figure is reached in a State or exceeded in a State, but I say at the same time it must be qualified by the 120-percent, then the program is not working properly.

Then the formula is not working.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The in-

sured unemployed?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is cor-

rect. 4 percent of the labor force who are unemployed is what I am talking about.

Whenever that figure happens to be reached by a State, I want that State to get the benefit of this rule.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE PAGE BELCHER

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay tribute to a great Oklahoman, a gentleman who has served for 22 years in this body. He is a friend, I am sure, as I have witnessed to every Member of this body, and that is the Honorable Page Belcher.

I knew Page Belcher first about 1929, when I was the chairman of the Young Republican Organization in Garfield County, Okla., and Page was running for his first political office. During Page’s early career, he had a very unusual thing happen. He had a tie race, and to break the tie they flipped a coin, and Page lost.

Page has one of the best speeches that I have ever heard in my lifetime pertaining to one vote. This speech was brought about, because of this instance in his life.

Page served northwest Oklahoma until 4 years of his Congressan, and then moved in to Tulsa, Okla., because of redistricting. Previous to his experience in Congress, Page was an assistant to the Congressman from the Sixth Congressional District in Oklahoma, Mr. Ross Wiley.

Page has completed a good tenure in Congress. He has been an individual who has been respected by all Members of this body. Through his retirement this year we will lose a very fine Member, as well as a very fine friend of this body.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will I yield to the distinguished Mr. CAMP. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma has spoken eloquently, and properly so, about our colleague, Page Belcher.

I can say without any hesitation, re-

servation, or equivocation that there has not been a more staunch person in this body when it came to tough issues than Page Belcher.

On the other hand, I have seen him in committee; I have seen him on the floor, work effectively to get things done. I call to mind one particular instance in this Congress. I am sure we all believe we would have had an acceptable pesticide control bill if it had not been for Page Belcher. The previous pesticide legis-

lation was unsatisfactory and unaccept-

able. Page Belcher, by diligent work after hour after hour, helped to pre-

sent a pesticide control bill to the House, and subsequently worked in conference to improve it for a delegation which is a vast im-

provement over previously existing law.

This is only one indication of the kind of topflight legislator Page Belcher has been. He has done masterful work in getting constructive legislation through the House, through the Congress, so that we could have a better America.

People in agriculture owe a great debt of gratitude to Page. People of the dis-

trict, of the State of Oklahoma and of the country are indebted to Page Belcher for the long and constructive service he has rendered during his term of office in the House, and in the Congress.

In my responsibilities I could turn to Page at any time, and he would give a straight answer, a good answer, and he would stand like a rock against pressures from all sides for the things that were right and good for his country.

I will miss Page. We all will. I wish him and his family the very best.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague for yielding.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Oklahoma Members may extend their remarks on the subject of the service and life of Page Belcher, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days, or such legislative time as remains, to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O’NEILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my good friend from northwestern Okla-

homa has taken this time to pay trib-

ute to Page Belcher. As a matter of fact, most of the territory geographically which Mr. CAMP represents today in the House was represented by Page Belcher when he first came to Congress.

No one will be more missed in this body than Mr. Page Belcher, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, Page Belcher. We have been colleagues and friends for a long time. Page has served the State of Oklahoma less than I have—I came in the 80th Con-

gress and Page in the 82d.

We served together on the Committee on Agriculture. I also served on the Wheat Subcommittee, a subcommittee which I chaired when he was ranking mi-

nority member. As I mentioned, Page represented the northern part of Okla-

homa and the oil-producing area in the State. His service on the
Wheat Subcommittee was critically important to his constituents as well as to all wheat growers.

We worked well together on the subcommittee and the committee. Page believed, as I did, that the farmer had far too large a handicap in the marketplace; he and I always supported commodity price support programs which, though smaller than I would have liked, were a fighting chance to stay on the land, and try to maintain a reasonable balance between their capital investment and operating costs and the price for their crops.

Of the State as well as other rural areas still had some distance to go in obtaining adequate electric power and telephone lines, and Page and I always supported rural electrification and telephone programs.

There, of course, were times when we did not agree legislatively, and a few occasions, I recall one in particular, where I wanted to mention this before an audience. At a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in Tulsa I introduced Page as "my good friend and a great statesman." Page told them that he, "had much in common, both of us being Members of Congress, lawyers, Southerners, Methodists, and members of many of the same organizations. I then said, "Page, just made one mistake which Page told them: He became a Republican." This was greeted with silence. I then turned to Page and said, "You know, Page, that would not hurt you with this group." The audience applauded and brought a chuckle from the crowd.

In addition to other similarities in our background, Page and I are both Tau­reans, his birthday being April 21 and mine May 8. We have not played up the fact that we both were born under the sign of the bull but it may explain why we discovered years ago that we were avid and compatible bridge players. Page was my house in the Congress­sional Staff Club's weekly sessions. We also played in tournaments together, including the Nationals. We happened to be playing at the Sherry­ton Hotel in Washington the day after I was elected majority leader. The photographers kept snapping away at us until the other partners demanded to know what was going on. Page told them that his partner was the next majority leader of the House of Representatives. Page always had a lack of "side" and a modesty which made him happy to focus attention on anyone who had succeeded or advanced in any way.

A few years later when I was convalescing from a heart attack, Page wrote me a letter which I hope he will not mind having you read.

From all the accounts in the paper you seem to be regaining your health and I am extremely happy about that. I think one of the most tiresome things you have to do, Carl, is not to overwork yourself and get ambitious too quickly. I personally want you to be able to carry on your pretty good social life and want any changes in the Majority leadership.

I think it would be very good for you to spend a little bit more time playing bridge with me instead of taking care of all the social demands that aren't worth a darn to you.

Thus he sought to entice me to spend more time playing the game we both love.

Page certainly understands the burdens of leadership. He is ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture. If the Page family has the authority to organize the House, he, of course, would be chairman of his committee.

He also represents Oklahoma and 12 other States on the powerful House Re­publican Committee which formulates the policy for the party on legislation coming from all of the committees of the House.

As you know, every organization has certain people who are known for their even-tempered, compassionate nature. Whether you choose to use the word gentle­man, genteel, humane, or what have you, Page as a person is regarded in that light by his colleagues and friends. He is the least presumptuous person. He has a balanced view of himself, other people, and life. He is not a pious do-gooder, not an egoist, not a trivial man. He is a genuinely serious, dedicated, judicious American who has always taken his responsibilities seriously, but has the bal­ance to work into his life a happy family, entertaining and kindred interests. He is the kind of Congressman who gives genuine substance to a political party and a political body.

I am a friend of Page. I deeply regret to see him leave the House. But no one knows better than he and I, that personal freedom diminishes as responsibility increases. I cannot begrudge any man the right to have first call on his own time after many years of public service which, while gratifying, is a juggling whose demands are never entirely fulfilled. Page has served here 22 years. He has served our country honorably and has earned a rest. I hope that he and his good wife, Gladys, who is a wonderful friend of my wife and myself, will enjoy the retirement which they have earned.

I hope Page will have the opportunity to spend many more days and many more happy occasions with this wonderful per­sonal friend. I know of no man whom I admire more for whom I have a higher personal regard than this colleague from Oklahoma, Page Belcher.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speak­er, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speak­er, with all the depth of sincerity that I possess, I associate myself with the re­marks just made by the Speaker. He and I have been Members of this body for many years on the Committee on Agriculture, and should I be recalled and should the Republican caucus see fit, I will be in the position of endeavoring to fill some very large shoes. To fill the shoes of a man who is a wonderful friend of my wife and myself, I hope that he and his good wife, Gladys, who is a wonderful friend of my wife and myself, will enjoy the retirement which they have earned.

The only possible difference I could find from the Speaker's comments—and they were not intended by him to be meant in this sense at all, I know—would be this: Page always has been only a great American, possessing a fine mentality and know-how, and a fine Member of Con­gress, but in spite of his little indisposi­tion, which he seems to be getting over rapidly, he will be out there on that golf course shooting in the low 80's and get­ting eagles, as he does from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss him very much as my leader on the Committee on Agriculture, the position which he has held during these long years in which we have served together.

Mr. BELCHER. I am just delighted and honored to have been able to pay tribute to Page Belcher, a really great American.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speak­er, will the gentleman from Okla­homa yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speak­er, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, although it was never my privilege to serve on the Committee on Agriculture, it was 12 years ago that I first came to know Page Belcher. Since that time the passage of time has only served to increase my admiration and respect for the contributions that he has made to agriculture.

I think that we have had an unusually large number of tributes in the closing days of this second session of the 92d Congress paid to various departing Members of Congress. I cannot more richly deserve these tributes than the man about whom we are now speak­ing, Page Belcher.

Mr. Speaker, as many stories come into my mind about Page because of the very unusual and very pungent and pitying sense of humor with which he was equipped.

I remember on one occasion as a freshmen Member of this body asking Page, "What do you do when you go home and campaign?"

His reply was simply this: "John, I go home and sit down on a wagon tongue and listen to what the peo­ple have to say."

Mr. Speaker, I think that may be part of the secret of his great success as a legislator. It is what has endeared him to many of us as a man: His willingness to listen and to take interest in our prob­lems.

Coming, as I do, from a great agricul­tures State, I feel it very reasonable to ap­preciate the great contributions that he made to the American farmer. We are going to miss him in this body, and I am pleased that I have had this opportunity to pay this final tribute and to wish him and his wife many happy and useful years in retirement.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Okla­homa for yielding to me.

Page Belcher was one of my precept­ors when I came to this body in 1964. He is one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. Some of the advice he gave me has helped me through these years. I hope that he and his wife, Gladys, will enjoy the retirement which they have earned.

Another thing was concerning the con­struction of dams. He said that everyone below a dam was for it; everyone above the dam was against it; and everyone at the dam did not give a dam.

Mr. Speaker, Page Belcher was not only a great football player, but he was a great golfer and a master in playing bridge.
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Truly the House is losing a great person­
ality, and I regret that Page Belcher is
retiring.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the
gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I
recognize and appreciate for having
served in this great body. He knows pre­
viously from Oklahoma regarding our beloved
friend, Page Belcher, who is retiring
from the Congress at the end of this
session.

I am confident Page Belcher will be
recognized and appreciated for having
been a ranking minority member, has left an
indelible mark on American agriculture.
Everyone involved in agriculture will long
remember his contributions.

His service on the House Agriculture
Committee, including his tenure as its
ranking minority member, has left a
remarkable record in American agriculture.

His record of success in the 92d Congress
as the ranking minority member, has left an
distinguished mark of the gentleman
from California regarding our beloved
friend, Page Belcher, who is retiring
from the Congress at the end of this
session.

I am referring to the settlement of the
World War II lend-lease debt owed to
the United States by Russia and the new
trade agreements.

Congressional implementation of the
trade agreement, of course, depends
largely on what the Soviet Union does
to facilitate the emigration of Jews who
wish to remain.

But even here, there are hopeful signals.
News reports indicate the Soviet Union
will ease the imposition of exit taxes,
applying them selectively for the time
being and then allowing them eventually
to wither into disuse.

The significance of the two agreements
signed today cannot be underestimated.
The Soviet Union has agreed to honor
its World War II debts 12 years after
the last negotiations were broken off.

The trade agreement has the potential
of a major economic partnership between
America and Russia, a partnership which
will make it easier to resolve outstanding
and future political differences between
us. I am sure it will be quickly imple­
mented by Congress if the Soviet Union
adopts an equitable policy on Jewish emi­
gration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted
for the historical record—if nothing
else—that the House Foreign Operations
and Government Information Subcommittee
of the Committee on Government
Operations played an instrumental role
in helping to initiate the United States-
Soviet debt talks. We are proud of that
contribution and hope that it will lead
to new understandings between our two
great countries.

I have received a letter from Com­
merce Secretary Peterson commencing the
subcommittee and I insert the text of
that letter following my remarks:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MOORHEAD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Opera­
tions, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Moorhead: I am pleased to ad­

vising you that today the U.S. and the Soviet
Union have signed a trade agreement which
we believe marks a major step forward in the
economic relationships between our two
countries.

The agreement includes a settlement of the
lend lease obligation which the Soviet Union
incurred during World War II. As you know,
the bilateral trade talks of the ministers of
the two countries have been in progress since
President Nixon met with Mr. Brezhnev earlier
this year to discuss details of the new
agreement and the lend lease settlement are con­
tained in the attachment.

I am most appreciative of the advice and
counsel you have given me on this subject,
and I earnestly hope you will be satisfied
with the terms of the agreement.

So the experience of the Committee today,
I recognize that more detailed briefings may
not be possible at this time. Please be assured
that we shall make every effort to apprise you
and members of the Committee of the
specific details of the agreement
and that the lend lease settlement are con­tained in the attachment.

I am most appreciative of the advice and
counsel you have given me on this subject,
and I earnestly hope you will be satisfied
with the terms of the agreement.

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from
North Carolina (Mr. Ruth).

Mr. RUTH. I thank the gentleman for
yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when I came here in 1949
as a new Congressman I was looking for
friends and advice, and I did not find any
anywhere, according to Clark MacGregor.

I would like to say I am honored to have been
able to serve with this gentleman,
and I wish him all the best in his
new life.

Mr. RAVISION. Mr. Speaker, I wish to
join the members of the Oklahoma
legation and other colleagues in the House
in commenting on the distinguished serv­
ice of Page Belcher of Tulsa.

As the Member of Congress from one of
the major agricultural districts in the
United States, I have had frequent occa­sion
to confer with the gentleman from
Oklahoma in regard to farm matters. He
has been most helpful to me and to the
people whom I represent in his capacity
as the ranking minority member of the
House Committee on Agriculture.

Page, during the past 12 years, has
worked more length and more eloquently
than I but none with greater respect
for you and your good work in behalf of our
country. I wish you continued good health
and good fortune in the years ahead.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like
to acknowledge that my wife and I have
been long-time friends of Gladys and
Page Belcher. We wish for them the
best in the years to come.

LEND-LEASE DEBT

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today
the United States and the Soviet Union
signed two historic agreements which it
agreed to carry out in good faith might change
the destiny of the world and help to
secure international peace for decades to
come.

I am referring to the settlement of the
World War II lend-lease debt owed to
the United States by Russia and the new
trade agreements.

Congressional implementation of the
trade agreement, of course, depends
largely on what the Soviet Union does
to facilitate the emigration of Jews who
wish to remain.

But even here, there are hopeful signals.
News reports indicate the Soviet Union
will ease the imposition of exit taxes,
applying them selectively for the time
being and then allowing them eventually
to wither into disuse.

The significance of the two agreements
signed today cannot be underestimated.
The Soviet Union has agreed to honor
its World War II debt 12 years after
the last negotiations were broken off.

The trade agreement has the potential
of a major economic partnership between
America and Russia, a partnership which
will make it easier to resolve outstanding
and future political differences between
us. I am sure it will be quickly imple­
mented by Congress if the Soviet Union
adopts an equitable policy on Jewish emi­
gration.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted
for the historical record—if nothing
else—that the House Foreign Operations
and Government Information Subcommittee
of the Committee on Government
Operations played an instrumental role
in helping to initiate the United States-
Soviet debt talks. We are proud of that
contribution and hope that it will lead
to new understandings between our two
great countries.

I have received a letter from Com­
merce Secretary Peterson commencing the
subcommittee and I insert the text of
that letter following my remarks:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MOORHEAD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Opera­
tions, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Moorhead: I am pleased to ad­
personnel employed now or previously by the White House and the Committee to Reflect the President.

In the military service, a unit's excellence is generally the result of a commanding officer's leadership when a unit performs badly, it is usually because of a failure of that leadership. The commander creates the environment in which subordinates either feel free to commit errors or not. The Commander in Chief owes an explanation as to whether he knew of the Segretti and Watergate operations, and if not, who it was who knew of them and why he did not advise his superiors.

I say these things with regret, I have been a Republican all my life. My Republican colleagues in the House and Senate include some of the most decent men and women in America. The activities of the Committee To Reflect the President, however, are such as to impeach all of us to dissociate ourselves from that committee and those to whom they have reported in the White House until a full explanation is made. The identity of the highest official who was aware of and condoned the Watergate and Segretti operations should be made public so that he should be fired forthwith, whether it is Dwight Chapin, John Mitchell, or the President himself.

The activities in question challenge the most basic of our national assets, the most basic of our national assets, the highest leaders of the nation, the President himself. Whether it is Dwight Chapin, or the President himself, whether it is Dwight Chapin, or the President himself, whether it is Dwight Chapin, or the President himself, it should be rejected on November 7th, 1972.

By Mark Twain on war:

"Peace" is authorized because it honors a man who has been so ineffective as to be without reason or reason. There never was a just one, never an honorable on any planet, a man from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDADE: Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, the 23rd of October, there will be celebrated in Scranton a mass of thanksgiving honoring the Reverend Andrew B. Bocianski, pastor of the Church of SS. Peter and Paul. This is an appropriate occasion because it honors a man who has given nearly 50 years of his life to the service of God and to his fellow man as a pastor in the Diocese of Scranton. It is well that his people should give thanks to God for such a pastor, and all of us might join in that thanksgiving.

Father Bocianski was born on October 7, 1896, in Simpson, Pa., the son of Frank and Catherine Wilantly Bocianski. He attended St. Thomas College in Scranton, then St. Mary's College and Scranton Theological Seminary. He was ordained a priest of the Catholic Church on October 7, 1926, at Orchard Lake, Mich. He then attended the Sulpician Seminary at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C., and was ordained to the holy priesthood at St. Peter's Cathedral, Scranton, by the Most Reverend Michael J. Hoban on May 29, 1926.

It would seem a simple thing to detail the priestly work of Father Bocianski, as assistant pastor at St. Hedwig's Church in Scranton, as pastor of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary in Scranton, and at St. Stanislaus in Nanticoke; then as pastor of Holy Cross in Butternwood, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in Mayfield, of St. Margaret's in Old Forge, then at SS. Peter and Paul in Scranton.

In fact, of course, that recitation does little to show how immensely this distinguished and beloved parish priest in the Diocese of Scranton. During those years, Father Bocianski served as pastor of the Scranton Chapter, Alumni of the Orchard Lake Schools; as a member, Supervisor Council, Alumni of the Orchard Lake Schools; chaplain, Ladies Auxiliary of the Orchard Lake Schools; member of the President's Club, University of Scranton; member of the chaplain of the Polish National Guard; member of the Century Club, Catholic University of America; vice-chaplain, Polish Union of the United States of America; chaplain of the Polish American Veterans District XI: spiritual director of the Polish National Alliance, Groups 3911 and 1218; spiritual director of the Polish Women's Alliance; chaplain, Polish National Guard; director of the Polish Falcons, Nest 214; director of the Diocesan Council Catholic League for Religious Assistance to Poland; director of St. Stanislaus' Institute, Nativity of St. Joseph, Scranton; treasurer, Friends of Poland Society of Lackawanna County; chaplain and honorary member, General Convention, Polish National Guard; president and member of the Board of Pastors, West Scranton Central Catholic High School.

It is a story of participation in the life of this community almost without peer, and his participation was to bring the richness of his own spiritual life into everything he touched.

For the past 17 years, Father Bocianski has served as pastor of SS. Peter and Paul Church in Scranton. He has been the spiritual leader of his people, but most especially he has given his heart to the young people of the parish. His greatest care has been for the parish elementary school, and the parish, under his pastorate, has sponsored the Cub Scout, the Boy Scout Troop 70, and the new "Young" Cub Scout pack.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will join me, as will all my colleagues here in the House, in that mass of thanksgiving on Sunday. In these difficult and trying times, when each day seems to bring new cares, new problems, it should take pause, however briefly, to thank God that He has sent to us so many remarkable men among us to lead us through our difficulties, men like our own good Father Bocianski.
REPORT OF THE 92D CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the end is a time for summing up, and as this 92d Congress concludes its business, I would like to report its successes and failures to the people of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

It may be premature to write the final history of the 92d Congress when swiftly moving events can sometimes alter endings. There have been significant accomplishments, however, in a Congress whose every action was taken against the backdrop of the Viet Nam war and whose posture on that war seemed finally to evolve into resignation to the will of the President. Here then is a report on that Congress.

SALT

One of the most historic acts of the 92d Congress was the ratification of the interdependent nuclear arms agreement with the Soviet Union. Hopefully, this end product of the President’s trip to Russia will also turn out to be one of the milestones in mankind’s struggle to survive and not perish.

REVENUE SHARING

I would call the enactment of the program in which revenue collected by the central government is returned to State, county, city and town governments one of the most significant developments in the recent history of federalism. It is an important cession of power and it is very direct relief to financially beleaguered subdivisions of government, which now have to support themselves. I recognize this great need and strongly advocated revenue sharing. Tenth District cities and towns will soon receive approximately $8 million under the first year allocation.

SENIOR CITIZENS

This Congress has been especially good to our senior citizens. It was particularly gratifying to me to see approval of a 25-percent increase in benefits over a 2-year period. This, together with the increase in the amount of outside income seniors could earn, I worked very hard in support of both.

CONSUMERS

American consumers got a half a loaf from this Congress. It consisted of a bill creating a program to assure consumers the products they buy and use are safe, and, if they are not, there is an official redress available. The Consumer Protection Agency, that would have given the public a double wrapper of safeguards in the marketplace was, unfortunately, filibustered to death in the Senate.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

The action of the 92d Congress which I lived with and take the most pride in was the enactment of my legislation creating a National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis. The hard-won agreement of the House and Senate in the dying hours of the session means the 92d Congress has done something that it now has more than a faint hope of help, they have a

nationally spotlighted effort designed to help them. This represents the Congress of the United States at its responsive best.

VETERANS

Increased benefits and better health care characterized the veterans legislation enacted by the 92d Congress.

As a member of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, I cosponsored seven major bills that provide for these increases in educational, disability and dependent benefits and in better hospital treatment.

Specifically, the legislation liberalized disability and death pensions; raises dependency and disability compensation to veterans over 65; extends veterans’ medical care to the dependents of veterans; creates a National Cemeteries System under the VA and provides burial plot allowances; increases compensation and allowances for disabled veterans.

In education, there are increases in allowances for vocational rehabilitation, special training, advance education and regular education.

There is a special program of Federal assistance to medical schools and other educational institutions training doctors and health personnel in conjunction or affiliation with veterans hospitals.

And, in the veterans housing bill, there is improved overall care in VA hospitals, upgrading of the operating and personnel practices of the hospitals, and extension of treatment to the dependents of veterans to their own or the veterans’ death from service-connected causes.

A new drug treatment and rehabilitation program for servicemen and veterans had been passed in both houses but there was no final agreement at session’s end.

HOUSING

The House Banking and Currency Committee, on which I serve, worked for more than 2 years on legislation to modernize and consolidate Federal programs to accommodate the Nation’s expanding housing needs.

The new housing bill that finally emerged was blocked by the Rules Committee from consideration on the floor of the House as the session drew to a close.

I was proud to have authored a number of provisions in the bill, two of which I think are significant.

One would have prohibited any discrimination against single, divorced, or widowed women trying to obtain FHA home mortgage financing; and it would have required that the income of married women be counted when they and their husbands apply for FHA home mortgage financing. This would not only have prevented a stop to the unwritten law that women should not be extended mortgage credit in their own name or in partnership with their husbands.

The other provision I sponsored would have extended Federal assistance to the owner-occupants and tenants of three-family housing—triple deckers. This was to encourage the rehabilitation of existing neighborhoods by making it unnecessary for low- and moderate-income families to relocate to sterile public housing developments. This would have been particularly beneficial in Fall River.

Regardless of whether another attempt is made in the next Congress to revise or rewrite the housing legislation, I intend to have these two provisions written into law. I believe that they are needed. And because housing legislation has become so complex as it increases in importance and touches nearly every aspect of the quality of life, I also believe there ought to be a separate House Committee on Housing and Urban Affairs.

Housing legislation is now handled by a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, which, needless to say, has many other concerns within its jurisdiction. Yet, the great needs of the American people are too broad and deep for them to have subcommittee status. I think only a full major committee with no other jurisdiction can do justice to this critical national issue.

SOVIET JEWRY

The terrible repression of Jews in the Soviet Union has grown worse. Any Jewish citizen now wanting to emigrate to any other country is subjected to the cruelest punishment and often to physical abuse.

Every Soviet Jew applying for a visa to leave is immediately dismissed from their job, and it is only after the visa is approved, before they can leave the country they must pay to the Government the equivalent cost of whatever level of education they have achieved.

This amounts to an inhuman ransom and constitutes the Soviet response to the outcries from the rest of the world over its previously reprehensible, but not as diabolical, treatment of its Jewish citizens.

I have introduced legislation which withholds from the Soviet Union favored nation treatment by the United States in any trade agreements between the two countries until this treatment of Jews is stopped.

The Soviets obviously are anxious for special trade with this country. Perhaps, they will be willing to act more civilized in order to get it.

DAY CARE

The biggest day care breakthrough in months came at the Republican convention in Miami Beach. As a member of the committee drafting the party platform, I made day care my No. 1 concern and I was able to win approval of a plank in the platform that puts the party on record in favor of a national program of locally controlled, federally assisted day care centers.

But it was not easy. It took no less than 96 writes before we came up with language that won the platform committee’s endorsement. It was worth it, because I think this more than anything has set the stage for congressional action that has a good chance of being signed into law.

That is going to be one of my top priorities in the next session of Congress.

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

A form of Federal assistance to parents overburdened by the rising costs of nonpublic education took a significant step forward in this session of Congress. It is still far from a reality, however.
Just before the end of the session, the House Ways and Means Committee approved legislation that would provide an income tax credit to the parents of nonpublic schoolchildren equal to half the annual tuition they must pay for each child, or $200, whichever is less. This is even more generous than the legislation I proposed and testified on before the committee. I hope that this tax credit approach does not violate the constitutional separation of church and state, which I strongly favor. It meets some of the tests of constitutionality laid down by the Supreme Court in older cases. The recent Ohio decision of the Court does cast a shadow on this approach. But that involved the expenditure of appropriated money whereas tax credit is a distinctly different matter.

Besides, it is desperately needed if the traditional American freedom of choice, inherent in the existence of a nonpublic school system, is to be preserved.

To allow that system to succumb to economic strangulation would also place an intolerable burden on the public schools of this country whose own sources of tax revenue are strained to the breaking point and which consequently already face a fiscal crisis of their own.

For example, if all the nonpublic schools in Falmouth were to close and the students transfer to public schools, the city real property tax rate would have to be increased by $46.20 per $1,000 assessed valuation. In Taunton, the increase would be $39.70. In Attleboro, $6.40.

In the same vein, I am also continuing my efforts to secure tax credit to help parents grapple with the skyrocketing cost of higher education.

**RESULTS OF REPRESENTATIVE MARGARET HECKLER'S 6TH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

(The figures below indicate the percentages in favor of the various positions outlined. The percentages do not add up to 100 because most people checked more than one category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>His</th>
<th>Her</th>
<th>Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam: Would you favor a national referendum on the war?</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The present mining and bombing policy</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Immediate and total withdrawal of U.S. forces</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Withdrawal by a date certain concurrent with release of U.S. prisoners</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Total military victory</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax reform: Would you favor appointment of a blue-ribbon constitutional amendment granting men and women equal rights?</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Complete medical and hospital coverage for everyone financed by federal matching contributions</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Limited coverage financed by employer-employee contributions with separate Federal pool for poor and low-income families</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Limited coverage with individual financing options and separate State pool for poor and low income</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Limited coverage with individuals granted credit on their Federal income tax liability for health insurance premiums they pay</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENIOR CITIZENS**

The country owes senior citizens something for the investment of themselves in decent, hard-working, law-abiding lifetimes that, in the aggregate, built America. I believe it owes them economic security, comfort, ease, good health care, Social Security income equal to their needs, adequate housing suitable to their needs, easy transportation, protection from crime, and the opportunity for social activities. Thus I have been supporting and working for 30-percent increase in Social Security benefits. I urge the Reagan Administration to provide these things for seniors.

Of more immediate importance is the Federal money that is currently able to obtain for additional senior citizens’ housing in Taunton.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has provided initial funds for planning and design work on an 80-unit complex for seniors. The project had been snarled in red tape, but we worked it out with city and Federal officials, and it is now proceeding on schedule.

**SOME OF MY OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATION**

URGE definite withdrawal date from Vietnam, concurrent with release of American prisoners.

Create a Joint Committee on the Environment.

Prohibit discrimination against the physically and mentally handicapped.

Provide tax credits for private non-profit elementary and secondary education and for higher education expenses.

Authorize programs to promote the cultural heritage of ethnic groups.

Establish Comprehensive Child Development Program.

Permit tax exemption of the first $5,000 of retirement income.

**CONSUMERS**

Two issues affecting Massachusetts consumers the most are food and fuel oil.

I have been working to bring price relief on both.

I called for a White House study of the entire food price situation which finds neither farmer nor housewife the beneficiary. Uncontrolled food prices defeat any attempt to check inflation by controlling wages and other prices.

The Price Commission held hearings on the subject, as I urged, but whatever little result there has been is not enough.

Massachusetts oil consumers—victimized by high prices resultant from increased imports of foreign crude oil—may be helped by two recent developments, but, again, not enough.

One is that the foreign oil import quota for New England has been slightly increased, boosting the supply and, hopefully, lowering prices.

The other is the decision to build a pipeline to bring Alaskan oil to California. I urged that the pipeline be built in Canada to bring the oil closer to New England. I just hope some of the additional oil from Alaska finds its way to Massachusetts to ease the price pressure.

I have been working on the oil situation with the bipartisan Congressional delegation from Massachusetts since I came to Congress. But the problem is that the big oil-producing states in the West and Southwest, which have money and a lot of votes, want foreign imports controlled to protect the domestic oil industry. That is New England’s chief competition and it is formidable.

**FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

**H.R. 14628. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax laws applicable to Guam, and for other purposes**

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 3 and recedes from Senate amendments numbered 4, 7, and 9 through 17 to a bill of the House of the following title:

**H.R. 10791. An act to establish the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, to provide for the preparation and carrying out of a development plan for certain areas between the White House and the Capitol, to further the development and carrying out of a development plan for the National Mall and the surrounding area, and for other purposes**

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments to a bill of the House of the following title:

**H.R. 4678. An act to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara**

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

**S. 1524. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of action for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property**

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 House to the bill (S. 3939) entitled “An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes”.

**October 18, 1972**
ER knows that the fact that he has not missed a day in Congress or a rollcall vote is not the sole test of a good Repre­sentative, but, Mr. Speaker, I know that he is definitely of the opinion that each Member should stand up and be counted on each issue. I have always believed this myself and I know that this is the main reason why I aze proud of the record that he has established.

As the records will disclose, Mr. Spea­ker, I do not have a perfect voting record, but I have an excellent record and one that I am proud of. I have endeavored to cast the vote of my people the way it should be cast.

Mr. Speaker, if the Clerk of the House would check the records back to March 4, 1775 which was the opening date of the First Session of the 1st Congress which met in the city of New York, he would find that no Member has served in either the House of Representatives or in the Senate of the United States who had a comparable record. We have a number of Members of Congress today who have excellent voting records and this (I was) the only one that I know of. Bill Natcher's record is a perfect record since he has never missed a vote for a period of 19 years.

BILL NATCHER is a Member of the Com­mittee on Appropriations and I know that his assignment to this committee certainly has placed him in a position where on more than one occasion he has had close calls in order to be present to cast his vote.

Mr. Speaker, the record established by Representative Natcher is one that he and his people can be proud of, and it is a privilege for me to call attention to the Members of Congress to this record.

THE ABZUG REPORT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, as Congress prepares to adjourn, I am sending my fourth report to my constituents on my work as their Congresswoman. This is­ sue recaps the entire 92d Congress and sets forth a few highlights of the bills and amendments which I have sponsored and supported.

I include in the text of the Abzug re­port at this point in the Record:

The Abzug Report

ON VIETNAM

The Abzug Resolution—A Bill to cut off all funds for the Vietnam War. The bill which I have introduced in the House calls for 1) cutting off funds for bombing and mining in Indo-China, 2) cutting off funds for military assistance to the Thieu government, and 3) withdrawing all U.S. military forces from Indo-China within 90 days of an agreement about war prisoners and establishing a coalition government that reflects political and military reality.

Other key issues that I have supported every attempt to force Congress to reassert its role in Foreign Policy by cutting off funds for the Vietnam War and setting a date for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops.
Free air rights in Chelsea—At 30th Street and 6th Avenue, I forced the Post Office to allow the air rights to the Morgan Annex to be used for low and moderate income housing, at no cost to New York City taxpayers.

ON SOCIAL SECURITY

The Abzug bill to increase social security benefits by 15%—I introduced the Abzug bill to increase social security benefits by 15%. This bill, known as H.R. 1, which passed the Senate on October 5, 1972, included numerous provisions, including:

- Increased "wifolds" benefits from the present 92% to the full 100% of the husband's benefits.
- Permission for social security beneficiaries to earn up to $3,000 (presently $1,500) annually without loss of benefits.
- A "qualified" minimum annual payment of $330 to each aged couple.
- Medicare payments for outpatient drugs.
- Reduction of the retirement age from 65 to 60.
- Reduction of widows' retirement age from 65 to 60.
- Other key issues—Some of my proposals which have not been enacted into law include:
  - A Cabinet Department for Elderly Affairs.
  - Elimination of the 3-year limit in applying for Medicare, housing and property tax relief for the elderly.
  - Employment for the middle-aged and elderly.
  - Pension insurance and portability programs.
  - Elimination of Medicare premiums and deductions and grants to private groups to provide transportation for the elderly.

ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

Emigration of Soviet Jews—I sponsored a resolution calling upon President Nixon to raise the question of treatment of Soviet Jews when he visited Moscow. I sponsored legislation to limit guarantees on U.S. companies' private investment in the U.S.S.R. if Jews are not allowed to emigrate. I sponsored and fought for legislation authorizing $85 million to Israel for resettlement there of Soviet Jews who did manage to emigrate.

The Fort Worth Five—I have opposed the imprisonment of those Irish-American patriots for refusing to testify before a Texas grand jury. I introduced a bill which would allow the Justice Department to investigate directly to a location convenient for witnesses, and joined with other members in pressuring the Justice Department to pursue the men while their case was on appeal. Frank Durkin, attorney for the men, credited my bill with helping to get defendants freed on bail.

solution of the Stormont government, and

ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The struggle for urban mass transit funds which I fought in committee and on the House floor to free highway trust fund money for subways, buses and other mass transit uses. I led the fight on the floor to make $700 million directly available to the cities.

The Abzug Water Pollution Control Bill—$1 billion dollars for New York State—I introduced the bill to clean up our lakes and rivers and I fought hard for strict provisions through Public Works Committee's year-long consideration of the bill. The version sent to the President, October 4, 1972, included a number of amendments which I proposed, including:

- Retainment of localities for funds already spent on pollution abatement (worth nearly $1 billion to N.Y. State);
- User charges on industrial users of municipal water treatment plants to pay for the waste they produce and pour into the municipal system;
- Citizen's groups against polluters and against public agencies which fail to stop pollution;
- 75% federal funding for local construction of water treatment plants.

Other key issues—I voted for strengthening the Environmental Protection Agency; and against nuclear testing at Amchitka Island.

ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS

The Equal Rights Amendment—I co-sponsored and worked very actively for the equal rights amendment to the Constitution which now has won approval from 20 of the necessary 38 states.

Maternity protection—The legislation which I introduced would assure adequate pre-natal care to pregnant women and guarantee that women would not be penalized for taking maternity leave time from their jobs and careers.

The Equality Act of 1972—I introduced the Equality Act of 1972. This bill prohibits sex discrimination in public education, federally assisted programs, housing sale and rental, and provides equal pay for equal work.

Other key issues—I have spoken out and introduced legislation forbidding sex discrimination in the granting of credit and got passed into law provisions on discrimination against women in major federally-funded programs.

ON TAXES

Abzug co-sponsors major tax reform proposals—I am the co-sponsor of several tax reform proposals, all of which have the effect of forcing the very wealthy to pay their fair share of taxes and reduce the tax burden on the middle class and the poor.

ON HEALTH CARE

Extending medicare coverage—The Medicare Bill which I co-sponsored eliminated all deductibles and premiums, and the cost of some deductibles and premiums to private groups to provide transportation for the elderly.

ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Federal funds to put more cops on the beat—I am a co-sponsor of the Kennedy-Griffith Bill which would establish a national Federal system of health insurance and encourage group medical practice.

ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Federal funds to put more cops on the beat—I am a co-sponsor of a bill to provide federal funds to increase the size of local police forces and upgrade the quality of local police protection.

Reform of the Criminal Justice System—The Bill which I co-sponsored, provides grants for speedy trials, improved correctional facilities, and direct local funding of criminal justice programs.

Tribute to the Honorable James A. Byrne

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend, Jim Byrne. His departure from the Congress is an occasion for deep personal regret on my part, for I shall miss him very much in the days to come.

Jim Byrne has compiled an outstanding record of service to the people of his district, to our State of Pennsylvania, and to the Nation.

Before he ever arrived in the House of Representatives, he was engaged in productive public life in Pennsylvania, serving as U. S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, chief disbursing officer for the State treasury, and as a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature from 1950 to 1953.

Jim was never too busy to give his best efforts to those positions that the people of Pennsylvania's Third Congressional District determined to send him to be their representative in the House. They renewed the mandate to him for 10 consecutive elections.

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania's Third District is Philadelphia's center city and the neighborhoods around it. It truly is a melting pot of ethnic and racial groups residing there. It has its rich and its poor, its educated and its barely literate.

It is a tribute to the genius of Jim Byrne for 20 years he gave a great majority of that disparate electorate the kind of representation they desired in Congress. He always put the service of his people first, working tirelessly to assure that they received a fair shake in their dealings with the Federal Government, whether on social security or on veterans' benefits or on their mail service.

Jim Byrne has been particularly active in looking for funds to increase the size of local police forces and upgrade the quality of local police protection.

Reform of the Criminal Justice System—The Bill which I co-sponsored, provides grants for speedy trials, improved correctional facilities, and direct local funding of criminal justice programs.

Job for ex-addicts—I have introduced a bill to create a National Environment Service Corporation, to be staffed by individuals convicted of drug violations.

More housing policy—I have introduced a bill to provide more housing policy in public housing projects.

As chairman of subcommittee No. 4 of the Armed Service Committee, Jim has been particularly active in looking out for the health, education and general welfare of the men and women of
the Armed Forces, and of their dependents. As a result of his energetic sponsor-ship of measures to aid our fighting men, our military is the best fed, receives the best medical and dental care, and is the best educated in the world.

Every man and woman wearing the American uniform had a friend in Jim Byrne, whether they knew him or not. This is largely as Jim prepares to leave this body and enter into a well-deserved retirement.

Jim, your many friends in the House wish you all the best for the future. May you return here often to visit us and give us the benefit of your experience and sage advice on the many difficult issues which the future will bring.

Mrs. Morgan joins me in wishing you, Jim, and your wife, Virginia, good health and all possible happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. TATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable James A. Byrne. Jim has been an asset to the State of Pennsylvania where he has served the district since 1852. His service to this body and the halls has been outstanding and I have tremendous admiration for Jim Byrne.

As a member of the Pennsylvania Delegation, I have observed that Jim is one of the State's finest legislators. Pennsylvania has lost a most dedicated man— a representative who has always thought of the welfare of his District, State, and Nation. As a Congressman, Jim has always shown depth, good judgment and wise counsel in the concern he has had for America's interests.

As a friend, I have in wishing him every success in his future endeavors as he returns to Pennsylvania.

I salute James A. Byrne as a man who has made an indelible mark in Congress and as a man whose friendship I shall always treasure.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Congressman James Aloysius Byrne is my friend. He has been a friend and colleague for over 30 years and I hope our friendship continues for another 30 years. I believe it will.

I would like to comment on his leave-taking. I feel privileged today, to have an opportunity to express my sincere feelings regarding my colleague and personal friend, James A. Byrne of Philadelphia. One of the first Members of Congress I knew was Jim Byrne. The floor of the House was James Byrne, who, incidentally, consciously introduced himself to me, the new Member. This gesture is typical of Jim Byrne's consideration and compassion for his colleagues in the House and for people generally. His constituents, I know, have long recognized this great quality of real feeling and concern of his fellow man.

Jim Byrne was a tireless worker and made meaningful and effective contributions to the Pennsylvania delegation in its attempt to represent all of Pennsylvania as a member of Congress. They knew him or not.

Jim Byrne was the American uniform had a friend in Jim Byrne, whether they knew him or not. This is largely as Jim prepares to leave this body and enter into a well-deserved retirement.

Jim, your many friends in the House wish you all the best for the future. May you return here often to visit us and give us the benefit of your experience and sage advice on the many difficult issues which the future will bring.

Mrs. Morgan joins me in wishing you, Jim, and your wife, Virginia, good health and all possible happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. TATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable James A. Byrne. Jim has been an asset to the State of Pennsylvania where he has served the district since 1852. His service to this body and the halls has been outstanding and I have tremendous admiration for Jim Byrne.

As a member of the Pennsylvania Delegation, I have observed that Jim is one of the State's finest legislators. Pennsylvania has lost a most dedicated man— a representative who has always thought of the welfare of his District, State, and Nation. As a Congressman, Jim has always shown depth, good judgment and wise counsel in the concern he has had for America's interests.

As a friend, I have in wishing him every success in his future endeavors as he returns to Pennsylvania.

I salute James A. Byrne as a man who has made an indelible mark in Congress and as a man whose friendship I shall always treasure.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Congressman James Aloysius Byrne is my friend. He has been a friend and colleague for over 30 years and I hope our friendship continues for another 30 years. I believe it will.

I would like to comment on his leave-taking. I feel privileged today, to have an opportunity to express my sincere feelings regarding my colleague and personal friend, James A. Byrne of Philadelphia. One of the first Members of Congress I knew was Jim Byrne. The floor of the House was James Byrne, who, incidentally, consciously introduced himself to me, the new Member. This gesture is typical of Jim Byrne's consideration and compassion for his colleagues in the House and for people generally. His constituents, I know, have long recognized this great quality of real feeling and concern of his fellow man.

Jim Byrne was a tireless worker and made meaningful and effective contributions to the Pennsylvania delegation in its attempt to represent all of Pennsylvania as a member of Congress. They knew him or not.
His guidance and counsel have always been of great value and I am sure will continue to be so.

We will miss him here, his wit, his humor and his charm as well as his advice and assistance.

Of Jimmy Byrne. It can be said that to know him is to love him.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years the Third Congressional District of Philadelphia, as well as the city of Philadelphia, has been represented in Congress by a dedicated and able servant—the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE. It is a privilege to join in a salute to this much beloved gentleman.

During his years in Congress Jimmy Byrne has served with distinction as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. His vast knowledge of military matters has been of infinite value to our city and to our Nation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, for 14 years ago. He has been a good friend and an able adviser.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in praise for our beloved colleague James Byrne. I have had the honor of serving with him on the Armed Services Committee for many years and it has been indeed be a pleasure to call him an inspiration. He has always been a man full of compassion for the serviceman and a strong supporter of what our country has needed in its defense. Yet he has never failed to be on the side of reason when it could be secured without imperiling our national security. Our country owes him much; and I wish for him and his lovely wife, Virginia, all the best.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to James Byrne. Those of us who have worked so closely with him will remember always his leadership, dedication, understanding, and most of all, friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I want to admit his devotion to the Armed Forces. His service, not only to the people in Pennsylvania, but to so many throughout the entire country, will not be forgotten. To you, Jimmy, my warmest wishes for the best in health, happiness and memories.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say goodbye to your colleagues who are retiring, or otherwise, finishing their congressional careers. It is doubly hard when that person is a member of a strong delegation, a friend and a friend. Such a man is Jimmy Byrne.

I've known Jimmy ever since I came to Congress 14 years ago. He has been a good friend and an able adviser.

Mr. MOOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say goodbye to your colleagues, who are retiring, or otherwise, finishing their congressional careers. It is doubly hard when that person is a member of a strong delegation, a friend and a friend. Such a man is Jimmy Byrne.

I've known Jimmy ever since I came to Congress 14 years ago. He has been a good friend and an able adviser.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to James Byrne. Those of us who have worked so closely with him will remember always his leadership, dedication, understanding, and most of all, friendship. I have always admired his down-to-earth approach. His service, not only to the people in Pennsylvania, but to so many throughout the entire country, will not be forgotten. To you, Jimmy, my warmest wishes for the best in health, happiness and memories.

H.R. 17072—A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO ALLOW A CREDIT AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX FOR TUITION PAID FOR THE ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY EDUCATION OF DEPENDENTS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this special order along with other matters today. H.R. 17072 (Mr. BYRNE of Wisconsin and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts) in order to provide a detailed analysis of this important legislation.

This is an analysis of the bill as it has been acted upon by the Ways and Means Committee. I think it important that Members have the opportunity to carefully consider this analysis in advance of the 93rd Congress. In this way we hope to insure that H.R. 17072 be one of the first items for consideration in the new Congress, and that its prompt passage be assured.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that the analysis of H.R. 17072 be included at this point in the Record.

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of the bill is to provide tax relief to low- and middle-income parents who bear increasingly severe financial costs of educating their children in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. If this relief is not provided for these parents, it is probable that many of them will be forced to stop sending their children to nonpublic schools, thus substantially eliminating the benefits received from these schools, and increasing school costs for taxpayers generally.

The bill provides an individual income tax credit for tuition paid by parents (or certain other persons who support schoolchildren) for the elementary and secondary education of their children. The credit is 50 percent of tuition paid up to a maximum credit of $200 per year per child. The total credit available is reduced by $1 for every additional $10 of the parents' total adjusted gross income over $18,000. To qualify for the credit, tuition must be paid to a school that meets specified standards, and the children must be full-time students as defined by the regulations. This credit would definitely encourage and assist those parents who support schoolchildren.

II. REASONS FOR THE BILL

Many low- and middle-income parents who now send their children to nonpublic schools bear a heavy burden in sending their children to school. At the same time, the cost of public schools also is rising substantially, and taxes keep increasing to meet these costs. Increasingly, a realistic delegation school parents must pay for the increased costs of both public and nonpublic schools, even though they relieve the public school the cost of educating their children. For many of these parents, this financial burden is becoming too great and this undoubtedly is an important factor in accounting for the decreasing enrollment in public schools and in the closing of many of them. The school closings prevent those families that are forced to stop sending their children to nonpublic schools from staying in the cities. Through diversity and innovation in education, these schools stimulate the Federal Government, thereby, nonpublic schools relieve the public school system, and thus all taxpayers supporting public schools, of very substantial costs. It has been estimated that the costs of the taxpayers which would arise from the closing of nonpublic schools would be great.

According to the Department of Education, nonpublic schools is that they are sustained by the voluntary actions of parents and citizens, and maintained the unique quality of nonpublic schools, and it is important that this basis of support be maintained. As a result it has been decided to encourage the maintenance given should be in a form which reinforces these voluntary actions. Moreover, historically, the Federal Government has encouraged and assisted individuals who support education by relieving them of part of their Federal income taxes. Since 1917, the Federal income tax laws have allowed taxpayers a deduction from taxable income for contributions given to nonprofit educational institutions.

Two commonly accepted methods for easing tax burdens are allowing a deduction for income subject to tax or allowing a deduction for the tax itself (that is, a tax credit). As noted above, the charitable contributions deduction encourages voluntary support of education. Recently, voluntary contributions to political campaigns have been encouraged with the alternatives of a credit or a deduction. The retirement income credit has been used to aid the elderly with relatively low incomes.

It was concluded that in the present situation the credit is the best solution. A credit against taxes gives more assistance than a deduction. A deduction would permit tax-exempt eligible taxpayers who bear the greatest relative financial burden in sending their children to nonpublic schools. This is true because a deduction usually would be available only to those taxpayers who itemize their deductions and these generally are higher-income taxpayers. In addition, because of the progressive rate schedule, a deduction provides the greatest dollar benefit to higher income taxpayers, while a credit provides the same dollar benefit to all taxpayers.

It was also concluded that a credit for tuition payments is superior to a deduction. It is a credit for only a portion of the tuition paid. The 50-percent credit provided by this bill assures that the credit is based on the actual tuition paid. The credit is based on the actual tuition paid. Furthermore, the credit must rely on substantial voluntary support, since with a credit on this basis each parent chooses to support the school to the extent he or she desires, and the school to the extent it is to send his child to a nonpublic school. If the school does not meet an important need, parents will not spend their money.
own funds for this purpose and the school might improve or close. Also, with the per­
centage credit, there is no guarantee that there will be pressure on the schools not to increase tuition any more than necessary since the parents may be unable to absorb the whole increased tuition. Furthermore, in the case of parents who send their children to religiously affiliated schools, the 50­ percent credit also ensures that government does not subsidize sectarian education, since secular education clearly is more than half of the outcome of the process. Finally, the percentage credit ensures that the credit will remain a tax benefit to the parent and not become a payment by the Government to the school.

The bill limits the maximum credit for tuition to $200 per year per child, in order to minimize the assistance given to parents who send their children to high cost, private schools. The reduction of the credit where taxpayers have adjusted gross income over $18,000 limits still further the tuition as­sistance for higher income taxpayers. The greater financial burden on the Congress and chil­dren in school is recognized in this limitation, however, by reducing the ag­gregate credit available to a taxpayer, rather than the per child credit.

The schools to which tuition is paid must be nonprofit, tax­exempt institutions (re­ferred to as “eligible schools” in (c) (3) of the code). This requirement fol­lows existing law. For many years, the in­come tax laws have excluded the tuition benefits to be available to schools (and their contributors) these standards must be met. Moreover, the requirement of the qualified nonpub­lic schools for these tax benefits is limited to tax­law, no payment to a school that dis­criminates on the basis of race will qualify for the credit.

For the credit to be available, the school to which the tuition is paid must satisfy State compulsory education requirements. This means that the parents will receive the tax benefit only if the school they choose meets established and accepted standards of educational quality and curriculum.

This provision has been carefully consid­ered from the standpoint of the requirement of the Federal tax code and the Federal tax policy regarding racial discrimination to all school children during each calend­ar months during the school year (sec. 42(c) (5)). The term “school year” is defined as a one­year period beginning July 1 and ending June 30 (sec. 42(c) (4)).

To limit the amount of the credit to $200 in any one school year, the bill provides that only $400 of tuition is to be taken into ac­count with respect to any one school year. The operation of this provision may be ill­ustrated by the following example. T, an individual who is a calendar year taxpayer paid $1,000 tuition for the nonpublic second­ary school for his dependent daughter E, for the school year beginning July 1, 1973, and ending June 30, 1974. T paid $500 of this tuition during the calendar year of 1973, and the remaining $500 in January, 1974. Since only $400 of tuition may be taken into account during any one school year, the maximum credit $T is entitled to for B’s school year 1973­74 is $200, even though T made pay­ments in 2 different taxable years. There­fore, if T elects to take a $200 credit (as described below) for taxable year 1973, he cannot take a credit for taxable year 1974 with respect to the amount paid in January, 1974.

The credit is available only to a person who pays tuition during the calendar year. Therefore, when a person is only a conduit, being re­imbursed for tuition payment by grant or scholarship or similar gift, he is not entitled to the credit.

Reduction in Credit as Adjusted Gross In­come Increases (sec. 42(b) (2))

To avoid giving unnecessary tax benefits to parents with adjusted gross incomes over $18,000 the bill provides for a reduction in the amount of the credit as the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer (and his spouse) increases. Marital status is to be determined under the rules provided in section 146 of the code. The amount of the tax credit is reduced by $1 for every $50 of adjusted gross income of a taxpayer (and his spouse) over $18,000. Under this provision, the aggregate credit per child may not exceed the credit per child, thereby recognizing the fact that the more children a family has in school the more burdened is put on the cost of education to his family. The following table illustrates the effect of this provision for various adjusted gross incomes over $18,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted gross income</th>
<th>Reduction in credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Level at which maximum tax credit is eliminated for 1 dependent.
2 Level at which maximum tax credit is eliminated for 2 dependents.
3 Level at which maximum tax credit is eliminated for 3 dependents.

Definition of Private, Nonprofit Elementary or Secondary School (sec 42(c) (2))

To qualify under the bill for any one specific non­public elementary or secondary school, a school must meet certain criteria. First, the school must be an educational institution (described in sec. 501(c) (3) and sec. 170(b) (1) (A) (ii) of the code) and also is exempt from tax (under sec. 501(a) ). No school can meet these criteria unless it has a racially non­discriminatory policy and also is "not part of a system of schools operated on a racially seg­regated basis as an alternative to white stu­dents seeking to avoid desegregated public schools." It is intended that a school which is integrally a part of a church or other tax­exempt organization must meet these require­ments to the same extent as a tax­exempt school that is organized or operated as a separate entity. It is expected that the Internal Revenue Service will apply the same policy regarding racial discrimination to all schools whether or not separately organized or operated.

Second, the school must regularly offer education at the elementary or secondary level. Third, the school must satisfy the com­pulsory education laws of the State with which the school is situated, and the students attending the school who are subject to these laws. However, a student need not be subject to the compulsory edu­cation requirements in order for tuition expenses in his case to qualify for the credit (for example, he may be over age 16 in a State where compulsory school attendance is required only to age 16). However, for those students who are subject to compulsory edu­cation requirements, the school must satisfy the compulsory education requirements, the school must satisfy the compulsory education require­ments.
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HARRY L. MAGEE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, northeastern Pennsylvania has lost one of its greatest citizens.

HARRY L. MAGEE of Bloomsburg, Pa., industrial and community leader, philanthropist, pioneer in the carpet manufacturing industry, and respected fellow human being to all who knew him, died recently following an illness.

The story of Harry Magee's life is one that could not be told in this House today. There would not be enough time, and I could not muster adequate words of tribute to this wonderful man who spent his life helping others, in all of his vast undertakings.

His career began as a boy working in the mills of the Magee Carpet Co. in Bloomsburg, which was founded by his father. After finishing school he devoted his energies to making the Magee Carpet Co. one of the nation's leading rug-manufacturing firms. He became president on the death of his founder father, and spearheaded an industrial expansion that made the name "Magee" synonymous with carpeting, and the family name "Magee" one to be identified with leadership in all walks of life.

Harry Magee was a civil official, an industrialist, a banking official, a business leader, the moving force behind a radio station, who literally gave to his community a portion of all that he owned. That life in Columbia County, Pa., could be even better for those who lived there.

He retired as president of the Magee Carpet Co. in 1966, but remained as an active leader in the company, as board chairman, always concerned with the needs of his employees, his neighbors, and his associates. His son, Jim, became company president, and has since carried on the tradition of Magee family leadership.

There have been many tributes to Harry L. Magee, but perhaps the finest tribute which lasts is the proud memory which his father's memory will hold by those who knew him and those for whom he was an inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I present to the House the obituary of Mr. Magee, a valued friend whom I have lost, which appeared in the Berwick Enterprise:

HARRY L. MAGEE, AREA LEADER DIES

Harry L. Magee, one of the leading industrialists of Bloomsburg, passed away last Sunday at the Bloomsburg Hospital early Monday morning. He had been ill for some time.

Mr. Magee was the son of the founder of The Magee Carpet Company, and was well known for his active participation in community affairs and philanthropies, in addition to his leadership in management of the company.

Mr. Magee was born in Bloomsburg, on May 24, 1900, and was the son of James II, and Ella G. Magee. He secured his grade school education in the Bloomsburg Public Schools and was graduated, magna cum laude, from the Bloomsburg High Class of 1920. While attending high school he started working at The Magee Carpet Company during the summers, and the Company's record of employment was July 1, 1916. Following graduation from high school he attended Dickinson College, and began his full-time employment in the Company in February 1940 he became President and Treasurer of the Company, a position he held until February 1959.

Mr. Magee was a member of the Board of Directors, Executive Committee and Advisory Committee until the time of his death.

Mr. Magee's philosophy which contributed much to the Company's success may be summed up when he said, "In everything we do we must find a better way. Our Company must be a better, more secure one for which to work, we must be a better neighbor in our community, give excellent service to our customers, and we must continue to justify the faith our stockholders have in us."

He was appointed to the Bloomsburg Town Council which he served for several years; he also served for six years as a member of the Board of Education. In 1930 he was elected to the Board of the Park to the Town of Bloomsburg. This property is located on West Main Street and was deeded by the Magee family with the installation of lights and sidewalks.

He was instrumental in the formation of Radio Station WELM, AM-FM, which has served the local area since 1946.

During his business career, Mr. Magee also held the presidency of the Bloomsburg Amusement Company, the James Magee Webbing Company, the Leader Store Company, who operated the Leader Store, Hotel Magee, Madame Walker Consolidation with the Farmers National Bank, Bloomsburg Bank-Columbia Trust Company, and the Bloomsburg Museum. When the new hospital was built, he gave substantial financial support and again when the new wing was erected a number of years ago. He continued as a major supporter of this institution throughout his lifetime.

Mr. Magee was an active member of the Bloomsburg Masonic Lodge since its inception, and a director of the Bloomsburg Water Company. He was active in the Bloomsburg Country Club for many years, club president in 1939, and an honorary member at the time of his death. He also held membership in the League of Philadelphia, the Elks, and was a 33rd Degree Mason. He was a member of the following Masonic organizations: Washington Lodge No. 42, A.M., Columbia, Mo.; Moriah Council-Royal and Select Master Masons; Caldwell Consistory, Trem Temple Shrine.

He was the organizer of the Bloomsburg Flying Club in 1931. This non-profit organization was conceived by Mr. Magee, a licensed pilot, and he subsequently purchased the Hendershot Farm on the banks of the Susquehanna, this site was developed into one of the finest aviation facilities in the early days of aviation in Pennsylvania. He operated the airport under the name of Bloomsburg Municipal Airport, and his son, Harry III, operated the new airport under the name of Magee Airdrome, and he subsequently purchased.

Down through the years he also operated the following businesses which are not in operation at present: Magee Garage, Magee Sales, Magee Oil Service. He had also operated four farms in the past part most to the raising of Angus cattle.

In April 1939, Mr. Magee received the Silver Beaver Award from the Boy Scouts of America for outstanding service in the community over many years as a booster of scouting in the Columbia-Monotaur Council.

For the last several years he has served as an active member of the Northeastern Mutual Life Insurance Company.

He was active in the Republican Party both locally and statewide, and for a number of years served as Finance Chairman of the Columbia County G.O.P.

Following his retirement from active management of The Magee Carpet Company, he devoted his time and energies to the development of the Magee Museum on West Main Street and the Magee Transportation Museum on Millville Road. Both museums were continually developed and growing in popularity with the local people and tourists coming to Bloomsburg. Both Museums were extensively damaged in the June floods that were caused by Hurricane Agnes.

In his recollection, he dedicated much of his time to organizing the Magee Industrial Enterprises, Inc., a holding company, and served as Chairman of its Board.

He was a member of the Wesley United Methodist Church, a steward for many years, and more recently an honorary steward.

He is survived by his widow, Alice, and two children, Joanne M. Katerman and James A. Magee, who now serves as President of The Magee Carpet Company. He is also survived by six grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held Wednesday morning at 2 o'clock at the Wesley United Methodist Church of Bloomsburg. Dr. Frank Ake will officiate. Burial will be made in New Rosemont Cemetery.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL AND HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Hungate) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker. I requested this special order to pay tribute to two of our distinguished colleagues who are retiring at the close of this Congress. W. R. "Bill" Hull, Jr., of Missouri's Sixth District, and Durward G. "Doc" Hall, of Missouri's Seventh District, have served distinguished, and an outstanding service has earned him high regard and respect from his colleagues, and the citizens of the Sixth District he has represented so well. Bill Hull is a devoted to his constituents, and friendship, and sense of justice will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress.

"Doc" Hall has served southwest Missouri for 12 years with forcefulness and deep concern for his district, State and county. He has had the distinction in recent years of being the only Republican representing Missouri in Congress. This distinct recognition reflects his independence and the high regard his colleagues from both parties and his constituency have for him.

We Missourians are justly proud of these two colleagues and wish them well in the years ahead.

Several of our colleagues have asked that I pay this tribute in this plodding, both their remarks follow.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I join our colleagues in paying tribute to the two distinguished gentlemen from Missouri, W. R. Hull, Jr.,...
and Duward G. Hall, who are retiring at the close of the 92d Congress.

One of the rewarding aspects of my service in the U.S. Congress has been the privilege of association and friendship with these two gentlemen. As colleagues, they have earned my highest esteem and respect, so it is only natural that their presence will be missed in the 93d Congress.

Each has to his credit an outstanding record for which he can reflect upon with pride and satisfaction. Both have served their districts, Missouri, and our country untiringly, disinterestedly and with honor and distinction.

Bill, in his work on the Appropriations Committee, and Duward, in his work on the Armed Services Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have performed every task posed them with excellence. Their presence in the 93d Congress will be greatly missed by us as they return to their homes.

Mr. Rarick. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I join our colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. Duward Hall—the watchdog of the House.

I know of no more capable legislator, no one better informed about legislation that he has been in the 93d Congress. Though his retirement is a loss to all, I want to do my duty. So I express my sorrow to "Doc" Hall as a sign of my personal thanks and sincere appreciation for his many contributions to Missouri and the Nation.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, next year, the call of the consent calendar will be different. Objections from the right side of the aisle will be followed by the opening of the new fronted by the comment of witty repartee will be gone. The 93d Congress, bereft of the now familiar and demanding voice of "Doc" Hall will proceed with business, but the "know me" quality will be missing.

Duward G. Hall, the nemesis of the first and third Mondays of each month is retiring and I for one am saddened at his departure.

Duward G. Hall and I came to the Congress together, he a doctor, me a lawyer. Ever since that opening session, "Doc" Hall has been objecting to things I wanted to do. Sarge, I now know I know he was merely practicing his professional calling—looking out for my health, procedurally, however, rather than medically. That is the only service I have received from the medical profession that has not cost me. In fact, it has on occasion, benefited me "Doc" Hall's three masters; his constituency, his party, and his country, has benefited me most. Indeed, his colleagues in the House of Representatives have benefited. "Doc" Hall's attention to duty and to detail, to fairness and to equity are part of what made him a doctor, me an attorney. But more, he insisted on reason and deliberated speed. He took his job seriously and expected other Members to do likewise.

Words cannot express my gratitude for the honor of this friendship and for the privilege of having served with him. The Nation's debt to him is great. His character and attitude toward his job—everything about him—reflect what is truly great about America. It is the Nation's loss that he has chosen not to seek reelection at the end of this Congress.

"Doc" has performed a yeoman's job for his people and our country.

We will long remember with the people of the Sixth District of Louisiana in wishing "Doc" Hall the best of health and happiness during his every future endeavor.

Mr. Hull. Mr. Speaker, this year there are many good men retiring after years of service in Congress. Though they all deserve special recognition for their unselfish service to their districts, none can be singled out for truly exceptional work. Duward G. Hall is one such Congressman who warrant words of highest praise and honor. A look at his record demonstrates his concern for the welfare of his constituents. Surey there can be no greater tribute to him that the overwhelming affection he enjoys from the people of the Seventh District of Missouri.

From my personal viewpoint, it has been both my pleasure and honor to have served with this distinguished representative from Missouri. As a member of the same delegation, I have had the good fortune to be closely associated with him and to be able to consider myself his "good friend." Though his retirement is a loss to all who support honest, good government, I am certain he will continue to offer us the benefit of his wisdom and experience. So it is without reservation that I take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for his contributions to Missouri and the Nation.

Mr. Clancy. Mr. Speaker, with a combination of feelings, I bring notice of the departure from the Halls of Congress of Duward G. Hall. His leaving is a loss to all of us but we are happy for him in the prospects for a pleasurable retirement.

Doc Hall and I came together to the 87th Congress and we have served side-by-side on the Armed Services Committee. We are members of the same political party and many of our views on national policy are the same. Naturally enough, I consider him to be a good, personal friend.

His contributions to the U.S. Congress have been great the last 12 years. He was one of the most knowledgeable Members on military matters. He has been instrumental in the preparation of much of the legislation pertaining to the Department of Defense.

Because of his expertise, we all will miss him and, because we have known him, we wish him great happiness in the retirement which he so richly deserves.

Mr. Aspinall. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying the deserved tribute to our colleague, W. R. "Bill." Hull, Jr., as he is getting ready to leave his work on Capitol Hill.

I have known Bill Hull ever since he first came to Congress. It has been a pleasing relationship with me. Bill has been a quiet, dedicated, and effective Member of this body. He has represented his people at home most ably as he has worked among us. His pleasing and friendly personality has endeared him to all of us and I especially wish to give my tribute to him at this time.

I want to wish him and his loved ones well in their days ahead. Congress and the people of the Nation generally are his debtors for the service which he has rendered to all. Mr. Speaker, I have already lost one of our colleagues, Dr. Duward G. Hall, know by personal letter how much I value and respect his services as he served here on Capitol Hill as a dedicated Member of Congress.

No other Member has paid more attention to the daily activities and opera-
tions of our body. It can truly be said that he not only has been the “watchdog” of our actions, but he has been a part of both sides of the aisle, as well as all that has taken place on the floor, especially during his last years among us. He has an outstanding capacity for work. His talents have enabled him to get to the heart of legislative matters with a keen understanding of what is involved.

I not only pay tribute to these qualities of our colleague, “Doc” HALL, but I also give him the credit for his dedication and attention to his responsibilities. This House, this Congress and the Government of the United States are all the beneficiaries of his courage, his proposition, his understanding of the work.

He is possessed with a keen insight of what he thinks are the necessary ingredients to carry this Nation forward successfully. And he has not been afraid to state his position. These are qualities that all of us admire.

Mrs. Aspinall joins with me in wishing our colleague, and his loved ones the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mrs. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, when the 93rd Congress convenes on January 3, two familiar faces will be missing from the House of legislation, friends of our good friends, Doc Hall and Bill Hull.

First, since taking his seat in 1961 Doc HALL has become one of the outstanding Members of the House. I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree on that. Few Members know the rules and precedents of the House as well as he. As ranking minority member of the joint committee that worked on congressional reorganization, his understanding of the House, his experience in the House, and his knowledge of the work.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to extend my best wishes and all the support that is due to our colleague, BILL HULL, and wish him the best of good fortune in the days ahead.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining my friend BILL HULL in saluting two distinguished members of the Missouri congressional delegation who are retiring at the end of this Congress—W. R. “BILL” HULL Jr., and DURWARD G. “Doc” HALL. For the past 6 years, BILL HULL and I have been neighbors in a corridor of the Rayburn Building, about as far away from the floor of the House as you can be and still have an office on Capitol Hill. Of course, as distance lends clarity together, and in our conversations, I have come to know BILL HULL as a good friend and true gentleman. The people of Missouri’s Sixth Congressional District are fortunate to be represented by one of the few medical men to serve in Congress, "Doc" HULL has protected the interests of his constituents—and all Americans—well. I wish him every success for the future.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by the gentleman from the State of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to extend my best wishes to our colleague, BILL HULL, and wish him the best of good fortune and happiness in the days ahead.

While I am pleased to join today with my colleagues in paying tribute to Doc and Bettie our warmest good wishes for continued health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining my friend BILL HULL in saluting two distinguished members of the Missouri congressional delegation who are retiring at the end of this Congress—W. R. “BILL” HULL Jr., and DURWARD G. “Doc” HALL. For the past 6 years, BILL HULL and I have been neighbors in a corridor of the Rayburn Building, about as far away from the floor of the House as you can be and still have an office on Capitol Hill. Of course, as distance lends clarity together, and in our conversations, I have come to know BILL HULL as a good friend and true gentleman. The people of Missouri’s Sixth Congressional District are fortunate to be represented by one of the few medical men to serve in Congress, “Doc” HULL has protected the interests of his constituents—and all Americans—well. I wish him every success for the future.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to add my voice to those of my colleagues joining in the special order by wishing BILL HULL the best of happiness in the days ahead.
Consumer Protection and on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare has been noteworthy and commendable. He has been an excellent representative both in the interest of his constituents in Missouri and for the welfare of the country as a whole. This is an exemplary quality of an outstanding legislator.

I have been an admirer of Mr. Hall, just as I believe we all will miss the benefit of his hard work and counsel. Nevertheless, I am sure that Bill will not cease in devoting his time to many worthwhile endeavors for continued success in the future that I offer Bill my heartfelt and warmest wishes.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to offer my congratulations and best wishes to an active and dedicated Member of this House, the Honorable Durward G. Hall, U.S. Representative from the State of Missouri.

Durward G. Hall has been a wonderful asset to this body, for he preceded his years in the Congress with a distinguished career in the medical services, both civilian and military. This experience was of great benefit to him on the House Committee on Armed Services, where he served as a hard-working and devoted member. In addition, I have had the pleasure to work with Doc on the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

It is an honor to use this forum to commend Doc for his fine career in the House of Representatives and to express my warm thoughts to him for a bright and successful retirement.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of my good friend and colleague, "Doc" Hall, it is hard to find words to express the humility and gratitude which is in my heart for the experience of having associated with him for the past 6 years. More than any other man in public office, "Doc" has been a mainstay, a "Rock of Gibraltar," to his friends who sought his advice and counsel in these trying times. As one who was privileged to serve with him both on the Committee on Armed Services and in the House of Representatives, I can tell the "Doc's" courageous adherence to the Constitution of his beloved country and to sound legislative principles has been a source of inspiration and guidance to all who have been privileged to know him.

He is well deserving of the respect and admiration of his colleagues and every American owes a debt of gratitude to this great patriot who has served his district, his State of Missouri, and his Nation so well.

Mr. FUCILLA. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of our colleague Durward Hall gives rise to ambivalent feelings in me as he will be sorely missed in the House. I am pleased, however, that Bill will be able to take life at a more leisurely pace and become more available to his constituents back in the Platte County District whom he has represented so well during his years in the Congress.

The good people of the Missouri Sixth Congressional District have been the beneficiary of 18 years of protection and dedicated service by Bill and he has represented their interests nobly. His service on the House Committee on Appropriations gives tribute to the deliberative and responsible approach he takes to all matters of national importance. It has been an honor to serve with Bill during my years in the Congress and I take pleasure in the friendship we have developed.

Bill's constituents were not alone in receiving the benefits of his leadership and foresight. He is truly a national leader and a guiding force in the policies of our Government. I am a better man for having known and worked with Bill Hall, and my very best wishes go with him in the coming years.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great personal regret for me that a man I regard as one of the most valuable Members of this House--valuable and indeed almost indispensable to the American people as well as to us--is retiring this year. During my two and a half years in Congress, I never ceased to admire the ceaseless vigilance, keen interest, dedication to fiscal restraint and general economic sanity of that pair of sleepless watchdogs on the floor of the House, Congressmen Durward Hall of Missouri and H.R. Gross of Iowa. Now Congress will be deprived of the benefit of their advice and counsel and I only hope and pray that someone will come forward to fill at least to some degree, the enormous void that would otherwise be left with his departure.

Durward Hall was a true patriot, in the best sense of that much-abused and much-maligned word--a man who has kept the real interest of the American people and the American taxpayer first in his mind and has carried throughout his service in Congress. Each year a weekly periodical to which I have often contributed, the Review of the News, publishes its "Conservative Index"--a voting record which reveals how Members of this body voted on 10 selected issues during the course of the year. These are deliberately selected to be the "toughest" votes--the votes on which it takes the highest degree of moral courage to stand against the prevailing political and ideological trend. This year, Durward Hall was one of only three Members of this House who voted 100 percent in the Review of the News Conservative Index. And he was one of 31 statesmen to receive 100 percent in the voting of the Smithville Dam and Reservoir project; they have been authorized. He also has sought additional direct and insured loans for rural communities to establish water and waste disposal programs. Bill Hall has played a vital role in bringing the new town of Pattonville project to reality.

While Bill has concentrated on help to rural Missouri, he was also one of the strongest supporters of the Kansas City International Airport, an installation that already has received an annual subsidy in excess of $300 million in proposed business expansion in Platte County. Then there is the construction of Interstate 35 and Interstate 29, two major highways that opened up large portions of northwest Missouri to many millions of dollars of investments and commerce. Bill Hall was a member of the House Public Works Committee when it initiated the 1985 Federal Aid to Highways Act.

Bill Hall's foresight and persistence has met the challenge confronting rural Missouri. His efforts have broken ground for new programs for growth. His footsteps will be difficult to follow. Rural America and particularly rural Missouri will miss William R. Hall, Jr., a great Missourian.

Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the impending retirement of Congressman Durward G. Hall. He was one of the most important Members...
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The Honorable W. R. Hull, Jr., of Missouri, and the Honorable Durward G. Hall of Missouri.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous matter on the special order given today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Morgan) in tribute to the Honorable James E. Evans of Missouri.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WRIGHT (on behalf of Mr. KUCZYNSKI) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3939) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

(H. REP. No. 92-1619)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3939) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses the following:

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972."
S 402. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, as amended, is further amended by striking out the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the additional sum of $650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The additional sum of $8,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the additional sum of $5,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979, shall be used to apportion the sums authorized to be appropriated to the States out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, $4,000,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, $2,500,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979, $5,000,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, as follows: (a) For the Federal-aid primary system in rural areas, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $275,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. For the Federal-aid secondary system, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $425,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (b) For the Federal-aid urban system, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. For the extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. For the Federal-aid secondary system, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (c) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (d) For public lands development roads and trails, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (e) For park roads and trails, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (f) For parkways, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (g) For reservation roads and bridges, $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (h) For the Economic growth center development highways under section 148 of title 23, United States Code, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (i) For carrying out section 215(a) of title 23, United States Code, as follows: (A) For the Virginia Islands, not to exceed $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (B) For Guam not to exceed $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (C) For the Virgin Islands, not to exceed $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (j) For necessary administrative expenses in carrying out title 21, section 156 of title 23, United States Code, $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. (k) For carrying out section 215(a) of title 23, United States Code, and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three years" and by striking out "June 30, 1976," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1979." (l) For such sums as may be necessary and the second and third sentences of section 104(b) (3) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking out "place it appears" and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "1979." (m) Such section 104(b)(5) is further amended by striking out the sentence immediately preceding the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the receipt of appropriation by Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977." The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 3, 1976. Upon the approval by Congress, the Secretary shall use such revised estimates in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1978, and June 30, 1979. MINIMIZATION OF REDTAPE Sec. 108. Section 101 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection: "(e) It is the national policy that to the maximum extent possible the procedures to be carried out by the Federal-aid highway program affecting heads of Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities for carrying out this title and any other provision relating to the Federal highway programs shall encourage the drastic minimization of paperwork and the best use of available manpower and funds so as to prevent needless duplication and unnecessary delays at all levels of government. FEDERAL-AID SYSTEMS Sec. 109. Section 101 of title 23, United States Code, is amended as follows: (1) The second sentence of subsection (d) is amended by inserting immediately after "such area" the following: "and shall provide for the uniform and distribution of traffic within such area". (2) Subsection (d) is further amended by adding a sentence at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such State shall receive less than one-half of one per cent of each State's apportionment." (3) The next to the last sentence of subsection (h) is amended by adding immediately after "the Federal-aid highway system" the following: "and insert in lieu thereof "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Department of Commerce," traffic engineering and operational improvements." (4) The definition of the term "urban area" is amended by inserting immediately after "urban area" the following: "and insert in lieu thereof "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968." APPOINTMENT Sec. 110. Section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended as follows: (1) Paragraph (b) is amended by striking out "one-third in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States." (2) Paragraph (6) of subsection (h) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No State shall receive less than one-half of one per cent of each year's apportionment."
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(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out "20 per centum" in each of the two places where such phrase appears, and by striking therefrom in each such place the following: "30 per centum" and by striking out "paragraph (1) or (2)") or (3)"

(4) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Not more than 30 per centum of the amount apportioned in any fiscal year to each State in accordance with paragraph (3) or (6) of this subsection shall be repaid, if such project is approved by the Governor of any such State and is evidenced by the Secretary as required.

(5) The last sentence of subsection (c) and subsection (f) are hereby repealed.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL-AID RELATIONSHIP

SEC. 104. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of Federal law or any court decision to the contrary, the contractual responsibilities under this Act with respect to all portions of the State highway system on which such Federal-aid highway funds have been apportioned and expended under this Act shall cease to be a Federal-aid project.

(b) The amount of all Federal-aid highway funds paid on account of sections of the San Antonio North Expressway between Interstate Highway 35 and Interstate Highway 10, together with the unpaid balance thereof, shall be credited to the State highway account therefor.

(c) Nothing in this Sec­tion shall be construed to permit Federal-aid highway funds to be transferred to the interstate highway program.

(d) The amount of all Federal-aid highways (Trust Fund), at the time of such repayment the Federal-aid projects with respect to which such funds have been repaid and any other Federal-aid projects located on such expressway and programmed for expenditure on such project, if any, shall be canceled and withdrawn from the Federal-aid highway program. Any amount so repaid, together with the unapplied balance of such funds, shall be repaid, if such project is approved by the Governor of any such State and is evidenced by the Secretary as required.

ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 112. (a) The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 108 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "seven years" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten years".

(b) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 108 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "117. Certification acceptance." and inserting in lieu thereof "117. Secondary road responsibilities.".

HIGHWAY NOISE LEVELS

SEC. 113. Subsection (i) of section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the said subsection the following:

"The Secretary after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and local officials, may promulgate standards for the control of highway noise levels for highways on any Federal-aid system for which project approval has been secured prior to July 1, 1972. The Secretary may establish on a Federal-aid system to which noise-level standards are applicable under the preceding sentence, noise-level standards for Federal-aid systems. Such project may include, but is not limited to, the acquisition of additional rights-of-way, the acquisition of physical barriers, and landscaping. Eums apportioned for the Federal-aid system on which such project is approved shall be available for the purpose of controlling highway noise levels on such system. Such projects shall be deemed a highway project for the purpose of this Act."
highway system for areas in which signs, displays, and devices giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public may be erected and maintained: Provided, however, that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. The provisions of this chapter shall be enforced, and if, in the opinion of the Secretary, the development period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 30, 1967.

HIGHWAY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 121. Section 142 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To encourage the development, improvement, and use of public mass transportation facilities in the movement of passengers (hereafter in this section referred to as buses), so as to increase the traffic capacity of the Federal-aid systems for the movement of persons, the Secretary may approve as a project on any Federal-aid system the construction of exclusive or preferential bus lanes, highway traffic control devices, bus passenger loading areas and facilities (including shelters), and fringes and transportation corridor parking facilities to serve bus and other public mass transportation passengers.

(b) The development of routes and schedules of such public mass transportation systems shall be based upon a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on in accordance with section 142 of this title."

SEC. 122. Section 143 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) For all purposes of this title, a project authorized by subsection (a) of this section shall be deemed to be a highway project, and the Federal share payable on account of such project shall be that provided in section 120 of this title.

(d) No project authorized by this section shall be approved by the Secretary of Transportation unless the Secretary of Transportation has received assurances satisfactory to him from the State that public mass transportation systems will have adequate capability to fully utilize the proposed project.

(e) In any case where insufficient land exists within the publicly acquired rights-of-way of any Federal-aid highway to accommodate needed rail or nonhighway public mass transit facilities and where this cannot be accomplished without impairing automotive safety or future highway improvements, the Administrator shall be authorized to make such acquisitions of such lands and rights-of-way available without charge to a publicly owned mass transit authority wherever he may deem that the public interest will be served thereby."

ECONOMIC GROWTH CENTER DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAYS

SEC. 122. (a) Section 143 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "demonstration projects" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "projects", and by striking out "demonstration project" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "project", by striking out "the Federal-aid primary system" in each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof such phrase, and by striking out "the Federal-aid primary system" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "the Federal-aid primary system on which such development highway is located".

SEC. 122. (b) Section 143 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) of this section, the Federal share of the cost of any project for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of a development highway under this section shall be the same as that provided under this title for any other project on the Federal-aid system on which such development highway is located."

SEC. 123. Section 148 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "to demonstrate the role that highways can play" and inserting in lieu thereof the following section:

"§ 148. Special urban high density traffic program.

(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the construction of highways connected to the Interstate System in portions of urbanized areas with high traffic density. The Secretary shall develop guidelines and standards for the designation of routes and the allocation of funds for this purpose which include the following criteria:

(1) Routes designated by the Secretary shall not be less than ten million feet long.

(2) Routes designated shall serve areas of concentrated population and heavy traffic congestion.

(3) Routes designated shall serve the urgent needs of commercial, industrial, airport, or national defense installations.

(4) Any route shall be connected with existing routes on the Interstate System.

(5) Routes designated under this section shall be developed through the planning process required under section 143 of this title and determined to be essential by responsible local officials.

(6) A route shall be designated under this section only where the Secretary determines that no feasible or practicable alternative mode of transportation would meet the needs of the area to be served is now available or could become available in the foreseeable future.

(7) The designation of routes under this section shall comply with section 143 of this title and no route shall be designated which substantially damages or infringes upon any residential area.

(8) Routes shall be designated by the Secretary on the recommendation of the State and responsible local officials.

(b) No more than one route in any one State shall be designated as a "Special urban high density traffic program." The Secretary shall designate the State highway department, in cooperation with the State highway department, is directed to develop such routes and criteria for the designation thereof and to submit a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1973.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

SEC. 129. (a) Chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 145. Special urban high density traffic program.

(a) The United States Code is amended by adding to the end thereof a new section as follows:

"(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the construction of highways connected to the Interstate System in portions of urbanized areas with high traffic density. The Secretary shall develop guidelines and standards for the designation of routes and the allocation of funds for this purpose which include the following criteria:

(1) Routes designated by the Secretary shall not be less than ten million feet long.

(2) Routes designated shall serve areas of concentrated population and heavy traffic congestion.

(3) Routes designated shall serve the urgent needs of commercial, industrial, airport, or national defense installations.

(4) Any route shall be connected with existing routes on the Interstate System.

(5) Routes designated under this section shall be developed through the planning process required under section 143 of this title and determined to be essential by responsible local officials.

(6) A route shall be designated under this section only where the Secretary determines that no feasible or practicable alternative mode of transportation would meet the needs of the area to be served is now available or could become available in the foreseeable future.

(7) The designation of routes under this section shall comply with section 143 of this title and no route shall be designated which substantially damages or infringes upon any residential area.

(8) Routes shall be designated by the Secretary on the recommendation of the State and responsible local officials.

(b) No more than one route in any one State shall be designated as a "Special urban high density traffic program." The Secretary shall designate the State highway department, in cooperation with the State highway department, is directed to develop such routes and criteria for the designation thereof and to submit a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1973."

PRIORITY PRIMARY ROUTES

SEC. 124. It is the intent of Congress to establish priority primary routes in each State, and the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with the State highway departments, is directed to develop such routes and criteria for the designation thereof and to submit a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1973.
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highway. Such appropriations shall remain available until expended. No expenditures shall be made for the construction of such highways unless an agreement has been reached by the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States which shall provide in part that the Canadian Government—

"(1) will provide, without participation of funds appropriated under this title, such necessary right-of-way for the reconstruction of such highways, which right-of-way shall forever be held inviolate as a part of such highways;"

"(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use thereof;"

"(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of such highways by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of Canada.

"(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with agreements between the United States and Canada; and"

"(5) will maintain such highways after their completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The survey and construction work under this title shall be carried out under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"717. Alaska Highway.

[(b) For the purpose of completing necessary reconstruction of the Alaska Highway from the Alaskan border to Haines Junction in the appropriate Federal agency, the Secretary of the Interior shall appropriate the sum of $25,261,000 to be expended in accordance with the provisions of section 217 of title 23 of the United States Code.

BRIDGES ON FEDERAL DAMS

SEC. 126. (a) Section 320(d) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$16,761,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,261,000".

(b) All sums appropriated under authority of section 8,600,000 of title 23, United States Code, shall be appropriated in such manner as may be necessary to complete the conveyance and transfer of the properties, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay the principal of and interest on any bonds, of such agencies, as may be authorized to sell, convey, and transfer to the highway commission through the issuance of its revenue bonds pursuant to legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, or through the use of any other funds available for the purpose, or both. The above-described toll bridge structures shall be repaired, reconstructed, maintained, and operated by the highway commission in accordance with the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, applicable to bridges financed with said General Bridge Act of 1946 and applicable Iowa legislation and shall be continuously adjusted to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such toll bridge structures under economical management, to provide a fund for the retirement of said bonds, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds as may be issued by the highway commission, at the same time that the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of any all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity, and to repay any money borrowed by any other means in connection with the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, completion, repair, operation, or maintenance of such toll bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from such bridges are hereby pledged to such uses. No toll shall be collected from any employee of the highway commission, nor shall any toll be charged to the United States in the event of payment of the indebtedness prior to maturity. The cost to the highway commission of acquiring the existing bridge structures by the State of Iowa shall include all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic, surveying, and other expenses as may be necessary to accomplish the conveyance and transfer of the properties, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay the principal of and interest on any bonds, of such agencies, as may be authorized to sell, convey, and transfer to the highway commission through the issuance of its revenue bonds pursuant to legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

(d) After all bonds or other obligations issued or incurred by the highway commission or loans of funds for the account of said bridges and interest thereon, premium, if any, have been, or after a period of 10 years have expired, any payment shall have been provided and shall be used solely for that purpose, the State of Iowa shall deliver deeds or other adequately transferable instruments of conveyance of the property of the State of Iowa in to those persons or firms engaged in the performance of such services who may be agreed upon.

MANSFIELD, OHIO—The Interstate Bridge and Development Commission of the State of Ohio and the City of Portland, Oregon, hereby authorized to enter into agreements with the State of Illinois and any agency of any political subdivision of the State of Illinois for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision, for the purpose of acquiring, reconstructing, maintaining, and operating the Interstate bridge structures of the replacement bridge and of dismantling the existing bridges, including any incidental thereto as referred to in subsection (a) of this section may be provided by the highway commission, through the issuance of its revenue bonds pursuant to legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, or through the use of any other funds available for the purpose, or both. The above-described toll bridge structures shall be repaired, reconstructed, maintained, and operated by the highway commission in accordance with the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, applicable to bridges financed with said General Bridge Act of 1946 and applicable Iowa legislation and shall be continuously adjusted to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such toll bridge structures under economical management, to provide a fund for the retirement of said bonds, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds as may be issued by the highway commission, at the same time that the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of any all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity, and to repay any money borrowed by any other means in connection with the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, completion, repair, operation, or maintenance of such toll bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from such bridges are hereby pledged to such uses. No toll shall be collected from any employee of the highway commission, nor shall any toll be charged to the United States in the event of payment of the indebtedness prior to maturity. The cost to the highway commission of acquiring the existing bridge structures by the State of Iowa shall include all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic, surveying, and other expenses as may be necessary to accomplish the conveyance and transfer of the properties, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay the principal of and interest on any bonds, of such agencies, as may be authorized to sell, convey, and transfer to the highway commission through the issuance of its revenue bonds pursuant to legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

(d) After all bonds or other obligations issued or incurred by the highway commission or loans of funds for the account of said bridges and interest thereon, premium, if any, have been, or after a period of 10 years have expired, any payment shall have been provided and shall be used solely for that purpose, the State of Iowa shall deliver deeds or other adequately transferable instruments of conveyance of the property of the State of Iowa in to those persons or firms engaged in the performance of such services who may be agreed upon.

MANSFIELD, OHIO—The Interstate Bridge and Development Commission of the State of Ohio and the City of Portland, Oregon, hereby authorized to enter into agreements with the State of Illinois and any agency of any political subdivision of the State of Illinois for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision, for the purpose of acquiring, reconstructing, maintaining, and operating the Interstate bridge structures of the replacement bridge and of dismantling the existing bridges, including any incidental thereto as referred to in subsection (a) of this section may be provided by the highway commission, through the issuance of its revenue bonds pursuant to legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, or through the use of any other funds available for the purpose, or both. The above-described toll bridge structures shall be repaired, reconstructed, maintained, and operated by the highway commission in accordance with the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946, applicable to bridges financed with said General Bridge Act of 1946 and applicable Iowa legislation and shall be continuously adjusted to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such toll bridge structures under economical management, to provide a fund for the retirement of said bonds, and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds as may be issued by the highway commission, at the same time that the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of any all or any thereof redeemed or repurchased before maturity, and to repay any money borrowed by any other means in connection with the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, completion, repair, operation, or maintenance of such toll bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from such bridges are hereby pledged to such uses. No toll shall be collected from any employee of the highway commission, nor shall any toll be charged to the United States in the event of payment of the indebtedness prior to maturity. The cost to the highway commission of acquiring the existing bridge structures by the State of Iowa shall include all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic, surveying, and other expenses as may be necessary to accomplish the conveyance and transfer of the properties, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay the principal of and interest on any bonds, of such agencies, as may be authorized to sell, convey, and transfer to the highway commission through the issuance of its revenue bonds pursuant to legislation enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

(d) After all bonds or other obligations issued or incurred by the highway commission or loans of funds for the account of said bridges and interest thereon, premium, if any, have been, or after a period of 10 years have expired, any payment shall have been provided and shall be used solely for that purpose, the State of Iowa shall deliver deeds or other adequately transferable instruments of conveyance of the property of the State of Iowa in to those persons or firms engaged in the performance of such services who may be agreed upon.
HOUSE

STUDY OF TOLL BRIDGE AUTHORITY

Sec. 132. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized and directed to undertake a full and complete investigation and study of existing Federal-aid toll bridges, toll bridge facilities, and toll bridge projects and the regulations thereunder, with respect to the application of highway funds and the cancellation and refund of the amounts by which the principal amount of any tolled bridge is made free, in accordance with section 129 of title 23, United States Code, as amended by section 131 of this title, in the case of each jurisdiction, as determined by the Secretary, to be the lesser of two hundred miles, to be used for the Interstate System, or for the purpose of facilitating interstate highway development. The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1974, together with his recommendations for modifications or additions to the Interstate System, such modifications or additions to the Interstate System, such modifications or additions to the Interstate System, subject to the approval of the Congress, as he deems necessary to facilitate broad participation by the States in the urban area traffic operations improvement programs and projects for freeway and corridor parking facilities authorized by sections 135 and 137 of this title.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Sec. 134. None of the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities", approved March 2, 1966 (27 Stat. 532), as amended, shall apply to any segment of the Interstate System within the District of Columbia.

Sec. 135. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall permit no further action on Interstate Route I-287 between Montville and Mahwah, New Jersey, until no new corridor hearings are held.

(b) The Secretary of Transportation shall permit no further action on Interstate Route I-287 between Montville and Mahwah, New Jersey, until new corridor hearings are held.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Sec. 136. Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 108 of the United States Code, is amended as follows:

(2) The fourth sentence is amended by striking out "the 1968 Interstate System cost estimate set forth in House Document Numbered 199, Ninetieth Congress, as revised," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the 1973 Interstate System cost estimate set forth in House Public Works Committee Print Numbered 9, Ninety-second Congress, First Session.,"
standing the provisions of section 101 of this title, reimbursement of the Federal share of the cost of construction or reconstruction of such highway after the Federal share has been paid shall be made until the Secretary and the State have agreed that the construction or reconstruction of such highway shall begin in the immediate vicinity of Richwood, West Virginia, and the construction or reconstruction of such highway shall be part of the Great River Highway Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 330; Public Law 79-330), is amended by striking out "$500,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$600,000," except for projects on which Federal funds were obligated on or before that date.

GREAT RIVER ROAD

Sec. 144. (a) Section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (68 Stat. 345; Public Law 84-345), is amended by striking out "140,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "142,000." (b) The title of chapter 1 of title 23 of the States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Toll road reimbursement program."

HIGHLAND SCENE HIGHWAY

Sec. 142. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the States, is authorized to develop and construct as a highway the Highland Scene Highway from West Virginia State Route 49 to U.S. 250 near Bartow Knob.

(b) The Secretary shall be reimbursed for expenditure on such highway constructed or reconstructed by the Secretary and the State highway department or agency, and not to exceed 50 per cent of the cost, for acquisition of lands, easements, and rights-of-way, purchase of development, and all incidental expenses of construction or reconstruction, the Secretary shall be reimbursed for expenditure on such highway constructed or reconstructed by the Secretary for the purpose of paying the entire cost of construction or reconstruction pursuant to this subsection.

(1) Priority be given in the location of the Great River Road near or easily accessible to Federal-aid highways constructed or reconstructed by the Secretary and further priority be given to the construction and improvement of the Great River Road in the geographic area, indicating the direction of the transcontinental discovery of the Mississippi River.

(2) The Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(3) The Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs.

(4) section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road;

(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements, and rights-of-way for construction of roads and tunnels, the erection of signs for the protection of significant esthetic and archeological values which are a part of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River; Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(2) The Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(3) The Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs.

(4) section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road;

(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements, and rights-of-way for construction of roads and tunnels, the erection of signs for the protection of significant esthetic and archeological values which are a part of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River; Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(2) The Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(3) The Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs.

(4) section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road;

(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements, and rights-of-way for construction of roads and tunnels, the erection of signs for the protection of significant esthetic and archeological values which are a part of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River; Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(2) The Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(3) The Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs.

(4) section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road;

(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements, and rights-of-way for construction of roads and tunnels, the erection of signs for the protection of significant esthetic and archeological values which are a part of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River; Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(2) The Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(3) The Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs.

(4) section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road;

(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.

(c) For the purpose of this section the term 'construction' includes the acquisition of areas of historical, archeological, or scientific interest, necessary easements, and rights-of-way for construction of roads and tunnels, the erection of signs for the protection of significant esthetic and archeological values which are a part of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin River; Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(2) The Great River Road be connected with other Federal-aid highways and preferably with the Interstate System.

(3) The Great River Road be marked with uniform identifying signs.

(4) section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road;

(5) the provisions of section 129(a) of this title shall not apply to any bridge or tunnel on the Great River Road and no fees shall be charged for the use of any facility constructed with assistance under this section.
"147. Development of a prototype of a national scenic and recreational highway program."

**NATIONAL SCENIC HIGHWAY SYSTEM STUDY**

Sec. 145. The Secretary of Transportation shall make a full and complete investigation and study, and establish a national system of scenic highways to link together and make more accessible to the American people recreation, historical, scientific, and other similar areas of scientific interest and importance. In the conduct of such investigation and study, the Secretary shall consult with and cooperate with other agencies of the Federal Government, the Commission on Highway Beautification, the States and their political subdivisions, and other interested private organizations, groups, and individuals. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the Congress not later than January 1, 1975, including an estimate of the cost of implementing such a program. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 from the Highway Trust Fund to carry out this section.

**CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK**

Sec. 146. (a) Notwithstanding the definition of parkways in subsection (a) of section 101, funds available for parkways shall be available for the acquisition of land and relocation of Route 28E through the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, including construction of a tunnel and the approaches thereto, and to provide adequate traffic capacity.

(b) Upon construction, such highway and tunnel and all associated lands and rights-of-way shall be transferred to the National Park Service and managed as part of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

**TITLE II**

**SHORT TITLE**

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "Highway Safety Act of 1973."

**HIGHWAY SAFETY**

Sec. 202. The following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

1. For carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety programs) by the National Highway Safety Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

2. For carrying out section 403 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety research and development), by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $16,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

3. For carrying out section 402 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety programs), by the Federal Highway Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

4. For carrying out section 407(a) and 403 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety research and development), by the Federal Highway Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and $15,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

5. For carrying out section 407(a) and 403 of title 23, United States Code (relating to highway safety research and development), by the Federal Highway Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and $15,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

**RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS**

Sec. 203. (a) In addition to funds which may be available to carry out section 130 of title 23, United States Code, there is authorized to be appropriated for projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. Two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Such sums shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(1) Two-thirds for projects on any Federal-aid highway system (other than the Interstate System); and

(2) One-third for projects on highways not included on any Federal-aid system.

(b) Funds made available in accordance with paragraph (1) of subsection (b) shall be apportioned to the States in the same manner as sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 102 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. Funds made available in accordance with paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall be apportioned to the States in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned in paragraph (1). Such funds shall be apportioned on the same basis as provided in paragraph (2) of section 104(b) of this title.

(c) Funds apportioned to a State but not otherwise available to carry out projects authorized by this section may be reallocated by the State to carry out projects authorized by any other section of this Act.

**HIGHWAY RECONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT**

Sec. 204. (a) Subsection (b) of section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973", by inserting immediately after "1972," "1973," and by inserting before the period following "1973," "1974," and by striking out "out of the Highway Trust Fund, in the first sentence, and by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund for reconstruction and replacement of Federal-aid highways in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned in paragraph (1)." Such funds shall be apportioned on the same basis as provided in paragraph (2) of section 104(b) of this title.

**PAYMENT MARKING PROGRAM**

Sec. 205. (a) Subsection 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 148. Special pavement marking program.

(a) The Secretary shall, and is directed to, be in the vital interest of the Nation that a special pavement marking program be established to enable the several States to improve the pavement marking of all highways to provide for greater vehicle and pedestrian safety.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the last sentence for the fiscal year in which section 105 of this title, the Secretary may approve under this section such pavement marking projects on any highway whether or not on any Federal-aid highway system, as he may find necessary to bring such highway to the pavement marking standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administration.

(c) In approving projects under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to those projects which are located in rural areas and which, within the Federal-aid highway system or not included in any Federal-aid system, shall give priority to those projects which are located in rural areas and which, within the Federal-aid highway system or not included in any Federal-aid system, shall be otherwise available to carry out projects authorized by this section such pavement marking programs.

(d) The Secretary shall report to the Congress not later than January 1, 1975, including an estimate of the cost of implementing such a program. There is authorized to be appropriated $225,000,000 from the Highway Trust Fund to carry out this section."
DRUG USE AND DRIVER BEHAVIOR HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH

SEC. 207. (a) Section 403 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before the first sentence thereof, and by striking out "this section" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "this subsection"

"(b) In addition to the research authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall conduct a survey of all expressways, major streets and highways, and through streets to identify roadside obstacles which may constitute a hazard to vehicles, and assign priorities and establish a schedule of projects for their correction. Such a schedule shall take into account, among other things, the need for replacement, to the extent necessary, of existing signs and light supports which are not designed to be used as part of a roadside warning system, and for the other substances which shall be apportioned to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

PROJECT FOR HIGH HAZARD LOCATIONS

SEC. 208. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Projects for high hazard locations. (a) For projects to eliminate or reduce the hazards at specific locations or sections of highways which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials, by the Federal Highway Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, the sum of $1,000,000, except that two-thirds of all funds authorized and expended under authority of this section in any fiscal year shall be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Such sums shall be available for obligation for a period of one year after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized.

(b) Funds authorized by this section shall be available for expenditures as follows:

(1) two-thirds for projects on any Federal-aid system (other than the Interstate System); and

(2) one-third for projects on highways not included in any Federal-aid system.

"(b) Funds authorized by this section shall be apportioned to the States in an amount based on the Federal share of highway expenditures for the preceding calendar year.

"(d) Funds made available in accordance with subsection (c) shall be apportioned to the States in an amount based on the Federal share of highway expenditures for the preceding calendar year.

"(e) Commencing in 1974, the Secretary of Transportation shall report to Congress the progress made during the preceding calendar year in implementing improvements for the elimination of roadside obstacles. His report shall analyze and evaluate each State program, identify any State found not to be in substantial compliance with the schedule of improvements required by subsection (a), and contain recommendations for future implementation of the program.

"(f) The amount of Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Highway Safety Educational Program and Study

SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local Government and private agencies, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the uses of mass media and other techniques for informing the public of the need for and methods of reducing the frequency and severity of highway accidents. Such a study shall include, but not be limited to, ways and means of encouraging and encouraging cooperation between television and radio station licensees, for measuring audience reactions to current educational programs, for evaluating the effectiveness of such programs, and for developing new programs for the promotion of highway safety. The Secretary shall report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

FEASIBILITY STUDY—NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF HIGHWAY OPERATIONS

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall make a feasibility study of establishing a National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations. In conducting such study, the Secretary shall gather and analyze all available information concerning the feasibility of establishing and maintaining such a center, including the means of acquiring the necessary funds and personnel to make the study and to establish and maintain such a center. The study shall be conducted by the Secretary and shall report to the Congress his findings and recommendations not later than June 30, 1974.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

UNDERPASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 212. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall carry out a demonstration project in Anoka, Minnesota, for the construction of an underpass at the Seventh Avenue and County Road 7 railroad-highway grade crossing.

(b) The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress with respect to his activities pursuant to this section.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,000,000 to carry out this section.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT—RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS

SEC. 214. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall carry out a demonstration project for the elimination or protection of certain public ground-level railroad-highway crossings in or in the vicinity of Springfield, Illinois. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress with respect to his activities pursuant to this section.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,000,000 to carry out such demonstration project.
(e) Federal grants or payments for the purpose of subsection (d) of this section shall cover 70 per cent of the costs incurred.

(f) The Secretary shall make annual reports and a final report to the President and the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

(g) For the purpose of carrying out subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section, the Secretary may appropriate from the Highway Trust Fund, and not to exceed $5,000,000 out of any appropriation in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for carrying out the purposes of this section.

MANPOWER TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 219. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 408 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "approved in accordance with subsection (a)," the following: "including the Secretary's implementation of manpower training programs, and of demonstration programs that the Secretary determines, in accordance with other grants pursuant to this section, are deemed by the Secretary to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. The Secretary shall assure that no fees are charged for any meetings or services attendant thereto or other activities relating to training and education of highway safety personnel."
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responsible for the systemic and its urban extensions with the requirement that $900 million be expended for elimination of any highway dangers under Section 146 of Title 23, with special emphasis on railroad grade crossing elimination.

Five hundred million dollars would be authorized for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for the secondary system. The Secretary would be required to spend $50 million for each of those years be expended for public transportation under the provisions of the Senate bill.

Appropriations for the urban system authorized for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would be $900 million per year.

In addition to the authorizations for the regular Federal-Aid system, the bill also contains at increased levels funds for the Federal-Aid highway program, with funds for highways and Indian reservation roads and bridges being authorized to be appropriated from the trust fund. Funds for forest highways and public lands highway would be available from the fund in the amount required by the Department of Agriculture under the 1970 Federal-Aid Highway Act. The authorizations for these highways are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest highways</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lands development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads and trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Indian reservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads and bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park roads and trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Reservation roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section also authorizes $75 million for fiscal 1974 and fiscal 1975 for landscaping and scenic enhancement; $1.5 million for each of those years for the administrative expenses of the beautification program; and continues the territorial highway program established in the 1970 act with authorization to the territories in the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For fiscal years 1974 and 1975, each State would receive at least 1/4% of total apportionments for Interstate System in that State. Whenever such amount exceeds the cost of completing the system in any State, the excess amount would be added to primary, secondary, and urban small urban areas. The Federal share of the cost of projects would be 70 percent of the primary, secondary, and urban programs.

Section 108 of the Senate bill would provide that a State could also amend section 103 of Title 23 to allow use of general revenue funds for any substitute essential connection would be permitted.

The cost of substitute Interstate mileage for each project would be the maximum cost of any substitute essential connection is necessary or if the cost of substitute mileage is less than that of the original mileage.

The Secretary of the Treasury would be required to deposit in the fund in the amount required by law for the operation of the Interstate System.

For fiscal years 1974 and 1975, each State would receive at least 1/4% of total apportionments for Interstate System in that State. Whenever such amount exceeds the cost of completing the system in any State, the excess amount would be added to primary, secondary, and urban small urban areas. The Federal share of the cost of projects would be 70 percent of the primary, secondary, and urban programs.

Section 109 of the Senate bill would give the Secretary discretion to approve any controversial Interstate segment. After the Secretary withdraws his approval of any controversial Interstate segment within a State, dollar-for-dollar substitution of Interstate mileage for any substitute essential connection would be permitted.

The cost of substitute Interstate mileage for each project would be the maximum cost of any substitute essential connection is necessary or if the cost of substitute mileage is less than that of the original mileage.

The Secretary of the Treasury would be required to deposit in the fund in the amount required by law for the operation of the Interstate System.

For fiscal years 1974 and 1975, each State would receive at least 1/4% of total apportionments for Interstate System in that State. Whenever such amount exceeds the cost of completing the system in any State, the excess amount would be added to primary, secondary, and urban small urban areas. The Federal share of the cost of projects would be 70 percent of the primary, secondary, and urban programs.

Section 109 of the Senate bill would give the Secretary discretion to approve any controversial Interstate segment. After the Secretary withdraws his approval of any controversial Interstate segment within a State, dollar-for-dollar substitution of Interstate mileage for any substitute essential connection would be permitted.

The cost of substitute Interstate mileage for each project would be the maximum cost of any substitute essential connection is necessary or if the cost of substitute mileage is less than that of the original mileage.

The Secretary of the Treasury would be required to deposit in the fund in the amount required by law for the operation of the Interstate System.

For fiscal years 1974 and 1975, each State would receive at least 1/4% of total apportionments for Interstate System in that State. Whenever such amount exceeds the cost of completing the system in any State, the excess amount would be added to primary, secondary, and urban small urban areas. The Federal share of the cost of projects would be 70 percent of the primary, secondary, and urban programs.
Section 112 of the Senate bill would require that plans submitted for a section of the Interstate System after July 1, 1973, of their intent to build any remaining Interstate segments; otherwise, such segments would be removed from Interstate designation. States would be required to submit a schedule for completing the system (including alternate segments). States would also be required to submit a plan for completing the Interstate System on or before June 30, 1968, and which becomes toll free prior to July 1, 1976. In such situations, funds apportioned to the Secretary for Interstate highway projects would be expended for the construction, reconstruction or improvement of that road to bring it up to proper standards.

Section 121(b) of the Senate bill would allow expenditure of Interstate funds for the construction or reconstruction of any interchange between three or more Interstate routes and a toll road where improvements to such toll road have resulted in serious impairment of the capacity of the interchange and Interstate routes.

Section 122 of the Senate bill would make a section of the Interstate Beautification Act which have been suggested by the Interstate Beautification Commission.

First, the act would require that control of signs along the Interstate and primary systems would be eliminated. After January 1, 1973, the 10% penalty could be imposed for the removal of approved signs beyond 660 feet away which are "visible from the main traveled way" and are "erected with the purpose of their messages being read from such main traveled way."

Second, the present 600 foot limit of State law. This provision was authority to erect approved signs in areas zoned industrial and commercial. Second, the present 600 foot limitation would be extended for the sake of consistency to areas beyond 660 feet.

Third, unless determined otherwise by the Secretary, signs that are not in conformity with the laws are required to be removed no later than five years after they became nonconforming. The original act provided that signs erected after August 6, 1965, but were not in conformity with Federal law, could not be required to be removed before July 1, 1970, and other lawfully erected signs which were lawful on the effective date of the law would not be required to be removed for five years.

Fifth, just compensation would be paid for the removal of all outdoor advertising signs which have been lawfully erected under the original law and which are now authorized by law.

Sixth, the Senate bill would extend the allowable time period within which a highway construction project be begun following the advance purchase of right of way.

Section 117 of the Senate bill would prohibit the initiation of any highway program or the construction of any highway project under title 23 unless in conformity with guidelines promulgated by the Secretary to assure attainment of ambient air quality standards under the Clean Air Act, as amended.

Section 118 of the Senate bill would prohibit any informational signs, other than official signs, advertising or promoting any commercial enterprise, erected on any projects where actual construction is in progress.

Sec. 119 of the Senate bill would authorize in the case of the Interstate System, repayment to the States of an amount equal to the principal and interest of bonds whose proceeds are used to construct projects on Federal-aid primary or Interstate Systems, or extensions of any of the Federal-aid highway systems in urban areas.

Section 120 of the Senate bill would require that, when plans are submitted for a Federal-aid project, the State highway department must provide assurance that it has taken steps to ensure and foster public participation in the development of such project before and after the required public hearings.

Sec. 121(a) of the Senate bill would authorize the Secretary to submit periodic reports to the Interstate System on or before June 30, 1968, and which becomes toll free prior to July 1, 1976. In such situations, funds apportioned to the Interstate Systems would be expended for the construction, reconstruction or improvement of such road to bring it up to proper standards.

Sec. 121(b) of the Senate bill would authorize the Secretary to submit periodic reports to the Interstate System on or before June 30, 1968, and which becomes toll free prior to July 1, 1976. In such situations, funds apportioned to the Interstate Systems would be expended for the construction, reconstruction or improvement of such road to bring it up to proper standards.
located and designed according to an overall plan providing for safety and for contiguous routes. An additional $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would be available for planning Interstate highways for carrying on the provisions of this section. Such funds would be apportioned to the States in accordance with the apportionment formula for the Federal-aid primary system, except that no State would receive less than 1% of such apportionments. Trolley roads would be authorized to construct forest highways, forest development roads and trails, parkways. Indian reservation roads and authorized trails would be available for carrying out the provisions of this section at the discretion of the Indian tribes concerned with the administration of such programs.

No motorized vehicle would be permitted on trails and walkways authorized under section 132 of the Senate bill would authorize the Department of Transportation to reimburse States for the construction of passenger loading facilities and parking areas, in order to provide interpretive and educational services and related recreational facilities for parkways. Parkways constructed before December 31, 1972, would be deemed to be on the Federal-aid highway system. Section 132 would authorize the Secretary to reimburse States for the professional services of their highway safety programs to be used in reducing accidents.

Section 134 of the Senate bill would authorize $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, and $15,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1976, 1977, and 1978, for the construction of access highways to public recreation areas on Federal lands.

Section 135 of the Senate bill would make available an additional $250,000, as necessary to carry out the provisions of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

Section 147 of the Senate bill would require feasibility studies for including four proposed sections in the Interstate System:

(1) A route from Brunswick, Georgia, to Kansas City, Missouri; (2) extension of Interstate Highway 25 from Denver, Colorado, to Cheyenne, Wyoming; (3) a route from Amarillo, Texas, to Las Cruces, New Mexico; (4) a route from Kansas City, Missouri, to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, through Alexandria, Louisiana, and Shreveport, Louisiana, to Huntsville, Alabama, to Mechanicville, New York, to Rockford, Illinois; and a route from Kansas City, Missouri, to Chicago, Illinois.

Section 148 of the Senate bill would require the Secretary to undertake a study of existing laws and regulations governing toll roads and trails in the States for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to assure just and reasonable tolls nationwide.

Section 149 of the Senate bill would terminate the San Antonio North Expressway as a Federal-aid project and provides for the return of any Federal funds transferred to the State of Texas for that project.

Section 150 of the Senate bill would authorize the construction of a demonstration project in Lincoln, Nebraska, and $4.2 million to carry out a demonstration project in New Orleans, Louisiana. Section 151 would require the Secretary to undertake a study of the toll roads from the central city to eliminate a substantial number of railroad-road grade crossings.

Section 201 of the Senate bill provides that this title may be cited as the "Highway Safety Act of 1972." Section 202 of the Senate bill would broaden and strengthen the authority of the Secretary to review the planning, administration and evaluation of State highway safety programs.

Section 203 of the Senate bill would provide that, for purposes of apportioning funds for highway safety programs, the Secretary could require States to meet certain performance standards for the public road mileage in each State would be determined at the end of each calendar year.

Section 204 of the Senate bill would make it clear that the discretionary authority of the Secretary to suspend application of the 10 percent reduction in the apportionment of Federal-Aid Highway funds for those States not implementing a highway safety program would be eliminated with respect to the highway safety standards resulting from the Secretary's requirement in effect, the 10 percent penalty would be made mandatory for States not in compliance with this standard.

Whenever the Secretary exercises his authority to suspend application of the 10 percent penalty in Federal-Aid Highway funds to those States not in compliance with safety standards, he would be required to report his reasons for such suspension within ten days to appropriate committees of Congress, to publish the report in the Federal Register, and to notify the States involved.

Section 207 of the Senate bill would provide that the minimum apportionment to any State for highway safety programs would be 70% of the amount available to that State for any fiscal year, but not less than $10,000,000 in incentive grants to States.
which have achieved “above average results” and $10,000,000 to States which have made the “most significant improvement” in carrying out their programs.

Section 209 of the Senate bill would provide that Indian reservations would be made eligible for highway safety grants under Section 402. Funds normally apportioned to the States for this purpose would instead be apportioned to the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary would also be authorized to increase the Federal share if necessary to assist Indian tribes in meeting the non-Federal share of the cost of reservation safety programs.

Section 210 of the Senate bill would provide that Federal funds normally apportioned to States would instead be used to carry out research on the relationship between the consumption of drugs and highway safety and to promulgate, as soon as practicable, a highway safety program standard on drug use and highway safety.
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Section 126 of the House amendment would authorize projects for the construction of bridges on Federal-aid highways where major traffic would be prohibited, in connection with forest development roads and trails, public lands development roads and trails, parks, recreation areas, national reservations, and waterways. It would provide for a federally-assisted construction program for such projects.

Section 127 of the House amendment would add a new section to chapter 1 of title 23 which would authorize $100 million for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 out of the Highway Trust Fund to be available for the construction of bridges on Federal-aid highways. The funds would be apportioned to the ten states bordering the Mississippi on a needs basis.

Section 128 of the House amendment would amend the special Alaskan highway authorization in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 by providing $20 million from the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. These funds would be limited to Federal-aid highway projects.

Section 129 of the House amendment would amend section 141 of the House amendment to authorize an additional $26,500,000 as necessary to carry out the provisions of section 128 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966. These funds would be limited to Federal-aid highway projects.

Section 130 of the House amendment would authorize the city of Clinton, Iowa, and the Clinton Bridge Commission to convey its bridge structure and other assets to the State of Iowa and to provide for the completion of a partially constructed bridge. The funds would be used for the construction of a new bridge on or across the Mississippi River between Clinton, Iowa, and the City of Clinton, by the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa. The Highway Commission of the State of Iowa would assume complete responsibility for operating and maintaining the existing bridge, completing construction of the new structure, removing the old bridge, and operating the two remaining crossings as toll facilities until all outstanding obligations have been paid or a fund sufficient for retiring outstanding obligations has been established. Thereafter the bridges would be operated as toll facilities by the State and its political subdivisions. The counties and their political subdivisions would be reimbursed by the State for their amortization on the date the bridge is free of any and all restrictions.

Section 131 of the House amendment would amend section 138 of title 23 regarding parkland for the Interstate System in portions of urbanized areas with high traffic density. The Secretary would develop guidelines for designation of routes and allocation of funds to include several criteria. Routes selected would not exceed 90 percent of the cost of construction.

Section 132 of the House amendment would provide for a federally-assisted construction program for the Interstate System in portions of urbanized areas with high traffic density. The Federal share for any project under this section would not exceed 90 percent of the cost of construction.

Section 133 of the House amendment would authorize $20 million from the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 to be available for the construction of bridges on Federal-aid highways. An additional $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would be authorized for the General Fund for those sections of such highways and any Federal-aid projects.
The Cramer-Howard amendment would be further amended to provide that the costs to the United States of the aggregate of all federal-aid highway projects and modifications not included in any such project would not exceed the cost of the aggregate of all mileage which is not to be constructed and is withdrawn as nonessential. The Secretary would be required to give due consideration to the interstate system cost estimate rather than the 1968 estimate.

The Cramer-Howard amendment would be amended to require the Secretary in considering substitute routes and modifications along the route for an interstate highway system as a safeguard for interstate highway needs on a nationwide basis, to routes in States in which other routes were or hereafter are withdrawn as nonessential. The cost of routes would not be determined within cities served by a single interstate route, so as to provide traffic service entirely through such cities.

Section 144 of the House amendment would authorize $75 million out of the General Fund to evaluate the public mass transportation portion of the 1972 National Transportation Reports submitted by the Secretary. The evaluation would be submitted to the Congress not later than January 31, 1974 by the Secretary and would be conducted in cooperation with the governors and appropriate state agencies. The funds authorized would be used to cover the costs of the evaluation and the costs of the study of each state program, identify those not in compliance with improvement schedules and methods for reducing traffic accidents.

Section 146 of the House amendment would authorize $65 million to the Secretary of Transportation to make payments to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority for the continuing cost of providing accessibility for the handicapped through the implementation of Public Laws 90-480 and 91-246.

Section 201 of the House amendment would provide that title II may be cited as the Highway Safety Act of 1972.

Section 202 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $35 million for fiscal year 1976 and $10 million for each of fiscal years 1977 and 1978 for conducting research and demonstration projects in the highway safety program. The funds would be for the elimination or protection of certain hazardous locations, including any rural highway other than the Interstate System, so as to provide for the establishment of a national highway safety program.

Section 203 of the House amendment would authorize $150 million for fiscal year 1974 and $225 million for fiscal year 1975 for the elimination of hazards of all highway crossings. In addition to funds available to carry out section 130 of title 23, United States Code, two-thirds of these funds in any fiscal year would be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund of $35 million for fiscal year 1976 and $10 million for each of fiscal years 1977 and 1978 for the elimination of hazards of all highway crossings.

Section 204 of the House amendment would authorize $150 million for fiscal year 1974 and $225 million for fiscal year 1975 for the elimination of hazards of all highway crossings. In addition to funds available to carry out section 130 of title 23, United States Code, two-thirds of these funds in any fiscal year would be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund of $35 million for fiscal year 1976 and $10 million for each of fiscal years 1977 and 1978 for the elimination of hazards of all highway crossings.

Section 205 of the House amendment would provide for the elimination or reduction of hazards at specific locations or sections of any Federal-aid highway system. The funds authorized would be used to reduce the number and rate of accidents and to reduce the number and rate of injuries and fatalities at locations or sections of Federal-aid highway system.

Section 206 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $4 million for the fiscal year 1975 to conduct research and demonstration projects in the highway safety program. The funds would be used to provide for a comprehensive program by the Federal Highway Administrator. Priority would be given to projects located in rural areas and designed to provide for the establishment of a national highway safety program.

Section 207 of the House amendment would authorize $50 million for fiscal year 1975 to conduct a comprehensive program by the Federal Highway Administrator. Priority would be given to projects located in rural areas and designed to provide for the establishment of a national highway safety program.

Section 208 of the House amendment would authorize $50 million for fiscal year 1975 to carry out the bridge replacement program established pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144. Two-thirds of the funds authorized and expended under the program would be for projects on Federal-aid highways other than the Interstate System. One third would be from the General Fund for projects not included on any Federal-aid system.

Section 209 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $25 million for fiscal year 1975 to carry out the bridge replacement program established pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144. Two-thirds of the funds authorized and expended under the program would be for projects on Federal-aid highways other than the Interstate System. One third would be from the General Fund for projects not included on any Federal-aid system.

The Secretary would be required to submit to the Congress his findings and recommendations not later than January 1, 1974, and the Secretary would report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

Section 210(a) of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $1 million for the fiscal year 1975 to carry out the bridge replacement program established pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144. Two-thirds of the funds authorized and expended under the program would be for projects on Federal-aid highways other than the Interstate System. One third would be from the General Fund for projects not included on any Federal-aid system.

Section 210(b) of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $4 million for the fiscal year 1975 to carry out the bridge replacement program established pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144. Two-thirds of the funds authorized and expended under the program would be for projects on Federal-aid highways other than the Interstate System. One third would be from the General Fund for projects not included on any Federal-aid system.

The Secretary would be required to submit to the Congress his findings and recommendations not later than January 1, 1974, and the Secretary would report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

Section 211 of the House amendment would authorize the Secretary to develop highway safety pilot television messages of the communications Act of 1934, in accordance with the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934.

Section 212 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $4 million for the fiscal year 1975 to carry out the bridge replacement program established pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144. Two-thirds of the funds authorized and expended under the program would be for projects on Federal-aid highways other than the Interstate System. One third would be from the General Fund for projects not included on any Federal-aid system.

The Secretary would be required to submit to the Congress his findings and recommendations not later than January 1, 1974, and the Secretary would report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

Section 213 of the House amendment would direct the Secretary to carry out a demonstration project in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act for the construction of an underpass at the 7th Avenue and County Road 7 railroad-highway grade crossing. The Secretary must report to the President and Congress with respect to his activities authorized by this section.

Section 214 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $4 million for the fiscal year 1975 to carry out the demonstration project.

Section 215 of the House amendment would direct the Secretary to carry out a demonstration project in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act for the construction of an underpass at the 7th Avenue and County Road 7 railroad-highway grade crossing. The Secretary must report to the President and Congress with respect to his activities authorized by this section.
section. To carry out this demonstration project, there would be authorized to be appropriated $750,000. The trestle would provide for the relocation of railroad lines from the central area of the city of Lincoln, Nebraska, in conformance with the approved methodology and plan. The Federal share of such relocation project would be 78%. The Secretary would submit annual reports to the Congress with respect to activities authorized by this section. To carry out this demonstration project, the Federal share would be authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund and $9.5 million out of the General Fund.

Section 101. Prohibition of Discrimination on the Basis of Sex

This section prohibits discrimination on the ground of sex on any program or activity receiving Federal assistance or carried on under title 23.

PROVISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

Section 101 of the conference substitute is the same as section 101 of the Senate engrossed bill and section 101 of the House amendment.

Section 102 of the conference substitute is the same as section 102 of the House amendment.

Section 103 of the conference substitute is the same as section 103 of the House amendment. The authorization for the fiscal 1975; and in paragraphs in conformance with the same circumstances in other country may also provide for the relocation of the highway. The Federal-aid funds available for the same project there would be authorized to be spent for fiscal 1975.

Section 104(a) of the conference substitute is the same as section 104(a) of the House amendment, except that in paragraph (1) $725,000 is substituted for $425,000, which is used for fiscal 1975; and in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14), no authorizations are made for fiscal 1975.

Section 104(b) of the conference substitute is the same as section 104(b) of the House amendment, except that all references to fiscal 1975 are stricken.

Section 105 of the conference substitute is the same as section 105 of the House amendment.

Section 106 of the conference substitute is substantially the same as section 106 of the Senate engrossed bill.

The definition of "Indian roads and bridges" is modified so that Alaska Native Villages would be eligible for the funding under this conference substitute. The definition is the same as section 107 of the House amendment.

Section 108 of the conference substitute is the same as section 108 of the House amendment.

Section 109 of the conference substitute is the same as section 110 of the House amendment.

Section 110 of the conference substitute is the same as section 111 of the House amendment.

Section 111 of the conference substitute is the same as section 112 of the House amendment.

Section 112 of the conference substitute is the same as section 114 of the House amendment. The definition of "Indian roads and bridges" is made for fiscal 1975; and in paragraphs of the conference substitute the same as section 115 of the House amendment. Section 114 of the conference substitute is the same as section 116 of the House amendment.

Section 115 of the conference substitute is the same as section 117 of the House amendment.

Section 116 of the conference substitute is the same as section 118 of the House amendment.

Section 117 of the conference substitute is the same as section 119 of the House amendment.

Section 118(a) of the conference substitute is the same as section 120(a) of the House amendment except that "1975" is substituted for "1974" in section 118(b) (c), (d), (e), and (f) of the Senate engrossed bill, except that in subsection (b) "other" is eliminated where it appears before "official signs and notices".

Sections 118(b) (c), (d), (e), and (f) of the conference substitute are the same as sections 122(b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of the Senate engrossed bill, except that in subsection (b) "other" is eliminated where it appears before "official signs and notices". Section 119 of the conference substitute is the same as section 123 of the Senate engrossed bill, except that the third to last and last sentences are deleted.

Section 119(c) of the conference substitute is the same as section 127(c) of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 120 of the conference substitute is the same as section 129 of the Senate amendment, except that no authorization is made for fiscal 1975.

Section 121 of the conference substitute is the same as section 131 of the House amendment.

Section 122 of the conference substitute is the same as section 132 of the House amendment.

Section 123 of the conference substitute is the same as section 133 of the House amendment, except that the new section is numbered 145 instead of 146, and no authorization is made for fiscal 1975.

Section 124 of the conference substitute (relating to the Senate engrossed bill) and the definition of "Federal-aid small urban system," will be added to section 107(f) of title 29 of the U.S. Code, after, "the Federal-aid urban system."

Section 125 of the conference substitute is the same as section 130 of the Senate amendment.

Section 126 of the conference substitute is the same as section 131 of the Senate amendment, except that the new section will not correspond to any provision in either the Senate engrossed bill or the House amendment, but states the intent of the Congress to establish primary routes in each State and directs the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with the State highway departments, to develop such routes and criteria for their designation and to submit a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1975.

Section 127 of the conference substitute is the same as section 132 of the House amendment.

Section 128 of the conference substitute is the same as section 133 of the House amendment.

Section 129 of the conference substitute is the same as section 134 of the House amendment.

Section 130 of the conference substitute is the same as section 135 of the House amendment. The definition of "Indian roads and bridges" is made for fiscal 1975; and in paragraphs of the conference substitute the same as section 136 of the House amendment.

Section 131 of the conference substitute is the same as section 137 of the House amendment.

Section 132 of the conference substitute is the same as section 138 of the House amendment.

Section 133 of the conference substitute is the same as section 140 of the House amendment.

Section 134 of the conference substitute is the same as section 141 of the House amendment.

Section 135 of the conference substitute is the same as section 142 of the House amendment.

Section 136 of the conference substitute is the same as section 143 of the House amendment.

Section 137 of the conference substitute is the same as section 144 of the House amendment.

Section 138(a) of the conference substitute is the same as section 107(a) of the Senate engrossed bill, except that the definition of "urban area" is changed to be "an urban area having a population of less than fifty thousand, and not within an "urban area."

Section 139(b) of the conference substitute is substantially the same as section 107(b) of the Senate engrossed bill, except that the third to last and last sentences are deleted.

Section 139(c) of the conference substitute is the same as section 107(c) of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 139(d) of the conference substitute is the same as section 107(d) of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 139(e) of the conference substitute does not correspond to any provision in either the Senate engrossed bill or the House amendment, but provides that "the Federal-aid small urban system," will be added to section 10(7) of title 29 of the U.S. Code, after, "the Federal-aid urban system."

Section 140 of the conference substitute is the same as section 128 of the Senate engrossed bill, except that 1975 is eliminated.

Section 141 of the conference substitute is the same as section 130 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 142 of the conference substitute is the same as section 138 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 143 of the conference substitute is the same as section 145 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 144 of the conference substitute is the same as section 131 of the House amendment, except that the new section will not correspond to any provision in either the Senate engrossed bill or the House amendment, but states the intent of the Congress to establish primary routes in each State and directs the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with the State highway departments, to develop such routes and criteria for their designation and to submit a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1975.

Section 145 of the conference substitute is the same as section 132 of the House amendment.

Section 146 of the conference substitute is the same as section 133 of the House amendment.

Section 201 of the conference substitute is the same as section 201 of the House amendment.

Section 202 of the conference substitute is the same as section 202 of the House amendment.

Section 203 of the conference substitute is the same as section 203 of the House amendment.

Section 204 of the conference substitute is the same as section 204 of the House amendment.
Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. Rept. 3939) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with Title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WRIGHT (during the reading).

Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. The statement should be considered as read.

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I reserve only to ask the gentleman from Texas a question, I would like to ask if the gentleman will explain in some detail the study which is to be made of the 10,000 miles of the Federal primary system next year which is, I believe, to be by September.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will be glad to explain that at the appropriate time.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Later will be fine.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will explain it in connection with the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the conferees bring to the House an agreement on the highway bill. It is not a perfect bill. The House conferees yielded on a number of vital points. The Senate conferees yielded on some. We commend it to the Members as the best that could be reached in the current climate. We think it preserves intact the best and most necessary features of the highway program for at least 1 year. It presents a situation in which the House and Senate will come to come again next year and attempt to resolve some of the more highly controversial features that were eliminated from both bills.

At the outset I should like to say all conferees worked with great diligence and extreme care. In particular I should like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Harsha), the ranking minority member of the House conferees. He was not only diligent and knowledgeable and understanding and fair almost to the point of fault, but also it was through his innovations on several occasions that roadblocks were ended and logjams were dislodged and we were able ultimately to come to a resolution of the problems.

Essentially the bill we bring before the House in the conference report, Mr. Speaker, contains a 1-year extension of the authorization for the Interstate System and a 1-year extension of the authorization for the other systems, including the small urban systems. It contains $3 billion in authorization for mass transit out of the general fund, not out of the highway trust fund, and that $3 billion commits the Government to an 80-percent Federal matching share. Additionally, we would authorize a total of $400 million, $100 million for the present fiscal year and $300 million for the succeeding year, to be available for operating subsidies.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my distinguished friend the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman clarify for me, is this $3 billion for urban mass transit in contract authority or does it require action by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. WRIGHT. It requires action by the Committee on Appropriations, and that money, save for these amounts I have mentioned in operating systems, would be available only for construction purposes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For what fiscal years?

Mr. WRIGHT. For fiscal years 1973 and 1974, with regard to operating subsidies.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. How much each year?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is $100 million for fiscal year 1973 and $300 million for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Those are operating subsidies?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is exactly correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Now, on the $3 billion that the gentleman mentioned for urban mass transit, how will that money be made available?

Mr. WRIGHT. That money would be made available out of the general revenues through appropriations by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me get one further clarification. Is it contract authority?

Mr. WRIGHT. It does include contract authority to be exercised by the Secretary.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is contract authority, which means that a contract is made, and then when it goes through the appropriation process, the Committee on Appropriations has only the alternative of paying the bill, is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman is essentially correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And that would have an effect when?

Mr. WRIGHT. After 1975, and not before 1975.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. How soon could the contract authority be utilized?

The commitments could be made in fiscal year 1973, could they not?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, the construction grant commitments authorized in this bill would not be made before fiscal year 1975, fiscal year 1975.

Let me suggest one or two other points that are contained in the conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Perhaps it is the late hour of the evening and the very crowded schedule of other legislation which we have had to enact, and I am certainly still not clear in my own mind on the explanation that has just been offered as to this $3 billion that the
Mr. WRIGHT. All that is done is to amend Public Law 91-453 of the last Congress, which was an act to provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation purposes.

We provide no new language except that we add to the existing authorizations for mass transit an additional $3 billion to be available after July 1, 1975.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. As I re-collect it, we first set up the mass transit authorization back in 1964. If my memory served me correctly, and I think we went over these figures in the debate we had, I believe here in the House on the federal aid to highways bill, it was not until 1972—it was not until 8 years later that this Congress had actually appropriated $1 billion for mass transit.

Mr. WRIGHT. How will the operating subsidies be financed; by backdoor spending or appropriations?

Mr. WRIGHT. Out of the general fund, by appropriations, or by contract authorization.

Mr. MAHON. By appropriations or by contract authorization.

Mr. WRIGHT. By contract authority. If appropriations are not adequate, we have in the present procedures as to contract authority contracts can be entered into for mass transit and the Congress goes a long way toward meeting our transportation needs not just for highways, but more importantly for urban mass transportation.

Mr. MAHON. I believe under the present procedures as to contract authority contracts can be entered into for mass transit and the Congress, through its Appropriations Committee process, can only pick up the check and appropriate the money to pay the bill after the fact; but I do not believe that the administrative expenses have to be appropriated for directly. It has been possible, I believe, to hook onto these administrative expenses appropriations provisos that not to exceed certain sums of money can be contracted for within a given period of time for contract authority. So Congress does retain control. I should like to know for sure if I am correct in that assumption.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe the gentleman is correct that under existing law contract authority may be entered into. We do not change that law. We simply add $3 billion to be available after 1975.

We did not feel it within the purview of our committee to alter or change the basic thrust and concept of that law. As the gentleman from Texas knows, that act was not within the jurisdiction of our legislative committee. We did not have anything of that type included in the bill as we presented it to the House. It was contained in the Senate bill, and it was one of those points on which we yielded in an effort to achieve a meaningful and workable highway bill.

Mr. MAHON. I thank my friend from Texas. I commend him and the committee for coming out the best conference report that was possible under the circumstances.

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

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This is nothing more than we have done since 1916 in providing authorizations for the Highway Act. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright) explained, all we do is continue the same authorization process, contract obligations, that we have had all these years.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add in response to the question which was earlier presented by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Brinkley) the Senate bill expressly fulfills the intent of Congress to create a priority primary system of not to exceed 10,000 miles, to take up some of the glaring gaps that have developed in the past few years in our highway program. It can go to the Secretary of Transportation to present to the Congress by not later than September 30 of next year an inclusive report advising us as to his recommendations for criteria to be employed for the designation of the routes to be included in that system.

Beyond that, however, I must say to my friend that there is contained in this bill in an earlier, earlier, for the first time a provision authorizing $100 million for the current fiscal year and an additional $300 million for the succeeding fiscal year for operating subsidies for existing mass transit.

Mr. MAHON. How will the operating subsidies be financed; by backdoor spending or appropriations?

Mr. WRIGHT. Out of the general fund, by appropriations, or by contract authorization.

Mr. MAHON. By appropriations or by contract authority.

Mr. WRIGHT. By contract authority. If appropriations are not adequate, we have in the present procedures as to contract authority contracts can be entered into for mass transit and the Congress goes a long way toward meeting our transportation needs not just for highways, but more importantly for urban mass transportation.

In our housing bill, H.R. 16704, which failed to obtain a rule from the House Rules Committee, we had a very important title of the bill, title VII, which had a number of important changes in our urban mass transportation program. We provided, for the first time, for Federal funds for operating assistance to our urban transit companies around the country and increased the Federal share to 80 percent from the existing two-thirds Federal—one-third local contribution to a flat 80 percent Federal—30 percent local share; and an additional $3 billion in capital grants. And we also increased the capital grant program under the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

Since it is of utmost importance that we enact these urban mass transportation provisions, I sought the assistance of the distinguished members of the House Public Works Committee to see if they
could agree to accept our urban mass transit provisions in conference with the Senate. I deeply appreciate their cooperation on that matter, in particular the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, my colleague from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and the distinguished ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Hassel), and the very able assistance of the chief counsel of the committee, Richard Sullivan.

The co-op transportation bill contained our urban mass transportation provisions, and therefore was a matter up before the conference for consideration as I have already stated, and I am delighted that the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from California were able to agree on these urban mass transit provisions. Enactment of these provisions will help numerous public and private companies around the country from going bankrupt, and thereby cease to provide the needed transportation of our people by buses and subways.

I would also like to commend the conference committee, in particular the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KuczyNSKI) and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Richard Sullivan.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my friend from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) for all the hard work of members of the committee, for their work on this legislation, and their efforts to add $10,000 miles, and for all the other work they have done in connection with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been held—although I do not think it will ever be used in connection with this bill, but the point raised by my colleague from California (Mr. Hall) on the Committee on Appropriations, has a long history which may be very important in connection with the clean water bill, and numerous others, and that is the use of credit in connection with the Public Works Board, and the so-called Cooper-Muskie amendment, the gentleman who is speaking, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), has held under the earlier precedent that the Congress can put restrictions on the use of emergency funds and control the contract not only of a Government agency but of a Government corporation over a 10-year period.

There are a large number of precedents that the Congress can, by limiting administrative funds, tie strings on what those in charge of a corporation can do. I do not think that will arise in this instance, but I do call the attention of the Members to it here so that that point might be made clear.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of our committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express a little concern about one of the items there, and that is on the authorization of $3 billion from the general fund.

If I follow this, that means that after we have a wisdom of $3 billion from the general fund, and then if we follow with an appropriation of $3 billion at some future date from the general fund for mass transit, this would mean an inordinate cost of $3 billion. In those items that would have to be raised by additional taxes, would it not? Whereas a few weeks ago or a few days ago some of us had these issues in mind ahead of taking this money out of the general fund, we should take it out of the trust fund, where there is ample money, and we were only suggesting that that money be spent if those local people who were in charge of the local States and communities would spend it.

I think we are introducing a wrong principle and a wrong area. I would like to have the gentleman develop it as to why you would rather take the $3 billion out of the general fund where it would mean, if we appropriated it, additional taxes be levied in order for taking it out of the trust fund, where it is already and where there is ample money for this purpose and where it would not cost additional money.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will say very briefly in response to the gentleman's question that this was debated rather fully on the floor of the House. The reasons why we want to preserve intact the Highway Trust Fund are these: First, we have a good faith obligation to the American motorist who pays the road user taxes, and we promised to use that fund to develop useful highways. Second, we need every penny in that highway trust fund if we are to keep that obligation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Not at this point. I am still answering the gentleman's previous question.

Third, we have done everything we can reasonably do and offered to the part of the House conference to do even more.

In the conference we offered to assist mass transit immediately. We offered to assist it. I will say to the gentleman, with every basic premise of the so-called Cooper-Muskie or, we might say, Anderson amendment to permit the cities to have flexibility to make a decision, if they wanted to, within their own incorporated limits and to substitute rail for highways, and to give them that money through the Highway Trust Fund if we are to keep that obligation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from California. However, I would like to say this: I do not think that the House can ever agree to accept our urban mass transportation provisions in connection with the conference report.

Further Message from the Senate

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:


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 House to the bill (S. 2289) entitled "An act to amend sections 101 and 102 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Hijacking 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 Hijacking of Aircraft and to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to revoke the operating authority of foreign air carriers under certain circumstances.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee on further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the Senate to the bill (S. 16810) entitled "an act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973."

Conveyance of Assets to State of Iowa

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate bill (S. 3822) authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to convey its bridge structures and other assets to the State of Iowa and to apply for the conversion of a partially constructed bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, by the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HALL), accepting the recorded vote object, I would like to know whether or not this has been cleared with our House committee having jurisdiction over such authorization of construction.

Mr. CULVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.
it with the full Committee on Public Works and with the chairman.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the necessity for this unusual procedure of interrupting the consideration of another bill, in the event this bill does not pass in these twilight hours of the 92d Congress.

Will there be any cost to the Federal Government, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. CULVER. No. There will be no cost to the Federal Government at all.

I have been advised also, that the Member from the gentleman's own side of the aisle on the other side of the Mississippi River has objected, and he is a member of the Committee on Public Works. Does the gentleman know if that gentleman's objections or reservations have been relieved or not?

Mr. CULVER. Yes. The answer is the gentleman's reservations have been relieved. I spoke to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) today, and he authorized me to assure the gentleman that he has no reservation to this legislation.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the Ranking Minority Member of the committee.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Let me say that I am authorized to say that I spoke to Mr. DASCH, who is the ranking member. During the conversation I had with him he indicated no objection to this legislation. This is a provision of the bill now pending before the committee.

Mr. CULVER. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. CULVER. It would be redundant if they were both to pass, but the gentleman's concern is we might not be in a position to operate, and if there are no objections to the bill, I have no objection to it. But I have carried it around in my little hot hand for over a week now with many importunities and with many backings and有着背信弃义和实际信息 that has not officially appeared before the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the matter was discussed between the committee members and was incorporated into the bill. We were advised at one time that the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. GRAY, was opposed to this, but it is my understanding that this opposition was to another piece of legislation.

Mr. CULVER. That is entirely correct.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. So, if the gentleman will yield further, we are simply attempting to satisfy the people who are concerned about the Clinton Bridge.

Mr. CULVER. That is correct.

The Clinton Bridge Commission is a Federal bridge commission created December 21, 1944, by Public Law 536-78 which authorizes said commission to construct, maintain, and operate bridges for vehicular traffic across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton and Palooa, Ill. The Clinton Bridge Commission presently owns and operates at this location two toll bridges commonly referred to as the Gateway Bridge and the Old North Bridge. Because the latter is substandard and has been deteriorating rapidly, a replacement bridge is in the process of being constructed. Unfortunately, however, the Bridge Commission has been unable to secure funds necessary to complete the new structure. Three factors apparently account for the failure to secure necessary funds: First, limitations on bridge revenues; second, a legally fixed 6 per cent rate of interest on bonds issued by the Bridge Commission; and third, a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that the interest on bonds issued by the Bridge Commission are subject to Federal taxation.

After the bridge commission undertook construction on the new bridge, it discovered that it was unable to market bonds to support its entire cost. A loan to complete the substructure of the bridge was obtained with the intent of borrowing additional amounts for other sections of the bridge after the first obligation has been paid. Construction has been halted for several years, however, and the Bridge Commission has made little progress in securing essential financing. In the meantime, structural safety of the Old North Bridge continues to be of growing concern.

The bridge commission has been unable to devise a workable plan to proceed with the project under its interest rate and revenue limitations. This bill would allow the highway commission of the State of Iowa to assume complete responsibility for operating and maintaining the existing bridges, completing construction on the new structure, removing the old bridge, and operating the two remaining crossings as toll facilities until all outstanding obligations have been paid or a sinking fund sufficient for retiring outstanding obligations has been established. Thereafter the bridges would be operated as toll free facilities and would be maintained under agreements to be reached by the States of Illinois and Iowa with the Clinton Bridge Commission. The commission would cease upon conveyance of bridge structures, property, and assets to the Highway Commission of the State of Iowa.

Legislation passed during the 64th General Assembly of the State of Iowa authorized the Iowa Highway Commission to assume responsibility for completing this project. The committee believes that this would be a feasible undertaking. Since the interest on bonds issued by the highway commission would not be subject to Federal taxation, they could be sold at lower cost.

The Clinton situation appears to be unique; existing Federal statutes do not contemplate either the acquisition of existing bridge structures by the State of Iowa or the completion of the partially built structure. Passage of this bill would help solve a critical financing problem and provide the required consent of Commission to remove the Old North Bridge over navigable waters.

Mr. Speaker, there is in addition one other section in the conference report on the bill which I wish to call to the attention of this body. There is a provision in the conference report which authorizes the Bridge Commission in the process of preparing its report, to enter into contracts with the State of Iowa for the construction of additional bridges. It is possible that this provision may be necessary to accomplish the foregoing: Provided, however, that at or before the time of delivery of the conference report and the other instruments of conveyance, all outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities of said commission must either have been paid in full as to both principal and interest or sufficient
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I urge the House to approve the conference report and the Great River Road language it contains. The funds provided in the report will be used to improve the road surfaces of the Great River Road and provide permanent scenic and environmental protection through the acquisition of recreational parks and scenic viewing points and through acquisition of land and scenic easements.

This legislation is an example of environmental protection and protective development on a Federal level.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation and admiration to the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, John Blatnik, of Minnesota. His cooperatorship of the original Great River Road bill, his support of it in committee and on the floor of the House have proven invaluable in seeing that legislation advance as far as it has.

My gratitude also goes to the distinguished chairman of the Highway Subcommittee, Congressman Kluczynski, of Illinois, the members of the full committee, and staff. Their cooperation and advice were invaluable in my efforts to secure passage of this legislation against the most difficult and treacherous headwind.
funds must have been set aside in a special fund pledged to retire said outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities and interest thereafter thereon at or prior to maturity, together with all due and the redemption or repayment price of all or any thereof, deeded or repurchased before maturity, and the proceeds of any other means in connection with the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, completion, repair, operation, or maintenance of any of said bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from said bridges are hereby devoted to the repayment of any of said bridge structures, nor shall toll be charged officials or employees of the highway commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States, State of Iowa, or any municipality or agency thereof, as hereinafter referred to, and permit the dissolution of the commission as hereinafter provided, less the amount of cash on hand which is turned over to the highway commission by the commission.

Sec. 2. The highway commission is hereby authorized to accept the conveyance and transfer of the above-mentioned bridge structures, property and assets of the City of Clinton, State of Illinois, or any municipality or agency thereof, as hereinafter referred to, and the costs of surveying, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose and transfer of the property. The sum amount or such amount as may be necessary to provide for the payment of the outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities and interest thereof, in addition to the sum amount thereon at or prior to maturity, together with all due and the redemption or repayment price of all or any thereof, deeded or repurchased before maturity, and the proceeds of any other means in connection with the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, completion, repair, operation, or maintenance of any of said bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from said bridges are hereby devoted to the repayment of any of said bridge structures, nor shall toll be charged officials or employees of the highway commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States, State of Iowa, or any municipality or agency thereof, as hereinafter referred to, and permit the dissolution of the commission as hereinafter provided, less the amount of cash on hand which is turned over to the highway commission by the commission.

Sec. 3. After all bonds or other obligations issued in connection with said indebtedness incurred by the highway commission and any loans of funds for the account of said bridges and interest and premium, if any, have been paid, or after a sufficient sum of money has been provided, less the amount of cash on hand which is turned over to the highway commission by the commission, the highway commission shall be dissolved, and the books, records, and other assets of the commission shall be transferred to the State of Iowa. The highway commission shall include

Mr. WRIGHT. I would simply say to the Members of this House that with respect to what we have done in the Mass Transit Act of 1970, is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. BOLAND. I also want to compliment the conference and this committee for what has been done with respect to mass transit. I think it meets the problem and at least it is a step in the right direction. I understand, as I think you do, that there will be a lot more than $6 billion spent in mass transit in the years to come, and it is a step in the right direction. Mr. CORMAN. Can you tell us—can you buy buses under capital expenditures?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, you can.

I would simply say to the Members of this House that while this is not a perfect bill, it is the best bill that your conferees could get. We believe it is infinitely preferable to no bill at all. The highway departments

for the large cities of this country is an absolute necessity if these cities are to survive in the future. But I do want to make the position clear with respect to precisely what we are doing here.

As I understand it, the committee has agreed—or the conferees, rather—have agreed to a $3 billion authorization for operating subsidies and capital grants and operating subsidies starting in 1975, but at the same time you have $100 million for operating subsidies in fiscal 1973, and $300 million for capital grants and operating subsidies in fiscal 1974 for operating subsidies. I think the Members of this House ought to know that this is the first time that the Congress has authorized any payments for operating subsidies. I think the Members of this House ought to know that this is the first time that the Congress has authorized any payments for operating subsidies. I think the Members of this House ought to know that this is the first time that the Congress has authorized any payments for operating subsidies.
of every State in the Nation depend upon it. They are looking to us to pass this conference committee report tonight. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WRIGHT). I respect as well the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DoN H. CLAUSEN) for his efforts that they and others have made to bring us this particular conference report.

But I must painfully conclude that I cannot agree with those who have just expressed the feeling that somehow in this conference report we have done a great thing for the cause of mass transit in this country. I am going to take the time of the House at this late hour, anxious as we all are to return to our homes, to reiterate all of the arguments that I and others have made on the floor of this body just a few days ago about the critical need of the need. I think we demonstrated and we were not contradicted in our assertion that we are spending today literally $3 billion out of every dollar being spent on mass transit.

But somehow threading through the debate this evening there has been the notion that we have accomplished by this conference report an immediate and necessary move to the critical, instant, here and now need of mass transit systems in our urban areas. Simply, after listening to this explanation, can only come to the conclusion that far from meeting the problem, we are putting it on the backburner.

You say that in fiscal year 1975 you are going to make available $3 billion in authorizations for contract financing. The very modest proposal on which we have agreed to tonight is not a satisfactory answer to a critical problem.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'Neill). Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have to concur with some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois, particularly on the need for mass transportation in urban areas. We in the Massachusetts area have a terrific plight in the whole suburban area. We need mass transportation badly. The gentleman has been talking about going on the back burner. I join with the gentleman in wanting the Highway Trust Fund broken. There were two problems. Will we get mass transportation money? We are getting some out of this—on the highway fund being broken, no.

Another thing has been proven, I believe, in the last week, and that is that the mass transportation fund, the highway trust fund, is not a sacred cow. If we do not get the money as the gentleman anticipates we are not, I know and feel that the membership of this House is going to be back in here with special legislation to break that highway fund. I think we ought to accept what we have tonight.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), a member of the committee.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT). I respect as well the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DoN H. CLAUSEN) for the support of this conference report, not because I wholeheartedly agree with its provisions but I do feel that it is the only compromise that our conferences could bring to the House and hopefully save this legislation for enactment during the 93d Congress. This is vitally important to at least 36 States whose highway programs are in serious trouble with the early next calendar year if existing authorization is not extended.

I am pleased that this conference report does not open up the highway trust fund. It does not create any new debt or new governmental obligations. It does not increase the debt or the obligations of the other body. I think every Member of this House recognizes the great need existing for a solution to urban mass-transit needs. The House version approached it in a practical way by allocating $75 million to properly evaluate this need—something that has not yet been done on a nationwide basis. We don't know if the need is $3 billion, $50 billion, or $300 billion. We know that it is a very, very expensive program and it is becoming urgent.

Let us hope that the $3 billion will be a start to tackling the need but that in the next Congress we address ourselves to a solution that will not encroach on the highway trust fund. Road needs have been proven to be critical needs and the development of knowledgeable, highly technical engineering and fiscal experts in 50 State highway departments as well as the Department of Transportation. The critical needs for the Nation have been established at $300 billion and total need projections reach a figure of $600 billion by 1990. Considering the long delay in projecting a figure that the rate is not as far away as it might at first seem.

I suppose my biggest disappointment with the conference report is the failure to implement the 10,000 miles priority program that the House has had an opportunity to see a written conference report it is my understanding that is congressional intent to establish a Federal highway legislation does not expire, the authorization does not expire, the next Congress will be instructed to develop a plan including criteria to develop such a system and report back to the Congress by June 30, 1973. This is recognition that the plan is getting somewhere and the program should move forward.

Speaking from my own State's stand-
The gentleman is aware, is he not, of the desperate straits into which some of our States will be placed if there is no highway bill?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure the gentleman from Texas has my traffic on my mind, as he himself acknowledged, and I, both in our leadership, had different viewpoints when this legislation was on the floor and considered by the House. He never considered my position, and I maintain my position. During the consideration of this bill the gentleman from Texas and I fought shoulder to shoulder to maintain the integrity of the highway trust fund and I am not changing my position.

Mr. RYAN. I do not think he will change his position, but I do not think we have to move in, in this conference report, $4.4 billion of provisions which would not have been germane at the time the House considered the highway legislation. That is a poor way to legislate.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely gratified by the final success of a most complex and difficult House-Senate conference on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972, which has produced workable legislation encompassing the Nation's needs for both highways and mass transit.

Mr. Speaker, I mention two. No. 1, it is hazardous to make judgments, or, at least, hazardous to make an impossible situation in a bad circumstance, but I happen to have the conviction that this is the wrong way to operate. I do have it and I regret it and I will the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, yield?

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very significant of the problems we confronted at the conference which seemed at times almost incapable of resolution, that the chairman of the gentleman's party conferees, those on his side, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), is opposing this conference report on the ground that it does not do enough for mass transit and he wants the money out of the trust fund, while the distinguished minority leader is opposing it on the ground that he and I both want to protect the trust fund, but he is not willing to go to the contract authority.

So we are caught in this uncomfortable position of having done more than some wanted and less than others wanted. It is a difficult position, but I do believe the gentleman from Michigan, as he himself acknowledged, will agree that we brought the best solution of the problems, the best compromise, hammered out on the anvils of mutual sacrifice, that we could possibly achieve.

The gentleman from Texas is not right, because the funding for our highway programs and extend them into areas of the Nation that have not been neglected, particularly in rural sections where economic development and job opportunity have been shortchanged for lack of good highway communications.

The compromise legislation which we have arrived at includes these major provisions:

Authorization of $3.5 billion for fiscal year 1974 for continued work on the Interstate Highway System.

An urban system authorization of $700 million, an urban system of $125 million and a small urban system of $50 million for fiscal year 1974, and the same total amounts for rural primary and secondary roads. This results in an even split of $1.15 billion for rural projects and $1.15 billion for urban projects.

A $1.1 billion authorization for highway safety programs in fiscal year 1974.
Most importantly to my fellow citizens in the Chicago area, as well as to the many millions of Americans living in other metropolitan centers, this bill provides contract obligation authority of $3 billion for grants to cities for mass transit facilities with an 80-percent Federal participation.

Further, this legislation establishes a mass transit operating subsidy of $100 million for fiscal year 1973 and $300 million for 1974.

These mass transit aids will come from the general fund.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support and announce my intention to concur in the conference report of the House and Senate on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972.

In doing so, I want to state, very emphatically, that I do not agree with all of the provisions of the bill. However, due to their importance, on 1 year and recognizing the fact that State and local government, highway departments, the construction industry, the building trades, and the communities of America, were all in need of immediate action, we consented to accept the 1-year authorization contained in both the Senate and the House version.

This should not have been the subject of the beautification sections, because we were not, I repeat not. In disagreement, but to my deep chagrin, the Senate would not budge from their position of a 1-year extension on the ABCD system. We repeatedly told them that to vacate the ABCD systems would not budge from their position of a 1-year extension on the ABCD systems. We were not, we were not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Conference Committee, even with its weaknesses for it does reflect the locality's share of the Nation's transportation dollars. This money, to be added to the existing $3 billion authorized in the 1970 Urban Mass Transportation Act, will be used to keep the program moving forward, and we hope to see the program into the next 2 years as a modest as well as necessary one.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the conference reported Federal-aid highway bills providing provisions for an 80-percent Federal participation in mass transit and an opportunity to reconsider the Nation's total transportation needs next year by limiting the extension for the highway bill to 1 year and recognizing the fact that it lacks the provision adopted in the Senate opening the funds in the Federal aid urban system to mass transit expenditures. This provision, known as the "Cooper-Muskie Amendment," did not mandate mass transit construction in any localities nor alter the distribution of funds to urban areas. It simply gave metropolitan areas the option to use their funds for mass transit projects. It is time that localities had this flexibility in Federal transportation dollars. During the House's consideration of the Federal-aid highway bill, my colleagues and I from California (Mr. Anderson) sponsored an amendment like the Cooper-Muskie provision and shared his distress that the House was never allowed to vote on it.

To its credit, the bill agreed to by the House and Senate conference will provide $400 million in urgently needed funds to assist mass transit systems that are plagued by mounting deficits and deteriorating service. Today, we are suffering the toll of years of neglect of our transit systems: Inefficient service and continual equipment breakdowns. Too many of our transit systems are not able to operate with equipment that is 30 to 40 years old and too many have simply been forced to go out of business, leaving without any means for the transportation of the public.

In this country we have a $4 billion agricultural subsidy program, we subsidize air travel, and we give aid to the maritime industry. Surely, the proposal in the House and Senate conference to increase in transit operating subsidies over the next 2 years is a modest as well as necessary one.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the conference reported Federal-aid highway bills providing provisions for an 80-percent Federal participation in mass transit and an opportunity to reconsider the Nation's total transportation needs next year by limiting the extension for the highway bill to 1 year and recognizing the fact that it lacks the provision adopted in the Senate opening the funds in the Federal aid urban system to mass transit expenditures. This

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House, at this late hour, to agree with and accept this position.
AMENDING SECTIONS OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

MR. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (S. 2280) 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 operation authority of non-US air carriers under certain circumstances, with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 1. (a) (1) The United States Government must establish and maintain an air transportation security force of sufficient size to provide a law enforcement presence and capability at airports in the United States adequate to assure the safety from criminal violence and air piracy of persons traveling in air transportation or in intrastate or interstate air transportation. He is directed to delegate to this authority to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration who shall be responsible, and designate each employee of the force who shall be empowered, pursuant to this title, to-(1) detain and search any person whom he has a reasonable cause to believe has (A) violated or has attempted to violate section 902(1), (2), (3), or (4) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, or (B) violated, or has attempted to violate, section 21, title 18, United States Code, relating to crimes against aircraft or aircraft facilities; and (2) arrest any person whom he has reason to believe has (A) violated or has attempted to violate section 902(1), (2), (3), or (4) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, or (B) violated, or has attempted to violate, section 21, title 18, United States Code, relating to crimes against aircraft or aircraft facilities; and (3) exercise the authority set forth in the preceding paragraph as a continuing function, as the Administrator shall determine is necessary for the purpose of subsection (a) of section 37141 of this title.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion that the House go into closed session for the purpose of considering this vital, serious, and immediate matter.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 2. Senate amendment No. 2, Page 8, at the end of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

TITLE II—AIR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

Sec. 21. This title may be cited as the “Air Transportation Security Act of 1972.”

Sec. 22. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) the United States air transportation system which is vital to the citizens of the United States is threatened by acts of criminal violence and air piracy;

(2) the United States air transportation system continues to be vulnerable to violence and air piracy because of inadequate security and a continuing failure to properly identify and arrest persons attempting to violate Federal law relating to crimes against air transportation;

(3) the United States Government has the primary responsibility to guarantee and assure safety to the millions of passengers who use air transportation and intrastate air transportation to avoid the laws of the United States relating to air transportation security; and

(4) the United States Government must establish and maintain an air transportation security program and an air transportation security-law enforcement force under the direction of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in order to adequately assure the safety of passengers in air transportation.

Sec. 23. (a) Title III of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following additional new sections:

"SCREENING OF PASSENGERS IN AIR TRANSPORTATION"

Sec. 315. (a) The Secretary shall as soon as practicable prescribe regulations requiring that all passengers and property intended to be carried in the aircraft cabin in air transportation or intrastate air transportation be screened by weapon-detecting devices operated by employees of the air carrier, intrastate air carrier, or foreign air carrier prior to boarding the aircraft for such transportation. Over a one-year period of such regulations the Secretary may alter or amend such regulations, requiring a continuation of such procedures for a sufficient period of time only to the extent deemed necessary to assure security against acts of criminal violence and acts of air piracy in air transportation and intrastate air transportation. The Secretary shall submit semianual reports to the Congress concerning the effectiveness of this screening program and shall advise the Congress of any regulations or amendments thereto to be prescribed pursuant to this subsection at least 180 days in advance of the next period of such report.

(b) The Secretary shall acquire and furnish, for the use by air carriers, intrastate and foreign air carriers, aircraft and other equipment within the United States sufficient devices necessary for the purpose of subsection (a) of this section, and shall remain the property of the United States.

(c) The Secretary may exempt, from procedures under subsection (a) of this section, operations performed by air carriers operating pursuant to part 136, title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there are authorized to be appropriated from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund established by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 such amounts, not to exceed $5,500,000, to acquire the devices required by the amendment made by this section.

Sec. 24. Title I of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is further amended by adding the following new section:

"AIR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY FORCE"

"POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITY"

Sec. 316. (a) The Secretary shall establish and maintain a law enforcement presence and capability at airports in the United States adequate to assure the safety from criminal violence and air piracy of persons traveling in air transportation or in intrastate air transportation. It is directed to delegate to this authority to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration who shall be responsible, and designate each employee of the force who shall be empowered, pursuant to this title, to-(1) detain and search any person whom he has a reasonable cause to believe has (A) violated or has attempted to violate section 902(1), (2), (3), or (4) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, or (B) violated, or has attempted to violate, section 21, title 18, United States Code, relating to crimes against aircraft or aircraft facilities; and (2) arrest any person whom he has reason to believe has (A) violated or has attempted to violate section 902(1), (2), (3), or (4) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, or (B) violated, or has attempted to violate, section 21, title 18, United States Code, relating to crimes against aircraft or aircraft facilities; and (3) exercise the authority set forth in the preceding paragraph as a continuing function, as the Administrator shall determine is necessary for the purpose of subsection (a) of section 37141 of this title.

"TRAINING AND ASSISTANCE"

"(m) In the administration of the air transportation security program, the Secretary may-(1) provide training for State and local law enforcement personnel whose services are available or may be available to the Secretary to assist in carrying out the air transportation security program, and (2) utilize the air transportation security program to furnish assistance, if requested by a State, to any air carrier, operator, or any air carrier, intrastate air transportation system.
carrier, or foreign air carrier engaged in air transportation or intrastate air transportation to carry out the purposes of the air transportation security program.

"(c) Except as otherwise expressly provided by law, the responsibility for the administration of the air transportation security program and the force functions specifically set forth in this section, shall be vested exclusively in the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and shall not be assigned or transferred to any other department or agency.

Sec. 25. Section 1111 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORITY TO REFUSE TRANSPORTATION"

"(a) The Administrator shall, by regulation, require any air carrier, intrastate air carrier, or foreign air carrier to refuse to transport—

"(1) any person who does not consent to a search of his person to determine whether he is unlawfully carrying a dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance, or

"(2) any property of any person who does not consent to an inspection of such property to determine whether it unlawfully contains a dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance. Subject to reasonable rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, any such carrier may also refuse transportation of a passenger or property when, in the opinion of the carrier, such transportation would or might be injurious to safety of flight.

"(b) Any agreement for the carriage of persons or property in air transportation or intrastate air transportation by an air carrier, intrastate air carrier, or foreign air carrier, for compensation or hire, by an air carrier, intrastate air carrier, or foreign air carrier, for compensation or hire, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(28) 'Intrastate air transportation' means the carriage of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, by turbojet-powered aircraft capable of carrying thirty or more persons, wholly within the same State, whose destination is within the same State, and is further amended by redesignating paragraph (22) as paragraph (24) and redesignating the remaining paragraphs accordingly.

Sec. 29. That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading:

"TITLE III—ORGANIZATION OF AGENCY AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATION"

is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 315. Screening of passengers in air transportation.

Sec. 316. Air transportation security force.

(a) Training and responsibilities.

(b) Overall responsibility.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. PICKLE moves to disagree to Senate amendment No. two.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes in favor of the several motions was laid on the table.

PROTECTING THE TRAVEL CONSUMER

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the House to take up legislation passed by the Senate, which deals with the major problem of travel fraud, is a matter of great concern to the traveling public from undesirable practices of travel agents and firms leaves a major gap in the record of the 92d Congress with regard to consumer protection.

Travel, particularly by air, is a mammoth business, and travel agents handle well over a billion dollars in air ticket sales. Many of these sales are handled by chartered airlines, and the proportion is going up. Transatlantic air charter passengers, for example, increased 500% from 1966 to 1.5 million last year.

Strandings of Americans who have paid hard-earned money for charter travel have also increased greatly and have be-...
Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to further summarize some of the bills and problems acted upon by the Congress during the 92d Congress. Since hundreds of bills passed, all cannot be fully described but I am including some which I believe to be of the most interest.

**COMMODITY RESERVE**

In December 1971, the House of Representatives passed my bill (H.R. 1163) to establish commodity reserve—"food bank"—for wheat and other feed grains as corn. Some grain would be purchased and insolated from the market when there is a surplus so it would be available during times of short supply. It would aid farmers by keeping grain prices from dropping when there is a surplus and protect consumers by making sure adequate supply of wheat and feed grains is on hand in case of an emergency. This would also help stabilize cattle and hog supplies. It also contains other features to promote U.S. export expansion.

In my testimony in September 1972, on the Russian grain agreement, I pointed out that a drought in the Soviet Union caused them to buy massive amounts of grain from the U.S. market. The need for these huge and sudden purchases was not revealed by the Department of Agriculture officials or the Russians until they had bought their needed grain at the low price for surpluses and showed again that a commodity reserve is needed to provide a better price while waiting for a need to appear.

The administration was strongly against my bill and managed to get it killed in the Senate, but I feel this legislation is badly needed and plan to keep working for its enactment.

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

Public Law 92-419, the Rural Development Act, contains a number of important provisions—including improved farm income in the minimum size of farm operating loans, improved terms for real estate loans—designed to provide a better life in rural America and cut down on the migration to cities. The new law expands existing laws that have worked well for many years including increased funding authority for the rural water and sewer program for communities of 5,500 population or less.

In 1970, I secured an amendment appropriating $100 million for this program—the maximum amount available then under the basic authorization law—but the administration has only allocated about half the amount available. As a result, many applications from communities needing basic water and sewer systems have been turned down.

**WATER POLLUTION CONTROL**

Congress needs the first comprehensive water pollution control bill in history. The bill includes strict antipollution standards for industries and municipal waste treatment plants, plus a program of Federal financial assistance for construction of waste treatment facilities. Existential water pollution laws were expiring and without this bill water pollution control would come to a halt. The overall purpose of the bill is to make the Nation's watersways pollution free by 1985. President Nixon vetoed the bill but the Congress overrode the veto.

**FOREIGN AID**

Public Law 92-420 establishes a 5-year program under which Federal funds will be allocated on a "revenue sharing" basis to State and local governments. The main purpose of this legislation is to assist State and local governments in providing needed services. The administration's budget reduces or eliminates some Federal funding under existing programs for States and cities on the assumption they will be the revenue sharing money instead. Only time will tell if this will occur.

Under this legislation, Iowa will receive a total of $77 million for the year beginning January 1, 1972, with $25.6 million allocated to the State government and $51.4 million to local and county governments. The city of Des Moines will be allocated about $2.2 million.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**

Public Law 92—establishes a commission to recommend improvements in the Federal court system.

Public Law 92-381 amends and extends for 2 years Federal grants to public and nonprofit agencies to control and prevent juvenile delinquency.

**ANTIPOVERTY**

Public Law 92-424 extends the antipoverty program for another 2 years generally as it currently exists.

Congress in 1971 passed, but the President vetoed, legislation extending the antipoverty program, establishing a new child day care system and setting up a National Legal Services Corporation designed to insulate the administration of the current Legal Services program from outside pressures. The President vetoed the 1971 bill because he objected to the day care program.

**GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

Public Law 92-484 establishes an Office of Technology Assessment to aid Congress in evaluating scientific and technical proposals for legislation.

Public Law 92-483 is aimed at abolishing unnecessary advisory committees which have accumulated in the various Federal agencies. According to one estimate, there may be as many as 2,300 of these committees and their cost may be about $100 million annually.

Public Law 92-366 establishes a Marine Mammal Commission and contains other provisions to protect seals and other marine mammals.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Public Law 92—expands the Youth Conservation Corps program, which provides summer jobs in some Federal agencies.

Public Law 92—extends and improves the Older Americans Act to assist the elderly.

Public Law 92-411 authorizes $45 million for public television broadcasting for the fiscal year starting July 1973. Earlier, the President had vetoed a bill to provide longer ranged funding for public broadcasting.

Public Law 92—authorizes control of pollutants which pose a risk to humans and the environment and provides that they be classified into a "general" category and a "restricted" category for more qualified applicants.

Public Law 92—establishes a new independent Federal agency to protect consumers against injury or death from hazardous products. This law resulted from a study showing that some 20 million persons are injured each year in the home products due to accidents involving consumer products.

Public Law 92-460 provides for a 20-percent increase in railroad retirement benefits from September 1972, through June 1973, and was passed into law over the President's veto. The increase was requested for a longer period, at this time because of a need to assure that the system is actuarially sound in the future.

Public Law 92—amends the Airport and Airway Development Act to increase the Federal share of financial support for construction and improvement of airport facilities. The law also prohibits the imposition of a "head tax" on airline passengers.

Public Law 92-332 amends the Child Nutrition Act to continue and expand the program under which the Federal Government provides financial assistance to States and local school districts for breakfasts for needy children.

Public Law 92-68 provides Federal assistance for projects designed to help rebuild the economy in "distressed" areas.

Public Law 92-41 extends the renegotiation Act for 2 years and includes a provision authorizing the Treasury Department to determine the interest rate on excessive profits by defense contractors.


**FOREIGN POLICY**

Public Law 92—establishes a National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases to enhance the Federal Government's role in medical research.

Public Law 92—reorganizes Plan No. 1, approved by Congress, combines the Peace Corps, VISTA—the agency for domestic anti-poverty workers—and some smaller programs into ACTION, a single agency administering the Federal Government volunteer service programs.

Public Law 92-305 establishes a National Institute of Allergy, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases to enhance the Federal Government's role in medical research.

Public Law 92—extends until June 1974, the operation of the Export-Import Bank, which guarantees and makes loans to facilitate foreign purchases of American products.

Public Law 92-9 extends for 2 years the interest equalization tax on the sale of foreign securities in this country. This law is designed to help deal with the balance-of-payments problem.
H.R. 1 places the administration of the program for the aged, blind, and disabled under the Federal Government; extends Medicare benefits to those qualified to receive social security disability benefits; provides that widows may receive Medicare benefits to those qualified to receive Social Security; and provides for automatic enrollment in part B—insurance for physician's fees—under Medicare. The Senate omitted a provision passed by the House in June 1971 for welfare reform.

**SPENDING LIMITATION**

Congress passed legislation (H.R. 16810) under which the President, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, is authorized to reduce funding for certain specified programs when total Federal expenditures for that period exceed $250 billion.

**CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN: A MAN OF STUBBORN INTEGRITY**

(Rev. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, no one can capture the essence of a man in a few words. Eulogies and memorials are very rarely anything more than cere­monial, and are very rarely more than commentary, when these two confronted each other. The battle between Bill Ryan and meager progress. He was a man who always had an opinion, and he never hesitated to express it. He was a man who never妥协. He was imbued with a perpetual sense of outrage, which kept him from treating others less willing to be embarrassed.

Bill knew that he was not going to turn the Congress around overnight on the war, or on civil rights, or on civil liber­ties. He knew, when he annually was in the forefront of opposition to HUAC, that the votes were just not there. He knew, when he voted against the first appropriation bill for the war in 1965, that a majority, whatever it was to exist, was in­deed not with him then.

Yet, he insisted on going his way. More than that, he insisted on leading—in the directions of justice and fairness and people-oriented housing and social se­curity, and he would not let anyone else settle for less.

Perhaps, in stating these words, I make Bill sound obstinate, stubborn. He was. Yet, he insisted on going his way. More than that, he insisted on leading—in the directions of justice and fairness and people-oriented housing and social se­curity, and he would not let anyone else settle for less.
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came to Washington at the call of President Roosevelt in 1933 to serve as Chief of the Civilian Conservation Corps and on Economic Security, the same Committee which drafted legislation setting up the social security system. Later, he became Chairman of the Board of the President's Committee on Economic Security. Long before the creation of the Social Security Board, set up to administer the income security program that was eventually to cover most of the population of this country. From his position of Chairman of the Social Security Board, he moved in 1946 to Commissioner of Social Security. Years later, when the social security system was celebrating its 33rd birthday, he received the highest award offered by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A new award was also established in his name.

It is customary for the news media to laud a man at the time of his death. But Mr. Altmeyer had the distinction of receiving profuse laudatory comment on the event of his retirement from Government service. He was well recognized for his extraordinary selflessness to the public service, and for his remarkable gifts of patience and wisdom and understanding of human problems. These were not hollow accolades, but well deserved praise.

Long before most public figures took up the cause of eliminating poverty from our national life, Mr. Altmeyer was associated with a concept of proposals embodied now in the social security system. Long before medicare came to Washington at the call of President Roosevelt in 1945, and has served on the Ways and Means Committee for 26 years. He has infinite skill, keen experience, and keen insight made him the key man on the Ways and Means Committee for many years—Members on both sides of the aisle followed his direction and good judgment.

It was an education to listen to him explain the philosophy and theory of the legislation being considered, and how he proceeded to write, and when he concluded his remarks. When he, Chairman Mills, and Mr. Altmeyer all agreed on a common position, the die was cast since their combined talents represented the best leadership of our Ways and Means Committee for many years.

John Byrnes was a prodigious worker and probably spent more time at committee hearings and executive sessions by personal attendance than any other Member. His decision to retire from Congress leaves a void that cannot easily be filled and the Nation is going to lose the services of one of the eminent tax men in the country. Wields a life that is greatly to be appreciated for his leadership, good judgment, and comprehensive thinking.

Joun still has many productive years and is well and we are happy with him well in his profession and hopefully, we shall see him often here on the Hill if he remains in Washington.

THE HONORABLE JACKSON E. BETTS

(Mr. SCHNEEBELI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Jack Betts has been one of my closest personal friends during my time in Congress. For more than 10 years, Martha and Jack Betts have lived in the same apartment house as the Schneebelis and we were together socially quite frequently because of so many interests which we share. My wife and I will be so much at his passing.

The full commerce committee is on the verge of taking up consideration of two bills already approved by a subcommittee, and rival consumer class action proposals also will be revived. Also, as Lee noted, opponents of my amendments had long carried it would come from the Federal courts with cases. Though, a few weeks earlier, I had modified the provision in a manner tending to lighten the load on the courts, the Chief Justice's careful consideration of this bill as was the Supreme Court, that the Federal courts are "for a limited purpose." He said Congress should examine proposals carefully that would add to the courts' duties and added:

"The Supreme Court, like the Congress, is not a dream factory. It is not the public interest in the area of problems of pollution, of crowded cities, and of consumer class actions, that the courts may have the easy way out. The Congress should not fight by putting the courts in the position of having to make up the law. Congress, the states and the local communities should find ways of solving the problems of pollution, of crowded cities, and of consumer class actions, that the public interest in the area of problems of pollution, of crowded cities, and of consumer class actions, the people are denied the facilities of any court to protect their interests.

As I have said, all these expressions of Chief Justice Burger are mere homilies unless they are considered in context with legislation and have been sterilized and implemented to call for a denial of any adequate
remedy to consumers, such apparent generalizations are much more than the innocent error that might otherwise appear to be. They are part of a subtle lobbying effort, a tampering in the legislative process that ill becomes a Chief Justice of the United States. I did not overlook them to be so in 1941, because I had not yet had an opportunity to see how the Chief Justice's statements would be used; I have, now. The Chief Justice has also had that opportunity; yet he has stated that he cannot find the making of his tampering with the legislative process. Thus, I have overcome my reluctance to find fault with the Chief Justice.

Now, again, in this term of Congress, the Chief Justice has chosen to make comments which can only be construed as unfriendly to legislation that would let average people, like consumers, use courts in the same manner that others do whose suits involve large sums. And again, the time such comments are made coincides with important activity in Congress concerning consumer legislation.

In August 1972, he gave another annual "state of the judiciary" message which included the following:

And simply adding more judges every few years and hoping that there is nothing from constantly enlarging the federal judicial establishment, except to adopt new judicial methods and improve performance as we are trying to do, and to have Congress carefully scrutinize all legislation that would create more cases. [Emphasis added.]

He then recommended that every piece of legislation creating new cases be accompanied by a "court impact statement."

Now, this language standing alone is again innocuous, particularly in view of the Chief Justice's further amplification that he was not suggesting "that Congress reject legislation simply because it would increase litigation in the Federal courts" but that he only wanted "Congress not to increase the already overwhelming burdens on the Federal court system by passing legislation creating new cases for the Federal courts without regard to the impact on the Federal court system."

He suggested that Congress before passing such legislation should have available to it, through its Judiciary Committees, a study and findings as to the effect on the Federal court system.

The plea applies most pertinently to the Consumer Product Safety bill, H.R. 15008, on the Rules Committee agenda for its meeting on September 6th.

Much work behind the scenes must have ensued, and an amendment sharply limiting the number of suits that could be brought by persons damaged by violation of safety standards was developed and submitted to the House. For, on September 20, David Daniels of Indiana, not a member of the committee, successfully offered an amendment to deny Federal court jurisdiction in cases involving less than $10,000 in damages. But there is no escape from the fact that the Consumer Product Safety Act has long been a sensitive stage. It is hard to believe that the Chief Justice did not immediately learn about it, through issuance of a sensitive piece of legislation and issued a warning when one of his top administrative aides had been visiting the Speaker of the House along with a lobbyist opposing such areas of Federal legislation. The Chief Justice did not learn about it until the next day, October 13, the day that the House passed legislation creating new cases for the Federal court system. The Chief Justice of the United States did not immediately dissociate himself with any lobbying against the bill, but the lobby against the bill was in a sensitive stage.

Actually, the lobby broke in Jack Anderson's column on October 5. The bill was in conference at this time, and the conference report was filed on October 12. Denial by the Chief Justice and Kirks did not occur until the next day, October 13, the same day that the House passed the conference report. The Senate agreed to the conference report on October 14.

Certainly Mr. Kirks was not so insensitive to the considerations as to fail to understand the significance of the timing. And it is hard to believe that the Chief Justice of the United States is so naive as to fail to understand that when some of his most sensitive areas of legislation and issued a warning when one of his top administrative aides had been visiting the Speaker of the House along with a lobbyist opposing such areas of Federal legislation. The Chief Justice did not learn about it until the next day, October 13, the same day that the House passed legislation creating new cases for the Federal court system. The Chief Justice did not immediately dissociate himself with any lobbying against the bill, but the lobby against the bill was in a sensitive stage.

He should not have waited 8 days to disclaim interest in the legislation. Indeed, he did not deny interest; he denied that he had waited in order to tariff legislation before Congress. Then he said that he will continue to call attention to the impact new laws have on the caseload of Federal courts. The Chief Justice's latest letter did not deny that Kirks, at Burger's behest, had asked Corcoran to accompany him to the meeting last summer.

As I said, 2 years ago I put the best face on the matter and gave the Chief Justice the benefit of the doubt. Since then I have found that the consumer class action bill, the product warranty bill, the Consumer Product Safety Act, and the product safety bill have been assailed by a cleverly intermeshed program of opposition, which has included the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the drug lobby, the District of Columbia Antitrust Bar, the Justice Department, the Office of the President, and the Chief Justice of the United States. Records of the 92d Congress.

Times of October 13, 1972, said he considered the visit a routine effort to inform Congress about the impact of the bill upon the courts but insisted that Chief Justice Burger did not learn about it until it was reported in the press on the next week.

The Chief Justice did not immediately dissociate himself with any lobbying against the bill, but the lobby against the bill was in a sensitive stage.

Actually, the lobby broke in Jack Anderson's column on October 5. The bill was in conference at this time, and the conference report was filed on October 12. Denial by the Chief Justice and Kirks did not occur until the next day, October 13, the same day that the House passed the conference report. The Senate agreed to the conference report on October 14.

Certainly Mr. Kirks was not so insensitive to the considerations as to fail to understand the significance of the timing. And it is hard to believe that the Chief Justice of the United States is so naive as to fail to understand that when some of his most sensitive areas of legislation and issued a warning when one of his top administrative aides had been visiting the Speaker of the House along with a lobbyist opposing such areas of Federal legislation. The Chief Justice did not learn about it until the next day, October 13, the same day that the House passed legislation creating new cases for the Federal court system. The Chief Justice did not immediately dissociate himself with any lobbying against the bill, but the lobby against the bill was in a sensitive stage.

He should not have waited 8 days to disclaim interest in the legislation. Indeed, he did not deny interest; he denied that he had waited in order to tariff legislation before Congress. Then he said that he will continue to call attention to the impact new laws have on the caseload of Federal courts. The Chief Justice's latest letter did not deny that Kirks, at Burger's behest, had asked Corcoran to accompany him to the meeting last summer.

As I said, 2 years ago I put the best face on the matter and gave the Chief Justice the benefit of the doubt. Since then I have found that the consumer class action bill, the product warranty bill, the Consumer Product Safety Act, and the product safety bill have been assailed by a cleverly intermeshed program of opposition, which has included the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the drug lobby, the District of Columbia Antitrust Bar, the Justice Department, the Office of the President, and the Chief Justice of the United States.
since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act over a century ago. This measure extends all existing aid to higher education programs and creates important new avenues of support for states, counties and cities, Congress this year enacted a new Federal Government Educational Opportunity Grants, enrolling every college student to an extent never before. The amount his parents can contribute; A new program of direct institutional aid for colleges and universities will make available for occupational and vocational education; A National Institute of Education to develop career-oriented teaching and learning at every level—pre-school through graduate school. Expanded Head Start Program to enable children of working families as well as the poor to participate in this voluntary day care program. National School Lunch Act Amendments provide free and low-price meals for needy children. Vietnam Veterans Education Assistance means a major increase in aid for education and vocational rehabilitation for returning veterans. THIRTY-TWO PERCENT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE LEADS LIST OF ELDERLY BENEFITS For older Americans, this has been one of the greatest Congresses in history—and the 32% Social Security Increases passed in 1971 and 1972 are but the tip of the iceberg. At a time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed, this Act will mean many benefits to our 20 million senior citizens will realize from Congressional initiatives: Nutritional meals for those who need them—senior shut-ins; Low-cost transportation; Job training and employment; Community: pre-retirement training; Health and education services. These new benefits will help solve the variety of problems older Americans face; A new National Institute of Aging to conduct research on the aging process and the special health problems of the elderly; and Congress also overrode a Presidential veto of a 30% increase in Railroad Retirement benefits. Note: the major legislation passed for America’s older citizens during 1971-72 originated not in the White House, but in Congress. This legislation represents a lasting commitment to every American over 65. NEW BILLS IN VETERANS AT A time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed, the Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. This Act is designed to limit the amount of advertising spending in campaigns. Requires broadcasters, newspapers and magazines to sell advertising to candidates at the lowest commercial rate. Requires campaign committees to report contributions and expenditures of $100 or more. Limits the amount a candidate or his family can contribute to his own campaign. REVENUE SHARING AIDS STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS In response to pleas from hard-pressed states, counties and cities, Congress this year enacted a $90.1 billion revenue sharing bill. State governments will receive one-third of the funds; local governments the other two-thirds. The money is expected to be spent on such high priority items as: Public safety, environmental protection, public recreation, health, recreation, libraries, and social services for the poor and aged. NEW CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON FOREIGN, MILITARY POLICY Among the several actions of the 92nd Congress in foreign and military policy are: SALT Agreements To Limit Strategic Wep­ ons; Congress approved a five-year U.S.-So­ viet accord limiting offensive nuclear weap­ ons. ABM Treaty With Soviet Union: The Sen­ ate approved a treaty with the Soviet Union limiting the number of ballistic missiles. Military Draft: Congress amended the Se­ lection and Training Act of 1940 to allow con­ ductive. Extend the draft to June 1976. Grant student deferments. Increased military pay in order to encourage volunteer service. A GREAT CONGRESS FOR VETERANS Many observers are calling the 92nd Con­ gress the greatest Congress for veterans in American history. In this Congress we passed major laws to educate our veterans, to pro­ vide them better treatment in VA hospitals, and to liberalize burial allowances for vet­ erans. New GI bill This landmark measure increases educa­ tional allowances for Vietnam veterans by 25 percent. Fulltime students will now receive: Single students: $200 a month; married students: $261 a month; married and one child: $298 a month; and each additional dependent: $18 a month. National cemetery bill This law transfers to the VA responsibility for administering prices for many cemeteries; increases burial allowances for veterans who die from service-connected disabilities; pro­ vides a 10% increase in burial allowances for veterans who do not wish to be buried in na­ tional cemeteries. VA Medical School Act To help meet the nation’s medical man­ power shortage—and to improve VA medical care—this pilot program authorizes the es­ tablishment of eight new medical schools in veterans’ hospitals by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Veterans medical care This new act will vastly improve the entire VA medical care system. To ease crowded hospital conditions, veterans with non-serv­ ice-connected medical problems can now be treated as outpatients. Some families of per­ manently-disabled veterans or their survivors can also now receive hospital care. Disabled veterans’ benefits Provides a 10% boost in benefits for dis­ abled veterans. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY Clean air and water, and the conservation of our resources and wildlife have been chief concerns of the 92nd Congress. One of the most far-reaching water pollution bills ever passed, is to end all discharges of pollutants into navigable waters by 1985. Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act will help protect man and our environ­ ment, while permitting farmers to use pesti­ cides to grow food and fiber. Wildlife Hunting from Aircraft is prohibited, protects certain wild birds, fish and other animals. Youth Conservation Corps—To extend and expand this pilot youth conservation program. CONGRESS ACTS TO MEET HEALTH CARE CRISIS Quality health care—at prices people can afford—is one of the major problems facing Americans today. As a Nation, we have slipped from 19th to 22nd place in male life expectancy, from 8th to 12th place in heart thor­ 200,000 persons in the U.S., mostly children. National Institute of Dental Research—Provides federal grants to conduct research on communicable diseases. National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act. Rehabilitation Act—an extension of the 50-year-old Vocational Rehabilitation Act, adding new programs to aid the se­ verely handicapped and other disabled per­ sons. Black Lung Benefits—To make it easier for coal miners, stricken by black lung disease, to receive benefits. CONGRESS Focuses on Consumer Protection Serves to protect workers, consumers, and the host of measures on behalf of the American consumer. Truth-in-lending ... wholesome meat and poultry ... truth-in-packaging ... fair credit reporting ... these are a few. The 92d Congress has expanded this record. Flammable Fabrics Amendments of 1971 require manufacturers to certify that their products meet stringent anti-flare require­ ments. Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 as­ signs the Federal government a major role in protecting the consumer from unreason­ able risks of death, injury or illness caused by consumer products. A new Consumer Product Safety Agency will set mandatory safety standards and remove products from distribution when necessary. The “Automobiles and Traffic Bill” directs the Secretary of Transportation to fix minimum standards for bumpers to halt or reduce auto damage from low speed collisions. This bill also outlaws tampering with mileage gauges. NEW BILLS TO FIGHT CRIME AND DRUGS Every public opinion poll of recent years shows that crime and drug abuse are major concerns of the American people. The 92d Congress continued to face up to mounting problems in these crucial areas: Crime Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. This major law provides $150 million over two years for: Education and counseling; health services and recreational facilities for potential ju­ venile delinquents and training personnel in the juvenile delinquency field. Drug Abuse Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. This new law provides over $8 billion to: Establish a National Institute on Drug Abuse, with funds for special drug proj­ ects under the Community Mental Health Centers Act; help states develop drug abuse programs; and require federally funded health facilities to offer needed treatment to drug addicts. Foreign Shipments of Narcotics. Gives the President power to halt foreign aid to coun­ tries which allow shipments of narcotics into the U.S. or allow the continued flow of drugs to America. Addiction of Servicemen. Another new law requires the military to identify drug-de­ pendent servicemen and to treat them. Rehabilitation of Addicts. A third measure
creates new programs to encourage the employment of rehabilitation addicts, with special programs for veterans.

CONGRESS ADDS RURAL AREAS

Too many rural Americans are denied the basic necessities of modern life. That's why my bill...

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS TROUBLE CONGRESS

Business is off, profits are down and government tax revenues have dropped sharply. The Federal budget continues to show record deficits.

So one of the top priorities of this Congress was to help put people back to work. We passed the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971, authorizing $2 billion to create 170,000 jobs in the public sector. (President Nixon vetoed this bill, then passed the Emergency Employment Act authorizing $23 billion for transitional public service jobs and special state employment assistance programs.) Below the mark of $675 million for additional unemployment benefits and allowances.

Meanwhile...

Increased the personal income tax exemption per taxpayer and dependent to $675.

In the aid of small businesses by increasing the amounts of Federal loans and guarantees.

Finally, Congress acted to hold down recriminatory cost-cutting by cutting the fat out of the Administration's budgets, while seeking to meet the nation's genuine needs. During the past three years, Congress has cut a total of $114.6 billion from the Administration's appropriations requests—and the total appropriations this year will again be below the President's budget.

CONGRESSMENTS BROADEN RIGHTS

The 26th and 27th Amendments to the Constitution were passed by this Congress to guarantee the vote to 18-year-olds and to end discrimination based on sex.

This Amendment, first proposed in World War II, extends the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older in all elections. It was quickly ratified by the states and signed in July 1971. Because of it, eleven million more voters are eligible to vote in the Presidential election this year.

Equal rights for women

Throughout our laws, attitudes, regulations and customs have often discriminated against women. Numerous distinctions based on sex still exist in law. For example:

Sixty-seven states have fair employment practice laws, but only fifteen prohibit discrimination in employment based on sex.

Some communities still have dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers.

This discrimination, the Equal Rights Amendment says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

Twenty-one states have already ratified the Amendment; thirty-eight are required.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET

I have been asking interested parties for comments on the bill. The response has been a tremendous outpouring of support from men and women all across the country. There is widespread agreement that such legislation is needed.

As an indication of the support received, I am including at this point in the Record a partial list of the comments I received. All such viewpoints will be carefully evaluated prior to reintroduction of the bill in the 93rd Congress in January. After the bill in reintroduced with revisions, we will seek hearings and adoption.

The comments on the bill follow:

HON. PATSY T. MINK, House Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This is in response to your letter of April 12. Florence Hicks, Director of the HEW Women's Action Program, requested our comments on your proposed bill, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

As the Department supports the spirit of the bill and its worthy goals as you know from my testimony of May 10 before the Task Force on Sex Discrimination, in response to the recommendations in the January 1972 Women's Action Program Report, each of the Department's agencies is preparing to help us begin solving the problems women face both as HEW employees and as recipients of the Department's programs.

As part of the preparation of its action plan, the Office of Education has established a Task Force on Sex Discrimination of all Federal authorities and programs to assess their strengths and weaknesses in meeting women's education needs. The Task Force expects to complete its work the beginning of September. Their in-depth study of all education programs within the Department will present a clearer and more comprehensive picture of how HEW can improve its efforts to meet the education needs of women in the United States.

Until the report is in, however, the Department would like to reserve comment on the specific provisions of your proposed legislation. It will, certainly be in a better informed position to comment after the findings and recommendations of the Task Force have been made public.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

ELIOT RICHARDSON, Secretary,


HON. PATSY T. MINK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for your letter of October 18, 1972, and the opportunity to comment on your proposed H.R. 14451, "The Women's Education Act of 1972."

Legislation relating to making grants for special educational programs for women is a matter under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. From a personal standpoint and not necessarily the Administration, I find the intent of your proposals in keeping with both Federal and non-Federal efforts to provide sex opportunities for women. Women will only be fully utilized in employment in all phases of our society when they have been afforded full opportunity to participate in all of the educational opportunities, including vocational and community education programs, without being guided exclusively into old stereotyped occupational fields such as clerical, personal and home economics.

In January 1972 of this year the Women's Action Program of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare published a report on the status of women in HEW and the impact of HEW programs on women in the nation. I am enclosing a copy of this report for your information in the event you may not have had a chance to review it. Our efforts in vocational education and job training is discussed commencing on page 73.

The September 1972 issue of our newsletter, "Women in Action," (January 1972 issue) includes a speaker's resource list of approximately 80 women and men knowledgeable on equal rights for women. We have listed their names, addresses, and areas of specialization. I have checked the names of those on this list and are especially concerned with educational opportunities for women. If you have not already contacted these individuals, you may wish to do so.

In a recent article on the Federal Women's Program in the "Public Administration Review," March/April 1972, I discussed some of the impact of women's education as it relates to Federal employment and future manpower needs. You may be interested in reviewing this article. I have enclosed a copy for your convenience.

I hope this information is helpful to you. I will be happy to provide any further information concerning the Federal Women's Program or Civil Service Commission programs in general.

Sincerely,

HELEN S. MARKEY, Director, Federal Women's Program,


HON. PATSY T. MINK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Thank you for your letter of July 31, 1972 concerning the proposed Women's Education Act of 1972, and soliciting my comments on the bill.

I think the general intent of the measure is most praiseworthy, for the Equal Rights Amendment and other laws prohibiting discrimination on account of sex, have accomplished little more than the raising of false expectations of equal treatment unless they are buttressed with public action programs based on the programs guaranteeing the expectation of equal treatment. For example, the University of Hawaii School of Medicine has a strong policy prohibiting discrimination on account of sex (and has established a record of accepting a higher proportion of women applicants than men). But the School also recognizes the basic problem that not enough women apply for admission. Consequently, we are taking steps to meet that problem by the institution of an active program designed to encourage women to apply for entry into the Medical School. The program includes activities related to career counseling for high school students. For instance, at least four bro...
ties, as well as the rights, when the Equal Rights Amendment is effectuated. Your bill nothing more than equality for women, participatory ties, as well as the rights, when the Equal Rights Amendment is effectuated. Your bill nothing more than equality for women, the right to be construed as prohibiting men from citizens.

We are too inclined sometimes, I believe, to thank you for sending me a copy of your bill, of HEW, with many qualifications and conditions specified given the perspective of our legislative department for their consideration and will follow

up with them as soon as they have had an opportunity to analyze it. My personal judgement is that it is an "excellent bill and amendment" in which my power to inform others and help to develop a climate of support for the bill. With respect to the organizations that may be concerned, I submit that you have used the mailing list of the groups which had for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. I must think that Flora Crater would be an ideal contact if you have not already discussed it with her. It is a woman as capable as you representing Hawaii in Congress. You are doing a marvelous job. Keep up the good work!

Sincerely yours

SHIRLEY McCUNE, Associate Director, Center for Human Resources, National Education Association.


Hon. Patsy T. MINK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your Women's Education Act of 1972. I am most impressed with the scope of the bill; apparently a good deal of thought and hard work went into the drafting of the bill.

As you know, I have long been involved with the problems of the education of young girls and women. The variety, ranging from biased curriculum materials and textbooks, inadequate counseling, lack of adequate programs, and outright discrimination. Women at all levels—faculty, students in high school and college, mothers of elementary school children, and others throughout our country are working in a variety of ways to remedy the difficulties faced by girls and women in our educational systems. What we have accomplished has largely been in the area of sensitizing people to the problems. Now that administrators and others have begun to reevaluate educational activities and programs for their impact on girls and women, it is critical that funds are made available to help those in a position to effectuate change.

Ideas for new programs that would help develop the skills of our nation's reserve corps of teachers are sorely pressed for funds. Your bill for the general funding for a variety of much needed programs as well as give impetus to the evaluation of current programs. There are new ways to deal with the education of girls and women.

I was delighted to see Section 4(e)(7), which provides for the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex. Although already prohibited by the new Higher Education Act of 1972, it is critical that programs developed under the Act are not limited to women only. Boys and men will surely benefit as much from the Act.

One technical error: Section 4(f) (page 8, line 15) apparently has omitted word. Should "must" be inserted after the words "one year?"

If I can be of any help to you concerning this bill, please let me know. The help that the bill will bring to the girls and women of this nation is tremendous.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Executive Associate.

JUNE 16, 1972.

Hon. Patsy T. MINK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I wanted to thank you for sending me a copy of your bill, HR 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972. I found it a most comprehensive effort for dealing with the problems facing women in achieving equality of opportunity. I have passed the bill along to my legislative department for their consideration and will follow your lead.

In closing, just a few words of appreciation.

With aloha,

DOROTHY B. SHIMEK.

DECEMBER 18, 1972.
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Committee on Standards in Higher Education regarding it and already have received some very favorable comments. As a member, I have been actively interested in this bill. I am a member of WEAL.

We were very pleased when you introduced the bill in Congress! A few persons with whom I have discussed the bill, however, have raised an anticipated question: "Why separate legislation for the education of girls and women?" Are we not concerned about equal education for all?

The answer to such an argument, I believe, is to the effect that we must justify Women's Studies or Black Studies. While there is concern for equal educational opportunity for all Americans, a special Women's Education Act is needed to meet the specific needs of women in almost every field of study—history, psychology, sociology, literature, art. Special emphasis therefore is required to fill in major gaps in knowledge and understanding about women so that the education of women and men can become truly equal.

I have just had an opportunity to see a new film, "Career Education," developed by the U.S. Office of Education, which is an excellent example of the lack of understanding of the educational needs of young women, portraying the usual stereotyping of women's occupations. The Department of Commerce's publication, "Occupational Outlook for College Graduates," is another glaring example and is an excellent tool for those who could advise women about their career opportunities. APOA recently made a direct request to Congress to pass a special Women's Education Act. It is to this kind of need that the Women's Education Act is specifically directed and why it must be passed.

You will have the support of many women's groups in pressing for action on the Women's Education Act of 1972. This letter expresses particularly personal appreciation to you for your recognition of the needs for passage of WEAL, and not the official position of AAUW.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH M. OLTMAN, Ph.D., Assistant Director of Program, Higher Education.

DRAKE UNIVERSITY,
CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, July 17, 1972.

Hon. Patsy T. MINK, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. MINK: Thank you for the opportunity to study H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972. My overall reaction is very favorable. I commend you for your recognition of the needs for passage of WEAL, and not the official position of AAUW.

Sincerely yours,

BRENDA J. DUNN, Director, Women's Programs and Chairman, Board of Directors, National Education Association, Inc.
To the College of General Studies,
Continuing Education for Women,

Hon. Patsey Mink,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Mink: Please pardon my delay in replying to your letter regarding HR 14451, Equal Rights Act of 1972. Our staff of Continuing Education for Women applauds your efforts on behalf of women. However, I wish to correct what you claim that ERA will provide women with the right to acquire benefits of our society but that they will continue to face barriers to achieve jobs and other rights. When ERA becomes a constitutional amendment and opportunities for the education of women (as outlined in your bill) become available, not only will they benefit, but the synergetic effect will aid our nation and the world.

I believe the investment in the education of veterans after World War II through the GI bill aided not only the individuals (mostly men) but also promoted the economic growth of this country. Now, the future growth of our country depends upon a comparable investment in the education of women.

During the past 8 years, more than 3,000 women (ages 18 to 64) have participated in our programs. Continuing Education for Women. Of this group, 2,500 completed Developing New Horizons for Women, a general survey counseling course. Their aptitude tests indicate outstanding ability. Of this group, 42% (or more than 1,000) have attended courses related to achieving beyond 4 years of college. (Only 16% of the general population has this ability!) Yet only one-half of this group have graduated. How can we award a bachelor's degree? I feel this is only a small sample of talent available in our country. To develop potential of women, we need opportunities for additional education, and greater awareness of cultural blocks that inhibit developing potential of women.

Women have the ability to achieve beyond 4 years of college. (Only 16% of the general population has this ability!) Yet only one-half of this group have graduated. How can we award a bachelor's degree? I feel this is only a small sample of talent available in our country. To develop potential of women, we need opportunities for additional education, and greater awareness of cultural blocks that inhibit developing potential of women.

Additionally, there is a need for a program such as the one outlined in your bill. A critical part of the effectiveness of your bill will be the Council on Women's Education. Could you include provision for consultation with appropriate women's groups in the appointment of members of the President? Since individuals interpret the needs of women so differently, it is essential to assure that members of the Council will have a real commitment to providing equal opportunities for men and women.

The statement which you describe on page 5 of the bill seems to me particularly well chosen, and in need of financial support. Under separate cover, I am sending you copies of letters which I have written which strongly support some of the recommendations which are made in your bill.

Since your letter asks for "reactions, suggestions, criticisms, and ideas," I hope you will not mind if I make some minor comments on the specific wording of the bill in its present form. On page 2, line 2, the meaning might be clearer if the word "they" were changed to "we.

On the same page, lines 7-9, could the phrase "concerning women at all levels of education" be construed to imply support for any program which inhibits developing potential of women. But support for programs designed specifically to meet needs of various groups of women and educational institutions should not be able to appropriate funds provided through this bill for the support of educational programs specifically designed for women.

On page 4, line 8, the bill states that "the Council shall advise the Commissioner and the Secretary concerning the administration of public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, and other institutions which now exist with the purpose of providing educational programs specifically designed for women.

On page 4, line 9, if the bill states that "the Council shall advise the Commissioner and Secretary concerning the administration of public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, and other institutions which now exist with the purpose of providing educational programs specifically designed for women.

In summary, I believe this is an excellent and badly needed piece of legislation. Let me know what I can do to support its adoption. Others whose comments you may wish to solicit include:

J. Jacqueline Mattfeld, Dean of Academic Affairs, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.
Patricia Graham, Professor, Department of History, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.
Louise Waitman, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California, Davis, Calif. I assume that you are in touch with Bertram L. Sandler, University of California, Berkeley.

Sincerely yours,

Julia Montgomery Wahlen,
Senior Vice President.

Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.,
September 11, 1972.

Hon. Patsey T. Mink,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Mink: I read with great interest your bill on Women's Education, and think it represents an excellent step in the right direction. Having had some experience in this field, I feel the bill will go a long way toward solving some of the serious problems that now exist.

I have served for the past two years on the Executive Council of the Harvard Business School. My efforts to increase female participation in the educational process have been slow, but currently we are making progress and we hope it will continue.

My only concern for your project is such that I would like to see a cooperative effort. If experience would be helpful, to serve as a volunteer on the Commission you are proposing. In this way the Council shall have access to the experience of another person, and we may have a possible volunteer from you if I could be of any assistance.

I very much admire your work on the Hill, and wish you continued success in your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

Julia Montgomery Wahlen,
Senior Vice President.

The College of General Studies,
Continuing Education for Women,

Congressman Tom T. Mink,
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Mink: I was extremely pleased to receive your letter of June 14 and the enclosed copy of H.R. 14451. As someone who has been actively involved with the education of women at the undergraduate and graduate levels, I am aware of the need for a program such as the one outlined in your bill. A critical part of the effectiveness of your bill will be the Council on Women's Education. Could you include provision for consultation with appropriate women's groups in the appointment of members of the President? Since individuals interpret the needs of women so differently, it is essential to assure that members of the Council will have a real commitment to providing equal opportunities for men and women.

The statement which you describe on page 5 of the bill seem to me particularly well chosen, and in need of financial support. Under separate cover, I am sending you copies of letters which I have written which strongly support some of the recommendations which are made in your bill.

Since your letter asks for "reactions, suggestions, criticisms, and ideas," I hope you will not mind if I make some minor comments on the specific wording of the bill in its present form. On page 2, line 2, the meaning might be clearer if the word "they" were changed to "we.

On the same page, lines 7-9, could the phrase "concerning women at all levels of education" be construed to imply support for any program which inhibits developing potential of women. But support for programs designed specifically to meet needs of various groups of women and educational institutions should not be able to appropriate funds provided through this bill for the support of educational programs specifically designed for women.

On page 4, line 8, the bill states that "the Council shall advise the Commissioner and the Secretary concerning the administration of public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, and other institutions which now exist with the purpose of providing educational programs specifically designed for women.

On page 4, line 9, if the bill states that "the Council shall advise the Commissioner and Secretary concerning the administration of public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, and other institutions which now exist with the purpose of providing educational programs specifically designed for women.

In summary, I believe this is an excellent and badly needed piece of legislation. Let me know what I can do to support its adoption. Others whose comments you may wish to solicit include:

J. Jacqueline Mattfeld, Dean of Academic Affairs, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.
Patricia Graham, Professor, Department of History, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.
Louise Waitman, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California, Davis, Calif. I assume that you are in touch with Bertram L. Sandler, University of California, Berkeley.

Sincerely yours,

Eliza Wunderman,
Special Assistant to the President.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Representative Tom T. Mink,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Mink: As a member of the M.I.T. Task Force on Equal Opportunity, I am very interested in H.R. 14451 which would provide for Federal grants and contracts for special education programs and activities for women.

Would you please send me a copy of the bill so that I may be advised of its progress.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Marilyn S. Swartz,
Community Planner.

Fenns & Co., Inc.

Hon. Patsey T. Mink,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Mink: I read with great interest your bill on Women's Education, and think it represents an excellent step in the right direction. Having had some experience in this field, I feel the bill will go a long way toward solving some of the serious problems that now exist.

I have served for the past two years on the Executive Council of the Harvard Business School. My efforts to increase female participation in the educational process have been slow, but currently we are making progress and we hope it will continue.

My only concern for your project is such that I would like to see a cooperative effort. If experience would be helpful, to serve as a volunteer on the Commission you are proposing. In this way the Council shall have access to the experience of another person, and we may have a possible volunteer from you if I could be of any assistance.

I very much admire your work on the Hill, and wish you continued success in your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

Julia Montgomery Wahlen,
Senior Vice President.

Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.,
September 11, 1972.

Hon. Patsey T. Mink,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Mink: Thank you so much for sending us a copy of H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972. We agree with you that, in spite of the Equal Rights Amendment, legislation such as this is very important.

There is a great need for a bill such as H.R. 14451 if women are to acquire the education needed to compete on an equal basis with men in the job market. There is also need to root out all traces of discrimination in education covert and subtle. As present, there are very few, if any, funded programs which will benefit women as a class.

At our most recent National Convention in July, delegates reaffirmed BPW's interest in education by including on our 1972-73 National Legislative Platform a plank which calls for support of legislation to accomplish equal educational opportunities for all persons. We believe that your bill will take important steps to eliminate the inequities which now exist.

There is a list of our state officers for the 1972-73 year. I am sure they will be most interested in receiving copies of your bill.

Thank you again for bringing the Women's Education Act of 1972 to our attention. We hope you plan to hold hearings on this measure. If you do, we would very much like to take part in them.

Sincerely yours,

Lucilla H. Shively,
Federation Director.

Baltimore City Council

Congresswoman Patsey Mink,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: I want to congratulate you and let you know of my support of the
HOUSE AND WISH YOU SUCCESS AT THE MALE GROUPS THAT NEED SOME HELP SO THAT THEY ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF WOMEN AND ETHNIC GROUPS IN OUR SOCIETY.

HON: PATSY MINK,
NCAN.

DEAR MRs. MINK: I AM VERY INTERESTED ON THE COUNCIL, ONCE ESTABLISHED. I WOULD EXPRESS SOME MEANING. PLEASE KEEP ME INFORMED.

SINCERELY,
BARRA A. MICHULA,
TUCSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
TUCSON, ARIZ., JUNE 14, 1972.

DEAR MRS. MINK: I AM PLEASED TO SEE THAT YOU ACTED SO PROMPTLY AND SUPPORT TO HAVE WOMEN LIKE YOU ON THE BILL YOU INTRODUCED, H.R. 14451, THAT DEALS WITH THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ACT FOR WOMEN.

SINCERELY,
BARBARA A. MICHULA,
COORDINATOR BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL PROJECT.

JACKSON STATE COLLEGE,
JACKSON, MISS., JULY 8, 1972.

HON. PATSY MINK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.


OUR NCAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE STANDS PROUDLY BEHIND IT. I AM sending you a copy of our release to the press all over the country on may 7 when we met in chicago as a 17-member executive board of NCAN.

WE DO WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT WE WILL STAND BEHIND YOU IN ALL YOU DO TO ESTABLISH THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON WOMEN'S EDUCATION PROGRAMS. A FEW OF US ON THE NCAN BOARD ARE CONSIDERING RUNNING FOR THIS BILL WOULD BE NEEDED TO STAND FOR THE COUNCIL.

I AM PROUD TO SHARE WITH YOU A NOTE THAT WILL WARM THE COOKIES OF YOUR HEART. AT OUR LAST MEETING OF THE FACULTY HERE, I, A WHITE WOMAN IN AN ALL BLACK MALE-ORIENTED COLLEGE, WAS PUBLICLY Nominated TO SERVE AS SENATOR IN THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED FACULTY SENATE BY A MALE! BY SECRET BALLOT I WAS ELECTED TO THE POlT.

I DO HOPE THAT FROM THE DIRECTOR—SISTER MARGARET ELLEN TRAFTER—OF NCAN YOU ARE ON OUR MAILING AND RECEIVING OUR NEWS RELEASES. YOU SHOULD BE PROUD OF THE GOOD WORK! WE NEED WOMEN LIKE YOU!

SINCERELY,
CLARA S. GEBROWSKA, PH. D., PROFESSOR OF MF LANGUAGE.

Anne Grant West, NOW Education Coordinator, 650 Seventh St., Brooklyn, New York.

Shirley Roberts, President NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, P.O. Box 3081, New York, N.Y.

With best wishes for success in your efforts, I am

Respectfully yours,
LYNN MYERS,
Compliance and Enforcement Coordinator.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
NEW YORK, N.Y., JUNE 6, 1972.

HON. PATSY MINK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR PATSY: THANK YOU FOR sending me a copy of the above mentioned legislation. I am very much for the copy of H.R. 14451, as I suggest that you send a program of women's legislation. The act seems to provide the necessary financial assistance so that new textbooks and more balanced curricula can be developed. This would be a significant step in eliminating sex-role stereotype in children's early schooling.

There is little I can add to this comprehensive proposal. My only suggestion is to specifically mention women's studies centers and courses on college campuses, although the act as it is to provide funding for such programs, the establishment of these centers is essential to the education of women about women.

If we can of any assistance in getting the bill passed by Congress please let us know

Sincerely,
SHEILA PEISER PATEK.

WASHINGTON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN,
WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 5, 1972.

HON. PATSY MINK,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I APPRECIATED VERY MUCH RECEIVING A COPY OF YOUR BILL CONCERNING WOMEN'S EDUCATION. THE WOMEN'S EDUCATION ACT OF 1972, IF PASSED AND FUNDED, WOULD GO A LONG WAY TOWARD PROVIDING, AT ALL EDUCATIONAL LEVELS, THE EDUCATIONAL TOOLS WOMEN NEED IF THEY ARE TO ACHIEVE EQUAL STATUS.

THE BILL IS AN Important PIECE OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION DESCRIBING THE SUPPORT OF EVERYONE WHO CARES ABOUT EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN THIS SAGA.

Sincerely,
JANETTE FLEMING,
PRESIDENT.

NEW YORK, N.Y., JUNE 6, 1972.

CONGRESSWOMAN PATSY MINK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

MY REACTION TO YOUR BILL IS NOTHING SHORT OF TOTAL ENTHUSIASM. WE HAVE NEEDED THIS KIND OF LEGISLATION FOR YEARS. IF YOU DETERMINE TO HELP THE BILL PASS, WE WILL GET IT.

Sincerely,
AUBREY C. COHEN,
PRESIDENT, COLLEGE FOR HUMAN SERVICES.


Representative PATSY MINK,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE COPY OF H.R. 14451, AND YOUR ACCOMPANYING LETTER ASKING FOR COMMENTS.

THE NEED FOR SUCH A PROGRAM IS JUST BEGINNING TO BE FEELING, AND THERE MAY BE DIFFICULTIES IN COMMUNICATING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE RESEARCH EFFORT HAS DEPRESSED WOMEN OF COLOR AND WOMEN OF COLORED COMPARISON TO REALIZE THEIR FULL POTENTIAL. THEREFORE, I wish to articulate experts, which I hope will receive wide publicity, is essential in my view. ONE SUCH EXPERT WHO COMES TO MIND IS MAATTA
Hornor who described women’s “will to * * *” so vividly. I believe other experts such as Margaret Hennig of Simmons College, with whom I worked, also have valuable input. Another aspect which might be explored is the phenomenon of women’s estrogen level which is too high in the young. This might explain the attitude of those who do not go on to college, 98% are females. God knows how much genius is wasted just in this pool every year. Furthermore, the statistics have changed since 1954 when the first such study was made. I often think that if we had not systematically and without reason, cast away the development of virtually all female genius in the world we might now have a cure for cancer. After all, genius is a result of the future ~ is the woman who will understand a cure for cancer. It is not only that we have made it impossible for them to be educated but also that they have made it impossible for it to be identified in almost 50% of the population.

You are not only helping women with your Bill you are ultimately helping all human beings. Good luck in your uphill fight.

Sincerely yours,

ESTELLE RAINELY

SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS,
Baton Rouge, La., July 6, 1972.

Hon. Patsy T. Mink,
Congresswoman, Second District, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Mink: I commend you for your concern for the rights of women to acquire education, especially Bill H.R. 14451, the Women’s Education Act of 1972. I believe that there is a great need for its passage.

Particularly in all states and especially here in Louisiana, there is an urgent need for providing funds for research; preparation and development of curricula materials; training programs for teachers and other educational personnel; distribution of these materials; vocational education and career counseling for conferences, institutes, workshops, and seminars for assisting women to achieve equity of education in order for them to compete for jobs in the marketplace.

I have studied Bill H.R. 14451 and agree with its contents. I would especially recommend that suggested guidelines and procedures be worked out specifically so as to ways the funds would be used in the planning, developing, presenting and evaluating of these programs.

Please keep me informed concerning the progress of this Bill.

Very truly yours,

THREMA H. LEONARD, Ed. D., Professor and Acting Director.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,

Representative Patsy Mink,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Mink: I am very much interested in the Bill which you have introduced to help women; especially in the field of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to non-sexist textbooks, non-discriminatory counseling, etc. Could you send me a copy of this Bill, H.R. 14451? Actually, I could use about 50 copies of this, since I am calling a meeting in September of a group of women teachers in the New York City area. I believe that each of them will be most interested in this Bill. However, if it is too much to ask then one copy would be helpful to us.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY B. SCHMIDT

Georgia State University, Atlanta, Ga., August 17, 1972.

Representative Patsy Mink,
301 Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: I have carefully read H.R. 14451 and feel that the bill should prove most valuable in providing the means by which women may achieve equality in our society today.

Sincerely yours,

JULIẾTTE BARBARACO SCHMIDT

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
Department of Education,

Hon. Patsy T. Mink,
Congresswoman, Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: First let me commend you for your concern which led to the introduction of H.R. 14451, the Women’s Education Act of 1972. It is vital that the means to implement the Equal Rights Amendment be sought to truly provide meaningful legislation if women are to receive the benefits intended by the RA.

After studying H.R. Bill 14451, it appears well written in terms of comprehensive coverage of provisions to help women become achievers and professionals. Why don’t our any other country in the history of the world and an appallingly low percentage of women achieve a recognized status of equality. Why do we have more women in college than any other country in the world? It is particularly interesting to me that each of them will be most interested in this Bill. However, if it is too much to ask then one copy would be helpful to us.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA WEINSTEIN,
Labor Program Specialist.
October 18, 1972

My concern relates to the traditional three-year limitation placed upon Federal support. Somehow, someway it is essential that those educational institutions who receive funds pursuant to Title II, and solicited support when Federal funds are no longer forthcoming. I have been increasingly distressed with the evidence of such disinterest in the profit-motive rather than the people-motive.

This summer I was fortunate enough to be a participant in one of the I.E.W. workshops in Higher Education and had the opportunity to meet Mrs. Fraser and Mrs. Sandell. When discussing your bill, I pressed when solicited support for the bill as I carry out my responsibilities as program chairman for the A.F.G.A. regional convention to be held in the next few months. It is by no means any other way we can support your bill please let me know.

Sincerely,

Kathleen D. Crouch, Ed.D., Assistant Director, Counseling Center.


Hon. Patsey Mink, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review your bill H.R. 14451. The bill would be a great step forward for women, I have not had experience with legislative form and, therefore, I am not certain whether the question I am about to raise is a legitimate one. It concerns Section 4, Part f, lines 13-18, p. 8. If I understand the House of Representatives provision indicates that an organization must be in existence for at least a year prior to being eligible to submit a proposal for funds. It appears that such a provision would discriminate against women, who for reasons such as discrimination in the recent past, formed their own organizations for special activities. Let us consider the case of women proposing to examine their own institutions with respect to, say, the training of women for the clerical positions. It appears that such a provision indicates that an organization must be in existence for at least a year prior to being eligible to submit a proposal for funds. It appears that such a provision would discriminate against women, who for reasons such as discrimination in the recent past, formed their own organizations for special activities. Let us consider the case of women proposing to examine their own institutions with respect to clerical positions.

Therefore, need to charge enrollment fees to cover our expenses. With your bill, I can envision groups from throughout the country organizing in order to turn their proposal. I will all follow your progress with appreciation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Mary E. Miller, Associate Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., June 6, 1972.

Hon. Patsey Mink, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mrs. Mink: We are extremely enthusiastic that your bill has turned into实实在在is the bill. If we have put into it the ideas in the education for women's education. If you wish supporting material to document your proposal, we will be pleased to provide as much as we have. Since 1969 we have developed and presented numerous programs for and about women such as: The Legal Position of Women in California, Group Counseling for Women (Opportunities in Educational, Vocational and Volunteer Activities), Paralegal Probate Specialist Training, Counseling Specialist Adult Women. We have served approximately 10,000 women, it is only a small dent in our Los Angeles community. Our resources have limited staff time to develop new programs and teachers, plus the fact that we must be self-supporting and therefore, need to charge enrollment fees to cover our expenses. With your bill, I can envision groups from all economic levels throughout the nation receiving the most relevant education.

You mention resource centers and information centers; I would hope these physical facilities would include classroom space and child care centers in order to accommodate one of the biggest needs of the young adult women. If each of these centers properly staffed it would be possible to create an environment for both boys and girls to explore, learn, grow, and develop stereotypic sex roles which are still taught through textbooks and attitudes of teachers in a majority of public schools.

Both the National University Extension Association and the Adult Educational Association now have women's sections. The Washington State University Extension Services, and Washington Educational Association where members lists are available:


Adult Education Association, 610 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20003 (202) 347-9754.

Again, I can only say that you have our wholehearted support and urge that the bill not be amended to exclude any of your salient points. The sections covered "appropriate geographical distribution" and "no grant can be made to any agency or organization... which discriminates on the basis of sex" are particularly suitable to the goals you wish to accomplish.

Congratulations and good luck.

Cordially,

ROSALIND LOEB, Director, Extension Programs and Special Projects.


Congresswoman Patsey T. Mink
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I heartily approve of H.R. 14451, I believe, it is a special pleading to add. I should like specific reference made to encouraging women to enroll in courses that are particularly suitable to the goals which discriminates on the basis of sex.

Very truly yours,

MARY W. GRAY, Professor of Mathematics, Chairman, Association for Women in Mathematics.

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, Atlanta, Ga., May 8, 1972.


DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: We noted with great interest a recent summary pertaining to your bill H.R. 14451 in the "Women in Education for women's educational programs and activities for women.

Within the last few years, we at Georgia Tech have placed particular emphasis on programs which would encourage women to serve as the leading school in the country for graduating women engineers. We believe there are many more programs which can be initiated to increase the number of women in engineering far in excess of the mere 1% which they now represent.

We would be eager to assist in planning and assisting you in any way possible to increase that percentage. If your bill is given proper attention, I would be pleased to discuss our being the leading school in the country for graduating women engineers.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHEPPARD, Associate Dean of Engineering.


Hon. Patsey Mink, Common House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: In a recent issue of the Congressional Record I have read of House Resolution 14451 which you have introduced, whereby the men and the women are funded special educational programs and activities concerning women and for other related educational purposes.

I am particularly interested in your Resolution as we have recently submitted a proposal to the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is titled Project Upward Mobility, and is designed to provide for women who have been absent from the educational opportunities during the years of two years, in each of the two years, the opportunity to be trained in the field of administration for higher education. These women will spend some time on the campus of the University of Puget Sound in classes conducted by the School of Education and the School of Business, and spend some time in offices of institutions of higher education located in Region X, and in the Region X office which is located in Seattle.
The Community Services provision (Title I) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, provided for much more in funds but was actually funded at $10 million the first year. At this level, small projects were fundable in many locations. (Tow's total was $168,000.) It is obvious that even four (three state and one local) is too modest a sum to do much in a state with this amount of money in terms of solving problems or educating the educational community.

As host as this subject is currently in all areas, but especially those having governmental connections such as higher education, my opinion is that the asking is too modest. My recommendation would be $30 million the first year.

If I can be of further assistance in this or other matters, please let me know. May I suggest that you also contact the following people, since all of these organizations are actively interested in and vigorously engaged in continuing education for women.

Dr. Ray J. Act, President, Coalition of Adult Education Organizations, Adult Continuing Education Center, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043.

Dr. Alfred H. Ast, President, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., Director, Extension Service, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109.

Dr. Armand H. Runner, President, National University Extension Association, Continuing Education Service, Michigan State, University, 114 Kellogg Center, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

Dr. Howell W. McGee, Executive Secretary, American Association of University Women, College for Continuing Education, University of Oklahoma, 1700 Asp Avenue, Norman, Oklahoma 73069.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE H. THOMPSON
Dean

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—GREEN BAY
Green Bay, Wis., August 16, 1972.

Ms. PATSY T. MINK
Member of Congress
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

I have just read your bill, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972. I think it is excellent. It provides for a broad range of projects and programs that are much needed. I have long been concerned that there is not enough money available for helping women achieve equal rights and to improve their educational level. I will support the bill in any way that I can.

Sincerely,

Ms. MAESE ENGELMAN
Director of Adult Education

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN—MILWAUKEE
Milwaukee, Wis., June 7, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: Thank you for sending me a copy of H.R. 14451 on the Women's Education Act of 1972. I was terribly enthusiastic and decided that I had no objections.

I have long admired your contributions to the Congress and your positions in various issues, and am gratified at the opportunity to tell you so.

I hope to hear further from you about the progress of the bill.

Sincerely,

CATHARINE G. NICHOLS
Professor, Department of Counselor Education

San Diego City Schools

Hon. PATSY T. MINK
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dr. MANK: I read with interest about the Women's Education Act of 1972 (H.R. 14451) which you have introduced.

Speaking as a Mexican-American woman who did not receive her B.A. degree until after marriage and three children, I know that many women such as the one you mentioned, at the present time I am director of the Career Opportunities Program in San Diego. This is a new program in San Diego (Part D) for paraprofessionals working in the schools who are also attending college classes.
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leading to teacher certification. Seventy-two percent of the programs participated in the 1972 program. It is most rewarding to see these programs which are working toward their educational and professional goals.

I am confident that your bill will receive the support of the House. Asstatistics published daily which attest to the infinitesimal numbers of women in administration and consulting positions.

When the "Council on Women's Educational Programs" at the Office of Education becomes a reality, I would like to submit my name in the hope that the Council will realize that these appointments are of a political nature, but I feel that I have firsthand knowledge of the needs of women who would make a contribution to the council.

Sincerely yours,

L. REIKEL, Supervisor, Career Opportunities Program

G. RUPPS JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Grand Rapids, Mich.
Representative PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: In the recent publication of the APGA Guidepost, I was indeed interested to read the article relative to your "Women's Education Bill" (HR 14451). As a woman, a professional counseling psychologist, and a counselor at a state university junior college, I have been aware of the broad needs for the equality for women in education.

My interest and deep concern for improving the opportunities and creating an environment in which women can attain educational equality has been brought into sharp focus by the questions, problems, frustrations, anxiety, and ego-defeating experiences which women from all age groups bring into my office.

My own personal encounters of inequality in the educational/academic environment as well as the difficulties with which a woman must cope on a job and in society in general give me a depth of understanding of the total problem. To fully understand a problem area one must have experienced it.

It is my firm belief that equality in education is a basic block upon which full equality for the American woman must be built.

At the present time, some of my clients feel that they are involved in approaching this educational problem at our own level, educational level. We are researching needs which women at various age levels, backgrounds and life styles feel could be met by new and innovative educational programs. Such programs could range from self-identification, career investigation, self-improvement, training or retraining in specific skills, cultural enhancement, short term courses to investigate problem areas in which women lack information and/or are concerned, to preparation for entry into some type of career. We believe that all age groups for the programs and curriculums to be designed are not restricted or limited to "normal college age." New kinds of educational needs and special attention need to be given to these women relative to educational planning, counseling and development of their human potentials, so that they may actively and fully participate in our American society. Appropriate counseling may often be needed in the early stages of such educational experiences. All too often women have rather intense feeling of fear, rejection, anxiety, and lack of self worth to truly benefit from whatever education program chosen, such feelings must be recognized, explored, and dealt with as they appear.

As you well realize, I'm sure, our above endeavors are part of the efforts of pioneers and we encounter the problems of lack of financial aids for female students, lack of professional counselors, lack of underwrite innovative programs, and lack of positive concrete support from our male colleagues. Nevertheless, we feel that we are making some limited progress and hope to launch some pilot courses and specific counseling opportunities which would make a small beginning to meet some needs in the community.

Provisions in your bill for training women's counselors and their educational personnel and establishment of resource centers would provide the personnel and environment by which women could secure help and direction.

To establish a Council on Women's Educational Programs within the Office of Education and to have women appointed comprising more than one-half of the membership would concretely establish the position and importance of women by the federal government.

I do hope to be present at the APGA regional conference in St. Louis and have the privilege of speaking to you.

In whatever way my training, knowledge, experience, and energy can be used, I offer these in hopes of obtaining equality for all women in American society.

I offer the name of my colleague, Mrs. Winifred Fox who is the female member of our seven member counseling staff. She also offers her support to the passage of your bill.

Together we wish you success and express our gratitude that we have a Congresswoman who believes and works for the rights of all women.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MARY ANN GREGORY,
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: I was interested in reading about the proposed Women's Education Bill (HR 14451) as reported in the APGA Guidepost. I agree that our present educational system has created a position for those women who meet the needs of the emerging woman in her new role. As a counselor educator, I am particularly concerned for counselors who are going to be working with women in public schools. These counselors have a tremendous opportunity to be "change agents."

I would like very much to have a copy of this bill as well as the ideas presented concerning the Council on Women's Educational Programs. Additionally, if you know of programs now in existence in counselor education which meet one of the proposed goals of your legislation will be used, I hope to be of assistance to you in your concern for women's rights.

Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. MURRELL, Ed. D.,
Associate Professor of Education,
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SPRINGFIELD,
Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: I read with much interest, in The Guidepost, your concern for women's rights.

I appreciate your sentiment of representatives of your stature and prestige in HR 14451, Women's Educational Act.

As a Coordinator of Guidance Services for a city school system, I am acutely aware of the gross inequities relating to job placements, salaries and other rights. America, beset with myriad of knotty social problems can ill afford to ignore and depreciate the creative talents of one third of a great segment of her society—women.

You may be surprised that I'm male (not a particularly unusual interest in the rights of all Americans.

Should I ever be of assistance to you in your endeavor relating to women's rights, please let me know.

Your respectfully,

T. R. ROLLINS,
President, Missouri Personnel and Guidance Association.

APPLIED POTENTIAL,
Representative PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: I am most interested in learning more about your proposed legislation, HR 14451, which was recently reported in the APGA September Guidepost. Would you kindly send me a copy of the bill.

I am co-director of a counseling service for adult women who want to combine their family responsibilities with a professional career. Although most of our clients have a part or full-time professional career as their goal, we are interested in the idea of a return to school, to update their skills, or become trained in an entirely new field. We do not feel that the problems relating to the financing and the scheduling. Many colleges and junior colleges have established Continuing Education Centers which permit a limited schedule for those pursuing a second career. It is still very difficult for the mature woman to find a way to get outside funding for further education. I hope your legislation may be some provision for funding the education for these "second career" women.

For your information I am enclosing a brochure describing Applied Potential. We are a relatively new counseling service—we started in December 1971. However, we hope to develop into a community resource center for women such as you envision in your proposal.

I hope we will be able to bring public attention to the need for legislative action on behalf of the education needs of women.

Sincerely,

CAROLE A. WILK,
VILLA MARIA COLLEGE,
Erie, Pa., September 23, 1972.
Representative PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: After reading of your Women's Education Bill, I wish to applaud you for your foresight in the needs of today's women's education needs.

As an administrator of a small women's college, I see the great urgency for more career counseling—especially for the mature, middle-aged woman.

With this focus, we are planning a workshop, Search for Fulfillment, to help the woman over 35 to change her lifestyle of child-rearing to education, volunteering, employment, or the creative arts. Information such as the bill proposing would help finance programs such as this. We feel that the middle-aged woman has been very much neglected as far as governmental aid. It is time that we pay attention to her.

I will be interested in receiving any information that you may have available in regard to your bill as well as any other data on help for the woman 35 and over.

Thank you for your interest in us.

Yours truly,

MRS. JOAN D. PAINTER,
Director of Guidance and Placement.

Hon. Patsey T. MINK, Congresswoman—Women's Caucus.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: I am glad to have the opportunity to comment on your excellent bill, H.R. 14451, Women's Education Act of 1972. As Director of EVE, a vocational guidance center for women, I am very aware of the need for funds to enable women to continue training and proper guidance in order to enable them to enter fields now opening to them. I hope that Congress will support your bill.

EVE is an acronym for Education, Volunteer, Employment, and Ethics for Women. It is a community service of Newark State College. The enclosed brochure and copy of our last newsletter may help to describe our program. I imagine EVE would be considered a women's resource center, as mentioned in section 2, (b) and 4, (c) (5 and 9) of your bill, our purpose being well stated in lines 16-23 of section 6.

I am glad to see that your guidelines are broad. During the course of my work, it has come to my attention how often federal money is wasted because there are people whose career seems to be devoted to watching for appropriations and then devising programs to meet the specifications and obtain the funds. Often, those results in funds being used to support the salaries of administrators, whose work does not always serve the intended purpose.

I realize that evaluation of results is difficult, and prediction of future results doubly difficult, if not impossible. It seems to me that your guidelines place more of the responsibility on those in the community to come up with innovative and practical proposals. Narrow, specific guidelines permit development of proposals "just to get the money."

I hope that the Council provided for in section 6, (a) might have time, or even be directed to interview personnel involved in any proposal to be seriously considered. The success of a program largely depends on the quality and dedication of the people involved. Proposals, reports, statistics can always be made to sound good, much in the manner that "liars can figure, and figures can lie." Please do not think that the above remarks are intended to imply that all, or even most, governmental appropriations are wasted; more good work being done than bad, I'm sure.

One further comment. I question the limit in section 7 of $15,000 annually per grant. I can envision some constructive proposals that I might want to see legislation which emphasizes such educational programs. However, I would prefer to see legislation which emphasizes training and educational programs for under- and over-qualifications: I bring this to your attention because at present most of the activity regarding the status of women focuses on the academic and professional women. I think this is a mistake.

The bill as written is certainly clear and definite in recognizing the need for new and improved curricula which all in developing new perceptions about sex roles.

I would hope that appointments to the Council would be representative of economic and ethnic groups of women.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE HAVRILESKY
Assistant Director, Division of Field Services

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
Huntsville, Ala., June 8, 1972.

Ms. Patsey T. Mink,
Congresswoman—Women's Caucus.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: Thank you for your letter of May 30, and the copy of your proposed bill, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

I have studied the bill thoroughly, and find that I am in complete agreement with both its intent and provisions. I shall inform all of my women colleagues on the faculty here, and ask their support of it also.

If you would mail each of them a copy of the bill, I think it might be helpful (list attached). We shall then write our Congressmen, individually and collectively, of our concern and support.

The week of June 18-24 I shall be attending the Institute "Challenge: Women in Higher Education" at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and will be able to speak for it there. I will be happy to distribute copies of the bill, if you will send me a packet (about 100). Thank you for your concern for women. Best wishes for your continued good work in the legislative field.

Sincerely yours,

REESE DANLEY KIAGO, Ph.D.,
Director, Office of Student Affairs, Associated Student Council, Assistant Professor of Sociology.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
Reno, Nev., June 1, 1972.

Hon. Patsey T. Mink,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Mink: May I add my voice to the ranks of your supporters in reference to H.R. 14451.

Too long has the United States penalized women and, in the process, overlooked the truly significant pool of human resources.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. WHITTEMORE

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Congratulations on the foresight you displayed in introducing to Congress the Women's Education Act of 1972.

The bill, if passed, would reduce the discriminatory procedure that permeate the education of women from early childhood to professional degrees of education. Coincidentally, the New York State Board of Regents recently issued a position paper on educational programs for women. I'm sure you'll find the report informative.

I have taken the liberty of sending copies of your letter to the National and New York State Women's Caucuses, the National Organization for Women, the New York City Civil Liberties Union and the Professional Women's Caucus.

If we can assist you in any way to ensure the passage of this bill please let me know.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA A. CAIRNS

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your proposed legislation H.R. 14451—the Women's Education Act of 1972.

I strongly concur with your observation that while the Education and Labor Committee has long been aware of the need for comprehensive educational programs for women which would enable women to develop skills in traditional women's fields such as law, medicine, and the vocational sciences, we, thus, applaud your legislative proposals.

The question remains as to the most effective way of implementing the specifics of your legislation—the development of new and improved curricula, research and evaluation of model educational programs concerning women at all levels of education—the dissemination of such materials by the mass media—training programs for teachers, youth and guidance counselors and the planning of women's resource centers. I wonder if such a Council with far-reaching programs and intended involvement with community leaders, labor leaders, industrial and business leaders as well as government employees might be more effective as an ad hoc body outside the jurisdiction of the Office of Education but with strong ties to the office thus permitting feedback and on-going consultation and evaluation.

If such a course is not feasible, perhaps the application of financial assistance might be made to the entire Council as well as to the aforementioned commissions.

I welcome the opportunity to add my thoughts to your extensive proposal. Be assured of my continued interest in H.R. 14451.

Sincerely,

EVELYN CUNNINGHAM
Director, Women's Unit.

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN,

Hon. Patsey T. Mink,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for your letter of May 18 enclosing a copy of your proposed Women's Education Act. I have studied its provisions and wholeheartedly endorse both the concept of this legislation and the specific mechanisms through which it would be effected.

We have discovered a widespread need for— but almost the absence of— continuing education programs for women in Arkansas, combined with knowledgeable and sympathetic career counseling for mature women. The University of Arkansas is now considering...
ing initiating such a program on a small, experimental scale—finds such as this Act would provide could be most useful here.

Since no Members of the Arkansas Congress for Legislative Recommendation now serve on the Education and Labor Committee, I don't know how useful our Arkansas women could be to you at this stage. I will, however, see that interested women and groups in our State are informed of HR 14451, and I am attaching a list of those to whom I would appreciate your sending copies.

When hearings are scheduled on this legislation, may I make the following suggestions as to those who might make very articulate advocates?

1. Ms. Margie Chapman, newly elected President of the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students. She is a student at the University of Arkansas, has worked closely with the Arkansas Commission on the Status of Women and is a very ardent promoter of the women's movement. In her capacity as President of the IAWS, she speaks for 200,000 young women.

2. Ms. Blanche Cowperthwaite, Chairman of the Colorado Governor's Commission on the Status of Women. She personally and her organization has long been especially concerned with textbook sex-stereotyping. She is extremely Intelligent and articulate on this topic.

3. Our Arkansas Commission, in an effort to measure career aspirations and counseling by sex and to determine whether high school girls are being over-prepared for traditional occupations. This is a very pertinent project which needs your support.

I am personally interested in the women's movement. In my capacity as Commissioner on the Maryland Commission, I have been actively engaged in developing such a program at the undergraduate and graduate levels. We anticipate that the National Women's Education Act of 1972 would provide the necessary assistance of time, money and other resources to make it possible. The purpose is a very significant contribution to the women's rights movement.

An accumulation of reliable knowledge and its dissemination is needed to bring the problem to a level of awareness where change is possible.

Faculty women at Indiana University have been actively engaged in developing such an awareness for several years. Needless to say, it has been a slow, piecemeal and reiterative process. This bill, if enacted, would bring the problem to a level of awareness where change is possible.

More courses on the role of women are presently being offered, however, the great majority of these courses are taught by women on a voluntary basis—no compensation and no overload. This situation places faculty women at a disadvantage when their academic performance is compared to their male colleagues who are concentrating more on their research and teaching agenda. This is an area of concern which must be acknowledged and recognized.

As chairwoman of the School of Education Commission on Women's Task Force on Curriculum, I am especially interested in the progress of HR 14451 for dissemination and for promotional purposes. We anticipate designing a Program of Studies on Women at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The proposed legislation would make it possible for women (as well as men) to design curriculum, to conduct research, to teach innovative courses on women with the necessary assistance of time, money and personnel.

I am looking forward to receiving information of the progress of HR 14451.
of your thoughtfulness in sending a copy of your bill, H.R. 14451, to us for examination. We believe that you are fully aware of the importance and necessity of a bill to Congress. Our members who have read and examined the bill support its spirit, purpose, and structure and agree that the bill on the whole effectuates action for its implementation.

We would like to make a few suggestions in regard to the make-up of the bill. We feel that the representations of the areas that are underrepresented should be defined more specifically and concretely, with attention given to representatives from the university and college communities. We think it imperative that there will be representatives from those areas, public and private, directly affected by the concerns of the bill. Also, we think it desirable that a woman be head of the Council. Therefore, we suggest that the Council itself be responsible for the selection of the chairperson, thus allowing not only for a director who is agreeable to the Council, but also allowing for the stronger possibility of a woman's being selected as the Director.

We thank you again for your concern and interest in the positions the bill receives immediate passage and quick implementation.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH G. GODFREY, Chairman.

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 5, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Representatives.
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Thank you for your letter of May 18, concerning H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

The Pennsylvania Commission on the Status of Women would particularly like to commend the scope of your legislation, which will make it possible for an innovative approach to be taken in community education programs as well as in formal educational curricula.

We would, however, suggest that in making grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, emphasis be placed on improving those areas in which the greatest discrimination has been most prevalent, such as law and medical schools.

The Commission strongly supports this legislation and looks forward to implementing the principles embodied in the Equal Rights Amendment. If we can be of any immediate assistance, please write when action on our part will be most beneficial.

Sincerely yours,

ARLINE LOTMAN, Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Representative.
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I am writing in response to your recent letter on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession of the Organization of American Historians. I am enclosing a copy of your bill, H.R. 14451, and have shared its contents with my committee. We want to know of your enthusiastic support for the provisions of the Women's Education Act of 1972.

Our committee is concerned primarily with the furthering of research and teaching in the history of the United States. We feel very strongly that it is important to begin exploring this long-neglected part of our past in order to give a more balanced perspective on the American national experience. For too long we have assumed that history consists of what men have traditionally done—politics, war, international relations. Leaving out the contributions of women highlights a large part of our population, to be sure; but it also means that we neglect large segments of our society. The history of the family, or of voluntary organizations—that we would do well to understand—is there. Indeed, it is true, as you point out, that educational programs in the area of women's history will be an important influence in enhancing contemporary status of women in the United States. It is also our wish that H.R. 14451 would go a long way toward enabling us to make important progress in these areas.

Should you seek hearings on this bill, my committee would be glad to provide witnesses who are experts in the field of women's history, and who could speak convincingly of the importance of your bill. They could provide evidence of the current state of scholarship and teaching about women on the secondary as well as at the college level. And they could speak in some detail about curricular materials currently available, as well as the kinds we most need.

Probably your most useful contact in terms of reaching these objectives in regard to women's history would be the Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession. You may obtain a copy of their bill to the COWHP's chairman, Professor Sandra Cooper, Richmond College—CUNY, Staten Island, New York 10306. In addition, the Rockefeller Foundation recently sponsored a small research/planning conference in women's history. The person in charge was Mr. Peter Wood, assistant director at Rockefeller Institute in New York. He would also be interested in a copy of your bill. I am sure you must know that my counterpart in the American Historical Association is Dr. Charlotte Quinn at the AHA, 400 8th St., SE, Washington, D.C. 20003. In addition, if you haven't already done so, you would surely want to contact the chairmen of the women's caucuses or committees in the various other professions—e.g., the Modern Language Association, American Political Science Association, American Economic Association, etc. I am afraid that I do not have their names and addresses, but the Library of Congress ought to have some kind of directory of professional associations.

As an additional assistance, you can reach me at the above address in Washington (phone: 385-0224) until about September 1, after which I will be back in Princeton.

Yours sincerely,

NANCY WEISS, Assistant Professor of History.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
August 8, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
Congresswoman from Hawaii,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ms. Mink: I am very much interested in the Women's Education Act (H.R. 14451) which you have introduced in the House of Representatives. I am very interested in your bill. With this letter, I would like to share with you the copy of it.

My work as an Equal Employment Officer at this University makes me concerned with the inequalities in our society and with the unequal treatment of male and female at all levels of education.

If your office has other related materials for distribution, in addition to a copy of your bill, I would appreciate receiving them.

To my knowledge, there are no reports or consultation efforts on behalf of passage of your bill.

Sincerely,

HELEN BATECHELOR, Ph.D., Coordinator.

MONTCLAIR STATE COLLEGE,
June 6, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Representatives,
Second District, Hawaii,
Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Mink: Thank you for sharing with me the copy of H.R. 14451.

In the interest of sharing with you our own interest in equality of education for women, we are endeavoring to assemble testimonials, suggestions, criticisms, ideas as well as the names and addresses of others who are interested and would be likely to support your efforts for this bill.

With this letter, I would like to share with you the initial suggestions coming out of our Education for Aging Project at Montclair State College's Adult Continuing Education Center.

Further materials will be developed for your office.

As past president of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., I have shared your interests with members of the Executive Committee (AEA-USA) and have referred it to the Association's Commission "On the Status of Women in Education." The thoughts I am presenting are the results of several years of experience in teaching and also my recent association with the executive chairman of the Louisiana Commission on the Status of Women.

Looking forward to whatever assistance we can render to your efforts. Thank you for your interest in this problem.

Sincerely,

RAY J. AST, Administrator.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, La., June 8, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
Member of House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE MINK: I am interested in studying carefully the Act 14451 Women's Education Act 1972, which you introduced in Congress. The thoughts I am presenting are the results of several years of experience in teaching and also my recent association with the executive chairman of the Louisiana Commission on the Status of Women.

We are in a position in American society to plan and work for the improvement of education of all people from infancy throughout adult life. There are many areas of common interests to both men and women and some of these are understanding of self and others, management of resources, understanding the principles and applications of learning in informal and formal situations. Many of the common problems in technical and professional education are applicable to our different age levels: economic, social, and ethnic and the special interest groups. Seems that many of these areas are not sex-wise. There are some professionals and technical areas that may demand supplementary training for men and women. However, the academic and technical areas of society are controlling much in the maturation of the American society which may minimize the differences including interest in education needs of the two sexes.

The present need for education research is worldwide and demands on the part of the nations and the results made available for practices and application at an early date. The system of experience statewide Federal control and state policy development is the vital answer to experience and research in the
areas of behavioral science including psy-
chology, sociology, human development, and
cultural anthropology.

Another need many educators have pointed out is that centers designated for research and assessed the responsibility of experimenting and studying applications out of education. Research in the education field for the uses of results and application for the improvement of learning situations.
The doubling of minority concerns and women's concerns are to assume should be appraised carefully in the education field. I sometimes feel that the majority concerns and women's concerns are given hearing, but no funds. We are very lucky in this regard to the bill have to do with the State funds these days, that much of the money has been given to the state funds for the Women's Education Act of 1972. I feel that the House will be happy to write our Congressional delegation and to other members of the minority groups; should these community colleges be the chief source for continuing education of the middle class woman who may be in a precarious financial condition,

Growing population of community colleges and the responsibilities they are in position to assume should be appraised carefully in terms of economy and the education of youth adults and special training educational pro-
grams; should these community colleges be the chief source for continuing education of the American population.

Special study of education needs and train-
ing of administrators, counselors, and teachers of students who have special problems, we find in this area the need for teachers and staff who understand and serve the special physical differences, such as hearing and speech, and the emotional health of the children. I would like to point out the special need for those individuals beginning with the school population who exhibit special abilities in the creative arts and the need for understanding their needs and their interpersonal relationships. I shall continue my interest in the provi-
sions of this Bill HR 14481 and will follow the progress of the program in the Congress. Sincerely yours,

DR. CLARA TUCKER
Chairman, Commission on the Status of Women.

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION,

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Thank you so much for sending me a copy of House Resolution 14481 concerning Women's Education Act of 1972. I feel that the Washington State Women's Council can give complete support to such a bill, and will be happy to write our Congressional delega-
tion if you will notify us as to the hearing dates and also the appropriate time for hearings in the House.

I would be very interested in knowing what you feel the reaction will be to accept-
sion to such a bill. It seems to me with the flight for rather close federal funds and also state funds these days, that much of the money concerning women's concerns is given hearing, but no funds. We are very lucky in this State to have been given an appropriate time and place for hearings and also the other members of the Washington State Women's Council and to other organiza-
tions concerning various women's com-
misions at the Institutions of higher edu-
cation, the women's political action group, and any others that come to mind.

The Women's Council also has a concern when women have to compete for a share of

the pie they come out on the short end. Is it possible to have a direct appropriation to such an organization? $15,000 Innovative Grants for research on programs would hardly be a drop in the bucket even though I know they are supplementary to other funds that would be appropriated thereby. This type of research could certainly be a help to many groups, however it should be increased if possible. One other little comment that is just

placety, but something which has re-
ceived great attention in our State, is that we are very fortunate to use a more neutral term than chairperson and have gone to talking about chairperson, or members who chair meetings, etc.

Again, I feel this is an excellent idea, and I will wholeheartedly endorse it in the State of Washington and ask for continued review. Please keep us up to date on the progress of the Bill.

Sincerely,

E. ANNE WINCHESTER,
Deputy Coordinator, Chairperson of Washington State Women's Council.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE,

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: Notre Dame College, a four-year liberal arts college for women, is in full support of H.R. 14481 which you introduced. Legislation such as H.R. 14481 will highlight those progressive women's colleges similar to Notre Dame to develop programs which will fully explore and im-
plement innovative educational opportunities for women.

We gratefully encourage and support your efforts.

Sincerely,

JEANNETTE VEVERA,
President.

DEAR MISS MINK: Thank you very much for your letter of May 10, with enclosure. I am enormously impressed with your Women's Education Act of 1972 and will, indeed, call the attention of others to its provisions. So far as I can tell from a first reading of it, it is comprehensive and very much on target. I will certainly do what I can to further this worthy effort.

Respectfully,

JESSE BERNARD
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY,

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: I heard you last Tuesday at Southern Methodist University's Women's Symposium and was particularly interested in your views regarding Women's Studies in colleges and universities. I am a speech pro-

fessor at Texas Woman's University in Den-
ton, Texas, and have recently been appointed to an ad hoc committee to "study the feasi-
bility" of Women's Studies programs in our school.

It would seem that Texas Woman's Univer-
sity, the liberal arts university, would be a leader in such programs, but, unfor-
unately, the opposite is true. The students have been asking for these courses, but the administration has not recognized any pressing need. I have incorporated a nine week unit on speakers and organizations in the women's movement into a course in contem-
porary issues and speakers that I teach and a professor in the Sociology Department has been asked to develop courses that deal with Women's Studies. I have found the Women's Studies have been accepted by the Curriculum Committee.

I would greatly appreciate your aid in get-
ing a few courses in Women's Studies estab-
lished at this, the largest, university for women. Could you please write, in a letter to me, some of the views you proposed at SMU regarding the relevance and value of courses in women's history, literature, and social movements, and perhaps—in my area of interest—a course about women speakers.

Thank you in advance for your consid-
eration of material or sources concerning a woman's study program for TWU.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN QUINN,
Professor of Speech.

HON. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS MINK: I appreciate your asking
my opinion of your bill because it is a meas-
ure I consider long overdue. I have felt for some time that we need a welfare program for training women to be self-supporting. At this point in our society, it is those women who are old enough to have missed the type of childhood socialization we are working towards now that are suffering the most. The plight of welfare mothers is tragic; but so is that of the middle class woman who has invested all of her resources in a husband and family that dissolves. She is caught in a blind alley by becoming obso-

ete and child support responsibility shifting to both parents instead of just to the father—and she is not prepared to contribute at all.

Attached is my list of women who are very interested in identifying and preparing who may be in a position to offer support.

Sincerely,

Ms. ELLIE GOODWIN,
Director of Communications,
Skills Institute.

HON. PAGE BELCHER

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given per-
mission to extend his remarks at this point in the Racee and to include ex-
traneous matter.)

Mr. CAMP, Mr. Speaker, what has risen before you is the eroded remnant of a giant of a man—one who has had the distinction and delight—yes, even the obligation—to labor well nigh a quar-
ter of a century tete-a-tete with the in-
credible, peerless, formidable, lovable, courageous Congressman PAGE BEL-
cher of Oklahoma.

Well I recall our first encounter when I loomed over him when he first came to Congress. In that very first session, when I imprudently rendered a judgment coun-
ter to his, I discovered I quickly lost 3 inches in height due to his remarkably acerbic, rapier, and scalpel-like tongue. From that day forward I followed that old piece of doggerel in my relations with PAGE:

Those who fight
And run away
Live to fight
Another day.

Only by careful adherence to that doc-
trine have I survived to be here this eve-
nings, joining in our great task of who has been a mainstay of the Republican Party for all the years I have known him.

Now let us be perfectly frank about PAGE. After all, he would expect that of us. The simple truth is, it would prob-
ably be easier now and then to live with
Gloria Steinem than with Page Belcher, when you get right down to it. My observation has been that there are two roads to follow, as long with Page. One is his way. The other is his way. There is just no other way.

And that is precisely why he is what he has come to be—"Page the Incredible".

I have seen this man, during my 10 years in the White House, overcome not one, not two, not five, but a whole procession of obstacles—yet, for all his doggedness, his tenacity, his automatic, absolute insistence on achieving your purpose once your mind is made up.

Now in some people that kind of an attribute is not necessarily a handsome one. You know such a fellow can be viewed as domastic, or intolerant of other's views, or just plain bullheaded. Well, to be honest about it, my friends, there have been times that I have thought Page just a bit—and, of course, to some of those things when, no matter what I tried to say, and no matter what the President or anyone else tried to say, he would cheerfully carreeen down that highway of choice, forcing the rest of us to dodge away for fear of our lives.

But there is a difference here—a really noteworthy difference. Let me put it this way.

Did you ever see a lovable cocklebur? Now some of you would say you have not—but you lie in your teeth when you say that. For that is precisely what is with us this evening.

Yes. Page is tough and Page is rough, and Page is demanding, and he will push around the biggest people in the entire United States without the slightest hesitancy, and virtually always with complete success in what he is trying to do.

But—and here is the big difference—always we have known, we who have been so loyal to the work we find in his word. And this gifted man, that his motives always have been gold unleddled. It is party loyalty that motivates Page. It is loyalty to our country that motivates Page. It is that grand concept of the long-term interest of the American people, the avoidance of the tawdry, the expedient, the short-sighted solutions that control Page. And so, a soft-hearted, a good-hearted thistle—a tough man, a driven man—but, oh, such a good man—that is our Page.

I, for one, am so mightily proud to have known him, and also, I think, of many of his major achievements in his congressional years, and as a fellow Oklahoman I glow like a firefly because he is a product of my State.
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power over the purse. More than any President in our history, Mr. Nixon has been fit to impose directives and to impound funds appropriated by the Congress. His action thwarted the constitutional authority to control spending.

I would add here that during the First Session we continued the President's authority to control prices and wages. Were it not such a serious matter, his administration might think this author- ity could provide us with some comic relief from an otherwise grim situation in our country.

The President has, of course, been credited with some spectacular firsts in the field of foreign affairs during 1972. I refer to his trips to Peking and Moscow. He returned from Moscow with an Interim Agreement Between the United States and the Soviet Union on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, that is, mis- siles for delivery of non-nuclear warheads. The Senate has tried but has declined to authorize the President's proposal and instead authorized a study of it. Conferences dropped the entire matter from the bill when they could not resolve differences.

This bill also provided for changes in some Federal, state, and local welfare programs to make them more workable, financially secure, and helpful to those benefiting from them.

Tied to that bill was a 5-per cent increase in social security benefits. This increase was lifted from the bill, increased to 20 percent, and appended to a debt-ceiling increase voted June 30, 1972. The President opposed this increase for social security beneficiaries but then tried to grab credit for passage after reluctantly signing the measure. This action was typical of his practice of shifting the Congress on the one hand and then claiming credit for our good deeds on the other.

We passed legislation to aid in the development of national facilities in this country including: Assistance to the National Rail Passenger Corp.; Amtrak; the Federal-Aid to Highway Act, authorizing completion of the Inter- state highway system; an anti- hijacking measure to control this business of hijacking planes.

Finally, we passed legislation to aid veterans, particularly Vietnam veterans, and that legislation is summarized in my report.

From the foregoing, it is apparent that we have tried to legislate in the interests of the people. Regrettably, the President has vetoed nine of these important measures and has vetoed some significant pieces of legislation. It is no fluke that his vetoes have been directed at legislation that benefits America's worst most need, those in need of health care, those attending schools, those needing training for jobs, those unemployed and underemployed.

I think it is worth a few minutes of your time to listen to the vetoes of the President since he came to office. Members may find it instructive and illuminating. My good friends on the other side of the aisle will cry out that the President's vetoes were in the interest of fiscal responsibility. My rejoinder to that is: "But these are the people most in need,"

In 1970, the President vetoed the following list of bills:

H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act, Fiscal 1971, on the ground that it contained funding which was "excessive in a period of serious inflationary pressures" and pin-pointed the following items as particularly unacceptable: Im- pressed areas' aid, grants for vocational education, funds earmarked for poor children, college construction grants, student loan funds, and hospital construction grants;

H.R. 11102, Medical Facilities Construction Modernization Amendment of 1970 (overridden), with the President claiming that the bill would "significantly restrict Federal options in managing Federal expenditures," (money for Lockheed, yes; for hospital construction, no);

H.R. 12618, Office of Education Appropriation Act for Fiscal 1971 (overridden), on the grounds that to spend for education would exacerbate inflation and that the increases voted by Congress were too excessive;

H.R. 17548, Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1971 (sustained), for the same old tired reasons noted in earlier veto messages;

S. 3867, the Political Broadcast Spending Act (sustained), on the grounds that it unfairly discriminated against the broadcasting industry in an attempt to curtail campaign spending, and made the public need some time to overhaul Federal election campaign regulation law (which we did in passing P.L. 92-225);

S. 3887, Federal Manpower Training and Public Service Employment Act (sustained), a congressionally-initiated bill to help those unemployed to find work, on the grounds that "WPA-type jobs are not the answer" (it is more dignifying to get unemployment benefits, apparently);

S. 3418, Family Medical Practices Act (pocket veto), aimed at educating more people to be doctors in order to relieve a short- age of general practitioners but described by the President as "unnecessary and the wrong approach";

H.R. 17809, Wage Board Pay Increase (no time to attempt to override), on the grounds that to increase wages for these Federal em- ployees was inflationary but, it was not inflationary in an election year as the Presi- dent signed a similar bill this year (P.L. 92-922);

S. 576, Federal Firefighters Retirement Benefits Act (pocket veto), holds that "there is no demonstrated need for permitting Federal firefighters to retire at an
bacco type 21 and Virginia sun-cured tobacoo type 37 allotments, which previously could be transferred only from one farm to another in the same county. Public Law 92–233 extended the time for the negotiation and conclusion of marketing agreements for burley tobacco for the 3 years beginning October 1, 1971. Public Law 92–10 authorized poundage quotas in lieu of acreage allotments for burley tobacco and extended the time for burley tobacco allotments within counties.

In order to protect the health of the livestock on American farms, Congress enacted Public Law 92–152, which expanded the authority of Agriculture to cooperate with countries in the Western Hemisphere to prevent or retard all communicable diseases of animals.

The Congress also enacted Public Law 92–82, which is designed to ease the pressure on State and local law enforcement agencies and assure the safety of the millions of citizens who enjoy the resources of our national forest and recreational lands by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with any State or political subdivision in the enforcement of its laws.

Eight additional laws were enacted during the second session.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT AMENDMENTS (S. 1099, PUBLIC LAW 92–221)

Public Law 92–233 is designed to speed the handling of reparation complaints and to reduce the cost of such actions, both to the parties involved and to the Government. It requires that an opponent, for a benchmark reparation proceeding only if the amount claimed exceeds $3,000—instead of the $1,500 limit under previous legislation—and provides for the assessment of reasonable fees and expenses incurred in connection with the hearing in favor of the prevailing party if the losing party is a commission merchant, dealer, or broker.

POTATO MARKETING ORDERS (S. 2672, PUBLIC LAW 92–231)

Public Law 92–233 amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act to make permanent an existing provision exempting all marketing orders for potato marketing from marketing orders. Because potato products are marketed nationally, the competitive disadvantages accorded processors located in order areas and subject to such orders is such as to require exemption of all potatoes for processing.

COTTON CROP REPORTS (S. 1104, PUBLIC LAW 92–231)

Public Law 92–331 amends existing statutes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cotton crop reports simultaneously with the general crop reports. This will enable the Department of Agriculture to include cotton in the National and State releases with other crops, rather than issuing separate reports for cotton.

COOPERATIVE FORESTRY PROGRAMS (H.R. 8817, PUBLIC LAW 92–231)

Public Law 92–235 strengthens and updates the Nation's forestry programs. It amends the Cooperative Forest Act to extend its coverage to the protection, improvement, and establishment of trees...
and shrubs in urban areas, communities, and open spaces, and to all wood processors—rather than "processors of primary forest products" as in the past. This amendment will enable the Department of Agriculture to extend its technical advice and service to the owners of the 317 million acres of nonindustrial forest land throughout the country and to urban and suburban areas trying to preserve wooded regions and green belts. The appropriation authorization for this program is increased from $55 to $60 million. It increases the appropriation authorization for sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Clark-McNary Act of June 7, 1924, from $30 to $40 million. This legislation provides for cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in the forest fire prevention and suppression, and the increased authorization will enable the Federal Government to expand its efforts to protect our valuable forest lands from the terrible destruction wrought by forest fires.

NATIONAL FOREST VOLUNTEERS (S. 1376)
PUBLIC LAW 92-200
The National Forest Volunteers Act (Public Law 92-200) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish volunteer programs for the national forest program similar to the already existing volunteers for the national park system. The programs of the volunteers could include providing special information services to visitors, assisting at historical and special events, increasing the availability of interpretive programs, providing special skills, writing brochures, and working on or teaching special projects. This program offers a fine opportunity to the many people who would like to spend more time in national forests while encouraging individual participation in the effort to improve the Nation's environment.

EXEMPT DOMAINT POOL ALLOTMENTS (S. 1345, PUBLIC LAW 92-261)
Public Law 92-354 repeals an existing provision of law which requires that allotments established from the eminent domain pool be "comparable with allotments determined for other farms in the same general area," to allotments for flat land, extra-long staple cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, farm base acreage allotments for upland cotton, and domestic allotments for wheat, etc.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE FOR FARMERS UNDER AGE 21 (S. 1129, PUBLIC LAW 92-207)
Public Law 92-357 permits participation in the Federal crop insurance program by eligible farmers who have reached the age of 18 years. It reflects the Congress' feeling that young farmers should have the opportunity to participate in the benefits and assume the responsibilities of Federal crop insurance, particularly in light of their right to vote.

PEAK MARKETING ORDERS (H.R. 14015, PUBLIC LAW 92-466)
The purpose of H.R. 14015 is to authorize marketing orders for pears for canning and freezing. A new form of marketing promotion including paid advertising for pears; to require a favorable vote of two-thirds of the growers voting or two-thirds of the volume voted in each State of the production area, for issuance of an order applicable to pears for canning or freezing; to require that processor and producer representatives be elected by the growers to administer such an order shall be equal; and to require that at least a majority of each State's representatives on such agency concur in any recommendation for proposal of regulation. On September 25, 1972, the Senate passed this bill without amendments, and cleared it for the White House.

CIVIL RIGHTS
In the first session of the 92d Congress, on September 14, 1971, the House passed H.R. 234, a bill which repeals the Emergency Detention Act of 1917, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and which prohibits detention by the Federal Government of any citizen except pursuant to an act of Congress. The Senate subsequently passed the bill without amendment, and H.R. 234 became Public Law 92-128.

Additional legislation has been enacted during the second session.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION (H.J. Res. 208)
A proposed equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the Congress in March 1972. The amendment provides:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

The measure was passed by the House of Representatives on March 12, 1971, and by the Senate on March 22, 1972. A version of the equal rights amendment had been introduced in nearly every Congress since 1833. Under the amendment, men and women would share equally, under the law, the rights and responsibilities of American citizenship. The Amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. To date, 21 States have ratified the equal rights amendment.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR THE U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION (H.R. 14046, PUBLIC LAW 92-261)
When Congress established the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission by title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act it authorized the EEOC to enforce nondiscrimination in employment by conciliation and persuasion alone. In the first session of the 92d Congress, on September 18, 1971, the House passed H.R. 1746, a bill which authorized the EEOC to seek court enforcement of equal employment opportunity through the Federal courts. In the second session, on February 22, 1972, the Senate passed a substitute amendment to H.R. 1746 which likewise provided for judicial enforcement by the EEOC but which was in other provisions different from the House-passed bill. On March 6 the Senate agreed to the House amendment identical to the Senate substitute, and on March 8 the House agreed to the same bill. With the President's signature, H.R. 1746 became Public Law 92-261. Public Law 92-261 amends title VII in the following ways:

First, it provides that employers with 15 or more employees and labor unions representing 15 or more employees, or any group of those with 25 employees or members as heretofore, shall be subject to title VII 1 year after enactment; it extends coverage also to State and local employees, to State and local elected officials, and to their personal staff members and policymaking appointees; and it extends coverage as well to teachers except those in religious schools.

Second, it gives the EEOC authority to prosecute a case in a Federal district court on behalf of a person who has suffered employment discrimination if it cannot correct the situation by conciliation. If the case involves a State or local government employee it is the U.S. Attorney General rather than the EEOC who must go to court.

If the EEOC dismisses his charge or does not bring about a conciliation agreement acceptable to the complainant, or if the EEOC, in the case of a State or local government employee, the Attorney General, does not take his case to court within 180 days after he filed his complaint or within 180 days after a required period of reference to a State or local employment relations agency or a conciliation, the complainant himself may file a civil action.

Third, Public Law 92-261 gives to the EEOC 2 years after enactment the right to bring an action in a Federal district court against any pattern or practice of employment discrimination. This pattern-or-practice authority was vested in the Justice Department by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Fourth, it authorizes the EEOC to use the same investigatory power as the NLRB.

Fifth, it establishes the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council with membership consisting of the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the EEOC, the Attorney General, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission. The purpose of the Council is to call Federal departments and agencies work toward equal employment opportunity.

Sixth, Public Law 92-261 forbids discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in the Federal service and gives the Civil Service Commission overall responsibility for promoting equal opportunity among Federal employees and authority to review actions taken by departments and agencies on complaints. It gives any Federal employee the right to take his case to court within 30 days after his department or agency has made a decision or if his department or agency has not made a decision regarding his complaint of discrimination or within 30 days after the Civil Service Commission has made a decision on his appeal. He may also go to court if his department or agency or the Civil Service Commission delays making a decision on his complaint or on his appeal more than 180 days.

Seventh, Public Law 92-261 forbids any Federal contracting agency to deny or terminate a contract for noncompliance with equal employment opportunity requirements without a full hearing and gives the contractor due process if the contractor was satis-
fied Federal requirements in the same plant within the previous year.

Extension of the Small Business Administration

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has rendered invaluable service to the President and to Congress by investigating complaints of denial of civil rights, by studying problems of equal protection of the laws, and by reviewing the effectiveness of laws and policies of the U.S. Government with respect to equal protection of the laws. The Commission's jurisdiction is to expire on January 31, 1973. In the second session of the 92d Congress, on May 1, 1972, the House passed H.R. 12652 to extend the Commission for 5 years, until June 30, 1978. Until now the Commission's jurisdiction has covered denials of civil rights on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or in the administration of justice. Its jurisdiction has not included discrimination because of sex. At the same time Federal law and policy seek to eliminate unfair treatment on account of sex in various areas—in employment, for example. In order to make the Commission's jurisdiction coincide with Federal efforts to insure equal protection of the laws H.R. 12652 extends the Commission's jurisdiction to cover sex discrimination. In addition, the bill provides that members of the Commission be paid at the rate for executive level IV for each day they work, that consultants to the Commission be paid on a daily basis at the highest rate for GS-15, and that witnesses before the Commission be paid the same fees and mileage as witnesses in the Federal courts. The authorized ceiling on annual expenses is now set at $4 million. H.R. 12652 raises this ceiling to $5.5 million for fiscal year 1973 and to $7 million for each fiscal year after that.

Non-discrimination in Federal Jury Selection

The 90th Congress passed the Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968 to assure non-discrimination on account of race, economic status, and sex in the selection of Federal jurors. This act left a person free to decide whether or not to give information about his race and occupation in filling out the Federal juror qualification form. The consequence of leaving this optional is that these forms may not be filled out juror forms.

Commerce and Industry

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted Public Law 92–16 concerned with improving and expanding the service capabilities of the Small Business Administration. This legislation provided for increased by $900 million—from $2.2 to $3.1 billion—the amount of loan guarantees and other obligations or commitments which may be outstanding at any one time from the business loan and investment fund of the Small Business Administration.

During the second session the House reaffirmed the concern of Congress to further expand and improve the service capabilities of the Small Business Administration—SBA. Several initiatives in the House resulted from the overall effort of Congress to provide greater SBA funding and to increase the convenience and role in aiding victims of natural disasters. The California earthquake and the flood havoc of tropical storm Agnes provided new challenges for SBA disaster relief efforts and Congress responded vigorously in adding effectiveness to SBA's potential assistance to disaster victims.

The House also took initiatives related to the domestic and international commercial economies.

Small Business Act Amendments

Public Law 92–320 recognized the need for higher funding and reform in the various SBA programs to meet disaster related emergencies while in approving Public Law 92–385 we continued congressional efforts to reduce the numerous administrative burdens often associated with disaster relief to small businessmen. Public Law 92–385, which became law in August 1972, amends the Small Business Act to provide for additional relief to disaster victims. In addition, this legislation requires the President to conduct a thorough review of disaster relief legislation and submit to Congress, not later than January 1, 1973, a report containing specific legislative proposals for the comprehensive revision of the disaster relief programs of the Federal Government. The law further prescribes that these recommendations be directed toward improving the execution of the Federal Government's disaster relief programs by eliminating unnecessary administrative burdens and increasing access to disaster relief, and that Congress evaluate the impact of these recommendations and consider any necessary legislation.

Small Business Investment Act

The Small Business Investment Act of 1972 was approved by the Senate September 13, and by the House October 11. This legislation amends the Small Business Investment Act to give statutory recognition to new types of small business investment companies which are established for the sole purpose of assisting minority races and other persons whose participation in our free-enterprise economy has been hampered by social or economic disadvantages.

One of the most important pieces of consumer-oriented legislation to come to a vote in Congress was the Consumer

Counsel on International Economic Policy

Supporting the concern of Congress for a coordinated international economic policy in the Federal Government we passed Public Law 92–412 to create in the Executive Office of the President a Council on International Economic Policy. The Council will be responsible for assisting and advising the President in the annual preparation of a report entitled 'The International Economic Report to the Congress.' The Council's jurisdiction to cover sex discrimination has not included discrimination because of sex.
Product Act (S. 3419) designed to expand the Federal role in protecting consumers against unreasonable product hazards. It creates an independent regulatory Commission with the power to set mandatory product safety standards; it transfers to the Commission functions under several existing product safety laws; and it vests in the Commission new, comprehensive authority to set mandatory safety standards for a full range of consumer products. The original Senate bill (S. 3419) and the amended House version were in conference until late in the session.

The Congress in 1967 established the National Commission on Product Safety to study the scope and adequacy of existing measures regulating product safety. The Commission found that existing product safety laws regulated only a small proportion of the products produced for consumers and that authorities for the enforcement of laws were scattered among approximately 30 Federal organizations. In its report issued in 1970, the Commission recommended the enactment of a comprehensive product safety law covering the full range of consumer products and the creation of an independent agency to devise and enforce standards for these products.

The bill creates an independent Consumer Product Safety Commission with five members appointed for 7-year terms. It transfers to the Commission functions under several existing product safety laws—the Hazardous Substances Act; the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1970; and the Flammable Fabrics Act.

The Commission is authorized to collect and disseminate information on inquiries related to consumer products; to establish mandatory safety standards where necessary to prevent or reduce unreasonable product hazards or, where standards are infeasible, to prohibit the product from the marketplace; to obtain equitable relief in the courts to protect the public from products which present imminent hazards to health and safety; to require the notification and remedy of products which fail to comply with the Commission's safety rules or which contain safety-related defects.

S. 3419 also provides a system of product certification and permits the Commission to compel inclusion of certain safety-related information in product labels. The Commission is given broad inspection and recordkeeping powers. Enforcement may be obtained through court injunctive process or through imposition of criminal and civil penalties. Consumer suits are permitted to compel compliance with safety rules and certain commission orders.

The Commission is prohibited from regulating consumer services or products; tobacco and tobacco products; motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment; economic poisons; drugs, devices or cosmetics; food; and articles subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Commission is authorized under section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code. In addition, its authority does not extend to product hazards which could be prevented or reduced to sufficient extent under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the Act of August 2, 1956, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, or the Clean Air Act.

MOTOR VEHICLE INFORMATION AND COST SAVINGS ACT

(S. 976, H.R. 11927)

S. 976 cleared Congress late in the session. It establishes a Federal policy to make automobiles safer and less costly to repair. This is to be accomplished primarily by establishing new bumper standards which would reduce the damage to vehicles in low speed collisions; and second, by encouraging competition among manufacturers to produce vehicles which are more resistant to damage, safer and less costly to repair.

Title I directs the Secretary of Transportation to adopt Federal bumper standards which will substantially reduce front and/or rear end damage to vehicles in low speed collisions. This authority would have been delegated to the Secretary of Commerce to set Federal motor vehicle safety standards. In arriving at appropriate bumper standards, the Secretary would have been required to take into account the cost of implementing the standard compared to benefits; considerations of health and safety; the effect of the standard on insurance costs and legal fees; and the savings in terms of consumer's time and inconvenience.

Title II directs the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study of methods for compensating persons who suffer injury or death as a result of susceptibility to damage, crash worthiness, and ease of diagnosis and repair. Upon completion of the study, the information is to be disseminated to consumers. It is assumed that consumers can compare the true costs and risks of owning different makes of automobiles, manufacturers will compete to produce vehicles which are susceptible to damage and more easily repaired.

Title III directs the Secretary to establish demonstration projects to determine the feasibility of using diagnostic procedures and facilities generally available to consumers in conjunction with safety and emission standards.

Title IV is the Federal odometer law, designed to curb the practice of odometer tampering. Consumers commonly rely on the odometer reading as a measure of the vehicle's condition and fair value. It has become a widespread practice for unscrupulous dealers to disconnect or reset odometers in order to deceive prospective purchasers.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1971

(H.R. 10885, S. 9790)

In the first session, the House passed the Consumer Protection Act of 1971 providing a Federal or non-Federal agencies and to the United States, and to the Federal or non-Federal agencies and to further consumer protection. The Act authorized the Secretary of Commerce to set Federal standards to reduce the flammability of consumer-related products.
bicentennial celebration of the Nation's birth.

**METRO BUS SYSTEM ACQUISITION ACT**
(S. 4062, PUBLIC LAW 92-220)

In approving S. 4062 Congress continued to demonstrate concern for providing the Greater Metropolitan Washington Area with the most advanced integrated public transit system in the Nation. This legislation authorizes the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority—Metro—to enter into negotiations to acquire various bus systems in the District of Columbia and adjacent suburbs. Final congressional action assures the residents of the Greater Washington Area, as well as the millions of annual visitors to the Nation's Capital, access to improved public transportation at reasonable fares.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT** (H.R. 15965, PUBLIC LAW 92-410)

We passed H.R. 15980, to increase District police and firemen's salaries. Public Law 92-410 raises policemen's salaries to $10,000 for a rookie. Congress has thus authorized Metro—Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority—to continue to attract and retain qualified personnel that will enable it to operate efficiently within the constraints of its annual budget for fiscal 1973.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT** (H.R. 15965, PUBLIC LAW 92-410)

Public education in the District of Columbia received continued support with approval of H.R. 15965. This legislation provides District teachers and school administrators salary increases averaging 16 percent over a 2-year period. This pay increase will enable the District of Columbia school system to attract and hold fully competent personnel.

**EISENHOWER MEMORIAL BICENTENNIAL CENTER ACT** (S. 3943, H.R. 16645, PUBLIC LAW 92-334)

S. 3943 (H.R. 16645) authorizes the construction in downtown Washington of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Civic Center. It authorizes $14 million in Federal funds, plus estimated acquisition costs and initial construction costs, for this landmark project. The center will bring renewed vitality to Washington's faltering convention industry, contribute significantly to city revenues, and create approximately 4,000 new jobs for residents of the District of Columbia. It is to be completed in time for the bicentennial celebration in 1976.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE PERSONNEL RECORDS DISCLOSURE AND MEMBERS COMPENSATION ACT** (H.R. 11773, PUBLIC LAW 92-220)

The House approved and sent to the Senate H.R. 11773. This legislation helps to protect District of Columbia police officers, members, and their families from potential harassment or severe acts of revenge. The act excludes from public disclosure the home address and telephone number of all District police personnel.

**PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION** (H.R. 10781)

On October 14, the House passed H.R. 10781 to establish the Pennsylvania Avenue Bicentennial Development Corpora-
izes the Attorney General to bring suit in sex discrimination cases and extends coverage of the Equal Pay Act to executive, administrative, and professional employees.

Title II of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 also authorizes appropriations of $850 million for a 3-year program to help the States design, establish, and implement a national educational programs. It creates, in title III, a National Institute of Education within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to support, conduct, and disseminate results of research at all levels of education, and authorizes appropriations of $550 million for a 3-year period. It authorizes, in title IV, appropriations of $85 million over 3 years in grants to local education agencies for programs to help meet the special educational needs of Indian children.

**EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT (H.R. 13915)**

On August 17, 1972, the House passed the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, H.R. 13915. This bill redirects $40 million in emergency school aid funds and authorizes $25 million in appropriations for the conduct of summer food programs; extends the summer nonschool food programs; authorizes the use of $25 million of fiscal 1973-75; extends the statutory authority in grants programs; and authorizes the use of $25 million for a 3-year program. On August 15, 1972, the House passed H.R. 13915, making it possible for children from families with incomes up to $40 per month above the poverty level to receive reduced price lunches; authorizes $40 million for food programs for fiscal year 1973-75; recinds the statutory authority of the USDA to regulate the sale of food items in competition with programs authorized by the Child Nutrition and the National School Lunch Act, leaving the decision on such matters to State and local authorities; provides for Federal “performance funding” of the school breakfast and the milk programs; and provides for advance payments for the school lunch and school breakfast programs. Finally, the act authorizes a special 2-year pilot program of assistance to State health agencies for special nutritional projects which would make available supplemental food to pregnant and lactating women and to infants up to age 4 who are a nutritional risk.

**ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

Among the major issues facing this Nation in the years ahead is how adequately and effectively we will use our resources to meet the needs of our society and of our people. The nature of environmental problems dictates that the solutions be based on scientifically determined standards. Goals for acceptable levels of air or water quality, for example, must be so expressed as to satisfy both equity and the requirement of policy in terms of health, welfare, and esthetics.

Our Nation, as an industrial leader, must take the initiative in finding ways to heal the damage to our environment from inadequate planning and protection of the past. It is essential that we take full account of the impact of technological development on the environment, and we must continue to provide the programs and the funds necessary to eliminate such pollution. We have made considerable progress, but much remains to be done.

We have authorized and established standards for air and water quality and enforcement controls to assure that they are met. We have made substantial advances in the field of water quality by establishing nationwide standards for 67 contaminants with respect to 1,700 watersheds, the first step in the effort to look at watersheds to help them achieve these standards. We have required environmental impact statements to assess the effect of major Federal actions. We have authorized research programs to facilitate the recycling of solid waste and to develop efficient sources of clean energy. We have taken steps to conserve some of our most precious natural scenery and wildlife. We have established federal rivers and wetlands as areas to be set aside for preservation in their natural states. We have restricted the use of poisons to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 93d Congress, we enacted 12 bills of major importance to protect and preserve the environment. Public Law 92-82 authorizes a continuation of the salmon water conversion program, a program that has proven quite useful in converting sea water into usable water. The Interior Secretary was directed by Public Law 92-82 to report periodically to Congress on progress in the development, demonstration, and assimilation of the Water Resources Planning Act by increasing the authorization ceiling on annual appropriations to $1,500,000 for the administrative expenses of the Council on Water Research. The Council has the responsibility to assess the Nation’s water resources, review, and establish standards and procedures for Federal water resource development and to review comprehensive river basin plans.

Public Law 92-175, the Water Resources Research Institutes Act, increased the authorization for water resources research institutions and made a number of improvements in the act to foster more effective and efficient program administration. Public Law 92-50 extended the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act through September 30, 1971. A second extension was approved by Congress in September in Public Law 92-137, which moved the date to October 30, 1971. A third extension in this basic program legislation was passed in the House in October and the Senate in November. The date this time was extended to January 31, 1975.

Public Law 92-218, the Fisherman’s Protective Act amendments, conserves and protects Atlantic salmon of North American origin. The President was authorized to prohibit the importation into this country of fishery products from nations not conducting their fishing operations in a manner consistent with international fishery conservation programs. Public Law 92-107 of the Small Business Loan Program Act amendment, removed the requirement that irrigation be the primary purpose of a reclamation project and increased the limit on the total cost of each eligible project under the act.

Both Houses passed the separate legislation calling for a temporary moratorium on the killing of all species of whale, porpoise, and dolphin. Both bills provided for a moratorium of 10 years, during which time international accord on future conservation and utilization of the world’s whale population could be pursued. The House and Senate also passed separate pieces of legislation establishing a Joint Committee on the Environment, providing the Congress the opportunity to assimilate, organize, and offer plans for the future in the entire range of the environmental field. Although the committees would not have legislative power, it would play a vital role in furnishing information to other committees to help insure effective action on short as well as long-term environmental problems within the jurisdiction of the Congress. Neither of these became law.

We have been most active in these areas during the second session.

**ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND PROTECTION**

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SYSTEM (H.R. 14496)**

In response to the vital need for coordinated information services concerning the environment, Congress approved H.R. 56 providing for the establishment of a national environmental data system. H.R. 56 authorizes $1 million for fiscal year 1973, $2 million for fiscal year 1974, and $3 million for fiscal year 1975. The new
act authorizes funds for a central facility to serve as a clearinghouse for new and existing information on environmental matters. The act specifies that this information be authorized from the federal Government, State, and local governments, private institutions—including educational institutions, and foreign sources. The act will be divided to Congress and to Federal, State, and local governments without charge and to private individuals and groups at a reasonable rate.

Fortunately, there are numerous studies, programs, and projects generating data on the environment. There is, however, the need to establish a system for collecting, assimilating, and disseminating information. Not only should the data be readily available for analysis and evaluation, but there should be means to insure that all available scientific and technical information affecting the environment be quickly located and evaluated by responsible parties.

In addition to providing for the collection and dissemination of data, the new law authorizes the establishment of a Federal Environmental Data System Coordinator to serve full time to: First, administer and manage the operations of the data system under the guidance of the Coordinator; Second, institute a system to evaluate and monitor the methods on information technology and utilize new and improved techniques for accomplishing the purpose of the act; Third, utilize the knowledge developed during the study to develop criteria and guidelines to govern selection of data, including the development of predictive ecological models; Fourth, develop and publish from time to time environmental quality indicators.

State and regional environmental centers will combine and coordinate the environmentally related research and education extension capabilities of educational institutions within each State or interstate region. Interior and Atmosphere. The authorization in-aid increase. Communities cannot hope to attract new industries unless they provide ample water and sewer systems. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 developed a foundation for water pollution control, but the appropriated funds for environment improvement have seldom been sufficient to match the required needs.

To assist in the funding authorized in S. 2770, it sets rigid antipollution standards for industries. By July 1, 1977, industries will be required to have in use the "best practicable technologies" for the following pollution problems: First, the "best available technologies" must be in operation for reducing polluting activities. The overall goal is to have clean waters by 1985, authorizing $24.6 billion for this purpose.

In October, the House approved H.R. 1323, amending Public Law 92-125, to increase the appropriation authorization from $200,000 per year to $400,000 per year for a period of 3 years for the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere. The authorization increase reflects the realistic needs of the committee in carrying out its duties and responsibilities as outlined in Public Law 92-125. Funds will be used to support the special studies and analyses conducted by task forces of the committee, which has the responsibility to undertake a continuing review of the progress of marine and atmospheric science and service programs and recommend to the President what advice the Secretary of Commerce with respect to implementing the purposes of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
into the navigable waters of the contiguous zone and the oceans, to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of States and to plan the development and use of land and water resources.

The Environmental Protection Agency is instructed to draft standards of permissible discharge into streams, rivers, lakes, and the ocean for 3 miles offshore, for protection of fish, wildlife, and other marine resources.

To help meet the standards which will become effective in two phases over the next 11 years, the measure authorizes $18 billion for fiscal years 1973 through 1977. Federal matching funds to build and maintain sewage treatment plants and $800 million for low-interest loans to industry.

Of the $18 billion earmarked for municipal plants, $5.8 billion is available for fiscal 1973, $6 billion for fiscal year 1974 and $7 billion for fiscal year 1975. The remaining $6.4 billion of the $24.6 billion includes $800 million for business loans and $1.6 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency to implement guidelines for plants already built.

Finally, utility plants which discharge heated water must conform to the 1977 requirements. It could also order more stringent requirements on thermal pollution if it determined that the level of discharge is not harmful to water life. Also, it would have the power to regulate the discharge point where water life is not affected. Although the President vetoed the bill, Congress overrode his veto resoundingly.

COASTAL ZONE AND ESTUARINE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (H.R. 14046, H.R. 14146, PUBLIC LAW 92-190)

Recognizing the need for a national coastal zone and estuarine management program, Congress passed legislation setting forth a national policy to develop a program to assist the States in the effective management, protection, and development of the coastal zone. The National Ocean Survey has mapped most of the coastal waters and adjacent shorelands, strongly influenced by each and in close proximity to the shorelines of the coastal States, including the Great Lakes area. Under the terms of this legislation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make annual grants to any coastal State for the purpose of assisting in the development of a management program for the land and water resources of its coastal zone. The act provides that the management program is to include an identification of the boundaries of the coastal zone subject to that program; a definition of what shall constitute permissible land and water uses within the coastal zone which have a direct and significant impact on the coastal waters; an inventory and mapping of special areas of particular concern within the coastal zone; an identification of the means by which the State proposes to exert control over such areas; and a list of relevant provisions, regulations, and administrative actions. A grant to a State must be limited to not more than $2 million.

Management program grants are not to exceed 50 percent of the costs of the program in any one year and no State is to be eligible to receive more than three annual grants. Federal funds received from other sources are not to be used to match grants. In order to qualify for a grant, the State must reasonably describe to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such grants will be used to develop a management program consistent with the requirements set forth in the act. An initial grant has been made to a coastal State, no subsequent grants are to be made unless the Secretary finds that the State is satisfactorily developing the management program.

Management grants are to be allocated to the States based on rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, provided that no management program grant may be made in excess of 10 percent nor less than 1 percent of the total amount appropriated. Grants not obligated by a State during the fiscal year for which they were first authorized to be obligated shall revert to the Treasury. The House and Senate passed the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1971 which vested the Environmental Protection Agency with final authority to regulate dumping of waste and foreign material in coastal zones. To this end, Congress gave the Administrator of the Agency and the Secretary of the Army, the power to issue permits for ocean dumping only under specific circumstances. Penalties for persons dumping material into waters without such a permit. H.R. 9727 also provides for the termination of the depositing of radiological, chemical, and biological warfare agents and toxins, and authorizes the Secretary of State to seek effective international action and cooperation through the United Nations to insure the protection of the marine environment by all nations. The measure which was sent to conference in November 1971, was reported from conference late in the second session.

OIL POLLUTION ACT OF 1969 AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (S.R. 15677)

Late in the session, the House approved H.R. 15677 amending the Oil Pollution Act of 1969 in order to implement the 1969 amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Seas by Oil, approved in 1954. This legislation, which expands the penalty provisions of the act, is necessary in order to reflect the 1969 amendments adopted by the Assembly of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the repository organization for the Convention.

Among the bill's provisions are those which limit the exceptions under which discharges with oil content will be permitted. Tankers are limited to distances no more than 50 miles from the nearest port. The exemption for lubricating oil having leaked from machinery is eliminated, and the exemption from the requirements of the Convention of residue arising from purification or clarification of fuel oil or lubricating oil is abolished.

PORTS AND WATERWAYS SAFETY ACT (H.R. 8140, P.L. 92-340)

An act to protect the environmental quality of ports, waterfront areas, and waterways, and for other purposes. The act was approved this Congress. Public Law 92-340 authorizes standards and regulations to prevent oil spills and other accidents in U.S. ports and waterways, and provides the Secretary of Transportation with authority to establish comprehensive design and construction standards for vessels carrying hazardous bulk cargoes in order to protect the marine en-
environment. In addition, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish and operate marine traffic services in congested waterways to prevent water pollution.

Included in the legislation are provisions for standards for preventing destruction in navigable waters. The new act is meant to protect the navigators and their vessels from environmental harm resulting from vessel or structure damage, destruction, or loss.

The Secretary of Transportation, under whom the Coast Guard operates, is authorized to establish, operate, and maintain vessel traffic services and systems needed for ports, harbors, and other waters subject to congested vessel traffic. He may also require vessels operating in an area of vessel traffic service or system to utilize or comply with that service, including the carrying or installation of electronic or other devices necessary for use of the service. This legislation also authorizes the Secretary to, first, prescribe minimum safety equipment requirements for structures to assure adequate protection from fire, explosion, natural disasters, and other dangerous substances; second, control vessel traffic in areas which he determines to be especially hazardous, or under conditions of reduced visibility; third, establish standards for the loading and discharge of explosives or other dangerous substances; and fourth, establish procedures for examination to assure compliance with the minimum safety equipment requirements for structures.

A maximum civil penalty of $10,000 and a criminal penalty of not less than $5,000, nor more than $50,000, or 5 years in prison is imposed for violations of the act.

Rules and regulations are established for protection of the marine environment. Included in them is a requirement that a vessel obtain a certificate of compliance, issued by the Secretary of Transportation, stating that the vessel meets the rules and regulations as prescribed for marine traffic services.

The civil act, which is directed to commercial vessels. Although traffic control systems will not exist in all port and harbor water areas or under all circumstances, they will be imposed in those areas where past Coast Guard statistics indicate a necessity, and in congested areas under hazardous circumstances.

The necessity of such legislation has been shown by the expansion of marine traffic and the increase in vessel size. In light of such traffic increase and numerous accidents, it has become obvious that a system had to be taken to improve port, harbor, and waterway safety, while at the same time assuring a method for halting the damage to the environment through oil spills resulting from oil spills from coastal and internal pollution.

The new act provides the authority and means for handling adequately the serious problems of marine safety and water pollution confronting us today as never before.

SAFETY INSPECTION

Congressional action was taken in 1972 to provide authorization to the Secretary of the Army to implement a national dam inspection program through the Army Corps of Engineers. The Secretary is directed to provide results of the dam inspection program to the Secretary of the Army for Federal and state government officials to prepare plans for the orderly continuation of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the International Boundary and Water Commission, or Federal Power Commission. The authorized amount for the program is $10 million.

FEDERAL LOANS FOR LOCAL IRRIGATION SYSTEMS

Legislation providing for a more flexible Federal funding method to assist in construction of irrigation distribution systems was passed by the House August 7. H.R. 1198 amends Public Law 89-517 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide funds to State irrigation districts and other qualified borrowers to make loans from the Federal Government with which to design and construct irrigation distribution systems less expensively than could the Bureau of Reclamation. It is estimated that over $70 million worth of irrigation distribution system loans have been made under the law.

H.R. 1198 broadens the program to allow loans to be made for municipal and industrial water supply distribution systems and for drainage systems for the removal of surplus irrigation applications. This legislation also eliminates a requirement of the 1955 act that obligated borrowers to repay all right-of-way interests to the United States for the life of the loan. Experience has shown that contracts can be prepared in such a way that collateral is not required with respect to Federal real estate conveyance and conveyance procedure. Hence, the borrower and the United States are saved substantial sums of money by requiring the right-of-way interests to be made available to the United States as collateral for the completion of the project.
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Act represents a major advance in the Nation's efforts to halt the degradation of our air and water. In Environmental Quality revealed in 1971 that there are about 2 million chemical compounds in existence with about 250,000 new compounds being produced each year. While many of the compounds will not be commercially produced, others will be produced for the marketplace. It is these chemicals, as well as those now in use, that the act is designed to regulate.

H.R. 11021 authorizes the Environmental Agency Administrator to remove or render inoperative any device incorporated in a compliance with any standards established by him. Any violator of the act may be penalized for failure to maintain records or furnish required reports or information. Citizens suits are authorized against any violator of a noise control requirement or against the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for an alleged failure to perform in compliance with the act. A sum of $3 million for fiscal year 1972 is authorized. For fiscal years 1973 and 1974, $6 million and $12 million is authorized, respectively.

The Senate approved an amended version of H.R. 11021 on October 13.

Chemical Pollution

Toxic Substances Control Act (S. 478, PUBLIC LAW 92-323)

The Senate in May and the House in October approved S. 1478, which restricts the distribution and use of chemicals and hazardous products found to be toxic. Passage of the Toxic Substances Control Act represents a major advance in the Nation's efforts to halt the degradation of our air and water. In Environmental Quality revealed in 1971 that there are about 2 million chemical compounds in existence with about 250,000 new compounds being produced each year. While many of the compounds will not be commercially produced, others will be produced for the marketplace. It is these chemicals, as well as those now in use, that the act is designed to regulate.
that the percentage of surface mining will contrive to increase even as technology advances. It should be emphasized, however, that any adverse condition resulting from coal mined lands, and providing mandatory Federal grants-in-aid for coal mined lands; and fifth, to establish a national effort to regulate coal mining surface operations to productive and useful purposes; and, to abate the adverse effects from previously surface mined lands; fourth, to prevent further detriment to the Nation from coal mining surface operations through the establishment of criteria and standards for coal mining; and fifth, to encourage a nationwide effort to abate the adverse surface environmental effects resulting from surface operations of underground coal mining. The legislation would establish a national program for the rehabilitation of land and the tests of products which enter into or affect interstate commerce. Controls and restrictions of H.R. 4832 are to be applied uniformly to all States, thereby avoiding the inequities of existing State laws.

ENERGY LEGISLATION

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

In August Congress cleared legislation extending the deadline for States to enact natural gas pipeline safety legislation and providing mandatory Federal grants-in-aid for States' safety programs. Public Law 92-401 amends the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 which authorized the Secretary of Transportation to set standards for the more than a million miles of transmission, distribution, and gathering pipeline in residential and commercial areas.

As cleared the new legislation not only extends the deadline for all States to enact natural gas pipeline safety legislation and provide for Federal grants-in-aid for States' safety programs, Public Law 92-401 amends the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 which authorized the Secretary of Transportation to set standards for the more than a million miles of transmission, distribution, and gathering pipeline in residential and commercial areas. At the present time, 41 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have provisions substantially the same as the act of 1968. In four of the remaining States there is no chance of legislative action until an extension that led to the 1968 act remain: uncertainty over the condition of the pipe system, inadequate monitoring of compliance with standards, gaps in the enforcement pattern, and operating urban areas with attendant increasing risk of disaster, and the need for additional research into the techniques of pipeline safety.

OIL AND GAS COMPACT (SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 75, PUBLIC LAW 92-322)

Congress passed a resolution granting extending until September 1, 1974, the Interstate Oil and Gas Conservation Act and the Oil and Gas Public Law 92-322 requires the Attorney General to report to Congress within 2 years whether the activities of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission and its members are having any adverse effects related to the immediate purpose of the compact, that is, to conserve oil and gas through the prevention of physical waste from any cause.

The compact provides that the rights of each State while enabling the several States, as parties to the compact, to work together on a sound program of oil and gas conservation. States are given authority to choose to exercise police power within their own jurisdictions in furtherance of the general purpose to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves in each State. No prohibitions are imposed which the participating States do not voluntarily accept. Instead, the compact enables coordinated action. The compact was formed on February 16, 1935, and the continuing consent of Congress has been granted the compact since that date. The consent of Congress was last previously given by Public Law 91-158 of November 1, 1969, and continuing consent of Congress has been given by Public Law 91-158 of November 1, 1969.

The Atomic Energy Commission's authorization request for fiscal year 1973, as initially submitted to Congress on January 24, 1972, and amended on March 3, 1972, provides for authorizations of $2,068,430,000 for operational expenses and $656,420,000 for plant and capital equipment, making a total required authorization of $2,724,850,000. This request, as presented in H.R. 14731, provides for authorizations of $2,663,500, or about 17 percent, above the $2,325,187,000 authorized for fiscal year 1972.

FISH AND WILDLIFE PRESERVATION

FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT, PROVIDE EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT AGAINST SHOOTING BIRDS, FISH, WILDLIFE FROM AIRCRAFT (H.R. 14731)

On June 5, 1972, the House passed an amendment to the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1966 providing for the enforcement of the provision prohibiting shooting at birds, fish and any other wildlife from aircraft. During the First Session of the 92d Congress, we approved Public Law 92-159 which made it unlawful for anyone while airborne to shoot or attempt to shoot for the purpose of capturing or killing any bird, fish, or other animal, or knowing or having reason to know that such person is to use an aircraft for any of these purposes. Violators of the act are subject to a $5,000 fine or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

The need for this legislation arose from the fact that Public Law 92-159 declared a national fish and wildlife policy but contained no provision which would authorize enforcement responsibility. There was no wildlife enforcement authority in an act, then enforcement of that act falls upon the FBI to carry out.

It was felt, however, that enforcement of this Act should be in the Department of Interior, since it is already responsible for the enforcement of other laws concerning fish and wildlife. The Secretary of Interior is authorized to promulgate and enforce such regulation as he deems necessary to meet the intent of the legislation.

In addition, those appointed by the Secretary of Interior are authorized to arrest, without warrant, any person committing in their presence, or view, a violation of the act, and, with or without a warrant, search any place. All birds, fish, or other animals captured and all birds, fish, or other animals used contrary to the provisions of this act would be subject to forfeiture.

The enforcement provisions were passed in the Senate October 6 without amendment, thus clearing H.R. 14731 for the President's approval.
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MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT
(H.R. 10420, S. 2871, PUBLIC LAW 92–37173)

In a landmark measure, the Congress moved to protect, conserve, and preserve marine animals by approving a 15-year moratorium on the killing or capturing of water mammals, some of which are close to becoming extinct. Among the animals to receive Federal protection are whales, sea lions, polar bears, seals, dolphins, turtles, and sea otters, the manatee. This legislation gives the Commerce Department authority to grant exemptions, after public hearings, if such exemptions are in line with the policies of protecting and conserving the species involved.

The moratorium would not affect those mammals taken or imported under international agreements or those captured for scientific research or display in oceanariums. It also exempts native Alaskan Eskimos, Aleuts, and those Indians who use marine mammals for food, clothing, and construction. For the first 2 years, commercial fishermen will be exempt if they unintentionally take porpoises while netting tuna.

It has long been felt that a moratorium is necessary for scientists to determine what is really necessary for the preservation of a marine mammal. It is estimated that the harp seal has been reduced about 80 percent over the last 25 years; the population of the walrus is less than 100,000. The manatee is in danger of complete extinction. The program director of the Marine Mammal Council has predicted that by the turn of the century, the whale, largest and most intelligent mammal on earth other than man, has decreased by approximately 90 percent. Finback whales during the past 40 years have gone from 40,000,000 to 4,000. Polar bears are in imminent danger of extinction.

This legislation provides us with time to study the impact of pollution on the sea animals. It will allow us to consider alternatives to commercial operations that strip the ocean of marine life. There is no question that we need some increase in surplus mammals in this country and throughout the world. After this moratorium it is hoped that scientific wildlife management techniques can be applied with those responsible for running the program authorized to issue permits for the taking of marine mammals after notice and opportunity for public hearings.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION, USE OF REAL PROPERTY ACT (H.R. 12186, PUBLIC LAW 92–432)

Both Houses approved in the second session, legislation making surplus Federal land, valuable for wildlife conservation purposes, more accessible to the States. The American Society of Public Land and Water Conservation, for example, has purchased property in Arizona at a cost of $300,000 to $200,000 for the bald eagle. The legislation to protect further the bald and golden eagles was passed by the House on February 7, H.R. 12186, which

in emergency situations approved by the Secretary.

Annual payments to each State are authorized up to $300,000 for the first fiscal year and up to $200,000 for succeeding fiscal years. No more than 10 percent of the State share could be derived from sale of hunting, fishing, or trapping licenses.

Existing predator control programs, which have been in existence for the last 57 years, have only shown limited value in increasing game populations. This bill provides for an expanded program of research and operational programs for both the conservation and control of predatory game.

Federal officials are authorized to allow emergency use of chemical toxicants, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in cases where such use was essential for protection of human health and safety, preservation of species threatened with extinction, prevention of damage to natural resources, or prevention of major damage to domestic ventures.

Penalties of up to $10,000 and 1 year in prison, or both, for violations are authorized. Finally, $.95 million is authorized in annual appropriations for fiscal 1973 to $1.5 million for fiscal 1974 for the research funds, $3 million to financial aid to the States, and $5 million to operational control programs. For fiscal years 1975 through 1978, a total of $.65 million in annual appropriations are authorized.

On September 19, 1972, the House passed House Joint Resolution 1288 which authorizes the President to seek a treaty or other appropriate arrangement with certain countries calling for an immediate moratorium on the killing of polar bears. The composition of the treaty would give due consideration to the recommendations of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. Countries specifically mentioned in the Joint resolution are the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, Canada, Denmark, and Norway. The treaty, however, may be made with any other interested nation.

There is need for more effective protection of the polar bear whose population has been diminishing in recent years. Approximately 1,300 polar bears are killed each year by hunters. The world population is only between 10,000 and 20,000. Unless some effective measure is taken, such as an international treaty, to protect the polar bear, the animal is in danger of extinction.

On October 6, the Senate passed a differing version of House Joint Resolution 1288, with an amendment indicating that the treaty, rather than calling for an immediate and appropriate action to preserve and protect these animals, would call for immediate and appropriate action to preserve and protect these animals. The legislation was sent to the House for further action.

BALD EAGLE PROTECTION ACT (H.R. 12186)

Legislation to protect further the bald and golden eagles was passed by the House on February 7, H.R. 12186, which
amends the Bald Eagle Protection Act, makes it unlawful for anyone knowingly, or with negligent disregard for the consequences of his act, to take, possess, sell, barter, transport, export, or import at any time or manner any bald or golden eagle alive or dead.

The bald eagle population is estimated to be between 5,000 and 10,000 birds in Alaska, Wyoming, and Minnesota, with an estimated 800 pairs in the mainland States. Even now these eagles are being indiscriminately killed both by hunters and by ranchers for livestock protection. Even though protected by law, both kinds of eagle are threatened with extinction.

The legislation authorized by the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to assess a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 against any person who takes an eagle in violation of law, and who is convicted thereof. Under the legislation the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, as in the present law, to issue a permit for the hunting of bald eagles if it is necessary to protect wildlife, agriculture, or other interests, but only if there is a serious problem with golden eagles committing a depredation on livestock or wildlife. If enacted into law, there would be no additional expense to the Federal Government for fiscal year 1973 and the next succeeding fiscal years.

The legislation further provides for the issuance of a free annual entrance permit to be known as the “golden age passport” to any person 62 years of age or older. Penalties were provided of up to $1,000 for violation of regulations, or up to $250 and 6 months in prison for false manufacture of the passports. Although in the past the program has not produced as much revenue as anticipated, the program has generated capital revenue for the Federal Government in its effort to expand outdoor resources throughout the country.

Amendments to the CLIMATE OF HISTORY (S. 1497, PUBLIC LAW 93-400) Congress approved a valuable extension of the environmental education system by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a Climate of History program. The program is designed to educate young people about the importance of conserving the environment and to develop a sense of responsibility for the natural world. The program will be implemented through a national network of cooperating institutions, including schools, museums, and other educational organizations. The funding for the program will come from grants from the Federal Government, as well as from private sources. The program will be administered by the Department of Education, in collaboration with the Department of Interior.

Amendments to the NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND WILDERNESS Act (Public Law 92-297) Congress passed a bill to expand the national parks system, including the establishment of new national parks and the expansion of existing ones. The bill also included provisions to protect and preserve the nation's wilderness areas, including the creation of new wilderness areas and the protection of existing ones. The legislation authorized an indefinite extension of the program when Congress authorized a 4-year extension of the program. The bill also provided for an indefinite extension of permits administered by the Department of Agriculture for national recreation areas.
In Georgia; H.R. 15597, authorizing additional funds for acquisition of interests in land within Picayutaw Park in Maryland; H.R. 13067, providing for administration of the National Historic Site in Florida; H.R. 8766, establishing the Hohokam Pima National Monument in Arizona; H.R. 6446, providing for addition of the Minam River Canyons to the national wilderness and Wallowa and Whitman National Forests; H.R. 11449, providing that the United States disclaim any interest in certain lands in Colorado; S. 27, establishing the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in Arizona and Utah; and H.R. 13396, providing for land acquisition for the Delaware National Recreation Area.

S. 1982, designating a segment of the St. Croix River in Minnesota and Wisconsin as part of the national wild and scenic rivers system; H.R. 14444, establishing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area; S. 1441, designating the Flat Tops Wilderness, Routt, and White River National Forests; S. 1473, creating the Chisos National Historical Site; S. 1198, authorizing a review of the Indian Peaks Area in Colorado as to suitability for preservation as a wilderness.

**FORESTY PROGRAMS**

COOPERATIVE FOREST PROGRAMS (H.R. 8817, PUBLIC LAW 92–288)

In passing Public Law 92–288 Congress continued to recognize the need in the years ahead for improved technical assistance to implement programs for land now planted with timber, as well as unprocessed land suitable for tree planting programs. Not only is technical assistance needed to encourage the application of research knowledge in the management of forests, but assistance is needed to initiate programs for improving the efficiency and economy of cultivation and the cutting of timber with a concern for environmental protection.

Passed by the Senate July 1, 1972, Public Law 92–288 makes available additional funds to the Forest Service for planting more trees in those areas of the national forests that are in most need of reforestation. The Supplemental National Forest Reforestation Fund will be financed from the gross duties' receipts on wood and paper and printed matter.

This legislation requires the Secretary of Agriculture to report to Congress with respect to the scope of the total national forest reforestation needs, and to submit a planned program for reforestation such lands, including a description of the extent to which funds authorized by this act are to be applied to the program. Congress, it is hoped, will then be provided with an accurate perspective on the needs for reforestation, along with a method of insuring that funds will be properly directed to and used in the reforestation program. The Secretary must submit his report within 1 year of the date of enactment and annually thereafter.

**GENERAL GOVERNMENT**

Mr. Speaker, each year we consider and enact legislation which affects the operation of the National Government and its programs. Three bills passed by the Congress, or the House, during the 92d Congress concerned with early retirement under existing law. The President signed Public Law 92–382 August 14, 1972. The President signed Public Law 92–243 February 26, 1972. The President vetoed a similar bill January 1, 1971.

**FEDERAL FIREFIGHTERS** (S. 916; PUBLIC LAW 92–382)

Congress cleared, August 1, for the President a bill (S. 916) which includes Federal firefighters in the definition of "hazardous" occupations which qualified for early retirement under existing law. President Nixon had vetoed a similar bill January 4, 1971. President Nixon signed Public Law 92–382 August 14, 1972. Public Law 92–382 is one of the reasons that the Congress in the second session has enacted additional legislation.

**SUPREME COURT ANNOUNCEMENTS** (H.R. 12101; PUBLIC LAW 92–397)

Public Law 92–397, approved August 22, 1972, was enacted by the Congress very soon after the media reported that due to inadequate survivor benefits for the Supreme Court Justices some of the widows of former Justices were in financial difficulties. In 1954 Congress granted widows of Supreme Court Justices a pension of $5,000. Under Public Law 92–397 the widows of the Justices will have an annual pension of $10,000.

**FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE** (H.R. 12202)

The House, on April 27, 1972, passed H.R. 12202 for the purpose of increasing the Government's contribution to the Federal employee health insurance plans. As passed the bill would provide that the Government's contribution...
made available to the requesting committee or other appropriate committees and be available to the public unless disclosure would violate security statutes or the Board determines that they should not be made available.

The Board has authority to tap resources both within and outside the Government in making assessments. The act specifies the cooperation and assistance of the Congressional Research Service in the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office. It calls for coordination with the National Science Foundation in order to remain abreast of the rapid advances in new technology. Finally, there is established an Advisory Council of 12 persons which will review and make recommendations on activities of the Office and on its assessment findings. Ten of the 12 members of the Council shall be persons eminent in either physics, biology, the social sciences, engineering or in the administration of technological activities. The Board of Directors of the Office and the Comptroller General are the other two members.

**ELECTION LAW AND REGULATION OF CAMPAIGNS**

During the first session, Mr. Speaker, we enacted two significant measures in the area of the regulation of campaigns. In one action we sent to the States the 26th amendment to the Constitution, lowering the voting age to 18 for all elections in the United States. It was the popular vote that became part of the Constitution on July 1, 1971. Since then, we politicians have been assiduously courting the vote of this new group in the election and thus trying to spend the count $1 million. In this presidential election, by the way, there are some 25 million voters who are eligible to cast ballots for the first time for President and Vice President. They constitute over 18 percent of the eligible electorate.

In the other action we approved a Presidential Campaign Fund Act in passing the Revenue Act of 1971—Public Law 92-225. As we recall the election of 1976, the fund would be financed from tax revenue with the taxpayer having the right to designate to which party, if any, he would like his $1 contribution to go. Candidates could choose to finance their campaigns from public funds or from private funds.

Congress also came near to completing action on the Federal Election Campaign Act. However, a conference approval in the House occurred during the second session. I have summarized this important measure for the benefit of Members.

**FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT (S. 362, H.R. 12821, PUBLIC LAW 92-225)**

Early in the second session the House approved the conference report on S. 362, the Federal Election Campaign Act. House of Representatives conference approval in the House occurred during the second session. I have summarized this important measure for the benefit of Members.

The Office was composed of a policymaking body called the Technology Assessment Board and an operational unit to be headed by a Director. The Board would consist of 13 members, six Senators, three from each party, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; six members of the House, three from each party, appointed by the Speaker; and the Director of the Office, appointed by the Board for a 6-year term, who will not be a voting member.

Requests for assessments may be initiated by members of committees, the Board, or the Director, in consultation with the Board. Assessments shall be in the bill. The House, on June 23, passed a bill which omitted inclusion of the postal workers and limited the Government's contribution to 50 percent of the premium payments by 1976. The House voted to include employees of the U.S. Postal Service in the bill. The Senate, on June 23, passed a bill which omitted inclusion of the postal workers and limited the Government's contribution to 50 percent of the premium payments by 1976. The Senate voted to include employees of the Government's contribution to 50 percent.

The increase for 1971 was 4.3 percent. So candidates for the 1972 elections may spend the greater of $52,150, or 10.43 cents times the pertinent voting age population. As all candidates for the House and the Senate, except for candidates for Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and Delegate from the District of Columbia, they are limited in the November election to spending $52,150 for broadcast and nonbroadcast advertising. This occurs because no congressional district has a voting age population which exceeds 500,000.

The law further provides that a candidate may spend up to 60 percent of his limitation on radio and television advertising; for the 1972 elections for House candidates that is $31,290. If a candidate in the House spends nothing on radio and television advertising, he could spend the full $50,000 on magazine, newspaper, or billboard advertising and for paid telephone campaigning.

The law further provides that during the 45 days preceding a primary and the 60 days preceding a general election candidates for Federal office shall be charged at a rate equal to the lowest rate for the period for which they purchase radio, television, and telephone. Because more and more candidates rely on telecommunications to get their message to the voters, coupled with the media limitations voted in Public Law 92-225, Congress concluded that it was only fair to require broadcasters to charge the lowest rates during these periods of time preceding elections.

The law also contains some other than those specified, candidates are to be charged at a rate comparable to that for other users of the airwaves. The comparability charge provision applies as well to newspaper and periodical advertising and the use of billboards. This provision is designed to preclude rate gouging of candidates.

I would emphasize to each Member that he, or his agent, is responsible for keeping track of all advertising done on his behalf by political committees organized to support his campaign. The media expenditure limitations for each candidate applies to all money spent for this by him and his committees. No station may broadcast an advertisement, nor newspaper, magazine, or billboard owner print advertising, unless a candidate or his agent has authorized it in writing and certifies that the broadcast or printing will not violate his spending limitations.

Public Law 92-225 amended the Federal Communications Act to guarantee that candidates for Federal office shall have reasonable access to broadcast facilities. In the hearing process, broadcasters and licensees could refuse to permit candidates to advertise or appear on radio or television. Under the new provision of law, willful and repeated failure to
permit reasonable access can lead to loss of license for a station owner. The law contains provision for applying to the Federal Communications Commission for a license for a station owner. It is a State by law provides for limitations which do not exceed Federal limitations and if it states in that law that it intends candidates for State or local office to be governed by the Federal Election Campaign Act's provisions on media spending limitations, then the Federal law is applied to those elections. Nothing in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1925, as amended, were repealed by Public Law 92-235. The new law amends the criminal code to prohibit the promise of employment or other benefit for political activity; to limit contributions and expenditures by candidates and their immediate families—spouse, child, parent, grandparent, brother, sister, and the spouses of such persons—to their own campaigns—$50,000 for President or Vice President; $35,000 for Senator; $25,000 for the House; to prohibit those entering into contracts with the Federal Government from making, or being solicited for, campaign contributions or providing other things of value; to permit bank loans to candidates so long as they have an accounting of what it costs to run for public office in this country.

The law required the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission to promulgate regulations regarding the extension of credit to candidates for Federal office and each of them has issued its regulations. Finally, the law prohibits the use of Office of Economic Opportunity funds for political activities, and prohibits paying any CEO employee who engages in such activity while on official duty. Amendment of the Federal Election Campaign Act (H.R. 15276)

Mr. Speaker, subsequent to passage of Public Law 92-235 a misunderstanding arose regarding the fair presentation of the act barring corporations or labor unions holding government contracts from making direct political contributions. Some people felt that this law prevented such corporations or labor unions from establishing fund-raising groups to solicit voluntary contributions from employees or members, which right is guaranteed in another part of the act. Congress intended that this should happen. Accordingly, late in the session the House passed H.R. 15276 to make it clear that corporations and labor unions holding Government contracts are not prohibited from establishing such fundraising groups. It is not fair that corporations or labor unions which do not hold Government contracts can establish such groups while those that do fall outside the fold of the act.

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

During the first session, the Congress approved an extension, to April 1, 1973, of the provisions of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971, which established a new independent cabinet level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In the second session, the House Committee on Government Operations, which exercises jurisdictional authority over the governing legislation and guidelines for executive reorganization, issued its 11th report, entitled "Executive Reorganization: A Summary Analysis." It discusses in general terms the need for continuing reorganization in the executive branch and the ways in which it can be accomplished, as well as, more specifically, the considerations involved in President Nixon's legislative proposals to overhaul the Cabinet and convert it into a series of independent "super-departments." One bill, to create a Department of Community Development, was reported by the committee in May of 1972 following extensive hearings in 1971 and 1972.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT (H.R. 4383; PL 92-463)

This legislation is the result of a concerted effort on the part of the House Government Operations Committee to exert greater degree of control over Federal advisory bodies. An intensive investigation by the Special Studies Subcommittee during the 91st Congress revealed that there were 1,674 Federal advisory boards, and other advisory committees in the Federal Government, costing millions of dollars annually. Even more significant, the subcommittee's December 1970 report "The Role and Significance of Federal Advisory Committees" documented that no one in the executive branch really knew how many such committees were extant; hence, the ability to the public and to the Congress was completely impossible.

H.R. 4383 combined the best features of a number of different bills on which hearings were held by the Appropriations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee and by the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. Its purpose is to regulate the proliferation of advisory boards in the Federal Government, to force greater accountability on the part of such bodies both to the public and to the Congress, to prescribe standard advertising and informational guidelines, and to eliminate those advisory committees which are no longer necessary.

The main features of the law are as follows: first, it would require the President to make an annual report to the Congress detailing the activities, status, and changes in the composition of advisory committees in existence during the preceding year; second, with regard to Presidential advisory committees, the law would require the President—or his delegate—to report to the Congress within 1 year after such a committee had submitted a public report stating either his reasons for seeking or his reasons for inaction on the committee's recommendations; third, it would require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to establish the Management Secretariat to keep track of advisory committee activities and to prescribe administrative guidelines and management controls for them; and fourth, it would further require the Director of OMB immediately to institute a comprehensive review of all advisory committees in existence to determine whether they are performing a necessary function.

The new law would also require that: first, congressional committees considering legislation to establish advisory committees follow certain guidelines to ensure that their membership is properly balanced and that such committees are adequately funded and staffed; second, heads of agencies in which advisory committees are held be required to keep full and complete records on such panels; third, advisory committee meetings be open to the public, with adequate notice of meeting times published in the Federal Register; and fourth, unless the President or the head of the agency to which the committee re-
ports determines that the subject matter would be exempt from disclosure by the Freedom of Information Act; fourth, a depositary of committee reports and papers be maintained in the Library of Congress; and fifth, standard termination dates be met for all advisory committees. Certainly there is no question that advisory committees perform as a very useful adjunct to Federal agencies, and that their advice in many cases has served the President and the Nation well. However, it is also clear that the utilization of this kind of information-gathering device has gotten out of control; and it is the purpose of this law to introduce some measure of standardization into the whole Federal advisory committee system.

TRANSPORTATION ACT AMENDMENT
(H.R. 15054, S. 2840, PUBLIC LAW 92–
Amendments to the Transportation Act of 1940, as above approved by the House October 11, and by the Senate August 10. The Transportation Payment Act is designed to facilitate the payment of transportation charges by improving and modernizing the payment practices for the transportation of persons and property for the Federal Government. The intent of the measure is to simplify and update Government payment and settlement practices and to bring them closer to commercial practices. It will allow for greater use of automation and reduce costs both on the part of the Government and on the part of the carriers.

It is estimated that the legislation will eventually save industry $750 million a year and it will save the Government millions per year in addition.

THE JUDICIARY
In the first session of the 92d Congress the House passed a bill, which the Senate declined to consider, which would facilitate the judicial process. In order to encourage lawyers to retain in private practice at the bar, the House on July 19, 1971, passed H.R. 4606 which would provide for a special pay schedule for armed services lawyers during their first tour of duty and would allow them to sign up for additional tours of duty.

During the second session five bills of interest have been considered.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT FOR THE CHIEF JUSTICE
(H.R. 8809, PUBLIC LAW 92–200)
In addition to his strictly judicial duties the Chief Justice of the United States has heavy administrative responsibilities with inadequate staff assistance. Accordingly, the House passed Public Law 92–238 providing for an administrative assistant for the Chief Justice. The assistant is authorized a secretary and a legal assistant to aid him in serving the Chief Justice.

TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENT OF U.S. MAGISTRATES
(H.R. 9180, PL 92–200)
Public Law 92–239 authorized temporary transfer of U.S. magistrates from one court to another when there is specific need for assistance. Magistrates help carry the workload of district courts by trying lesser cases and by conducting bail hearings, pretrial conferences and post-indictment arraignments.

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
(H.R. 7378)
The caseload of our judges in the 11 Federal circuit courts of appeals has increased from 185 in the 1950's to 431 in 1973. The average number of appeals filed per judge in 1961 was 54; in 1971 it was 132. The backlog of appeals pending in the circuit courts was about 3,000 in 1962; it was about 9,000 in 1971. It is simply not possible for the judges to meet all the cases. The circuit courts presently cover vast areas in which they have had increasing workloads in the past decade. Yet, with one exception, we have not changed the boundaries of our judicial circuits since 1939. In 1957 we added the Trust Territory to the 11th Circuit. In the second session Congress passed H.R. 7378, to establish a Commission on Revision of the Judicial Circuits. The Commission will be composed of 18 members: four members appointed by the President, four members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, four Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, and four members appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

The Commission will study the present geographical boundaries of our judicial circuits and recommend to the President, the Congress, and the Chief Justice whatever changes in the boundaries it considers necessary to facilitate the work of the circuit courts. The Commission is required to submit its first report with recommendations 180 days after its ninth member is appointed. A second, and final, report is required within 15 months of the date on which its ninth member is appointed. A total of $370,000 is provided for administrative expenses for the work of the Commission.

LOWERING QUALIFYING AGE FOR FEDERAL JURY SERVICE TO 18 (S. 1973, PL 92–260)
After the 26th amendment lowered the voting age to 18 the minimum age required to serve on Federal juries was still 21. In the second session the Congress passed S. 1973—Public Law 92–269—which lowers the age for service on Federal juries to 18. S. 1973 also provides that master jury list shall be refilled not later than September 1, 1973, with names obtained from voter registration lists for the 1972 general election or from lists of actual voters in the 1972 general election, except in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone which shall refill their master jury lists by the same date from other sources which include the names of 18-year-old citizens. S. 1973 requires that qualified jury wheels be refilled from master jury wheels within the following month, by October 1, 1973. S. 1973 further requires that master jury wheels be refilled at least every 4 years.

STATUTORY CEILING ON SALARIES OF U.S. MAGISTRATES
(H.R. 7375, PL 92–458)
In the second session we passed and cleared for the President H.R. 7375. H.R. 7375 establishes a pay ceiling of $30,000 on salaries of U.S. magistrates—the same as the pay ceiling on salaries of full-time referees in bankruptcy—and a pay ceiling of $15,000 on salaries of part-time magistrates. The bill provides that the salary of a full-time magistrate cannot be higher than 75 percent of the salary of a Federal district judge.

GUAM AND VIRGIN ISLANDS DELEGATES TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
(H.R. 8778, PL 92–271)
The final congressional approval of H.R. 8778 on March 29, 1972, and subsequent enactment of Public Law 92–271 on April 10, 1972, culminates over a decade of efforts to provide for the election of nonvoting Delegates to the House of Representatives from the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands.

The rapidly changing economic and social conditions in Guam and the Virgin Islands, as well as the complex aspirations of these peoples—and the principles of American democracy—have extended consideration of the general welfare of these territories beyond the bounds of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The various and complex Federal programs which are responsive to the needs of these territories are now so numerous and so varied that the Territorial Delegates should have the opportunity to meet conditions in each territory. The enactment of Public Law 92–271 places the responsibility for the furtherance of the objectives of the 26th Amendment on the territories upon the newly elected Delegates.

As approved, Public Law 92–271 states that the Delegate from each territory shall receive no salary, allowances, and benefits as a Member of the House of Representatives, and shall be entitled to whatever privileges and immunities are, or hereinafter may be, granted to the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico. The Delegate shall also be entitled to vote in committee as provided by the Rules of the House of Representatives. Clerk hire allowance of each Delegate will be 60 per cent of that allowed a Member, and transportation expenses are limited to four round trips per year.

TUNA FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
(H.R. 12207, PL 92–444)
Congress in passing H.R. 12207 has authorized the Secretary of Commerce to institute a 3-year, $3 million program to develop and extend the fishing industry in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR THE U.S. TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (MICRONESIA) (S. 3307)
Public Law 92–257, approved March 21, 1972, promotes the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by authorizing a 30-year, $500 million, interest-bearing loan to the Trust Territory economic development loan fund. This law increases the fund from $1.9 million to $5 million, and authorizes provisions for making loans from the fund.

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION
AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION
(H.R. 15844; S. 3307)
The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was created by Joint reso-
tion of the 89th Congress for the
purpose of debating and coordinating an
appropriate commemoration of the 200th
anniversary of the birth of our Nation.
It consisted originally of 34 members:
Eight Members of Congress, nine Cabinet
officers or their designees, and 18 mem-
bers appointed from private life by the
President. Three Cabinet officials were
added by the 90th and 91st Congresses,
and Public Law 92-236 added to the Com-
mission the Secretary of Transportation.
In addition, to hire an Executive Director
and to hire an additional supergrade posi-
tions for bicentennial projects, the Com-
mission would be able to carry out its
functions. However, the measure would
also authorize the additional supergrades
for the Commission to be more evenly divided
among the two political parties, to cut the
additional supergrades authorized
from 10 to 5, and to require a monthly
report of the Congress relative to the use
of certain authorities—without regard to
making contracts—granted to the Com-
mission. In addition, two nongermane
amendments relating to Federal elections
were adopted on the Senate floor.
As Congress moved toward adjourn-
ment the Senate accepted the modified
authorization approved by the House on
September 19, 1972, as the measure for the
President’s signature.
Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 92d Congress several significant
health and medical measures were enacted into
law, among them the Health Professions
Education Act—Public Law 92-157, the
Nurse Training Act—Public Law 92-158,
and the National Cancer Act—Public Law 92-218. The Health Professions
Education Act provided a 3-year authoriza-
tion for appropriations—$225,000,000
for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972,
and $250,000,000 and $275,000,000 for the
next 2 succeeding fiscal years—for both
the construction of health research and
teaching facilities and for the training of
doctors, dentists, and other health
professionals.
The Nurse Training Act also provided a
3-year authorization for appropriations for
the construction of new facilities for
collegiate, associate degree, or diploma
schools of nursing and grants to assist in
the replacement or rehabilitation of
existing nursing facilities. The National
Cancer Act authorized the National Can-
cer Institute of the National Institutes
of Health to marshal the Nation’s resources
and launch an all-out attack against
cancer.
Significant congressional actions dur-
ing the second session include:
Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972
Mr. Speaker, the Drug Abuse Office and
Treatment Act—Public Law 92-225—
seeks to marshal Federal resources against
a serious national problem: drug
addiction. The Department of Justice
recently estimated that approximately
500,000 persons—many of them young
people—are heroin addicts. Authorities
also tell us that about 50 percent of the
violent street crimes in the United States
are attributable to those who see the
money they need, about $50 to $75 per
day, to support their habit.
What the law will do is to create a
Special Action Office for Drug Abuse
Prevention under a Director with broad
powers over the conduct of Federal drug
prevention, rehabilitation, and
education programs in the area of
dangerous drugs. This office will also fund
research into the causes and prevention
of drug abuse, and into new methods or concepts of drug prevention
and addiction treatment. In addition, the
act provides for a program of formula
grants for the States to assist them in
planning, establishing, coordinating, and
evaluating projects to deal with drug abuse.

On May 18, 1972, President Richard
Nixon signed into law—Public Law 92-
294—the National Sickle Cell Anemia
Control Act. This law will aid thousands
of our citizens afflicted with this blood
disease. There is no known cure for this
inherited disease, which primarily af-
flicts black Americans. Approximately
1,000 black infants are born each year
with sickle cell anemia, and it is esti-
mated that between 100,000 and 150,000
individuals are today afflicted with it. These
citizens often die before the age of 20;
few survive beyond age 40; and most are
dead by the age of 50.

To help combat this disease this act
provides for appropriation authoriza-
tions over a 3-year period of $115 mil-
lion. The bill also provides a national
program of care and treatment for individu-
als with the sickle cell trait and those
with the disease. The legislation provides
particularity in regard to marriage, for
the event that people with this trait
may marry, the probabilities are one in four
that a child born to them will have the
sickle cell trait. In addition, the act pro-
vides for further research into the diag-
nosis, treatment, and prevention of this
disease.

NATIONAL SICKLE CELL ANEMIA CONTROL ACT of 1972

Mr. Speaker, diseases of the heart and
blood vessels cause more than half of
deaths each year in the United States.
If these diseases could be eliminated, the
average American life span would be increased by about 11 years. Passage of
Public Law 92-423 by the Senate and
also the House will help the Nation’s
No. 1 killer—heart disease.

It should be noted that three types of
cardiovascular disease—heart attacks,
strokes, and peripheral vascular dis-
ases—have reached epidemic propor-
tions in this country. For example, ap-
proximately 1.2 million Americans suffer
heart attacks each year; stroke kills more
than 300,000 citizens each year, and
nperipheral vascular diseases disable more
than 150,000 individuals each year.

Public Law 92-423 enlarges the au-
thority of the National Heart and Lung In-
nstitute and establishes a 10-point program for it.

Some of these programs include: First,
the establishment of public and profes-
sional education programs relating to
every aspect of blood, heart, and lung disease; second,
research into the causes and prevention
of these diseases; and third, establish-
ment of programs for study and research into
diseases related to blood, heart, and lung dis-

This act also authorizes heart, blood
vessel, lung, and blood disease preven-
tion and control programs and establishes 30 new centers for clinical and basic research, 15 for heart and related diseases and 15 for lung diseases. To accomplish these and other objectives of the act, $1.3 billion has been authorized. Cooley's Anemia Control Amendments Act (S. 3442, PUBLIC LAW 92-449) On June 16, 1972, Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed the Communicable Disease Control Amendments Act (S. 3442) and the bill was signed into law on July 18, 1972. Adoption of the conference report came in mid-September. This measure extends and amends the present program of assistance to States and localities for the prevention and control of communicable diseases. Many of them, such as measles, whooping cough, and venereal disease, have been on the increase in recent years. For example, there were 624,000 reported gonorrhea cases in 1971, almost triple the number reported in 1962. The act authorizes categorical grants to State and local communities, with specific authorizations for various categories. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is granted the authority to transfer funds from one program to another, thus enabling the department to respond to the necessarily changing nature of its responsibility in administering such programs as tuberculosis, measles, or venereal control.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS, METABOLISM AND DIGESTIVE DISEASES (H.R. 13891, PUBLIC LAW 92-305) On June 16, 1972, the House passed H.R. 15859, the Emergency Medical Services Act. This act provides for the establishment of emergency medical systems; and third, the expansion and improvement. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to make grants for research and training in methods and techniques of emergency medical services.

REHABILITATION ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 3895) The Rehabilitation Act of 1972 provides an opportunity for many physically and mentally handicapped individuals to work, to earn, and to live independently in their communities. H.R. 8395 does this by extending for 3 years the appropriation authority of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. In addition, this measure introduces several new programs. One provides a program to deal with severely handicapped individuals, those with little expectation of being employed. Another includes authorization for 3 years of grants in aiding individuals with serious kidney diseases. H.R. 8395 also includes authority for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish comprehensive centers to serve the low-achieving deaf. Authority is also included for the establishment of special centers for individuals with spinal injuries. Finally, it provides for a National Commission on Transportation and Housing for the Handicapped. Handicapped persons have special needs in regard to housing and transportation. A primary function of the Commission will be to educate the public about these problems so steps can be taken to resolve them.

EXTENSION OF COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND DEPENDENCY TREATMENT ACT (H.R. 16675) H.R. 16675 extends for 1 year, the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970—Public Law 91-616—continuing grants to States or localities for the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. H.R. 16676 extends for 1 year the Community Mental Health Centers Act. This act authorizes the establishment of community-based mental health centers throughout the Nation. Under the authority of this act, the National Institute of Mental Health has established 416 community mental health centers of which over 325 are now operational. With the 1-year extension provided by H.R. 16676, programs of assistance for community mental health centers, alcoholism facilities, drug abuse facilities, and facili-
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First, a revision of the impacted areas program as it relates to Indian children; Second, special programs and projects to improve educational opportunities for Indian children; Third, certain special programs relating to adult education for Indians; Fourth, establishment of an Office of Indian Education within the Office of Education (HEW); and Fifth, various miscellaneous provisions.

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted two bills concerned with those who are employed by our Nation's railroads. Public Law 92-17 was emergency legislation aimed at preventing an impending nationwide strike. It directed striking railmen to return to work while providing for a 13½-percent wage increase and prohibiting future railroad strikes through October 1, 1971. Public Law 92-46 provided a 10-percent increase in retirement benefits for railroad employees to June 30, 1973, retroactive to January 1, 1971. This act also extended a June 30, 1970, expiration date for the Commission on Railroad Retirement, created to study the railroad retirement system.

Additional congressional action has been forthcoming during the second session.

**HEALTH**

Mr. Speaker, during the first session, Congress passed two major Indian bills in addition to claims and land-rights legislation. Public Law 92-203 (H.R. 10367), the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, was signed into law on December 18, 1971. This provided for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives. The legislation had one main purpose: To settle Native land claims by terminating all Native claims of aboriginal title in return for which the Natives were granted certain acreage and a specific payment.

Public Law 92-189 (H.R. 5068), to establish grants for the Navajo Community College, was signed into law on December 15, 1971. The purpose of the act is to assist the Navajo Tribe in providing education to the members of the tribe. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants to the Navajos and to tribes, or to local agencies in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the college.

During the second session, the following bill concerning Indian affairs was acted upon by Congress:

**EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972**

**PUBLIC LAW 92-310**

This measure is intended to remove initial impediments that have developed since amendments (Public Law 89-236) to the Immigration and Nationality Act. H.R. 9615 would make additional special immigrant visas available annually to each country. The number of visas would be equal to 75 percent of the 1955-65 average of immigrant visas issued, less visas issued each year under the permanent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, but not exceeding 500 visas per country per fiscal year; and reduce the backlog in visa issuance in the fifth preference category—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens.

**WARRANTING OF ILLEGAL ALIENS (H.R. 19188)**

H.R. 16188, passed the House by voice vote on September 12, 1972, and amends the Immigration and Nationality Act. This measure has two purposes: To make it unlawful knowingly to hire aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence or are not authorized by the Attorney General to work while in the United States, and to establish a three-step procedure for the imposition of sanctions against employers who hire illegal aliens.

This legislation aims to deter the illegal alien by eliminating his incentive for employment. To accomplish this, it increases the authorization for appropriations for comprehensive planning and open-space land grants and extends the deadline for communities to meet the planning requirements. For water-sewer grants, in addition, Public Law 92-213 makes entities, other than State or local public bodies and agencies eligible for supplemental grants for new community assistance projects.

Mr. Speaker, during the first session, Congress passed two major Indian bills in addition to claims and land-rights legislation. Public Law 92-203 (H.R. 10367), the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, was signed into law on December 18, 1971. This legislation had one main purpose: To settle Native land claims by terminating all Native claims of aboriginal title in return for which the Natives were granted certain acreage and a specific payment.

Public Law 92-189 (H.R. 5068), to establish grants for the Navajo Community College, was signed into law on December 15, 1971. The purpose of the act is to assist the Navajo Tribe in providing education to the members of the tribe. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants to the Navajos and to tribes, or to local agencies in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the college.
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**WARRANTING OF ILLEGAL ALIENS (H.R. 19188)**

H.R. 16188, passed the House by voice vote on September 12, 1972, and amends the Immigration and Nationality Act. This measure has two purposes: To make it unlawful knowingly to hire aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence or are not authorized by the Attorney General to work while in the United States, and to establish a three-step procedure for the imposition of sanctions against employers who hire illegal aliens.

This legislation aims to deter the illegal alien by eliminating his incentive for employment. To accomplish this, it increases the authorization for appropriations for comprehensive planning and open-space land grants and extends the deadline for communities to meet the planning requirements. For water-sewer grants, in addition, Public Law 92-213 makes entities, other than State or local public bodies and agencies eligible for supplemental grants for new community assistance projects.

**RENTS ON INSURED MORTGAGES (H.R. 9615)**

In July Public Law 92-335 was enacted into law extending the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish maximum interest rates on insured mortgages (H.J. RES. 250, PL 92-254). In addition, it increases the authorization for appropriations for comprehensive planning and open-space land grants and extends the deadline for communities to meet the planning requirements. For water-sewer grants, in addition, Public Law 92-213 makes entities, other than State or local public bodies and agencies eligible for supplemental grants for new community assistance projects.

**EXTENSION TO NONPROFIT HOSPITALS**

H.R. 11357, which amends the National Labor Relations Act by extending its coverage to employees of private nonprofit hospitals, passed the House on August 7, 1972, by a 285-to-96 rollcall vote.

The purpose of this measure is to restore to employees of nonprofit hospitals the rights guaranteed to most other employees by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

**LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS**

On August 16, 1972, the President vetoed H.R. 15417, a bill appropriating funds for fiscal 1973 for the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. The vetoed measure, sustained by the House, contained an amendment which prohibited funds from being used to inspect businesses employing 15 or fewer persons to determine if they were in compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-596), thus exempting such businesses from the act.

The new Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, H.R. 16654, contains a similar provision regulating compliance with the 1970 act. The Committee believes that the inclusion of the appropriations in H.R. 16654 would result in federal inspections of businesses employing three or fewer employees.
Congress failed to resolve differences over H.R. 7130 and it died with adjournment on October 18, 1972.

The maximum compensation for disability is not to exceed 200 percent of the national average weekly wage to be determined annually by the Secretary of Labor. The basic purpose of the act is to insure that the injured worker receives 66⅔ percent of his average weekly wage.

Law Enforcement and Criminal Procedure

In its first session the 92d Congress passed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to grant relief to certain types of advertising materials and the act provides that the provision of the act concerning youth employment and employing students of educational institutions.

Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensations Act (S. 2318, Public Law 92-95)

On October 14, the House passed S. 2318, amending the Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, to provide benefits to workers who suffer injuries while working on the navigable waters of the United States. The maximum minimum wage of nonagricultural workers covered prior to the 1966 amendments for $1.80 an hour during the first year and $2 thereafter: a minimum wage for nonagricultural workers covered by the 1966 and 1972 amendments for $2 an hour during the second year, and $2 thereaf ter. Agricultural workers would have received $1.50 an hour during the first year and $1.70 thereafter. These provisions would have become effective the first day of the second full month after the date of enactment.

The House version called for special minimum hourly wage rates and increases for employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands including hotel, motel, restaurant, government, and other nonagricultural employees, as well as agricultural workers. It retained present exemptions and exempted Canal Zone employees from hourly minimum wage rates. It extended minimum wage and overtime exemptions to employees in personal and household services for both personal and household service employees. It extended the provisions of the act concerning youth employment and employing students of educational institutions.

More than 200,000 longshoremen and ship repairmen are covered by the statute. In addition, another 300,000 employees of private employers within the District of Columbia are protected by the law as well as an additional 200,000 workers on defense bases in nonappropriaed fund agencies such as post exchanges and military round. In April 18, 1972, passed H.R. 45, a bill to establish an Institute for Continuing Juvenile Justice Studies providing for treatment programs for drug abusers who are confined to, or released from, correctional institutions.

And in its first session the 92d Congress passed an amendment to the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (H.R. 5674; Public Law 91-556) that authorized appropriation for the Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse to $4 million.

Legislation to prohibit the use of the mails to send obscene matter to minors, and to protect the rights of privacy of others by defining obscene matter, passed the House in July, 1971. H.R. 8808 establishes definitions of "obscene" matter that would be nondismissalable under the age of 17, and provides a definition of "obscene" matters for general application to distribution of matter through the U.S. mails. Finally, the bill provided that all persons cited not to receive unsolicited "potentially offensive sexual material." The Senate did not act on this bill.

In addition, the 92d Congress enacted, acts of violence committed by children under 18 and the rate of auto stealing increased by 85 percent. Children from 10 to 17 years old make up 16 percent of the national population, 50 percent of all arrests for serious crime are of young people in this age group. Arrests of persons in any other age group make up such a high percentage of arrests for serious crime. The gravity of the problem of juvenile delinquency must shock us into taking measures adequate to protect our communities and to guide young people away from violence and delinquency. And in its first session the 92d Congress during its first session passed H.R. 592 (S. 1372), which extended the act for 1 year, authorized funding of programs for delinquent young people, and established an interdepartmental council to coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

In order to prepare ourselves to deal with juvenile delinquency the House, in the second session of the 92d Congress, on April 18, 1972, passed H.R. 45, a bill to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Delinquency. Supervised by a Director appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for a 4-year term, the Institute would serve as an information bank on juvenile delinquency; it would publish data and distribute data and studies on juvenile delinquency; it would prepare studies on juvenile justice including comparisons and analyses of Federal and State laws and models laws together with recommendations on juvenile justice; it would devise and conduct seminars and workshops on juvenile delinquency; it would provide training program in methods for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency for law enforcement officers, juvenile welfare workers, juvenile judges and judicial personnel, probation officers, family counselors, and others; it would assist State, local, and private agencies to develop training programs on juvenile delinquency; and it would re-
ommended to Congress further legislation designed to overcome juvenile delinquency.

The Institute is authorized to seek information and assistance from Federal departments and agencies and to reimburse them for it; to utilize the cooperation of State, local, and private agencies; and to consult with, or provide public assistance to, agencies or individuals to do work pursuant to the Institute's functions; to pay for consultants at a rate up to $75 per day together with travel allowance and per diem.

H.R. 45 would establish an Advisory Commission to supervise the policy and operations of the Institute. The following would compose the Advisory Commission: the Director of the Institute who would be appointed by the President, Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Administrator of the Bureau of Prisons, Administrator of the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, Administrator of the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Administrator of the National Institute on Deafness and other Communication Handicaps having training and experience in the various areas of juvenile delinquency.

On September 13, 1972, the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency accepted H.R. 45 for consideration by the full Judiciary Committee, but the Senate did not debate the bill and it died without adjournment.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT (H.R. 1038, PUBLIC LAW 92-381)

Public Law 92-381, approved by the President August 14, 1972, provides assistance to elementary and secondary school systems, local agencies, and other public and nonprofit private agencies, for the prevention of juvenile delinquency. This legislation authorizes grants for local preventive programs, training of personnel for these programs, technical assistance for them, and information services. Local grants will be for the purpose of funding coordinated youth services. Federal grants, even will have the responsibility for finding out those services available within its community which can assist in preventing delinquency, and to coordinate programs which will in danger of becoming delinquent will have easy access to them.

Already there is a proliferation of services available to local communities such as model cities programs, neighborhood community health clinics, drug abuse centers, and legal services offices. It is the purpose of this act to create a focal point for children in trouble, or potential trouble, and to be helpful in the like existing facilities. The emphasis is to help a child before he or she becomes delinquent, with preventive effort directed toward identifying young people most likely to become delinquents.

The new law also requires that funds made available by Congress be concentrated in the Judicial Center, plus 15 persons to be appointed by the President.

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS (H.R. 2923, PUBLIC LAW 92-420)

This session final action was taken on legislation amending the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to permit the Federal government to finance clinics treating narcotic addiction, treatment programs. Public Law 92-420 amends the definition of the word "treatment" contained in three titles of the 1966 act to encompass the methods of treatment other than narcotic therapy, but not necessarily eliminate, a narcotic addict's dependence on addicting drugs. "Treatment" henceforth includes control of dependence, through the use of a suspect or a criminal, or the protection of a law enforcement or volunteer fireman, who die as the direct or proximate result of an injury sustained in the line of duty. An eligible public safety officer is defined to include State and local law enforcement or volunteer firefighters, who at the time of their injury are engaged in certain hazardous duty. In the case of a law enforcement officer he must be engaged in the apprehension of a suspect or a criminal, or the protection of a suspect, prisoners, or material witnesses, or trying to prevent a crime. The $50,000 death benefit would not be subject to Federal income taxes.

Funding was authorized at $75 million annually for 2 years, fiscal 1973 and 1974.

In August 1972 Congress cleared the bill to provide seed money to support a comprehensive program to improve job opportunity, income, and the quality of life in rural America. The act includes all the major components of rural development, such as housing, education, health, income, and environmental protection, and child care centers and institutions for the elderly.

Title I includes major expansions and improvements of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. The Farmers Home Administration—FHA—is authorized to make loans to persons to acquire, establish, or operate small businesses and to acquire, build and insure rural business and industrial loans, including pollution abatement and control loans. In addition, FHA loans are authorized to provide for community facilities such as firehouses and community centers and for enterprises connected with the 4-H Clubs or Future Farmers of America.

The FHA water and waste disposal and rural rural development and training act is designed to meet the immediate financial needs of the owner's survivors and, at the same time, to upgrade the quality of life in rural America. The act includes all the major components of rural development, such as housing, education, health, income, and environmental protection, and child care centers and institutions for the elderly.

Title II amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to include the conservation and utilization of land and water as well as water under the act. Title II amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to increase the amount of funding available for the drug abuse and illegal activity prevention programs, but was vetoed by the President.

Public Law 92-65, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1971, which authorized funds for public works, business loans, employment opportunities, and regional development; and Public Law 92-12, the Rural Telecommunications Act, which authorized supplementary financing to meet the growing capital needs of rural telephone systems.

Title II amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to include the conservation and utilization of land and water as well as water under the act. Title II amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, the 1968 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, and the 4-H Act to authorize the Federal government to finance clinics treating narcotic addiction, treatment programs. Public Law 92-420 amends the definition of the word "treatment" contained in three titles of the 1966 act to encompass the methods of treatment other than narcotic therapy, but not necessarily eliminate, a narcotic addict's dependence on addicting drugs. "Treatment" henceforth includes control of dependence, through the use of a suspect or a criminal, or the protection of a law enforcement or volunteer fireman, who die as the direct or proximate result of an injury sustained in the line of duty. An eligible public safety officer is defined to include State and local law enforcement or volunteer firefighters, who at the time of their injury are engaged in certain hazardous duty. In the case of a law enforcement officer he must be engaged in the apprehension of a suspect or a criminal, or the protection of a suspect, prisoners, or material witnesses, or trying to prevent a crime. The $50,000 death benefit would not be subject to Federal income taxes.

In August 1972 Congress cleared the bill to provide seed money to support a comprehensive program to improve job opportunity, income, and the quality of life in rural America. The act includes all the major components of rural development, such as housing, education, health, income, and environmental protection, and child care centers and institutions for the elderly.
agreements for a period of up to 10 years with landowners to share the cost of conservation programs within watershed projects.

Title III amends the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to promote rural community development by furnishing technical assistance and cost-sharing—up to 50 percent—to public agencies and local government entities for planning and carrying out projects to conserve and protect the quality of rural community water supplies, water quality management, control and abatement of agriculture-related pollution, disposal of solid waste in rural areas, and emergency use of water for rural fire protection. It also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a land inventory and monitoring program and prepare reports on soil, water, and resource conditions.

Title IV provides for financial and technical assistance to States to aid in rural community fire protection.

Title V establishes a pilot program of rural development and small farm research and education to be administered through the land-grant colleges.

Title VI directs the heads of all Federal agencies to give first priority to locating new offices and other facilities in rural areas.

The basic purpose of the Rural Development Act is to encourage economic growth and to improve the quality of life in rural America. The act, by coordinating and strengthening a wide variety of efforts, is expected to be of great significance in achieving these goals.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (H.R. 18071)

On August 16 the House passed the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1972. The original act, which was passed in 1965, provided for Federal assistance, both technical and financial, to economically distressed areas of our Nation. The purpose of the act was to make needed improvements in the law and to extend the programs of the act for an additional fiscal year to June 30, 1974.

The proposed amendments would establish a $10 million "public works impact" program to provide immediate useful work to the unemployed and underemployed. The bill would authorize 60 percent grants in areas which are rural with large population loss or which have large concentrations of low-income population, or substantial unemployment.

Four regional commissions which have undertaken extensive planning—Coastal Plains, Four Corners, Ozarks, and Upper Great Lakes—would each receive $100 million a year to carry out planned programs developed in earlier planning stages—New England, Old West, and Pacific Northwest—would get an annual $20 million each for planning.

To meet the problems of industries threatened with shutdown because of environmental regulations, 3 percent, 30-year loans for pollution abatement measures would be provided. In case of a shutdown displaced workers would be eligible for special unemployment compensation and other aid.

Assistance would be made available to States for preparation of overall State economic development programs and Economic Development District programs would be required to be consistent with them. Economic Development Districts also would get Federal assistance to provide technical assistance to local governments and in performing project notification and review functions under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95. The multitude of State and Federal measures would be promoted through a requirement that Districts provide copies of plans to regional commissions, which would have been included into consideration in preparing their projects.

The population maximum of communities eligible for growth center designation and special assistance would increase from 350,000 to 500,000. In addition "special impact" public works project areas would be redefined to assure more attention to pockets of high unemployment in urban areas.

The Senate passed an amended version of the bill October 12. In one of its final actions Congress sent the measure to the White House.

MONETARY, BANKING, TAX, AND FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. Speaker, during the first session, the Congress enacted laws concerned with monetary, taxing, and fiscal policies. They included: Public Law 92-5, which raised the permanent debt ceiling to $400 billion, increased the temporary debt ceiling to $430 billion until July 1, 1972, and provided for major increases in social security benefits; Public Law 92-9, which extended until March 31, 1973, the interest equalization tax which provides the incentive for American citizens to purchase foreign securities, and thereby aids the balance-of-payments situation; Public Law 92-178, the Revenue Act of 1971, which struck a balance between tax reductions for individuals and tax incentives for business by providing a job development investment credit, reducing the individual income tax, and phasing in the income tax surcharge; Public Law 92-221, which was amended by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration to supervise and grant insurance protection for Federal and State credit unions; Public Law 92-289, which extended the standby authority for the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration to supervise and grant insurance protection for Federal and State credit unions, beyond its current December 31, 1971, expiration date; and Public Law 92-445, which raised the permanent debt ceiling to $500 billion, divided among the States and local government fiscal assistance trust fund, to remain available without fiscal year limitation. Appropriated to this trust fund, out of amounts in the general fund of the Treasury attributable to the collection of the Federal individual income taxes not otherwise appropriated, is $300,336,400,000 over a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1972, and ending December 31, 1976.

Allocations of funds to a State will be on the basis of whichever of two formulas yields the greater amount for that State for that period. One formula multiplies the population of the State by its general tax effort, multiplied by the relative income of the State, and then compares the resulting product for the State with the sum of the products similarly determined for all of the States. The second formula provides a five-factor formula under which the annual rate at the start of the program is first, $3.5 billion, divided among the States, one-third on the basis of urbanized population, one-third on the basis of non-urban population, one-third on the basis of urbanized population inversely weighted for per capita income, and one-third on the basis of the general tax effort of the States, and one-half on the basis of the general tax effort of the States and local governments.

The law creates the State and local government fiscal assistance trust fund, to remain available without fiscal year limitation. Appropriated to this trust fund, out of amounts in the general fund of the Treasury attributable to the collection of the Federal individual income taxes not otherwise appropriated, is $300,336,400,000 over a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1972, and ending December 31, 1976.

Allotments of funds to a State will be on the basis of whichever of two formulas yields the greater amount for that State for that period. One formula multiplies the population of the State by its general tax effort, multiplied by the relative income of the State, and then compares the resulting product for the State with the sum of the products similarly determined for all of the States. The second formula provides a five-factor formula under which the annual rate at the start of the program is first, $3.5 billion, divided among the States, one-third on the basis of urbanized population, one-third on the basis of non-urban population, one-third on the basis of urbanized population inversely weighted for per capita income, and one-third on the basis of the general tax effort of the States, and one-half on the basis of the general tax effort of the States and local governments.

The law also amended title XI of the Social Security Act to impose a limitation on grants for social services under **Public Law 92-70**, which created an Emergency Loan Guarantee Board to guarantee lenders against losses on loans meeting certain Federal requirements; and **Public Law 92-165**, which revised the Investment and Economic Development Act of 1958 to provide that mutual fund investors must be systematically informed of charges to be deducted from projected payments and given notice of rights of redress.

During the second session, the Congress enacted additional major laws of importance to the American people.
public assistance programs. Federal matching for social services under programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled and aid to families with dependent children will be subject to a State-by-State dollar limitation, effective beginning January 1, 1973. The limitation will be limited to its share of $2.5 billion based on its proportion of population in the United States.

PUBLIC DEBT CEILING

The second session saw three separate actions to raise or maintain the public debt ceiling.

On March 15, 1972, Public Law 92-250—H.R. 12910—raised the public debt limit from $430 to $450 billion, through June 30, 1972.

On July 1, Public Law 92-336—H.R. 15390—extended the $450 billion ceiling to October 11. This second extension also contained a ceiling of $250 billion which required Congress, concern over losses suffered as a result of Hurricane Agnes; the tax code was revised to allow deductions for disaster losses in the taxable year immediately following the year in which a disaster occurs, if the losses are suffered within the first 6 months of the latter year. Public Law 92-336 also provided a 20-percent increase in old age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits authorized by the Social Security Act; in addition, social security benefits were tied to the cost-of-living index, which for the first time would provide a benefits hike whenever the cost of living rises more than 3 percent in any calendar year.

On October 10, the House approved H.R. 16810, further raising the public debt ceiling by $14 billion to $465 billion through June 30, 1973. The House bill also empowered the President to cut spending as he chooses in order to stay within the debt ceiling which reflected the President's military induction authority.

A revised version of the bill was passed with the President's support and the President's discretionary authority to cut in other areas can, however, go to $250 billion minus a ceiling of $2.38 billion increase in pay and allowances for military personnel, including aircraft hijacking and offenses relating to narcotic drugs; action regarding the Bryan-Chamorro Agreement of 1914 regarding a Nicaraguan vessel; and a convention on the enlargement of the Council of the sea, consisting of an International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, an International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, and amendments to the 1954 Oil Pollution Convention establishing more rigid control measures for oil tankers.

Also passed was Public Law 92-87, to include in the definition of "convention" any amendments to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act, and any treaty or statute under which a country may enter, into force for the United States; to define "person" and "vessel" to include those persons and vessels subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; to provide for any amendments to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act providing for a treaty or statute concerning the United States and Spain which lists 23 extraditable offenses, including aircraft hijacking and offenses relating to narcotic drugs; a convention regarding the unlawful seizure of commercial aircraft; a double taxation convention with Japan; the Locarno Agreement on International Disarmament Classification of Arms, and the Locarno Agreement on the enlargement of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

A supplemental bill, passed during the second session, Congress passed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps necessary to establish the price of gold at $20 an ounce. This legislation formally implemented the dollar devaluation agreed to by the United States and put into effect in December 1971, as part of a realignment of the values of many national currencies.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 92d Congress was Public Law 92-139, which contains provisions extending the President's military induction authority from July 1, 1971, to July 1, 1973; granting the President discretionary authority to order the call and additional volunteers to active duty; and providing for the Department of Defense to assume the obligation of the United States for the termination of all, or any part of, the North Vietnam agreement with the United States; to establish a "qualified" list of arms to be purchased by the United States; and requiring the President to report to Congress annually on the condition of all military bases in the United States.

A number of other laws were enacted during the first session of the 92d Congress that were of great significance to the national defense and foreign affairs of the United States. They included Public Law 92-123, which amended the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to exclude Bank receipts and expenditures from the budget and exempt them from budget outlay limitations; to increase the Bank's guarantee and insurance authority from $13.5 billion to $20 billion; to extend the Bank's life through June 30, 1974; to provide for credit transactions by applying only to exports destined to countries engaged in armed conflict with the U.S. Armed Forces, and to any other country if the President certifies that such transactions would be contrary to national interest; to increase its competitiveness versus principal foreign government-related lenders; and to reaffirm the exemption of export credit transactions from the foreign direct investment control programs.

Also passed was Public Law 92-87, to include in the definition of "convention" any amendments to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act, and any treaty or statute under which a country may enter, into force for the United States; to define "person" and "vessel" to include those persons and vessels subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; to provide for any amendments to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act providing for a treaty or statute concerning the United States and Spain which lists 23 extraditable offenses, including aircraft hijacking and offenses relating to narcotic drugs; a convention regarding the unlawful seizure of commercial aircraft; a double taxation convention with Japan; the Locarno Agreement on International Disarmament Classification of Arms, and the Locarno Agreement on the enlargement of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

A supplemental bill, passed during the second session, Congress passed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps necessary to establish the price of gold at $20 an ounce. This legislation formally implemented the dollar devaluation agreed to by the United States and put into effect in December 1971, as part of a realignment of the values of many national currencies.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

October 18, 1972

Section 7185

On March 3, 1972, the Senate voted acceptance of the Azores Base Agreement—Senate Resolution 214—which provides that new agreements between the United States and Portugal for military bases in Portuguese territory or for foreign assistance from the United States would be subject to Senate approval. The measure was reported from the Joint Committee on Internal Security and the Senate passed it upon the approval of both Houses of Congress for U.S. economic assistance to Portugal.
On August 10 the House passed by a 221 to 172 rollcall vote the Foreign Assistance Act of 1972—H.R. 16029, S. 3390. As passed, the bill contained amendments and an additional provision authorizing the President to cut aid to any country refusing to prosecute or extradite skyjackers and an amendment specifying that POW's released prior to any widening of American involvement in Indochina. Amendments were also adopted which struck language calling for the United States to withdraw from Indochina by October 1, 1972, and added an additional provision that restores the President's authority to regulate Rhodesian chrome imports. The measure was reported in the Senate on May 31 and when voted upon on July 24 it failed to obtain passage in a 42 to 49 rollcall vote. The measure was again reported in the Senate on September 19, adopted on the 28th and sent to conference.

STATE-USA APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION (H.R. 14734, PUBLIC LAW 92-352)

On June 30 Congress completed final action on the Department of State and U.S. Information Agency appropriation authorization—H.R. 14734—of which the House passed version of the bill passed the House on May 17 and cleared the Senate on May 31. Among its provisions are one creating a Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of International Affairs, which will conduct a study of the foreign operations activities of all U.S. Government agencies; one forbidding the distribution in the United States of USIA materials, except for study by students and scholars located in Washington, D.C., and for examination but not distribution by Members of Congress; one requiring the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to prepare a report to the House on the international transfer of conventional arms; one abolishing the Peace Corps National Advisory Council; one permitting persons appointed to positions in foreign affairs agencies to use their views and recommendations when requested to do so by a congressional committee; one requiring all persons designated ambassador or minister to be subject to Senate confirmation, excepting personal ranks given for special missions for the President and lasting 6 months or less; and one establishing the positions of Deputy Secretary of State and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

FISHMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT AMENDMENTS (H.R. 7117)

The House voted passage of the Fishermen's Protective Act Amendments—H.R. 7117—on August 2, 1971, but the Senate did not approve the legislation until May 25 of this year after it was adversely reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The measure would expedite the reimbursement of U.S. vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of their ships and crews which were illegally seized by a foreign nation.

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR SOVIET JEWS (H. CON. RES. 471)

On April 17 the House passed a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 471—expressing the sense of Congress that the President take immediate steps to urge the Soviet Union to safeguard the human rights of Soviet Jews, that the Soviet Union allow its citizens to emigrate, and to raise the matter of possible transgressions of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights by the Soviet Union before the U.N. General Assembly.

NAVY VESSEL LOAN AUTHORIZATION ACT (H.R. 9526, PUBLIC LAW 92-270)

On March 24 the Senate approved the Naval Vessel Loan Authorization Act—H.R. 9526—which the House had passed on December 6 of last year. As signed into law—Public Law 92-270—the legislation provides for the loan of certain defense vessels to Spain, Turkey, Greece, Korea, and Hawaii for a period of 10 years, extendable to 15 years, or for special missions for the President and lasting 6 months or less. The act requires that the Secretary of Defense keep Congress informed on all loans made under the legislation and further indicates that such loans shall not constitute a U.S. commitment to the defense of the countries receiving such loaned vessels.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION PARTICIPATION (S. 299, PUBLIC LAW 92-247)

On October 20, 1971, the Senate passed legislation—S. 299—providing for increased U.S. participation in the International Development Association. The House passed the bill—H.R. 8750—on February 1 of this year and it was, after conference, signed into law—Public Law 92-247—on March 10. Among other provisions the legislation grants the President authority to instruct U.S. officials with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association to vote against loans made to any country: First, nationalizing or expropriating or seizing property owned by U.S. citizens or business interests of any country; Second, repudiating or nullifying contracts or agreements of a U.S. citizen or business interest of which not less than 50 percent is officially owned by U.S. citizens; second, repudiating or nullifying contracts or agreements of a U.S. citizen or business interest of which not less than 50 per-
cent is beneficially owned by U.S. citizens, third, imposing or enforcing discriminatory taxes or other extractions against same. Provision is made for the President to determine if compensation, arbitration, or good faith negotiations have failed, thereby eliminating the need for such repriusal votes. The act also contains a similar directive regarding voting against a loan or fund utilization by nations failing to halt narcotic drug traffic, production, or processing.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION (H.R. 5014, S. 748, PUBLIC LAW 92-248) - Passed by the Senate on September 12, and by the House on November 15, 1971, this measure contained the same directives and authority as contained in legislation concerning the International Development Association with regard to loans or funding to nations neglecting or ignoring drug traffic, production, or traffic drug, production, or processing. The amendment to the IADB was signed into law—Public Law 92-248—on March 26.

The language of Public Laws 92-246 and 92-247 was also included in legislation authorizing contributions to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank. Passed by the House on February 1 of this year and by the Senate on October 20, 1971, and by the Senate on October 21 of the previous year, the bill also provided that U.S. special resources would be used to finance specific high priority development projects with an emphasis on those in the Southeast Asian region. That is, U.S. special resources would be expended only for the procurement of U.S. goods and services. The measure was signed into law—Public Law 92-246—on March 10.

POW/MIA INCENTIVE PROGRAM (H.R. 9900, PUBLIC LAW 92-279) - Passed by the House on February 29 and by the Senate on April 13, an amendment (H.R. 9900) to the Internal Revenue Code was signed into law—Public Law 92-279—on April 28. The amendment excluded prisoners of war and personnel missing in the Vietnam conflict from the requirements of the Income Tax Code.

SPECIAL PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS TO SERVICE ACADEMIES (S. 2845, PL 92-365) - On July 17 the House passed a measure—H.R. 15495—approved by last year, which permits the President to appoint to the service academies, in addition to those he is currently empowered to name, the sons of those who served in the armed forces during the Vietnam conflict. The measure was signed into law—Public Law 92-365—on August 7.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION (H.R. 15495, PL 92-498) - Passed by the House on June 27 and by the Senate on August 2, the military procurement authorization (H.R. 15495) contained certain amendments added within the Senate which required a con-ferene. These amendments, such as a provision for funds for weather modification, a policy declaration regarding persons volunteering for experimental projects receiving Federal research funds, and a fund cutoff provi­sion to avoid over financing of the Mekong, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, were dropped in the conference discussions and the conference version of the bill was agreed to by a 336-to-43 House vote on September 13 and was cleared by the Senate in a 73-to-5 vote 2 days later.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1971 (H.R. 12067, PL 92-242) - The Senate completed action on the fiscal 1972 Foreign Assistance Act (H.R. 12067) on February 4, 1972, the House having adopted the measure on December 8, 1971. By the time a conference had been held and agreement to the report was obtained, some 8 months of the fiscal year had elapsed. The legislation, as signed into law—Public Law 92-242—on March 8, appropriated over $3 million less, but also prohibited the use of these funds for non-citizens of Ecuador due to that country's harassment of U.S. fishing vessels, unless the President determined that such aid was important to U.S. national interests. A few days earlier, the Senate had rejected a provision that U.S. contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency should be reduced through nego­tiation with member nations to not more than 31.5 percent of the total contributions.

TREATIES ENACTED DURING THE 92D SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS

During the second session of the 92d Congress, the Senate ratified two treaties transmitted during the previous session. These included the prohibition of nuclear weapons on the seabed, approved on February 15, 1972, and the Inter-American Treaty of Diplomats, accepted on June 12, 1972. The International Plant Protection Convention, transmitted during the 84th Congress, was approved on June 12, as well.

After passing an agreement amending article VI of the International Atomic Energy Agency statute on March 17, the Senate in late May ratified three treaties on June 13. These included a convention on the taking of evidence abroad, a partial revision of international radio regulations, and an extradition treaty with Argentina. On the previous day, June 12, a treaty with Honduras regarding the Swan Islands was also approved.

Three treaties were given Senate con­ ference on August 11 when a convention providing for a single national program as substitutes for present AFDC programs; To provide for a single national program for assistance to the blind, the aged, and the disabled and to repeal existing programs in these areas; To establish a family assistance plan as one of the major components of the nation's welfare system. Among its many pro­ visions, as passed by the House, are ones: To provide widows and widowers a benefit equal to the amount their deceased spouses would have been entitled to; To increase the amount a person on social security can earn without loss in benefits from $1,680 to $2,000; To extend Medicare benefits to dis­ abled persons qualifying for social security or railroad retirement benefits after 2 years of disability, To increase premium increases in the sup­plementary medical insurance program to increases in social security or railroad retirement benefits and to other­wise preclude such increases; To phase in Medicare and social security benefits by raising to $10,200 the earnings on which such tax be levied;

To provide for a single national pro­gram for assistance to the blind, the aged, and the disabled and to repeal existing programs in these areas; To establish a family assistance plan as one of the major components of the nation's welfare system. Among its many pro­visions, as passed by the House, are ones: To provide widows and widowers a benefit equal to the amount their deceased spouses would have been entitled to; To increase the amount a person on social security can earn without loss in benefits from $1,680 to $2,000; To extend Medicare benefits to dis­ abled persons qualifying for social security or railroad retirement benefits after 2 years of disability, To increase premium increases in the sup­plementary medical insurance program to increases in social security or railroad retirement benefits and to other­wise preclude such increases; To phase in Medicare and social security benefits by raising to $10,200 the earnings on which such tax be levied;

To provide for a single national pro­gram for assistance to the blind, the aged, and the disabled and to repeal existing programs in these areas; To establish a family assistance plan as one of the major components of the nation's welfare system. Among its many pro­visions, as passed by the House, are ones: To provide widows and widowers a benefit equal to the amount their deceased spouses would have been entitled to; To increase the amount a person on social security can earn without loss in benefits from $1,680 to $2,000; To extend Medicare benefits to dis­ abled persons qualifying for social security or railroad retirement benefits after 2 years of disability, To increase premium increases in the sup­plementary medical insurance program to increases in social security or railroad retirement benefits and to other­wise preclude such increases; To phase in Medicare and social security benefits by raising to $10,200 the earnings on which such tax be levied;

To provide for a single national pro­gram for assistance to the blind, the aged, and the disabled and to repeal existing programs in these areas; To establish a family assistance plan as one of the major components of the nation's welfare system. Among its many pro­visions, as passed by the House, are ones: To provide widows and widowers a benefit equal to the amount their deceased spouses would have been entitled to; To increase the amount a person on social security can earn without loss in benefits from $1,680 to $2,000; To extend Medicare benefits to dis­ abled persons qualifying for social security or railroad retirement benefits after 2 years of disability, To increase premium increases in the sup­plementary medical insurance program to increases in social security or railroad retirement benefits and to other­wise preclude such increases; To phase in Medicare and social security benefits by raising to $10,200 the earnings on which such tax be levied;
years it has been found that this program tends to perpetuate certain persons on welfare, to encourage fathers to desert their families, to allow individuals not adequately to provide for them, and to keep families in a state of near poverty. It has long been suggested that something be done out of this poverty pit. It would encourage fathers to remain with their families rather than to abandon them out of frustration or fear. At the same time it would penalize those who wish to remain out of the poverty pit.

Under these programs family assistance benefits would be computed at a ratio of $400 for the first two members, $400 for the next two, and $200 for a final member with the maximum available to a family of $3,600 per annum. A family of four under these programs would receive $4,400 per year. Child-care tax deductions of $750 for one child, $1,125 for two, and $1,500 for three or more would be available to families with an adjusted gross income up to $12,000.

Senate debate on H.R. 1 commenced late in the second session and resulted in the defeat of the major welfare reform proposals, most of which were found in the House version of the bill. However, the Senate bill, as with the House version, does provide for the Federal takeover of the basic program for the indigent, elderly, blind, or disabled.

In both the Senate and House version of H.R. 1, widow's benefits are raised from 82 to 100 percent of a deceased husband's benefit. While the House raised the social security earnings limit to $2,000, the Senate provides an earnings limit without loss of benefits from $1,400.

The House and Senate passed bill makes 1.7 million social security disability insurance recipients eligible for Medicare. The Senate version reduces the waiting period for disability benefits from 6 months to 4, as compared with 5 months in the House version.

With minor financial modification, the Senate approved a House passed provision that a person who has worked for at least 30 years in employment entitled him to social security shall have a minimum benefit of $200.

In the meantime, the Senate approved a 2% billion welfare cost bonus to States over the next 2 years. In addition, the Senate amended H.R. 1:

First, to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study of the retirement test, and to report to the Congress by June 1, 1974, with recommendations as to the feasibility and economic wisdom of eliminating such a test;

Second, to provide that when there is a general increase in social security benefits there will be a corresponding increase in the standard of need under public assistance programs;

Third, to provide for elimination of duration-of-relationship requirement in certain cases involving survivor benefits;

Fourth, to provide for a 5% increase in social security benefits, effective July 1, 1972, if the period that Puerto Rico may implement the so-called freedom-of-choice provision under the medicare program;

Fifth, to provide increased spending limits for county and local governments to eliminate dually funded public assistance programs;

Sixth, to make women eligible to receive social security benefits at age 60, and in the case of a widow at age 55;

Seventh, to make maintenance drugs available under Medicare;

Eighth, to provide that chronic renal disease be considered to constitute disability under the medicare program;

Ninth, to incorporate in provision of the bill the work bonus programs for low-income workers;

Tenth, to limit liability to States for optional State supplementation;

Eleventh, to provide medicare benefits to miners who are receiving black lung benefits, but who are under age 65, or are not disabled,

Twelfth, to authorize $200 million for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 for the conduct of pilot tests of the so-called working plan;

Thirteenth, to include a 20-percent increase in the States for the administration of their welfare programs;

Fourteenth, to extend from December 31, 1972, until June 30, 1973, time for effectuating a new method of reimbursement under the medicare program for supervisory physicians in teaching hospitals;

Fifteenth, to provide, in paying of supplemental security income for the aged, blind, or disabled, that there be no reduction for rent when such individuals are paying their own rent;

Sixteenth, to allow a tax deduction for working mothers for ordinary and necessary expenses involving babysitter fees;

Seventeenth, to provide that the recent 20-percent increase in social security benefits cannot be taken from public housing tenants, nor can food stamp eligibility be affected by such increases;

Eighteenth, to provide for reinsurance provisions regarding certain State expenditures for social services;

Nineteenth, relating to determinations— for Medicare purposes— of whether income of Alaska and Hawaii;

Twentieth, to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study feasibility or relating social security benefits to cost-of-living differentials;

Twenty-first, to exempt from income to the aged, blind, or disabled certain stock held in trust by Alaska Natives;

Twenty-second, relating to long-term care and related nursing home problems;

Twenty-third, to find and require runaway fathers to help support their children;

Twenty-fourth, in re rental charges for a family occupying low rental housing;

Twenty-fifth, to allow a mother not on welfare to utilize provisions in the bill to require runaway fathers to help support their children;

Twenty-sixth, to assure that Cuban refugees and eligible to receive benefits under the bill;

Twenty-seventh, to provide that social security benefits on a child shall not be taken into account in determining what other food each child is receiving more than half the support from the taxpayer;

Twenty-eighth, making $800 million available for child service programs to State and local governments;

Twenty-ninth, to provide supplemental service income for the aged, blind, and disabled;

Thirtieth, relating to eligibility of recipients of assistance for aged, blind, and disabled;

Thirty-first, putting limitation on spend down requirement under medicare aid;

Thirty-second, to include occupational therapy under outpatient rehabilitation services;

Thirty-third, providing carryover of social service contracting of up to $15 million;

Thirty-fourth, to require subsequent action of the Congress prior to effectuating sections 508 and 509, relating to eligibility for food stamp benefits;

Thirty-fifth, to require study by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of question of availability of clinical psychiatric services for certain programs;

Thirty-sixth, adding a new section under section 402, "State Plans for Aid to Families with Dependent Children";

Thirty-seventh, relating to alternative Federal share of assistance costs; and

Thirty-eighth, to reaffirm existing law that courts can rule only on question of eligibility of the client.

In one of its final actions the Congress adopted a conference version of H.R. 1. The welfare reform measure of both Houses were dropped from the bill, because neither House was willing to accept the other's version. The many costly provisions of the Senate version were not included in the final version, and the bill as it was finally adopted is in no way similar to the House-passed version, but without the FAP and OEP provisions relating to the aid to families with dependent children's program.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE—H.R. 15390, PUBLIC LAW 92-336

Inflation is most cruel to those living on a fixed income, and particularly to those dependent on social security for their existence. In passing H.R. 1 the House had provided for a 5-percent increase in social security benefits effective July 1, 1972. The Senate failed to act on H.R. 1 prior to that date. In the meantime inflation had increased to the point that a 5-percent increase would have been of limited assistance to the many on social security. Accordingly, an amendment was attached to the temporary debt ceiling increase (H.R. 15390) providing for a 20-percent increase in social security benefits, effective in September 1973.
was not cowed, however. Subsequently, in a highly questionable action, the Social Security Administration enclosed with the first check containing the increase a notification that implied that the President was in agreement with the increase. This is unfortunate. The practice of such an encroachment on the prerogatives of the Administration of Lyndon Johnson, but he was always enthusiastic in his support of such increases. Under the circumstances attendant with the latest increase it would have been fair not to have enclosed such a notice with the first checks. Be that as it may, the increase was needed and, I am certain, welcome.

The amendment provides for an automatic increase in future social security benefits tied to the increase in cost of living. Whenever the cost of living goes up 3 percent or more per annum, benefits will increase by that amount the following January. The first such increase can be made in January 1975. To finance the 20-percent increase the taxable wage base was raised to $10,000 for 1974 and $12,000 for 1975. Under the Administration's proposal for the 1972 year the base will increase as required to pay for additional automatic increases in benefits.

Amendments to the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1965—Public Law 89-73—were made in H.R. 19335 and are designed to improve the program of economic opportunity for the elderly. The Administration believes that the current program is not responsive to the needs of the aged and that the Social Security Amendments Act of 1972 has made the aged much more dependent on social security benefits. The Administration's proposals include: (1) a temporary program of matching grants to states and local governments for 1-year programs for matching grants to states and local governments for 1-year programs to provide a 1-year program of matching grants for construction and staffing of centers for the mental health of the aged with an authorization of $20 million for fiscal 1973. In addition, existing funds to carry out the purposes of the legislation, H.R. 14424 also provided for the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Aging within the National Institutes of Health.

**RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT BENEFITS INCREASE—** PUBLIC LAW 92-336

Annuities for retired railroad workers have always paralleled the benefits provided under social security. In order to assure our retired railroad workers equitable treatment we provide in H.R. 19327, providing a temporary 20-percent increase in retired railroad workers' annuities. This increase is comparable to the increased social security benefits provided under the Social Security Benefit Increase Act (Public Law 92-336).

H.R. 19327 calls for passage in the near future of legislation to devise a sound method of financing railroad retirement in order to make permanent the temporary increases voted in this act.

The President vetoed this bill October 4, but the same day the Senate and House overwhelmingly overrode his veto thus making the act public law. The President's veto is one more example of his style of government who can least afford it should suffer most the consequences of inflation.

**ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972—** PUBLIC LAW 92-242

Congress passed H.R. 13350, to extend the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity through fiscal 1974, and to authorize $8.75 billion over a 2-year period in antipoverty funds. Congress had passed a similar bill in September 1972, in the first session. It was vetoed by the President, which objected to its child development provisions among others.

The act creates a new environmental action program, the Economic Opportunity Administration, to work on projects that would not otherwise have been carried out. This provision was included so as not to displace those persons already employed.

The Economic Opportunity Amendments Act authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish procedures to assure that no less than 10 percent of the enrollment opportunities in Headstart be available for handicapped children. In addition, guidelines were established, for the Secretary in setting Headstart fee schedules for children of families with annual incomes over $4,320.

This act prohibits the use of funds appropriated for the Teacher Corps or for any other purpose for activities designed to influence the outcome of any election, voter registration project or the salary of any employee engaged in political activities. The act also provides that contractors for programs in which Federal funds were awarded must prohibit discrimination because of race, creed, national origin, sex, and political affiliation or beliefs.

Finally, this legislation authorizes the head of any agency administering a program funded under the Economic Opportunity Act to conduct an independent evaluation of the program administered by that agency. It also specifies that this evaluation not preclude the Director of OEO from conducting reviews of such programs and reports to both the agencies administering such programs.

**BLACK LUNG BENEFITS ACT—** H.R. 9212—PUBLIC LAW 92-303

A much needed liberalization of eligibility standards for benefits to coal miners and their survivors was passed by the Congress and became Public Law 92-303 on May 19, 1972. Black lung disease, which results from the inhalation of fine coal dust particles, has been called the largest occupational killer in the world today.

Public Law 92-303 amends the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 by permitting disability benefits retroactively to orphans of deceased miners, and permits dependent parents, brothers, and sisters of a deceased miner to receive benefits if no widow or child survives.

The measure also extends the Federal Government's responsibility for the payment of disability benefits for the remainder of a beneficiary's life. This responsibility was extended from January 1, 1972, under the Black Lung Benefits Act of 1969, at which time the industry will now assume new claims for black lung benefits.

The Black Lung Benefits Act makes the disability benefit program permanent for the individual claimant, thus guaranteeing that all existing and future claimants and beneficiaries will be entitled to lifetime benefits. It prohibits denial of a claim solely on the basis of a negative chest X-ray, and provides that miners with 15 years service, who are disabled by a respiratory disease, are to be presumed disabled by black lung disease unless proven otherwise.

The definition of total disability was broadened under this act to include any respiratory impairment which prevented a miner from engaging in a usual mining occupation. The Black Lung Benefits Act became Public Law 89-159, providing temporary, 1-year program of matching grants for construction and staffing of centers for the mental health of the aged with an authorization of $20 million for fiscal 1973. In addition, existing funds to carry out the purposes of the legislation, H.R. 14424 also provided for the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Aging within the National Institutes of Health.

The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965—Public Law 89-73—were made in H.R. 19335 and are designed to improve the program of economic opportunity for the elderly. The Administration believes that the current program is not responsive to the needs of the aged and that the Social Security Amendments Act of 1972 has made the aged much more dependent on social security benefits. The Administration's proposals include: (1) a temporary program of matching grants to states and local governments for 1-year programs to provide a 1-year program of matching grants for construction and staffing of centers for the mental health of the aged with an authorization of $20 million for fiscal 1973. In addition, existing funds to carry out the purposes of the legislation, H.R. 14424 also provided for the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Aging within the National Institutes of Health.
Amtrak directly to operate and control all aspects of its rail passenger service, and to take such steps as may be necessary to increase its revenues from the carriage of mail and express, including the acquisition or modification of equipment for that purpose.

It provides for free or reduced-rate transportation for attendants for the blind on Amtrak trains; it requires all Federal departments and agencies, including the Armed Forces, to treat travel by train on the same basis as other authorized modes of travel for their employees.

It requires monthly reports to the Congress and to the public, treating revenue, expenses, patronage and on-time performance of Amtrak trains and operations; and it repeals that beginning in 1973, Amtrak must make its annual report on January 15 of each year, and that beginning in 1974 the Secretary of Transportation and the Interstate Commerce Commission must make their annual reports by March 15 of each year. In addition, the act makes Amtrak subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

The amendment goes on to alter existing provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation and the Interstate Commerce Commission to act within 90 days on application by Amtrak to fix reasonable terms and conditions for the use of railroads' tracks and other facilities.

The amendment authorizes GAO audits of any railroad with which Amtrak has a contract to perform intercity rail passenger service, limited to those audits which are necessary to facilitate an audit of Amtrak itself, and it requires the Secretary of Transportation to transmit to Congress by March 15, 1973, a report on the effectiveness of Amtrak in implementing that act, and extensive evaluations of Amtrak's services and internal operations.

ANNUAL REPORTS BY MOTOR CARRIERS

Congress enacted Public Law 92-338 which amended §302(b) to require motor carriers to file annual reports on the basis of a 13-period accounting year, pursuant to the Interstate Commerce Act.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION

Congress also enacted Public Law 92-348 which extends the act of September 30, 1965 (49 U.S.C. 1631), relating to high-speed ground transportation, by enlarging the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to undertake research, development, and demonstration projects on high-speed ground transportation systems and of door-to-door ground transportation systems in order to determine what contributions might be made to more efficient, safe, and economical intercity travel.

The legislation provides that in awarding contracts in connection with research, development, and demonstration projects, the Secretary must give priority to proposals which will increase employment in labor areas with a high unemployment rate.

It further authorizes appropriations of $97 million for fiscal year 1974, $126 million for fiscal year 1974, and $82.9 million for fiscal year 1975; and it removes the termination date of the 1965 act.

The legislation goes on to provide that if the Interstate Commerce Commission undertakes to guarantee any private or public financing of transportation projects under this act, the Comptroller General may audit the financial transactions of the common carrier by railroad that is involved in such projects, and report with recommendations to the Congress.

AUTOMOBILE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE AMENDMENT (H.R. 473, PUBLIC LAW 92-339)

The Congress acted on July 28 to amend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act (72 Stat. 325; 15 U.S.C. 1231) to make the provisions of the act applicable in the possessions of the United States.

CONTAINER BARGE SERVICE (H.R. 9128)

On September 26 the House passed an amendment to the Shipping Act of 1916 (46 U.S.C. 801-842) to confer exclusive jurisdiction on the Federal Maritime Commission over the movement of containers and containerized cargo by barge in foreign commerce. The amendment vests in the Federal Maritime Commission exclusive regulation over rates and conditions relating to the transportation of containers by barges to and from ports in the United States.

First, the container or containerized cargo is being moved between a point in a foreign country or a noncontinuous State, territory or possession, and a point in the United States;

Second, the transportation by barge between points in the United States is furnished by a terminal operator as a service substitute in lieu of a direct vessel call by a common carrier by water transporting the containers or containerized cargo;

Third, the container or containerized cargo is being transported on a through bill of lading between a point in a foreign country or a noncontinuous State, territory or possession, and a point in the United States;

Fourth, the transportation by barge between points in the United States is furnished by a terminal operator as a service substitute in lieu of a direct vessel call by a common carrier by water transporting the containers or containerized cargo;

Fifth, the terminal operator is a State, municipality, or other public body or agency, and

Sixth, the terminal operator is in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Federal Maritime Commission for the operation of the barge service.

NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT FUNDING (H.R. 13875, P.L. 92-)

Congress passed legislation amending the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1973 and 1974. The amount of funds authorized is $52,714,000. The amount includes funds for implementing motor vehicle and related equipment standards, funds for assuring compliance with these standards, and funds for research and administrative expenses.

HIGHWAY ACT OF 1972 (S. 3908, H.R. 16556)

Congress failed to reach final agreement on the Federal Highway Act of 1972. The bill authorized the appropriation of an additional $8 billion for completion of the Interstate System; it authorizes the use of apportionment factors contained in the 1972 Interstate Cost Estimate for the apportionment of interstate funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1974–75. It authorized the appropriation of funds out of the Highway Trust Fund for the Federal-aid urban system, $700 million; for the Federal-aid secondary system in rural areas, $400 million; for the extension of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas, $400 million; for economic growth center development highways, $150 million; for forest highways, $33 million; and for public lands highways, $16 million. The bill eliminated the present single appropriation for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions within urban areas and substitutes a general apportionment based on a count of the Federal-aid urban portions of these systems. The bill also provided authorizations of $49 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 in addition to all other authorizations for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems.

Summed for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for certain categories of roads administered by DOT jointly with either Interior or Agriculture were as follows: forest development roads and trails, $170 million per year; public lands development roads and trails, $10 million per year; park roads and trails $30 million per year; national forest roads and bridges, $100 million; parkways, $20 million.

Apart from monetary authorizations the 1972 act continued the policy, initiated in the 1970 Federal-aid act, of funding and promoting innovative means of solving the transportation problems which plague metropolitan areas: congested traffic, inadequate mass transit systems, and need for alternative modes of travel. While providing funding for
the building of highway systems around and into metropolitan areas, the act also authorized use of trust funds for bus lanes, traffic control devices, bus passenger loading areas, passenger shelters, parking facilities for bus passengers, bus transit lines, and development of bicycle lanes to encourage commuter bicycling.

ANTI-HIJACKING LEGISLATION (S. 2840, H.R. 1619)

S. 2280, amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to improve the curtailment of aircraft hijacking. It brings into force as of the date of S. law the security provisions of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, and it creates new sanctions through which the United States may combat hijacking. The new sanctions are of three types.

1. SUSPENSION OF AIR SERVICES

The President is permitted to suspend the right of any U.S. air carrier or foreign air carrier to operate to and from a foreign nation that is acting in a manner inconsistent with the Convention on Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft; and he is permitted to suspend the operations of any foreign air carrier between the United States and the foreign nation that continues to act inconsistently with the Convention or with a nation which is acting inconsistently with the Convention.

2. WITHHOLDING, REVOKING OR IMPOSING OF CONDITIONS

The Secretary of Transportation may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, withhold, revoke or impose conditions on operating authority of the carrier receiving the notice, if the Secretary finds that the operations fail to meet the security measures at or above the minimum standards under the Convention.

3. CIVIL PENALTIES

Civil penalties of up to $1,000 per day are applicable to violations of suspensions imposed by the President. The Attorney General is authorized to seek judicial enforcement of suspensions.

AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT ACT (S. 3755, H.R. 14647)

The Senate August 10, and the House August 18, passed S. 3755, establishing an 18-month moratorium on taxation of airline passenger tickets by State and local governments. The moratorium would give the Civil Aeronautics Board time to review the financial condition of the Nation's airports, to study and report on State and local governments finding it difficult to raise matching funds for construction of airports with an eye toward levying a tax on airline passenger tickets.

The new private loan guarantee program is authorized in H.R. 3344 (H. R. 92-66), the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to make direct home loans to veterans. This program will supplement the Section 204 loan guaranty program in the counties where commercial credit is tight.

The record of the second session reflects particularly this Congress' concern with the problems veterans of the Vietnam conflict have.

VIETNAM ERA VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 12828, S. 2811)

This important legislation passed the House on March 8, 1972, and the Senate on August 3, 1972. Although both Houses passed H.R. 12828, the version adopted by the Senate was the substance of S. 2181, reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the Senate, which was adopted by the Senate on August 8, 1972.

The existing educational assistance programs for veterans was the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-358). This program was designed to provide a part of the educational expenses incurred by veterans and their wives, widows, and children and was established for veterans of the Vietnam war and for those G.I.'s who had served in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. The purposes of H.R. 12828 (S. 2181) are to increase the assistance given to those whose careers have been interrupted by military service and to raise the benefits for the Vietnam era veteran to a level equal to the rate of benefits provided for World War II veterans.

Both versions provide for an increase in the basic monthly rate for educational assistance allowances. In the House version, the rate is increased from the existing $15 to $200-35 percent, while the Senate version increases the rate to $250-43 percent. Both versions provide for advance payment of educational assistance allowance to eligible veterans. Experience has shown that under the existing allowance, the delay in the receipt of the veteran's allowance has discouraged many veterans from entering school, or has caused the veteran to work in order to pay their bills.

As it emerged from conference, H.R. 12828 incorporates rate increases contained in the House-passed version and includes a provision regarding employment preference for veterans.

VETERANS' DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT (H.R. 720)

During the first session on July 19, 1971, the House passed H.R. 9265 by a rollover vote of 379 to 0. On September 7, 1972, the Senate considered and passed H.R. 9265 after substituting the language of S. 2108. These efforts reflect the growing concern over the unfortunate popularity of drug abuse by members of our military forces. The Veterans' Administration has not been unaware of this problem. In fiscal year 1971 five drug dependence treatment centers were established and by the end of fiscal year 1973 that number will have grown to 44.

Both S. 2108 and H.R. 9265 aim to provide the VA with the authority to treat all drug dependent ex-service men without regard to a finding of service connection or the nature of their discharge. A main difference between the two versions is that the House version does not cover alcohol disabilities. In addition the Senate version provides for alternate treatment modalities, community-based facilities, mandatory contract services in certain circumstances, comprehensive outreach efforts, medical confidentiality, annual reports to Congress, GAO audit and expanded VA hospital care, medical rehabilitation services and readjustment medical counseling for certain veterans.

Another difference is that the House bill provides for VA treatment of active duty military personnel whereas the Senate substitute requires a serviceman's written consent for a certain specified time period before he can be transferred to a VA drug treatment center while on active duty. Additionally the House bill specifically authorizes VA treatment, confinement and discipline of veterans for unauthorized services and readjustment medical counseling for certain veterans.

Attempts were underway late in the session to resolve these differences and to send the bill onto the President for his approval. They failed, however, and the bill died with adjournment.

SURVIVORS BENEFIT PLAN (H.R. 10670, S. 3905; S. 2108)

On September 21, 1973, the President signed into law an act establishing a new survivor benefits program for retired members of the Armed Forces. Final congressional action on the bill came when the Senate agreed to the House-passed amendments adopted by the Senate. On September 8, the Senate had passed H.R. 10670 after substituting the language of S. 3905.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide a survivor benefits program for military personnel equal to that of career civil service personnel. In the past military personnel were entitled to retirement benefits up to 50 percent of their retirement pay for their dependents under the reduced serviceman's family protection plan—RSFFP—established by Congress in 1954. This plan and compensating program had prevented all but 15 percent of existing retirees from enrolling. Under the new legislation, future retirees would be ineligible to join RSFFP; those enlisted may continue with it, or may drop RSFFP and join the new plan, or continue under the old plan and join the new one.

The new legislation would enable service personnel to provide benefits to their survivors of up to 55 percent of their re-
In addition the authority now exercised by the Department of the Army for furnishing headstones for unmarked graves would be transferred to the VA. The act also authorizes an allowance of $150 for the purchase of a burial plot in a private cemetery on behalf of any veteran not buried in a national cemetery. This legislation will also authorize the interment of an unknown soldier from the Vietnam war in the Arlington National Cemetery.

VA MEDICAL SCHOOL ASSISTANCE (H.R. RES. 748, PUBLIC LAW 92–)

We passed an assistance program for veterans attending medical schools. The Veterans Administration Medical School Assistance and Health Manpower Training Act of 1972 authorizes the Administrator of the VA to provide certain assistance for establishing new medical schools and for improving existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans Administration. He is also authorized to develop cooperative arrangements between institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other public or non-profit health service institutions, and the VA to develop and conduct educational and training programs for health care personnel.

House Joint Resolution 748 authorizes for each of 7 fiscal years, beginning in fiscal 1973, an appropriation of $78 million for four major programs established under the act, all stressing development of innovative health programs, greater career advancement opportunities, and development of new types of training procedures and types of health care personnel. These are: VA grants to State universities to assist in the establishment of up to eight new schools at VA hospitals; VA grants to medical schools affiliated with VA hospitals and other VA facilities for the purposes of assisting such schools to expand and improve their training capabilities; VA grants to other health professions, allied health or other health personnel training institution or area health education center, which maintains a teaching affiliation with the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery, for expansion and improvement of the capacity of these institutions; and expansion of the VA’s own existing facilities to provide for expanded education programs.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Administration request</th>
<th>Amount passed by House</th>
<th>Amount passed by Senate</th>
<th>Final amount approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 12067, fiscal 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps, Int'l Finance, Instlt., etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,342,635,000</td>
<td>3,003,461,000</td>
<td>3,076,535,000</td>
<td>3,189,437,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal 1972, supplemental; H.J. Res. 1097, urgent supplemental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Medical School Assistance</td>
<td>957,476,059</td>
<td>957,476,059</td>
<td>957,476,059</td>
<td>957,476,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 14582, 2d supplemental</td>
<td>4,775,261,477</td>
<td>3,886,145,358</td>
<td>5,063,517,439</td>
<td>6,347,698,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes at end of table.

Note: The above excerpt is a summary of legislation addressing VA medical care programs and veterans' assistance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Administration request</th>
<th>Amount passed by House</th>
<th>Amount passed by Senate</th>
<th>Final amount approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans' Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Science, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 92-344, July 27, 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount passed</td>
<td>$2,909,181,095</td>
<td>$2,951,914,095</td>
<td>$3,066,994,095</td>
<td>$3,267,937,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1507:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation and related agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 15418:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Interior:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1585:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1586:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works—AEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomic Energy Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 16754, Military construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 15502:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 16654: Labor-HEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1174: Dollar devaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 16705: Foreign Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other foreign assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes at end of table.
CHARLES RAPER JONAS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, Members of this Congress who have served their constituents and the country so diligently and with such a quiet dedication as my good friend from North Carolina, CHARLES RAPER JONAS. It was my privilege to work with him on the Committee on Appropriations and since becoming minority leader I have relied on countless occasions on his knowledge and knowledge of the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies.

Aside from his legislative skills, CHARLIE JONAS is one of the best loved Members of the House and I greatly value his friendship. He will be very much missed as he voluntarily retires after two decades of devoted service in the House.

My wife Betty and I wish for CHARLIE and Annie Elliott many years of health and happiness together.

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

Mr. Speaker, in all of the 32 years that we have served together in the House no Member has been more effective or more expert in his understanding of complex legislation than the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, who is retiring at the close of this Congress.

BILL SPRINGER has been an invaluable public servant and a loyal and wise counsel to me in his capacity as ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has earned the respect and confidence of Members of both sides of the political aisle and it will be extremely difficult to fill his shoes. There have been no more staunch supporters of President Nixon than the gentleman from Illinois, and I find it difficult to express my sense of loss that he will not be battling by my side in future sessions.

My wife Betty and I wish for BILL and his wife Elsie, many, many years of health and happiness in the future.

HON. ALEXANDER PINNIE

Mr. Speaker, before this Congress is finally gavelled into history, I want to say a few words of appreciation for the distinguished gentleman from New York, ALEXANDER PINNIE, who is retiring voluntarily after 14 years of splendid service to the Congress and a lifetime of dedication to his country.

AL PINNIE, although nearly 40 years of age, volunteered in World War II and won the rank of colonel and the Bronze Star and the Legion of Merit. His overseas experience in the European theater has served him well as an extremely able and conscientious member of the Committee on Armed Services. He has steadfastly supported a policy of adequate national defense during the administration of four Presidents.

He is much beloved and respected on both sides of the aisle and his contributions, as well as his friendly personality, will be greatly missed. My wife Betty and I wish for him and Mildred a full share of health and happiness in the future.

DURWARD G. HALL

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. Speaker, a great many people have been saying the House of Representatives will be a different place when the 93d Congress
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ченувает because two score of our Mem­
bers are leaving us voluntarily even be­
fore and in so doing, I think that the House will be a very different place if only because the distinguished gentle­
man from Missouri, Durward G. Hall, in reti­
ring. I do not know how many times I have
tried to talk to my good friend, Doc Hall, out of objecting or calling for a quorum, but I think I can remember the number of times. I have lost, a year ago when we have remained the best of friends and like everyone else in this Chamber, I hate to see him retire. There is no Member who has been more diligent in attend­ance, who has been more a true democrat, large or small—or in expert attention to the rules and traditions of this great body. The rules exist to protect the rights of all Members and Doc Hall has been dedicated to the demanding
physician, Doc Hall has a great talent for friendship. I
of times
that we will continue to see
man in personal relationships. We hope
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Mr. Speaker, in addition to his legen­
dary role as a legislator and his skill as a
physician, Doc Hall has a great talent for friendship. I will particularly miss him as a friend. I have never known a more considerate and amiable gentle­
man, and I salute him for this unique con­
tribution. He will be greatly missed.
My wife Betty and I wish Doc Hall and
Bettie many years of health and
happiness together.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re­marks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ALBERT, Mr. Speaker, we mark today the 92d Congress and if I may be excused the personal refer­ence, of my first term as Speaker of this body. There is no honor so singular as the one I have enjoyed, no privilege ever con­ferred upon me for which I am more deeply grateful. The responsibilities of the of­fice are great and sometimes bur­densome, but I have been sustained by the knowledge acquired over many years, that the problems we deal with are the stuff of American life and affect millions of human beings around the world. The details of what we do here will be fleet­ing in the minds of all in our own lifetimes, but the statute books of this great Repub­lic will record them for all time and the changes, the benefits which will flow from them will bring us closer to realizing the grand vision of equal opportunity, justice, and civil liberties, guar­anteed to us in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

At no time, and as I have said previously, the 92d has been a “do-something” Congress. It has been a Congress creative in its con­cepts, strong in its initiatives, and in­
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nosis to assume a subordinate position to
ing to assume a subordinate position to
the executive branch, nor yet fearful of combating the powerful and unique issues which have come be­fore it. We have not legislated behind a
curtain; many Members have cast their
votes on individual and unique issues;

and the rules and traditions of this great
body. The rules exist to protect the
rights of all Members and Doc Hall has
been dedicated to the demanding
physician, Doc Hall has a great talent
for friendship. I
of times
that we will continue to see
man in personal relationships. We hope
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Mr. Speaker, in addition to his legen­
dary role as a legislator and his skill as a
physician, Doc Hall has a great talent for friendship. I will particularly miss him as a friend. I have never known a more considerate and amiable gentle­man, and I salute him for this unique con­tribution. He will be greatly missed.
My wife Betty and I wish Doc Hall and
Bettie many years of health and
happiness together.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re­marks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ALBERT, Mr. Speaker, we mark today the 92d Congress and if I may be excused the personal refer­ence, of my first term as Speaker of this body. There is no honor so singular as the one I have enjoyed, no privilege ever con­ferred upon me for which I am more deeply grateful. The responsibilities of the of­fice are great and sometimes bur­densome, but I have been sustained by the knowledge acquired over many years, that the problems we deal with are the stuff of American life and affect millions of human beings around the world. The details of what we do here will be fleet­ing in the minds of all in our own lifetimes, but the statute books of this great Repub­lic will record them for all time and the changes, the benefits which will flow from them will bring us closer to realizing the grand vision of equal opportunity, justice, and civil liberties, guar­anteed to us in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

At no time, and as I have said previously, the 92d has been a “do-something” Congress. It has been a Congress creative in its con­cepts, strong in its initiatives, and in­sistent upon immediate and constructive

family serves as an example for all families in congressional life and on Capitol Hill. They have made great con­tributions as individuals, they have been cooperative with each other and with the people with whom they have worked on so many important efforts over many years.

The Nesbitt family, too, are much on our minds while we hopefully awaited word of Hale and Nick's rescue in Alaska. The Nesbits are a typical American family-a loving wife, Peggy, is the wonderful mother of six children. There has not been a moment since I received the dis­turbing news that the plane carrying Hale and Nick was overdue for meet­ing that I have not had their welfare in my thoughts and prayers. The need for these two men in public life in the service of their country is very great. I retain the feeling that they will be back with us next year to continue their fruitful

The leadership is deeply in the debt of Majority Whip Thomas J. O'Neill and his hard-working assistant deputy whips, John McFall and John Brademas, as well as all the assistant whips. Their organization, their personal energy and dedication, and the staff provided an essential ele­ment in our operation and in the results produced.

Toward the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, I feel a sense of appreciation for their great talents, their great devotion, cooperation and help which I have received on every hand and without which I simply could not have operated. The Members of my own Party have given me great support on many issues. I have enjoyed the aid of steadfast friends of years, and the support of many new Members who have made a credit to both by their abilities and their loyalty.

The Republican leadership, too, have shown me many courtesies. I deeply appreciate the assistance of the di­
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The leadership is deeply in the debt of Majority Whip Thomas J. O'Neill and his hard-working assistant deputy whips, John McFall and John Brademas, as well as all the assistant whips. Their organization, their personal energy and dedication, and the staff provided an essential ele­ment in our operation and in the results produced.

Toward the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, I feel a sense of appreciation for their great talents, their great devotion, cooperation and help which I have received on every hand and without which I simply could not have operated. The Members of my own Party have given me great support on many issues. I have enjoyed the aid of steadfast friends of years, and the support of many new Members who have made a credit to both by their abilities and their loyalty.

The Republican leadership, too, have shown me many courtesies. I deeply appreciate the assistance of the di­
Medical personnel—Two new laws provide nearly $4 billion to train more family doctors and nurses.

Conquest of Cancer Act—Sets aside $1.5 billion for medical research.

National Cooley's Anemia Control Act—A national effort to prevent and treat this blood disease which affects some 200,000 persons in the United States, half of them children.

Multiple sclerosis research—Creates a National Advisory Commission to help find the cause of MS and develop cures.

Community Mental Health Act—Helps States and localities control the spread of communicable diseases.

National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act

Rehabilitation Act—An extension of the 50-year-old Vocational Rehabilitation Act, adding major new proposals to aid the severely handicapped and other disabled persons.

New Programs Benefits Students From Preschool to College

Young people throughout the Nation will benefit from the important education measures passed by the 92d Congress.

Social Security increases passed in 1971.

Emphasis on health personnel.

Important measures:

20 percent of the entire media budget can be devoted or abridged by the United States or any state for television and radio to candidates at the lowest going rates.

The 92d Congress was to put people back to work at a time when the costs of living were rising-at a time when the costs of living were rising.

Anemia affecting 200,000 persons.

Limit to $50,000 in advertising to candidates at the lowest going rates.

The 26th and 27th amendment to the Constitution were passed by this Congress to guarantee the vote to 18- to 20-year-olds and to end discrimination based on sex.

Eighteen-year-old vote—This amendment, first proposed in World War II, extends the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older in all elections. It was quickly ratified by the States and signed in July 1971. Because of it, 11 million more voters are eligible to vote in the presidential election this year.

Equal rights for women—Throughout history, our laws, attitudes, regulations and customs have often discriminated against women. Numerous distinctions based on sex still exist in law.

Thirty-seven States have fair employment practices laws that prohibit discrimination in employment based on sex.

Twenty-six States prohibit women from working certain occupations.

Twenty-one States have already ratified the amendment; 38 are required.

Some communities still have dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers.

To end such discrimination, the equal rights amendment says:

Equal rights for women under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state for any reason whatsoever.

The 2 years of the 92d Congress saw the Nation enter the longest period of recession and unemployment since World War II. Ironically, it was a period in which prices climbed to record highs.


And all the while, the Federal budget continued to show record deficits.

Clearly, one of the top priorities of Congress was to put people back to work. We passed the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971, which authorized $2 billion to create an estimated 170,000 jobs in the public sector. Unfortunately, President Nixon vetoed this bill. Subsequently, we passed the Emergency Employment Act which authorized $2½ billion to provide transitional public sector and direct State employment assistance programs. We also ear-
marked $275 million for additional unemployment benefits and allowances.

In the area of the overall economy, Congress:

Extended the President's authority to instruct the Federal Reserve Board to regulate credit—at a time when interest rates had climbed to the highest point since the Great Depression.

The 92d Congress continued to face up to the long-term problems resulting from the use of consumer products. A new independent regulatory commission will be vested with the authority to:

1. collect and disseminate information on consumer products-related injuries.
2. establish mandatory safety standards and remove products from distribution when necessary.

The Automobile "Bumper Bill" directs the Secretary of Transportation to set minimum standards for bumpers to eliminate or substantially reduce damage to automobiles in low-speed collisions. The bill also outlawed tampering with odometers.

**PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY IN CONGRESS**

Clean air, water, land, and the conservation of our resources and wildlife has been a chief concern of the 92d Congress. This Congress has taken important action to protect the Nation's environment.

Water Quality Standards Act provides $2 billion to develop standards for the Nation's lakes and control water pollution. The goal of this, the most far-reaching water pollution bill ever passed, is to end all discharges of pollutants into navigable waters by 1983. This bill was passed on a presidential veto.

Federal Environment Pesticide Control Act gives the Federal Government increased powers over the testing, selling, and use of pesticides. It will guarantee better protection of man and our environment, while permitting farmers to use pesticides in production of food and fiber.

Wild horses and burros will be protected, cared for, and controlled on public lands by the Government.

Wildlife hunting from aircraft is prohibited, except for the hunting of certain wild birds, fish, and other animals from being hunted.

**CONGRESS AND RURAL AREAS**

Passed the first Federal act which provides for Federal standards for the control and abatement of noise pollution in rural areas, with special emphasis on noise at airports.

Too many rural Americans are denied the basic necessities of modern life. That's why many migrate to the large cities.

With passage of the Rural Development Act of 1972, Congress sought to improve the conditions of rural living, especially by increasing job opportunities on farms and in small towns.

The new law provides help for rural communities for housing, water quality management, pollution control and farm credit.

The 92d Congress takes new foreign policy, military actions.

**Among the several actions of the 92d Congress in foreign and military policy are:**

SALT agreements to limit strategic weapons: Congress approved a 5-year United States-Soviet accord limiting offensive nuclear weapons.

ABM treaty with Soviet Union: The Senate approved a treaty with the Soviet Union limiting the number of ballistic missiles.
Military draft: Congress amended the Selective Service Act to:
- Extend the draft to June 1973.
- Grant student deferments.
- Increase military pay in order to encourage voluntary enlistments.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE
By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:
- Mr. O'NEILL, for today, on account of attending a funeral.
- Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED
By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:
- Mr. Minshall, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.
- Mr. Rosenthal (at the request of Mr. Keating) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)
- Mr. McDade, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mr. Gerald B. Ford, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mr. Buchanan, today, for 5 minutes.
- Mr. O'NEILL, for today, on account of extraneous matter.
- Mr. Carey of New York, today, for 5 minutes.
- Mr. Griffiths, today, for 10 minutes.
- Mr. Bradas, today, for 5 minutes.
- Mr. Flood, today, for 30 minutes.
- Mr. Hungate, today, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:
- Mrs. Mink and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the Record and is emblazoned by the Public Printer to cost $2,167.50.
- Mr. Carey of New York in five instances and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.
- Mr. Madox to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article in the Extensions of Remarks of the Record.
- Mr. Frelinghuysen and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.
- Mr. Hungate, and to include extraneous matter on S. 2770.
- Mr. Dineen, and to include extraneous matter on the veto of the Water Pollution Act just previous to the vote.
(There following Members (at the request of Mr. Keating) and to include extraneous matter:)

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED
By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:
- Mr. Russell in two instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
- Mr. Myres in five instances.
- Mr. Bray in three instances.
- Mr. Hansen of Idaho in two instances.
- Mr. Scherle in 10 instances.
- Mr. Chamberlain in five instances.
- Mr. Brovill of Virginia in five instances.
establishment of new State medical schools and the improvement of existing medical schools affiliated with the Veterans’ Administration; to develop cooperative arrangements between institutions of higher education, medical schools, and other nonprofit health service institutions affiliated with the Veterans’ Administration to coordinate, improve, and expand the training of professional and allied personnel; to conduct and evaluate new health careers, interdisciplinary approaches and career advancement opportunities; to improve and expand allied and other health manpower utilization; to afford continuing education for health manpower of the Veterans’ Administration and other such manpower at Regional Medical Education Centers established at Veterans Administration hospitals throughout the United States; and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 1301. A joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of land and mortgages under the National Housing Act.

On October 18, 1972:

H. J. Res. 10638. An act for the relief of John P. Woodson, his heirs, successors in interest or assigns.

H. J. Res. 11091. An act to provide additional funds for the establishment of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the causes of and cures and treatments for multiple sclerosis.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. One hundred twelve Members are present, not a quorum.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Speaker, Mr. O’Neill, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. One hundred twelve Members are present, not a quorum.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for this week is very important.
COMMUNICATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to the order of the House, October 18, 1972, the Clerk received the following communication from the Secretary of the Senate:

That the Senate agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4678. An act to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

It also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11031. An act to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of United States Constitution, Section 726, the Chair declares the second session of the 92d Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 2:25 p.m.), Wednesday, October 18, 1972, the House adjourned sine die.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1934. An act to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property.

S. 1971. An act to declare a portion of the Delaware River in Philadelphia County, Pa., navigable for commerce.

S. 3823. An act authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to convey its bridge across the Mississippi River to the State of Iowa and to provide for the completion of a partially constructed bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, by the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

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 thereafter signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1. An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; H.R. 4678. An act to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara, and for other purposes; H.R. 10751. An act to establish the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, to provide for the preparation and carrying out of a development plan for certain areas between the White House and the Capitol, to further the purposes for which the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site was designated, and for other purposes; H.R. 11021. An act to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; H.R. 13396. An act to authorize an increase in land acquisition funds for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; H.R. 14628. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax laws applicable to Guam, and for other purposes; H.R. 15974. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out jellyfish control programs until the close of fiscal year 1977; H.R. 16810. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; H.J. Res. 912. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the States of North Carolina, and Virginia, establishing their lateral seaward boundary; and H.J. Res. 1331. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 18, 1972:

H.R. 2895. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the National Firefighthing Museum and Center for Fire Prevention, Incorporated;

H.R. 3817. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to authorize the establishment of a National Guard for the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 3860. An act to designate certain lands in the Lava Beds National Monument in California, as wilderness;

H.R. 6318. An act to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Burns Indian Colony, Ore., and for other purposes;


On October 19, 1972:

H.R. 14677. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to personal exemptions in the case of American Samoa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4678. An act to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Santa Barbara, and for other purposes; H.R. 13396. An act to authorize in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1960; and for other purposes; H.R. 18885. An act to extend the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribal fund;

H.J. Res. 1211. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission; and

H.J. Res. 1283. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 30, 1972, as "National Science Day.

On October 14, 1972:

H.R. 12653. An act to extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights to expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include discrimination because of sex, to authorize appropriations for the Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15833. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the refunding of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from urban renewal; to provide for the refunding of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from Federal-Aid system programs; and for other purposes;

H.R. 17084. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

On October 17, 1972:

H.R. 11948. An act to amend the joint reso-
cludes authorizing appropriations for par-

On October 18, 1972:
H.R. 15961. An act to authorize the Admin-
istrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey cer-
tain property in Canandaigua, New York, to the Sonnenberg Gardens, a nonprofit educational corporation.

H.R. 14731. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to provide for the protection of fish and wildlife therein prohibiting the shooting at birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft.

H.R. 16570. An act to amend the Sockeye Salmon or Pink Salmon Fishery Act of 1947 to authorize the restoration and extension of the sockeye salmon and pink salmon stocks of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes.

H.R. Res. 984. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the establishment of the National Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

H.R. 14370. An act to provide fiscal assistance to State and local governments, to au-
thorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10655. An act to designate certain lands in the Lassen Volcanic National Park, California, for other purposes.

On October 20, 1972:
H.R. Res. 894. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the establishment of the National Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

H.R. 14370. An act to provide fiscal assistance to State and local governments, to au-
thorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10655. An act to designate certain lands in the Lassen Volcanic National Park, California, for other purposes.

H.R. 11032. An act to authorize appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Interior for fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes;


H.R. 15461. An act to facilitate compliance with the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed November 23, 1970, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15475. An act to provide for the es-
tablishment of a national advisory commis-
sion to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treat-
ments for multiple sclerosis.

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

H.R. 15765. An act to authorize the transfer of a vessel by the Secretary of Commerce to the Board of Education of the city of New York for use as a school.

H.R. 15768. An act to amend chapter 25, title 44, United States Code, to provide for two additional members of the National Hi-
thorical Publications Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15765. An act to provide for the fund-
ing of the joint resolution of 1954 with respect to per-
sonal exemptions in the case of American Samoans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1467. An act to amend the Fishermen's Protectivc Act of 1967 to expedite the reim-
bursement of United States vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of ves-
sels and crews illegally seized by foreign powers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 15475. An act to provide for the es-
tablishment of a national advisory commis-
sion to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treat-
ments for multiple sclerosis.

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

H.R. 15765. An act to authorize the transfer of a vessel by the Secretary of Commerce to the Board of Education of the city of New York for use as a school.

H.R. 15768. An act to amend chapter 25, title 44, United States Code, to provide for two additional members of the National His-
thorical Publications Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15765. An act to provide for the fund-
ing of the joint resolution of 1954 with respect to per-
sonal exemptions in the case of American Samoans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1467. An act to amend the Fishermen's Protectivc Act of 1967 to expedite the reim-
bursement of United States vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of ves-
sels and crews illegally seized by foreign powers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 15475. An act to provide for the es-
tablishment of a national advisory commis-
sion to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treat-
ments for multiple sclerosis.

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

H.R. 15765. An act to authorize the transfer of a vessel by the Secretary of Commerce to the Board of Education of the city of New York for use as a school.

H.R. 15768. An act to amend chapter 25, title 44, United States Code, to provide for two additional members of the National His-
thorical Publications Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15765. An act to provide for the fund-
ingen of the joint resolution of 1954 with respect to per-
sonal exemptions in the case of American Samoans, and for other purposes.
H.R. 11091. An act to control the emission of noise from aircraft. California, for other purposes;
H.R. 12897. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 in order to establish the Federal policy concerning the selection of sites and to provide for the acquisition of rights to related services for the Federal Government;
H.R. 13186. An act to raise a bridge across a portion of the Oakland Bay Bridge, California, the "George P. Miller-Leland W. Sweeney Bridge";
H.R. 13896. An act to authorize an increase in land acquisition funds for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes;
H.R. 1504. An act to amend title 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave and other benefits under the provisions of title 37, United States Code, and to authorize an additional Deputy Secretary of Defense and for other purposes;
H.R. 16444. An act to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;
H.R. 16925. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to provide special pay for special pay for nuclear-qualified naval submarine officers, authorize special pay for nuclear-qualified naval surface officers, and provide special pay to certain nuclear-trained and qualified enlisted members of the naval service who agree to remain, and for other purposes;
H.R. 17038. An act designating the Oakley Reservoir on the Sangamon River at Decatur, Ill., as the William L. Springer Lake;
H.R. 17126. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the States of North Carolina and Virginia establishing their lateral seaward boundary.
On October 30, 1972:
H.R. 1. An act to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;
On October 31, 1972:
H.R. 14628. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to laws applicable to Guam, and for other purposes;
H.R. 16074. An act to authorize appropriations for research and carry out jellyfish control programs until the close of fiscal year 1977;
H.R. 17034. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADOPTION
The President announced his disapproval of the following bills with memoraum of disapproval as follows:
H.R. 56
I am withholding my approval from H.R. 56.
My objections to this bill are centered upon two of its titles which would establish a National Environmental Data System, and establish environmental centers in each State. While both of these titles sound desirable in theory, they would in reality lead to the duplication of information, or produce results unneeded and counterproductive, and would result in wasteful of talent, resources, and the taxpayers' money.
A third portion of H.R. 56 would direct the Federal Government to purchase the Klamath Indian Forest lands in Oregon. After studying this proposal carefully, I believe that it would be sound public policy, and if the next Congress provides the necessary funds, I shall happily approve the acquisition of these unique lands.
In the form now before me, Title I of this legislation calls for the establishment of an independent, centralized environmental data system for the acquisition, storage, and dissemination of information relating to the environment. Data for the system would come from governmental, international, and private sources. A Director, who would be under the guidance of the Council on Environmental Quality, would determine what data would actually be placed in the system and who would have access to the data.
I believe there are serious drawbacks to such a data system which would outweigh potential benefits. The collection of data and statistics on the supposition that something can be done is in itself a highly dubious exercise. Data, taken out of the context of the questions they were specifically designed to answer, can even contribute to confusion or be misleading.
With this in mind, I believe the centralized collection of environmental data should be related to specific policies and programs. H.R. 56 fails to provide such a relationship and the presumption that this basic deficiency can be overcome, and a useful centralized system designed, is now under study by the administration. In the meantime, the Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies have consistently worked to strengthen the acquisition and exchange of such data and this effort will continue.
Title II of this legislation authorizes the establishment of environmental centers in every State to conduct research in pollution, natural resource management, and other local, regional or national problems. The centers would also train environmental professionals and carry out a comprehensive education program.
Research is a vital part of our effort to compete in the world of energy problems we face. This administration is currently spending literally hundreds of millions of dollars through directed research efforts sponsored by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of the Interior, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to name but a few. We will continue these programs and institute others where they are needed.
Academic talent and resources have a vital role to play in the success of our environmental research programs. As members of the academic community know, grants for research are awarded on the basis of not only the merits of the project, but also the capabilities of the institution to carry out its responsibilities. By creating research centers on a rigid State-by-State basis, and requiring them to be funded, the Congress is asking us to throw away our priorities and to fund programs regardless of their merits and in spite of the limited capabilities of some institutions. Equally important, this approach also ignores the independence and available capacity of already existing institutions and laboratories to carry out this vital research.
Further, I share the view of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that many environmental problems are essentially national in scope, and that most problems, even though they may appear to be local in nature, really affect many other States and localities. While there may be local problems, our present project-by-project approach in research can be used to marshal the best scientific talents, wherever they are located, to deal with such problems. Thus, there may be no justification for establishing up to 51 new environmental centers specifically charged with investigation of State and local environmental problems.
Titles III and IV of the bill direct the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase a tract of 113,000 acres in the Klamath Indian Forest in Oregon. I believe that acceptance of the bill would nullify the Senate's proposals to mark a significant and worthwhile addition to our National Forest System while, at the same time, assuring full environmental protection to this scenic part of Oregon.

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL
I have promised the American people that I will do everything in my power to avoid the need for a tax increase next year. Today, I take another important step in the fulfillment of that sincere pledge.
This effort really began last January, when I submitted the Federal budget for fiscal year 1973 to Congress. As explained at the time, that budget was carefully prepared so that all justified Federal programs could be provided without any need for higher taxes and without causing higher prices.
When it became clear that the Congress was exceeding the budget in many bills, I proposed that a spending ceiling of $250 billion be adopted as insurance against a 1973 tax increase.
The Congress rejected that spending ceiling. Instead, it approved spending far in excess of my no-new-taxes budget. Since then, the administration has presented many very difficult decisions about whether to sign or to veto. A number of them have attractive features, or would serve very worthwhile purposes—and of course I have received strong advice that to veto them would be politically very damaging.
Every entry in this memorandum are nine measures which I cannot sign without breaking my promise to the American people that I will do all in my power to avoid the necessity of a tax increase next year.
I made that promise in good faith, and I believe in keeping the promises I make—and in making only those promises that I am confident I can keep.
If I were to sign these measures into law, I would, in effect, be making promises that could not be kept—since the funds required to finance the promised programs would not be available without the higher taxes I have promised to resist.
I believe that political leaders must lay the facts on the line, to talk straight
to the people and to deliver on the promises they make to the people.

Although the choices are not easy, I am withholding my approval from 9 Congressional spending programs that would breach the budget by $750 million in fiscal year 1973 and by nearly $3 billion in fiscal year 1974.

Each of these measures by itself might seem justifiable, or even highly desirable. But the hard fact is that they cannot be considered by themselves; each has to be judged in the broader context of the total budget—in terms of how that total weighs on the taxpayers, and how it affects the struggle to curb rising prices.

I am withholding my approval from the following bills:

**LABOR-HEW AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT (H.R. 16664)**

This is the second time I have vetoed inflated appropriations this year for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This amounts to a textbook example of the seeming inability or unwillingness of the Congress to follow a prudent and responsible spending policy. In recommending that the Congress provide an increase of $2.1 billion over fiscal 1972 funds for the HEW programs contained in this bill, I have assumed that general increase—which would have provided substantial expansion while recognizing competing priorities in other program areas—the Congress amassed a budget-breaking additional increase of $1.8 billion. I vetoed this in August because it was clearly excessive and unwarranted.

The bill now before me contains the same face amount as the measure I previously vetoed. In a partial concession to that veto, however, H.R. 16664 contains authority for the overspending to be held to $635 million—a result that would still amount to pressure for higher taxes.

This administration is second to none in its demonstrated concern and clear accomplishments in health, education and welfare. But the fiscal 1973 budget represented a balanced and rational approach to the funding of many high priority domestic programs in a time of tight budget resources, while continuing this administration's shift of priorities and funds toward the human resources activities of the Government.

H.R. 16664 is as unwarranted as the version I vetoed last August.

**PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973 (H.R. 16071)**

This bill would unnecessarily add vast new authorizations for Federal programs which have been shown to be ineffective in creating jobs and promoting timely economic development. Public works projects have notoriously long lead-times—so by the time this spending became fully effective, the need for such stimulation would be passed and the stimulative effect would be inflationary.

The bill would strengthen and increase bureaucracy in the regional commissions by using them as a funding rather than a planning and coordinating level of government.

It would also provide assistance to workers and firms affected by Federal environmental actions. These provisions would be highly inequitable and almost impossible to administer. The unemployment insurance system would fragment and undermine our basic Federal-State unemployment insurance system and its costs would be essentially uncontrollable.

This Administration believes that the use control facilities loan program has only vague and unspecified objectives.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE MINING AND MINERAL POLICY ACT (S. 659)**

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide matching categorical grants to establish and support a mineral research and training institute in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico, as well as grants for related research and demonstration projects. It would fragment our research effort and destroy its priorities. Such an inflexible program would preclude us from taking advantage of the best research talents of the Nation—wherever they may be. The Federal Government's ongoing programs of similar and related kinds of research, currently funded at about $4 million annually, are working sound and efficient means of meeting minerals program of the highest national priority and can readily be adapted to continue to do so.

**AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT ACCELERATION ACT (S. 3755)**

This bill would increase Federal expenditures and raise percentage participation in categorical grant programs with specific limited purposes. I believe this would be inconsistent with sound fiscal policy. Airport development funds have been almost quadrupled since 1970 under this administration.

**FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1972 (S. 4012)**

This measure would authorize Federal projects which would ultimately cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It contains projects never approved or recommended by the executive branch. In addition, it contains objectionable features such as authorizing ill-defined and potentially costly new programs, and limiting my authority to establish criteria and standards to measure the success of Federal projects in determining which ones to recommend for congressional authorization.

However, a number of projects in this bill are in my judgment justified and I will recommend legislation to authorize their construction early in the next Congress.

**UPGRADING OF DEPUTY U.S. MARSHAL ACT**

This would raise the pay of some 1,500 deputy marshals by as much as 38 percent, through wholesale across-the-board upgrading. There is no justification for this highly prescriptive treatment, which discriminates against all other Government employees who perform work of comparable difficulty and responsibility and whose pay is now the same as that of the deputy marshals.

**NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 12674)**

This bill would block the orderly system of surplus land disposal established by general law and Executive order, by requiring an unusual Congressional approval procedure before any VA land holdings larger than 100 acres could be sold.

The use of these property transfer restrictions would undermine the executive branch's Government-wide system of property management and surplus property disposal which is designed to assure the best and fullest use of Federal property. It would impede the Legacy of Parks program and the procedures for disposing of surplus Federal property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

Also, the bill deals consistently with the serious problem of burial benefits for the Nation's veterans and war dead. It constitutes a study of this problem at the same time it prevents the results of such a study by authorizing new burial benefits which would annually add $55 million to the Federal budget beginning next year. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs already is at work on such a study, which will identify the alternatives for improving burial and cemetery benefits. In the interim, it is both fiscally unwise and unwarranted to increase total Federal resources as proposed by this bill.

**VETERANS' HEALTH CARE EXPANSION ACT OF 1973**

The liberalizing features of this bill would unnecessarily add hundreds of millions of dollars to the Federal budget. It would open the VA hospital system to nonveterans and would expand the type of direct medical services not available from VA. By providing direct medical services to veterans' dependents, the bill runs counter to this Administration's national health strategy which would provide national financing mechanisms for health care and sharply reduce the Federal Government's role in the direct provision of services.

The bill also appears to set mandatory minimums on the number of patients treated in VA hospitals. In testimony on this bill, the Veterans' Administration strongly objected to this provision on the grounds that it was totally unnecessary and could result in inefficient medical treatment and wasteful administrative practices. The tragic result would be a lower quality of medical care to all patients.

While I strongly support the VA health care system and will continue to encourage its improvement in the future, I cannot approve a bad bill.

**REHABILITATION ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 8395)**

This measure would seriously jeopardize the goals of the vocational rehabilitation program and is another example of Congressional fiscal irresponsibility. Its provisions would duplicate the rehabilitation program from its basic vocational objectives into activities that have no vocational element whatsoever or are essentially medical in character. In addition, it would proliferate a host of narrow categorical programs which duplicate and overlap existing authorities and programs. Such provisions serve only to dilute the resources of the vocational rehabilitation program and impair its continued valuable achievements in restoring deserving American citizens to meaningful employment.

H.R. 8395 also would create organiz-
national rigidities in the vocational rehabilitation program which would undermine the ability of the Secretary of HEW to manage the program effectively. The bill also would establish numerous committees and independent commissions which are unnecessary, would waste the taxpayers' dollars, and would complicate and confuse the direction of this program. Finally, the bill would authorize funding far in excess of the budget request and far beyond what can be made available and used effectively.

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

H.R. 1

I have announced today the signing of H.R. 1—a bill which represents a tremendous forward step in improving the income position and health services for older Americans. Two other bills concerning the elderly have also come to me for signature—the Older Americans Comprehensive Service Amendments of 1972 (H.R. 15657) and the Research on Aging Act of 1972 (H.R. 14424). Although I support some of the goals of these two bills, careful review has persuaded me that neither bill provides the best means of achieving these goals. Both authorize unbudgeted and excessive expenditures which would also require painful reductions or fragmentations of effort which would actually impair our efforts to serve older Americans more effectively. I have decided therefore to withhold my approval from these two pieces of legislation.

OLDER AMERICANS COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (H.R. 15657)

Last March, I submitted to the Congress a plan for strengthening and expanding service delivery programs under the Older Americans Act. This program would begin the development of more comprehensive and better coordinated systems for delivering services at the local level. I submitted also my proposal to broaden the highly successful Foster Grandparents Program. The Administration will continue its vigorous pursuit of these objectives.

However, the Congress added to the bill containing these provisions a range of narrow, categorical service programs which would seriously interfere with our effort to develop coordinated services for older persons. This is particularly the case with two categorical manpower programs which were added on the floor of the Senate and were considered without regard to manpower programs already serving older persons. Furthermore, this bill would authorize new funding of more than $2 billion between now and fiscal year 1975—far beyond what can be made available and used effectively and responsibly. I cannot responsibly approve H.R. 15657.

RESEARCH ON AGING ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 14424)

In my special message to the Congress on older Americans last March, I emphasized the need to develop a comprehensive, coordinated program of aging research—one which includes disciplines ranging from biomedical research to transportation systems analysis, from psychology and sociology to management science and economics. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has since appointed a new Technical Advisory Committee for Aging Research to develop a plan for bringing together all the resources available to the Federal Government in the aging research field.

H.R. 14424, however, would set up an entirely separate aging research institute that would duplicate these activities. This bill would create additional administrative costs without enhancing the conduct of biomedical research for the aging. In fact, it could even fragment existing research efforts. This bill also contains a new grant program for mental health facilities for the aging which duplicates the more general and flexible authorities contained in the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

In sum, I feel that both research and mental health programs for the aging should be a part of the broader context of research on life-span processes and comprehensive mental health treatment programs now underway.

H.R. 14424 would not enhance and could inhibit Federal efforts to respond to the needs of the elderly, and I cannot give it my approval.

THE WHITE HOUSE

RICHARD NIXON

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2432. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his determination that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank of the United States to guarantee, insure, extend credit and participate in the extension of credit, in connection with the purchase or lease of any goods or equipment, for the sale or lease to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pursuant to section 2(b) (3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2433. A letter from the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, without alteration or comment, the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and related activities, and to appoint joint committees to accomplish this interchange, to the Committee on Agriculture.

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. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany S. 1819 (Rept. No. 92-1616). Ordered to be printed.

MR. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. A report on the competitive impact of oil company ownership of petroleum products pipelines (Rept. No. 92-1618). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3999 (Rept. No. 92-1619). Ordered to be printed.

MR. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. The role of U.S. Small Business in Export Trade (Report No. 92-1619). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 17222. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of certain pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculptures or murals exported contrary to the laws of the countries of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 17223. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to provide for Federal regulation of the travel agency industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 17224. A bill to amend the tax and customs laws in order to improve the U.S. position in foreign trade, to improve adjustment of payment assistance benefits, and to provide clear labeling of foreign products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 17225. A bill to provide for improved labor-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCLOSEKY:

H.R. 17226. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOCNASID:

H.R. 17227. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide benefits to survivors of public safety officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 17228. A bill to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDERSON:


By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.B. 17230. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to report on title certain lands in Madera County, Calif., to Mrs. Lucille Jones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REGISTRATIONS

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1972:

NOTE ON ITEM "A":—(a) In General. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employer" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee").

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B":—Reports by Agents or Employees. An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C":—(c) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House... § 503(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended any value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution; (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]
The following quarterly reports were submitted for the calendar quarter 1972:

(continued as above, and is indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

---

NOTE ON ITEM "A":-(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(1) "Employer"—To file as an "employer", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employer" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employer".)

(2) "Employee"—To file as an "employee", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

---

NOTE ON ITEM "B":—Reports by Agents or Employers. An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that:

(a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified;

(b) If the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

---

NOTE ON ITEM "C":—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." The term "legislation" means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House. —§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

３. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C4" and fill out Item 'D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report —-

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dues and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gifts of money or anything of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total for this Quarter (Add items &quot;1&quot; through &quot;5&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Received during previous Quarters of calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add &quot;6&quot; and &quot;7&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;Expense money&quot; and Reimbursements received this Quarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE ON ITEM "E"—(a) In General.** The term ‘contribution’ includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.”—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **If This Report Is For an Employer.**—(1) In General. Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(2) **Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.**—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(3) **Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.**—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **If This Report Is For an Agent or Employee.**—(1) In General. In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 8" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(2) **Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.**—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

**D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):**

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts (other than loans)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $--------Dues and assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add items &quot;1&quot; through &quot;5&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. $--------Total from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add &quot;6&quot; and &quot;7&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. $--------&quot;Expense money&quot; and Reimbursements received this Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L o a n s R e c e i v e d:**

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loans Received</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. $--------Total now owed to others on account of loans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. $--------&quot;Expense money&quot; and Reimbursements received this Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE ON ITEM "E"—(a) In General.** "The term ‘expenditure’ includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **If This Report Is For an Agent or Employee.**—(1) In General. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 8") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

**E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:**

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures (other than loans)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $--------Public relations and advertising services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than Item &quot;1&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $--------Telephone and telegraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. $--------All other expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add &quot;1&quot; through &quot;8&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. $--------Total from January 1 through this Quarter (Add &quot;9&quot; and &quot;10&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Loans Made to Others:**

"The term ‘expenditure’ includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loans Made to Others</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. $--------Total now owed to person filing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. $--------Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I n General.** In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Name and Address of Recipient</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
<td>Roe Corporation, 2611 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>Public relations service at $800.00 per month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 851 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) $1,000.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.

E. (9) $300.


D. (6) $800. E. (9) $301.

A. Donald L. Badders, 910 South Michigan, Room 320, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

B. Standard Oil Co., 10 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

D. (6) $270.16. E. (9) $380.46.


E. (9) $94.49.


B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Geo. F. Bailey, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala. 36104.


D. (9) $6,425. E. (9) $1,061.42.


E. (9) $91.94. E. (9) $110.


E. (9) $100.


D. (6) $1,925. E. (9) $148.


D. (6) $165.50.


D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $4,855.77.


B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (8) $5,600.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Oreg. 97230.

B. Association of Oregon & California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Courthouse, Roseburg, Oreg. 97470.

D. (8) $1,200. E. (9) $47.55.

A. Weldon Barton, B. The Farmers’ Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2261, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $4,692.48. E. (9) $66.34.


B. Record Industry Association of America, 1018 Fifth Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (8) $54.20.


A. Batzell & Nunn, 1323 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.


A. A. David Baumbart, Post Office Box 583, Lorain, Ohio 44052.

B. Green Olive Trade Association, 62 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.


A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (8) $1,488.23.


D. (6) $1,504.48.


D. (6) $3,013.60.


D. (6) $150.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.


A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11232.


A. Caroline Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 706 Raleigh Building, Post Office Box 2776, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.


D. (9) $150. E. (9) $2.50.


D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $188.85.


D. (6) $800. E. (9) $2.50.


D. (6) $800. E. (9) $2.50.


D. (8) $150. E. (9) $2.50.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.


D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $188.85.


D. (6) $2,500.

B. Blue Allan Carstenson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.


D. (8) $500. E. (9) $2.50.


B. Liggett & Myers Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020.
E. (9) $65.
B. Lorillard, Division of Loews Theatres, 750 9th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Dental Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,355. E. (9) $1,078.64.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 162 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $475.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.
E. (9) $800.
D. (6) $500.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $325.
A. Paul G. Collins, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I. 02903.
B. Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I. 02903.
D. (6) $687.75.
A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo., 80202.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo., 80202.
A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Finance, care of Langdon P. Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.
D. (6) $8,460. E. (9) $1,099.64.
D. (6) $823,864.86. E. (9) $140,519.85.
B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $1,074.50.
B. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, 1265 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $1,550. E. (9) $250.
A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $6,649.76. E. (9) $4,666.66.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
A. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $2,600.
D. (6) $2,812.50.
A. Cook & Franke S. C., 600 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
B. Marshall & Iesky Bank, 710 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $10.95.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $932.66.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.
A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Portsmouth-Kittredge Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1133, Portsmouth, N.H. 03802.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $755.41.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1025 West Hastings Street, Vancouver I, Canada.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $259.16.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $153.50.
A. Cooperative League of the USA, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20058.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $825.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $926.
A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1611 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Finance, c/o Langdon Cook, President, 28 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.
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A. J. D. Durand, 1726 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $935.

D. (8) $1,075.

D. (8) $1,250. E. (9) $941.11.


D. (9) $89. E. (9) $25.67.

D. (8) $2,150. E. (9) $1,319.70.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (8) $437.50.

B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 955 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (8) $1,400.

A. Macom T. Edwards, Ring Building, Room 610, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12325, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $607.50. E. (9) $103.03.

B. Rakson Purina Co., Food, Agriculture, Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63118.
D. (8) $400. E. (9) $108.


A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hystatville, Md. 20764.
E. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,575. E. (9) $25.75.

B. Carbility, Inc., 1200 Carbility Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (8) $2,600. E. (9) $39.90.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,624. E. (9) $137.72.

B. The Farmers’ Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2851, Denver, Colo.
D. (8) $45.085. E. (9) $20,734.01.

A. The Farmers’ Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2851, Denver, Colo.
D. (8) $4,500.

A. A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hystatville, Md. 20764.
C. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500 Guiness Tower, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, B.C.
D. (9) $55,350. E. (9) $1,150.

B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 45th Floor, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Canada.

A. Francis S. Flibey, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $35.

A. Thomas Fink, Room S10, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

B. Crowell Zellerbach Corp., One Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $6,725.83. E. (9) $138.68.

B. American Medical Association, 835 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (8) $2,062.50. E. (9) $874.13.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
B. Minnesota Railroads Association.
D. (8) $500.

B. American Medical Association, 835 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (8) $2,343.75. E. (9) $294.71.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (8) $583.83. E. (9) $61.15.

A. David H. Foster.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 916 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (8) $2,500. E. (9) $237.50.

A. William C. Foster, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., Post Office Box 576, Bellevue, Wash. 98009.
D. (8) $750. E. (9) $284.30.

A. William C. Foster, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rainier Puina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63128.
D. (8) $300. E. (9) $63.


A. Fred, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y. 14779.
D. (6) $1,800.
A. Fred, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Ice Sleet & Wapticon Sioux Tribe, Sisseton, S. Dak.
E. (9) $11.30.
A. Philip F. Friedlander, Jr., 1843 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.
A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street SE., Washington, D.C.
A. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $250.
D. (6) $100.
D. (6) $250.
D. (6) $250.
D. (6) $250.
A. Gadsky & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
A. Gadsky & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Professional Services, 1100 G Street NW., Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $13.01.
A. Gadsky & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $21.05.
D. (6) $1,215.
A. Nicole Gara, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $5,584.37.
E. (9) $610.65.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $150.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,900.
A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $870.
E. (9) $406.50.
A. George W. Gephart, Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.
D. (6) $1,350.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,294.69. E. (9) $59.91.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $131.44.
A. Arthur P. Gilde, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati Ohio 45219.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.
E. (9) $288.72.
A. Joseph B. Gill, 18 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 18 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
C. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $184.50.

A. Lawrence E. Kreider, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $750.

D. (6) $2,049.90. E. (9) $33.38.

A. William J. Kuhfuss, 225 Toughy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Toughy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) $975.

A. Lloyd D. Kuhn, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $9,324.60. E. (9) $1,215.64.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20055.
D. (6) $4,984.60. E. (9) $4,826.

E. (9) $13,035.37.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $200.

A. James J. LaPenta, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $386.37.

B. National Right To Work Committee, 1901 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert B. Laurens, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va. 22150.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 950 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $1,900.

D. (6) $784.76. E. (9) $794.97.

D. (6) $440. E. (9) $125.


A. Lee, McCarthy & DeRosa, 102 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10005.
E. (9) $550.


D. (6) $40.

A. Nils A. Lennartsson, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $12,374.98.

B. Shell Chemical Co., 2401 Crow-Canyon Road, San Ramon, Calif.

A. Metropolitan Chamber, National Association of Social Workers, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Midland Enterprise, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. S. R. Levering, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,385.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Harry LeVine, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Stanley Lewis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,912.

B. National Small Business Association, 1125 19th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,859.53. E. (9) $6,889.53.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Lindsay, Naholt, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Ore. 97201.
B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lindsay, Naholt, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Ore. 97201.
B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Ore. 97201.

A. John E. Linster, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wasau, Wis. 54401.
B. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
D. (6) $500.

B. The American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1265, Denver, Colo. 80201.
D. (E) $1,500.
B. National Committees for Civil Airlift.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
A. James M. Morris, 1609 L Street NW, Room 804, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (E) $2,500. E. (F) $1,290.88.
D. (E) $2,500. E. (F) Under $100.
D. (E) $6,350. E. (F) $191.88.
A. John J. Motley.
D. (E) $5,000. E. (F) $350.
A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 404 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (E) $777. E. (F) $1,272.02.
E. (F) $183.31.
B. National Customs Service Association.
A. Richard W. Murphy, 1200 18th Street NW, Suite 1105, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (E) $400. E. (F) $64.
D. (E) $185.
D. (E) $2,887.30. E. (F) $44.25.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (E) $2,000. E. (F) $886.
A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, New­ ark, N.J. 07102.
D. (E) $41.25.
B. Aviation Insurance Assn., 1870 West State Street, Menasha, Wis. 54952.
D. (E) $875. E. (F) $875.
D. (E) $57.50. E. (F) $87.50.
A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 950 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (E) $30,250.00. E. (F) $5,921.39.
A. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (E) $3,500. E. (F) $1,50.
D. (E) $1,115.84. E. (F) $5,536.59.
A. National Association of Farmer Elected Committee Members, 1900 South Ends Street, Box 382, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (E) $229.78. E. (F) $232.75.
D. (E) $500. E. (F) $500.
A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc. 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
E. (F) $12,703.39.
A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (E) $781,503.61. E. (F) $72,253.07.
E. (F) $30.
A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, 2511 East 46th Street, Suite B, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.
A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (E) $1,981.37. E. (F) $1,981.37.
D. (E) $4,486.11. E. (F) $4,486.11.
A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (F) $17,406.58.
A. NBA Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (E) $554.69. E. (F) $554.69.
D. (E) $500. E. (F) $500.
C. National Cotton Council of America, 2915 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30305.
D. (6) $15,631.76. E. (9) $15,479.41.

D. (9) $25,824.75. E. (9) $37,129.63.

D. (6) $656.76. E. (9) $755.58.

A. National Council Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco, Inc., 2000 South Kansas Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,475. E. (9) $133.30.

A. National Council Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $833.33. E. (9) $74.85.

A. National Council Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. United States, Inc., 200 East 38th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $230.09.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30305.
E. (6) $515.


A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

D. (5) $18,930.70. E. (9) $19,930.70.

D. (5) $2,826.50. E. (9) $2,385.41.

A. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $300.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,422,877.72. E. (9) $1,122,220.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
E. (9) $504.83.

D. (9) $15,631.76. E. (9) $15,479.41.

D. (6) $3,917.55. E. (9) $3,917.55.

D. (5) $774.79. E. (9) $1,985.82.

A. National Institute of Locker & Freezer Producers, 224 East High Street, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022.
D. (6) $87.61. E. (9) $817.81.


D. (9) $4,246.42. E. (9) $4,246.42.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $735.

D. (6) $4,025.50. E. (9) $750.

D. (9) $1,295.46. E. (9) $1,295.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y. 10001.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,904.34. E. (9) $1,904.34.

D. (9) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.32.

D. (6) $12,600. E. (9) $13,345.

A. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,531. E. (9) $5,016.00.

E. (9) $805.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders, 1593 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Calumet Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $18,408. E. (9) $8,758.57.

A. National-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $3,260. E. (9) $5,350.27.

A. Alexander W. Neal, Jr., 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20033.
D. (6) $1,295. E. (9) $18.80.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 999, Los Angeles, Calif. 90077.
D. (9) 200. E. (9) $5,100.00.

D. (6) $300.
A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, Barr Building, 910 17th Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $5,265.75. E. (9) $4,469.86.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (9) $1,175.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,050.

A. Max Shine, 1126 16th Street NW, Room 202, Washington, D.C. 20005.


A. Lucien J. Sichel, 1730 M Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill. 60064.
D. (6) $300.

A. Talmage E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $50.

D. (6) $36.61. E. (9) 897.


B. American Institute of Architects, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,750. E. (9) 94.
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B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.


B. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 4170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.


A. Banksers Association of Puerto Rico, care of Wender, Munroe & White, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Francis 0. Williams, B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) $100.

A. Harding de C. Williams, 1325 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94111.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Harry D. Williams, 1650 L Street NW, Suite 204-05, Washington, D.C. 20030.

B. Ashland Oil, Inc., Post Office Box 391, Ashland, Ky. 41101.

D. (6) $250.


D. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $707.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 153 East Superior Street, Chicago, III.

D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $1720.85.


B. Oil Investment Institute, 2800 Dunstan, Suite 605, Houston, Tex. 77005.


B. American Airlines, Inc., 634 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

D. (6) $7,752.

A. W. E. Wilson, 633 Oakley Drive, Shreveport, La. 71106.

B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $70.

A. E. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. Richard F. Witherall, Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.


A. Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, 1215 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.

D. (6) $3,045.76. E. (9) $5,042.33.


B. National Association of Retail Drugists.

One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $159.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.


A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

B. The Signal Cos., Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017.


D. (6) $2,850.


A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 7515 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.


A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North QuinCY Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va. 22207.

B. Association of Professional Re-Refiners, 1500 No. Quincy Street, Arlington, Va. 22207.

D. (6) $375.


B. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $131.98.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,331. E. (9) $404.98.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $205.40.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,331. E. (9) $404.98.
The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1972 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

**FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:**

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

**PLACE AN “X” BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE “REPORT” HEADING BELOW:**

**PRELIMINARY REPORT (“Registration”):** To “register,” place an “X” below the letter “P” and fill out page 1 only.

**“QUARTERLY” REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an “X” below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page “3,” and the rest of such pages should be “4,” “5,” “6,” etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

### Year: 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE ON ITEM “A.”</strong>—(a) IN GENERAL. This “Report” form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) “Employee.”—To file as an “employee,” state (in Item “B”) the name, address, and nature of business of the “employer.” (If the “employer” is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an “employee.”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) “Employer.”—To file as an “employer,” write “None” in answer to Item “B.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) <strong>SEPARATE REPORTS.</strong> An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer’s Report:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. State name, address, and nature of business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE ON ITEM “B.”**—**Reports by Agents or Employees.** An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) If the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as “employers”—is to be filed each quarter.

**B. EMPLOYER.**—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write “None.”

**NOTE ON ITEM “C.”**—(a) The expression “in connection with legislative interests,” as used in this Report, means “in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation.” “The term ‘legislation’ means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.”—1302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a “Preliminary” Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a “Quarterly” Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

**C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:**

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an “X” in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

4. If this is a “Preliminary” Report (Registration) rather than a “Quarterly” Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a “Quarterly” Report, disregard this item “C4” and fill out item “D” and “E” on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a “Preliminary” Report (Registration) with a “Quarterly” Report.

---

**AFFIDAVIT**

[Omitted in printing]
A. Casey Lane & Mittendorf, 818 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
A. Casey Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
B. Alaskan Building, Post Office Box 85, Fairbanks, Alaska.
A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill., 60611.
B. Americana Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill., 60611.
D. (6) $2,600.
D. (6) $1,245. E. (9) $1,245.
D. (6) $4,006.27. E. (9) $407.11.
A. Peter Coye, 413 East Capitol Street S.E., Washington, D.C.
B. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $450.
A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $3,045.70. E. (9) $1,037.20.
A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1 Farragut Square, South Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (9) $1,245. E. (9) $227.67.
A. Daniels & Houllihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Lumber Importers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $680.
E. (9) $1,850.85.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $532.35.
D. (6) $4,000.
D. (6) $4,000.
D. (6) $4,150. E. (9) $4,150.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $1,850.
A. Peter M. Kirby, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $599.81.

A. Kominers, Port, Schaefer & Boyer, Fifth Floor, Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.


D. (6) $235. E. (9) $1,723.25.

A. Laurence F. Lane, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.


D. (6) $222.90. E. (9) $474.30.

A. Guy B. Masaritz, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Albert E. May, 1626 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.


D. (6) $88.50. E. (9) $23.22.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 410, Washington, D.C. 20001.


A. C. H. McCall, Post Office Box 6554, 5051 Westheimer, Box 77055, Houston, Tex. 77005.

B. Alaska Interstate Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex. 77005.


D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $255.


B. Brotherhood of Railroad, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) $4,654. E. (9) $782.78.


D. (6) $1,252.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) $2,583.27.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) $7,590.


B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $649.


B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1750 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.

D. (6) $4,000.


D. (9) $337.51.


B. Sharon, Pieczen, Semmes, Crollus & Finley, 1064 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

D. (6) $455.


B. The American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo. 80201.

D. (6) $1,600.


B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) $542.25.


B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Neb. 68102.

D. (6) $2,000.


D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 4 Executive Park NE, Atlanta, Ga. 30328.

B. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park NE, Atlanta, Ga. 30328.

D. (6) $220. E. (9) $189.22.


D. (6) $875. E. (9) $875.


D. (6) $896.11. E. (9) $1,000.40.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10011.

D. (6) $14,016.79. E. (9) $14,383.20.


D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.


D. (6) $32,679.34. E. (9) $33,035.55.


E. (9) $12,376.74.


E. (9) $186.82.


D. (6) $15,737.61. E. (9) $3,664.

D. (6) $845. E. (9) $2,287.80.


A. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $826.

D. (6) $985. E. (9) $750.


D. (6) $920. E. (9) $8,437.91.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,404.85. E. (9) $900.

A. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,000.

D. (9) $4,161.86. E. (9) $4,585.31.

E. (9) $1,856.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $16,777.60. E. (9) $6,194.06.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 117 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $295.85.

B. QTE Service Corp., 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $106.


A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa. 18332.
B. Northern Helix Co., 2222 Dodge Street, Omaha, Neba. 68102.
D. (6) $2,662.50. E. (9) $800.05.

B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20035.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $170.76.

B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
C. Claude E. Oimstead, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Layton Olson, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $12,759.94.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa., 19036.
B. Campbell Soup Co., Campbell Place, Camden, N.J. 08101.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.
B. Missouri Basin Flood Control & Conservation Association, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

B. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1699 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

B. Committee on Modern, Efficient Transportation.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Schectt, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $9,856.55.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
B. National TWA Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,573.89.

A. James H. Pettitton, 1000 Liberty Bank Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.
B. APCO OU Corp., 1000 Liberty Bank Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

D. (6) $710. E. (9) $76.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Street, Evanston, Ill. 60204.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20035.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $18,530.

A. Robert F. Riddle, 723 Washington Street, Evanston, Ill. 60204.

A. John W. Riddle, 732 Washington Street, Evanston, Ill. 60202.

B. Volume Retailers of America, 51 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10013.

A. John Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by Hon. James B. Allen, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. Eison, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE
The PRESIDENT OFFICER, the clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE.
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. James B. Allen, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

James O. Eastland,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14628) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax laws applicable to Guam, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 17, 1972, be dispensed with.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas K. Glennan, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the National Institute of Education.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY’S DESK
The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration which had been placed on the Secretary’s desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE RECORD OF THE 92D CONGRESS
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, hopefully, we may bring to a close the 92d Congress—a Congress which has worked hard for 2 years and produced legislation of major significance. The Senate of the 92d Congress has compiled a record of achievement which is to the credit of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

In closing out the session, the Senate has worked for weeks on end, convening at an early hour in the morning and working late into the evening. For the first time in the 20th century, Senators have gone on record on 323 roll call votes in one session of Congress. The Senate has met a total of 162 days, worked for over 1,137 hours, and passed a total of 767 measures. We have also acted on 19 treaties, two of which—the SALT Agreement and the ABM Treaty—are of overriding importance in our foreign policy. Bear in mind, too, that for every hour of the 1,137 hours the Senate has met, Senators have spent many more hours working in committees and in House-Senate conferences to produce the bills acted on this floor.

In the area of budgets, deficits, and surpluses, I think the record should show that during the 4 years of the present administration, which includes fiscal years 1970, 1971, 1972, and 1973, that the administration incurred a deficit, conservatively speaking, of $143.5 billion and that in those same years, the Congress reduced, I repeat reduced, the President’s budget requests by the sum of $20.2 billion. These figures speak for themselves and by years they break down as follows:

Reductions by Congress below administration budget requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>In billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5.740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 20.2

Administration deficits over the past 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>In billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 (administration estimate)</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 104.3