fense forces which has occurred in recent years, we must approach 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 sacrifice 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 Peking opening lines of communication and cooperation between these two adversary powers?

Or an 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 25 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 the 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 relizable goal—a goal 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 uniform, that we will continue to use every available approach to bring about the return of American prisoners of war and an accounting of the missing in action in Southeast Asia. This we can and will achieve—but not if we supinely pull all our forces out and place our trust in the enemy's goodwill. I would remind you 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 the final analysis, 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 address a group such as the National Association of Supervisors because I know that you understand the role that national defense plays in our quest for a generation of peace.

But you also understand that although we will never settle for less than is sufficient for adequate defense, we cannot afford to spend more than is necessary. Competing domestic priorities simply do not allow the luxury of "fat" in defense spending.

I'm confident that both our military and our civilian employees can do the job—

In the military the transition to 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.

JEWISH HALL OF FAME

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1,200 people will attend the first annual Jewish Hall of Fame award at a breakfast on Sunday, November 5, at the Commodore Hotel Grand Ballroom in New York City. The Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, Inc., consisting of 34 organizations representing 130,000 Federal, State, and New York City civil service employees, is sponsoring the Jewish Hall of Fame of New York, Inc. Louis Weiser, a retired New York City police lieutenant, is president of the Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, Inc. Alex Novitsky of Brooklyn is the founder of the Jewish Hall of Fame of New York, Inc.

Novitsky said:

Jews who have made contributions in American life will be selected annually to have their names in the Jewish Hall of Fame to serve as models for our youth.

Novitsky also said that contributions made by Jews in American life are indeed enormous. Jews have been prominent in many areas and unfortunately many of these forgotten, outstanding people do not receive recognition they deserve.

The Jewish Hall of Fame of New York, Inc., a nonprofit organization, will salute and annually award those outstanding people of Jewish heritage who have excelled in various fields such as education, journalism, medicine, government, science, entertainment, commerce, labor, sports, arts, and culture to receive recognition for serving mankind.

The Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, Inc., will give four scholarships during the Jewish Hall of Fame award announcement on November 5 at the breakfast. The scholarships will be named after the late Herman P. Mantell, former president of the Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, Inc.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE THOMAS DELAP

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 17, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce with profound sorrow to Members of this House the death of a good friend, respected labor leader, and trusted member of my district staff, Mr. George Thomas Delap.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second death among my staff within the past month. I have lost two irreplaceable friends with the passing of John Griffin and, now, George Delap, who passed away on Friday, October 6, 1972.

George Delap was a man widely known and widely admired in Hudson County, N.J. He served as business agent to locals of the International Longshoremen's Association. In fact, only on Friday, just a few hours before his sudden and tragic death, I had called him on the telephone to discuss the pending Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act which was pending business on the House floor. As my adviser and consultant on labor matters, George was vitally concerned with the passage of this bill and, in large measure, its passage would be a memorial to this fine man.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in expressing our sincerest sympathy to George Delap's lovely widow, the former Frances Dolan, and their children, in this time of sorrow. Rest in peace, dear friend.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, October 18, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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 fail 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"God of justice, save our people
From the clash of race and creed.
From the strife of class and faction
Make our Nation free indeed.
Keep her faith in simple goodness,
Strong as when her life began;
Till it finds its full fruition
In the brotherhood of man."

Again we pray for the safe return of our majority leader and our colleague.

May Thy peace and Thy comfort abide in all our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1331) entitled "Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had voted to override the President's veto of the bill (S. 2770) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The objection of the President not withstanding.

The message also announced that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 3 and 4 to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3858) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the program of medical assistance to areas with health manpower shortages, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84–689, appointed Mr. ALLOTT as an alternate delegate, on the part of the Senate, to the North Atlantic Assembly to be held in Bonn, Germany, November 18 to 24, 1972.

The message also announced that the Senate disagree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 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."

And that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, to the above-entitled bill, with an amendment.

And that the Senate further insist upon its amendments to the above-entitled bill and request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE CONTROL ACT OF 1972

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, as the Members well recognize, is the Environmental Noise Control Act of 1972, to which I objected yesterday, principally on the basis of protest against the procedural press of year-end legislation. Since then and immediately thereafter I have been importuned by the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and many people across the length and breadth of the Nation, to withdraw my objection. I well know their fears of more stringent regulation in 1973, but rather than acceptance, now, I believe they will gain amelioration in the committee's mature deliberation. In principle I am against Federal preemption of State rights.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into prayerful consideration of this bill, which does require unanimous consent, because of the legislative bind in which we find ourselves. I have resurrected the legislative file, with all my notes pertaining thereunto, as it passed the House by a vote of 356 to 32 on February 29 of this year, with its amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted against it at the time, on the basis that it was not coordinated between the new Environmental Protection Agency and responsibilities of the Federal Aviation Agency, which I understand from my friend from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), is presumably corrected in the House amendment to the Senate amendments in the House-passed version of the bill. There has been no conference in this procedure, and these is no printed report on which to base a mature judgment.

At the time of the original House consideration, my objection was predicated further on too severe penalties, the new granted right for citizens to bring civil suits leading to these too severe penalties, the fact it was applicable to much noise abatement, besides those of the transportation industry, and so forth.

I felt, Mr. Speaker, it would come back to haunt us as the occupational health and safety bill has done. I also made an annotation at that time that I thought it was too costly for experimental legislation. I have reviewed all of that and had a conference with the distinguished chairman this morning, but I regret to say in my heart and in my most considered judgment I find, with the increase costs—doubled—offered in these amendments, and as related by the chairman yesterday on page 36957 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that my conviction is more deeply founded and more profound than ever, and therefore I must object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16810, PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 16810) 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Arkansas if this is the measure which also pertains to the extension of the unemployment benefits program.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will yield, it does. Yes.

Mr. PICKLE. With great hesitation and reluctance, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that portion of the bill is no germaine.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise that this is a matter of disagreeing to the Senate amendments and that issue is not before the House at this time, so a point of order is not available at this time.

Mr. PICKLE. Then the same point of order may be reserved when it comes back from conference?

The SPEAKER. Perhaps.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS of Arkansas, ULLMAN, BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Messrs. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and SCHNEEBELI.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 458]

Abbitt	Begich	Broyhill, Va.
Abernethy	Bell	Burleson, Tex.
Abourezk	Bergland	Burlison, Mo.
Anderson, Tenn.	Betts	Byrne, Pa.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bevill	Byron
Annunzio	Biaggi	Cabell
Archer	Blackburn	Caffery
Arends	Blanton	Cederberg
Ashbrook	Boggs	Chappell
Ashley	Bolling	Clark
Aspin	Bow	Clawson, Del
Badillo	Brooks	Clay
Baker	Broomfield	Cleveland
Baring	Brotzman	Collier
	Brown, Ohio	Collins, Ill.
	Broyhill, N.C.	Collins, Tex.

Cotter	Hébert	Riegle
Crane	Heckler, Mass.	Robison, N.Y.
Curlin	Hillis	Roncalio
Danielson	Hosmer	Rooney, N.Y.
Davis, S.C.	Hunt	Rosenthal
Davis, Wis.	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Delaney	Jarman	Runnels
Dellums	Jones, Tenn.	St Germain
Denholm	Keith	Scheuer
Derwinski	Kuykendall	Schmitz
Dickinson	Link	Schwengel
Dorn	Lloyd	Scott
Dow	Long, La.	Sebelius
Dowdy	McClory	Shipley
Dwyer	McClure	Shoup
Edmondson	McCormack	Sisk
Edwards, Ala.	McDonald, Mich.	Skubitz
Erlenborn	McKay	Snyder
Eshleman	McMillan	Springer
Evans, Colo.	Martin	Steiger, Ariz.
Findley	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Fisher	Mayne	Stephens
Flowers	Meeds	Stratton
Flynt	Melcher	Stuckey
Foley	Michel	Sullivan
Ford, William D.	Mikva	Talcott
Forsythe	Mills, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Frey	Mollohan	Thompson, Ga.
Galifianakis	Monagan	Thompson, N.J.
Gallagher	Montgomery	Thomson, Wis.
Gettys	Morgan	Udall
Giaimo	Moss	Van Deerlin
Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.	Waggonner
Grasso	Murphy, N.Y.	Waldie
Gray	Nichols	Whitehurst
Green, Oreg.	Patman	Wiggins
Griffiths	Peyser	Wilson, Bob
Gross	Podell	Winn
Gubser	Price, Tex.	Wolff
Hagan	Pryor, Ark.	Wyatt
Haley	Pucinski	Wydler
Hanna	Purcell	Wyman
Hansen, Wash.	Railsback	Yatron
Harvey	Randall	Zablocki
Hastings	Rees	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 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 immedate consideration.

The Clerk read 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.

OUR THANKS FOR THE SERVICE OF OUR GOOD COLLEAGUE "DOC" HALL

(Mr. ROUSSELOT 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, unfortunately, we do not always show our appreciation for a job well done until someone makes the decision to move on to another activity or passes from 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 watchdog 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 principled stand and just plain courageous position of acting as the conscience of the House. This has been needed and I am sure that you realize by the vast number who daily seek your advice and counsel how the respect of your colleagues has grown since that time in 1961 when we both arrived in Congress.

There are so many things on which I could comment, but because I know you also are opposed to having our RECORD 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 whim or undue organizational pressure.

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 almost 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 extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me altogether fitting that BILL McCULLOCH and I should both be leaving the institution we both love at the same time. We, as everybody knows, have worked together in the closest of harmony, and so I feel fully qualified to state categorically that BILL McCULLOCH has over and over again proven himself to be a man of the highest courage, unbreakable in spirit, devoted to his country and the well-being of his fellow men. I shall always hear him say in a voice of the strongest sincerity—

When we are talking of civil rights, remember, we are talking really of constitutional rights.

So he was, a defender of the Constitution. His probities are beyond question, his contributions are already part of history and his leadership tested and never found wanting.

My appreciation of BILL McCULLOCH is equaled only by my affection. Bill and his dear wife Mabel have come to be a part of my life, and I hope and trust when they are back in Piqua enjoying the tranquility which he has so richly earned that he and Mabel will sometimes think of me.

I owe much to BILL McCULLOCH and want to state for the record that this debt of gratitude I can never really repay.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I share all of the sentiments expressed by the distinguished dean of the House of Representatives in regard to BILL McCULLOCH.

BILL and I were sworn in together on January 3, 1949, but BILL was elected to fill an unexpired term, so during our nearly 24 years of service BILL was senior to me in the House of Representatives.

We shared many common views and we worked in close tandem in trying to accomplish those things that were beneficial to the country in the way of legislation. I can only mention a few of them; the gentleman from New York has mentioned several.

BILL McCULLOCH's record in the field of civil rights legislation is unparalleled; his efforts to try to change the method of electing the President of the United States, unfortunately, are not included, but he successfully led the fight in the House of Representatives. He did many, many other things in a constructive and visionary way.

BILL McCULLOCH's rapid progress up the ladder of the Judiciary Committee resulted a decade later in his becoming the ranking Republican on that great committee. All the time that I have had the privilege of being the Republican leader BILL McCULLOCH has been the ranking Republican member of the great Committee on the Judiciary.

I could not have had a more cooperative and helpful colleague in that capacity, for which I express my appreciation and gratitude at this time.

We have not agreed on every issue, but his willingness to understand my viewpoint endeared him to me even more, perhaps, than if we had always agreed.

Of course, BILL McCULLOCH's outstanding record as a Member of this body could have been foreseen, because he served with great distinction in the Ohio State Legislature. He was a former speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives and held other important

posts during his outstanding career in that 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 in future Congresses.

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 every inch a man during his entire service in the House of Representatives. Like the Dean of the House, 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 to be one of the finest people she has ever known. Both BILL and Mabel are so genteel and so humble and so fine and yet at the same time so determined in everything in life that is worth while.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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 dean of the House in this well deserved tribute to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM MCCULLOCH.

BILL MCCULLOCH has, with Mr. CELLER, been long engaged 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 denied to no one. And, through all my years of association with him as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I 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 legislative endeavor.

BILL MCCULLOCH will be long remembered in our Nation's history for these great achievements. As a friend, I shall miss his presence both on this House 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 York.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, BILL MCCULLOCH, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee is a Member of conviction and compassion. BILL MCCULLOCH stands for courage in this House, and when the voting rights bill was under attack by this administration he stood firm and stanch to insure its passage; to make totally plain 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 country for the 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 for many, 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 pay tribute to BILL MCCULLOCH, our distinguished colleague, but to FRANK BOW and JACK BETTS who as you all know are retiring from the Congress. I should 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. 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 on the Judiciary and to work with him in this way.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

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

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

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

BILL MCCULLOCH's leadership in the field of civil rights marks him as one of the greatest statesman 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 desegregaton, 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.

An independent, hard-working Congressman, BILL MCCULLOCH has received many awards and honors. One of the most distinguished was from the American Bar Association for distinguished public service. This was given in 1971 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 presence 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 truly written for himself, and I think more importantly for the entire country, the kind of imperishable record of public service and most particularly in his devotion 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 on many occasions and reminded all of us of our solemn duty and responsibility under the Constitution.

I had the opportunity on one 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 the esteem in which he is held by the people whom he represents.

We will miss you, BILL MCCULLOCH. We

will miss the wise counsel, the wisdom, conviction, courage, and capacity that you have brought to this House in your role as ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Beneath a calm and unruffled exterior there is a warm heart that beats with compassion and concern for the cause of equal rights in our Nation. You have always been mindful of our great heritage as the party of Lincoln. In calm and measured tones during sometimes stormy debate you have consistently displayed the knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles that has made you a voice to be respected and listened to.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I will personally miss the companionship and counsel of BILL MCCULLOCH more than that of any other retiring Member of this body. I will forever treasure our deep friendship, and wish both him and his lovely wife, Mabel, long life and continued health and happiness.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I will cherish for the rest of my career is that I was granted the opportunity of serving on the Committee on the Judiciary with two very great men—Chairman CELLER and the ranking minority member BILL MCCULLOCH.

I was particularly privileged, because Mr. MCCULLOCH is the dean of the delegation from my home State of Ohio—and he has brought great honor to the State of Ohio because of his steadfast defense of the Constitution of the United States and the rights that it guarantees to all its citizens. He has done this without regard to partisanship—without regard to personal political considerations. He has set a standard to inspire all of us and which I hope we will succeed in following through all the years to come.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to underscore everything that the members of the Committee on the Judiciary have said about BILL MCCULLOCH and the great privilege it was to work with him during the years when we were doing so many constructive things in the field of civil rights legislation.

I had the unique privilege to serve with BILL MCCULLOCH on President Johnson's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. We looked at a terribly complex problem that faced this Nation of ours. I hope that the Commission in its report shed a little light on that basic problem. If it did it was primarily because of the compassion and the reason and the wisdom of the gentleman from Piqua, Ohio.

I traveled with him in 1967 to the major cities which had suffered from explosion and eruption. It was BILL's calm, deliberate contribution to the Commission's work that made its final report such an extraordinary document, for it spoke to us in terms of what America must do to achieve social justice for every American—a commitment to which BILL MCCULLOCH has devoted his life.

It has been a great privilege to have served with BILL in the House. I shall miss him very much.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. 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 Republican member.

It has been my privilege to have known these two men. Not being a lawyer, I do not know them and I do not judge them professionally, but as humanists it is understandable why they have won 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 revere him just as I revere the chairman.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman in the well for giving to me the privilege of joining him and our colleagues 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 to be able to point to a statesman, a scholar, 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 and a conscience 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 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 the 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 join with my colleagues here this afternoon in this eminently merited 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 unwaivering example of the highest personal character and integrity, his progressive accomplishments have been indelibly inscribed in the annals of our congressional history and they will everlastingly stand as an inspiring reflection of a quiet, but great man, serving his district, his State, and his country, in accord with the highest nonpartisan traditions of American patriotism, courage, and idealism. It has been by high honor to serve with him on the House Judiciary Commitee, 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 regard to his own political career, mark him as one of the greatest legislative leaders who have ever served in this body.

However, BILL MCCULLOCH has endeared himself even more to his colleagues here because, through the years, he has consistently proven himself to be a warm, principled, and compassionate human being with a genuine concern for every one of his associates, on both sides of the aisle, and for all his fellow men.

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 join in paying tribute to the most distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MCCULLOCH). He will take something quite substantial with him when he leaves this House.

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 undefended when others were silent was his understanding and advocacy of equal rights for women.

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

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 wish 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 is one of 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 as the ranking member of the minority, and I appreciate 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 Ohio.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion as we sit together in legislative consideration for perhaps the last time, I want to pay tribute to my good friend and respected colleague from Ohio, the Honorable WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH.

BILL has been an outstanding Member of the U.S. Congress and this body for 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 Ohio and the United States of America.

He has played a prominent role in a great deal of fine legislation which we have all considered. As a prominent and respected member of the Committee on 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 his colleagues, both of Ohio 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.

BILL has won our 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 5 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 having 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 originated, it was

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 American life. Cleaning up the Nation's waterways is a matter of urgent concern to me, as evidenced by the nearly tenfold increase in my budget for this purpose during the past four years.

I am also concerned, however, that we attack pollution in a way that does not ignore other very real threats to the quality of life, such as spiraling prices and increasingly onerous taxes. Legislation which would continue our efforts to raise water quality, but which would do so through extreme and needless overspending, does not serve the public interest. There is a much better way to get this job done.

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 fiscally responsible manner. Unfortunately the Congress ignored our other vital national concerns and broke the budget with this legislation.

Environmental protection has been one of my highest priorities as President. The record speaks for itself. With the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency, we have established a strong new framework for developing and administering forceful programs in this problem area. I have proposed more than 25 far-reaching laws to deal with threats to the environment; most still await final action in the Congress. Pending enactment of new legislation, our enforcement agencies have cracked down on polluters under old laws seldom enforced by previous administrations.

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 grants for local sewage treatment plant construction have increased almost tenfold, from an annual rate of $214 million appropriated up to the time I took office, to $2 billion in my budget for 1973. This dramatic growth in the share of Federal Government resources being devoted to the environment exceeds, many times over, the rate of increase for funds in most other major government programs.

Every environmental spending increase 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 protect the working men and women of America against tax increases and renewed inflation.* Specifically, the water pollution control bill which I originally sent to the Congress last year was fully consistent with the concept 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 momentum toward that high standard of cleanliness which all of us want in America's waters.

By contrast, the bill which has now come to my desk would provide for the commitment of a staggering, budget-wrecking $24 billion. Every extra dollar which S. 2770 contemplates spending beyond the level of my budget proposals would exact a price from the consumer in the form of inflated living costs, or from the taxpayer in the form of a new Federal tax bite, or both.

Ironically, however, only a portion of the $18 billion by which my bill was fattened on Capitol Hill would actually go to buy more pollution control than the Administration bill would have done. One backward-looking provision, for example, would provide $750 million to reimburse State and local governments for work already completed on sewage treatment plants *between 1956 and 1966*. The precedent this would set for retroactive reimbursement in other matching grant programs is an invitation to fiscal chaos. Another provision would raise the Federal share of the cost of future facilities from 55 percent to 75 percent. Neither of these costly actions would, in any real sense, make our waters any cleaner: they would simply increase the burden on the Federal taxpayer.

There is a well-worn political axiom which says that any election year spending bill, no matter how ill-advised, defies veto by the President. But I say that any spending bill this year which would lead to higher prices and higher taxes defies signature by this President. I have nailed my colors to the mast on this issue; the political winds can blow where they may.

I am prepared for the possibility that my 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 have been lured to the wrong side of the fight by the false glitter of public works money for their districts or States. They seem to forget that it is their constituents' pockets from which the higher taxes must come as a result of their votes this week. Others, to their great credit, voted for the spending limit to try to hold taxes down. Taxpayers must be sad to learn that a majority are charge account Congressmen.

If this veto is not sustained, however, let the issue be clearly drawn. As with the spending ceiling, so with this bill, a vote to sustain the veto is a vote against a tax increase. A vote to override the veto is a vote to increase the likelihood of higher taxes.

Even if this bill is rammed into law over the better judgment of the Executive—even if the Congress defaults its obligation to the taxpayers—I shall not default mine. Certain provisions of S. 2770 confer a measure of spending discretion and flexibility upon the President, and if forced 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 unnecessary price from the public. For I am convinced, on the basis of 26 years' experience with the political realities here in Washington, that the pressure for full funding under this bill would be so intense that funds approaching the maximum authorized amount could ultimately be claimed and paid out, no matter what technical controls the bill appears to grant the Executive.

I still hope, with millions of taxpayers, that at least one-third plus one of the Members in one House will be responsible enough to vote for the public interest and sustain this veto. It should be noted that doing so would by no means terminate the existing Federal water quality programs, because the Environmental Protection Agency will continue to operate those programs until the merits of a new water bill can be dealt with as a first order of business in the new Congress.

I look forward to cooperating with the next Congress on a prudent bill, to achieve ends on which we are mutually agreed, and by means which I trust will take better account than S. 2770 did of the working men and women who must ultimately pay the bill for environmental quality.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 17, 1972.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for 10 days and nights I have prayed that this issue would not be brought before the House; indeed, I had become convinced by the President's own words and those of his closest environmental advisers that he could not, in good conscience and with due regard for the national interest, allow himself to veto this bill.

The President of the United States has told us time and time again that we must come forward with a strong and effective water pollution control law if we are to save our environment. And we have done so.

The President's own environmental protection administrator has warned that the entire pollution control program "probably will be destroyed" if this act is permitted to die under the knife blade of a Presidential veto.

The President's own Council on Environmental Quality warned him most solemnly in its third annual report, just 2 short months ago, that the life-or-death need to save our environment must not be subordinated to short-run, temporary economic considerations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told in the President's veto message that the cost which Congress has placed on the survival of our environment—a cost arrived at after 15 months of the most soul-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 11 days ago, this body approved that program by passing the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 by the overwhelming margin 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 been assured that 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 of 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 overriding interest.

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 years when America pays its debt to 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.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
October 10, 1952.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing over 15,000 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 for approximately $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 capial construction process. The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors had 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 and continuous source of project funding throughout the lengthy time period needed to build treatment works;

4. Adequate means are available to the Administration to ensure national fiscal responsibility;

5. The fight to clean up the nation's waterways has been led by the nation's cities, that level of government financially least well off. Cities have shown their commitment by financing treatment works at 70% of total costs, and often beyond, assuming 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 also adhere to 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 that Federal commitment to spend the money to help build the treatment plants is made, we will have no alternative but to insist that the time schedule for achieving the national goals of clean water be postponed. There is no difference of opinion between the cities, the Congress and your administration regarding the final 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. GUNTHER,
Executive Director, U.S. Conference of Mayors.
ALLEN E. PRITCHARD, 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 one of the conferees and one 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 have an urgent need for improved and expanded sewage treatment facilities. I doubt that there is a river or stream left in this country that 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 proposal was hammered out only after 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 disconcerting. 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 realize the most immediate benefits. It is the singlemost problem—inadequate municipal sewage treatment—which is the most widespread and acute. This cost is not only warranted; it is critically imperative.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have emphasized over and over again that if Federal spending must be curtailed, and if such spending cuts 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 was intended to emphasize the President's flexibility to control the rate of spending.

I might add, while this legislation does provide for contract authority, the present administration recommended contract authority in H.R. 18779, the bill I introduced in behalf of the administration some time ago.

Furthermore, let me 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, it can just as rightly 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 clearly the understanding 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 that the first major impact of obligations from the $5 billion authorizations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, is in fiscal year 1975. During that year the appropriations required for payment for obligations authorized 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 $250 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 law, 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 it 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 don't think there is one Member of this 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 think that there is one Member of this body who could report that after such 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 vote to override the veto of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 was a vote to increase the likelihood of higher taxes. So be it, the public is prepared to pay for it. To say we can't afford this sum of money 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. FRASER. 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 and streams grow filthier by the day. In 1970, the Public Health Service reported potentially harmful levels of chemicals in one-third of our drinking-water supply. In 1971, the President's Council on Environmental Quality found 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 signified that they want this law to clean up our country's waters. Rarely has the President shown poorer judgment—or a falser sense of economy—than in his decision to veto this measure.

The problem will not go away. The longer we wait the more it will cost.

In his 1970 state of the union message, Mr. Nixon told the country that he was committed to putting "modern municipal waste treatment plants in every place in America where they are needed to make our waters clean again, and to do it now." In his February 1971 message on the environment, Mr. Nixon repeated his commitment to "adequate funds to insure construction of municipal waste treatment facilities needed to meet water quality standards." Yet, he now rejects a measure designed to do just this and rejects it on ground of expense.

The moneys which this bill authorizes for waste treatment plant construction are based on estimates of needs provided by Mr. Nixon's administration. The Environmental Protection Agency, in its 1972 report on the "Economics of Clean Water," set these needs at $14.5 billion for the next 3 years. Left out of EPA's estimates were funds for combined storm sewers and recycled water supplies, which would be eligible for grants under the new law.

In a letter of October 16, the EPA Administrator, Mr. Ruckelshaus, pointed out these facts to the President and emphasized that the bill is based on the administration's own estimate of construction needs.

The National League of Cities has calculated construction costs for waste treatment plants to be much greater—from $33 to $37 billion in the next 5 years. Minnesota's plans for construction of 140 sewage treatment plants will require $212 million in the coming year. Seventy-five percent of this—the maximum Federal share—would come to $159 million. Under the vetoed bill, Minnesota would be eligible for about $100 million.

This is not "extreme and needless overspending"—to use Mr. Nixon's language. The moneys authorized are based on estimates made by his own administration. Furthermore, the bill sets up a new system of user charges, by which industrial users would return their share of operating and maintenance costs of waste treatment plants—an estimated $4.5 billion—to the Federal Treasury.

Our economy can, and must, absorb the costs of pollution control. A March 1972 report of the President's Council on Environmental Quality on "The Economic Impact of Pollution Control" notes that no real attempt has yet been made to quantify the benefits of a cleaner environment and that studies tend consequently to overstate the net costs to society.

Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps the most important environmental legislation the Congress has yet enacted. The question is not, "Can we afford to spend $18 billion over the next 3 years for waste treatment plants?" but "Can we afford not to?" To delay acting now would only mean greater expense later. I urge the House to override the veto.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to support wholeheartedly the efforts to override the Presidential veto of S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Act Amendments of 1972.

As I indicated earlier in these chambers, I feel that this legislation represents one of the most significant achievements of the 92d Congress, as we are determined to meet our commitment to cleaning up the polluted rivers, streams, lakes and other waterways of this Nation. Congress long has had a concern over water pollution. This goes back to the 86th Congress which was my first in Washington, when the first antipollution legislation was adopted, only to be vetoed by President Eisenhower.

The following year, 1961, the Federal Water Pollution Act was drafted by the House Public Works Committee, on which I serve, and the Federal Government jumped into the pollution fight with both feet. Federal participation was expanded in 1966 and again in 1970, in legislation which broadened Federal concern to include not only rivers and lakes but also coastal and inland waters contaminated by oil spills.

A tremendous boost to the water pollution fight would result from approval of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, which the President vetoed last night. The goal of this bill and its $18 billion in grants to local government, is to achieve by 1983 water quality suitable for protection and propagation of fish and wildlife, for recreation use and for the elimination of discharge of all pollutants into the rivers and lakes by 1985.

In my career in Congress, there has been no single piece of legislation which demanded more time and energy, both mine personally and that of my colleagues on the Public Works Committee, than this one. Hopefully, my colleagues here in the House of Representatives share this determination to meet our commitment to clean water and will join me in voting to override this important piece of legislation of which I am proud to have coauthored.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that we have, what I believe, is a very solid, realistic legislative program, one which received very careful scrutiny during the subcommittee and full committee proceedings in the House Committee on Public Works, one which withstood substantial debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, when the House acted on this legislation. The bill then, as we all know, went to conference and was the subject of one of the most intensive and comprehensive conferences ever held between the House and Senate, representing 39 conference sessions and hundreds of hours of work.

I feel that you can vote with confidence in support of this bill today, for I believe, that not only is it one which will help us meet our commitment to clean the water in our Nation, but it is also one which will prove most beneficial to local government by providing over the next 3 years from $18 billion in Federal assistance to local communities, to solve our sewer and water pollution problems with the Federal Government participating with 75 percent of the total cost. Here in my mind is the real way to help local government meet their problems. This is a sound investment in the future of this Nation.

Thank you.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has demonstrated his true commitment to the national environment by vetoing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972.

In his veto message the President declared that his approval was withheld from 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 convince 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 Labor-HEW 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 the check.

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. Delay in implementing 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 the House and Senate have worked extremely hard on this measure, both in committee and in conference. I submit that it is a bill that we can all be proud of. Therefore, let the President blame us for its passage, for 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 squarely 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.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, the President has exercised a veto for the 19th time since he came into office. This latest act vetoed was the Water Pollution Control Act—S. 2770—and was done over the strong objections of William Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and a Nixon appointee. Mr. Ruckelshaus argued that this bill would not cause economic hardships because the Government would not have to start paying on contracts until fiscal year 1975. Mr. Nixon has hinted that this measure would hurt the economy now and that, in order to have this piece of legislation, we would have to raise our taxes immediately. This kind of politics is not necessary.

Presidential 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 item veto power given to the President. 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 in an attempt to get a quid pro quo arrangement. Congress will get what it wants only if the President gets what he wants. This is a subversion of the will of the people and the needs of the Nation.

At the same time Mr. Erlichman indicated that the President may veto the second Labor-HEW bill of this session. A veiled threat of this nature only further illustrates the President's insensitivity to the needs of this country. If he does veto the second Labor-HEW bill he will again show that he cares little for the health of our citizens, the nutritional program for the elderly, the education supplements for our children, the public health office supplements, and many more. The President cannot browbeat us into forgetting the very people who elected us and who make this great country function.

This water pollution control bill will enable us to start cleaning up our major waterways, many of which are nothing but large sewers. It is a crime that the most advanced technological country in the world cannot have clean waterways, and the most populated cities in the Western World have antiquated sewer systems which do little to treat the raw sewage being poured into our waterways. This bill is not something that can be played with by politicians—it is not a bill which is aiming at heading off a particular evil some time in the future; it is a bill which is trying to correct a disaster which is almost beyond our grasp. This bill represents a commitment by this Government to clean up what it has allowed industry to get away with for decades. It is our commitment to make this country ecologically safe for future generations.

I hope that all of you will join me in overriding the President's veto this afternoon. Of the 19 times the President has vetoed bills passed by this body, we have only overridden three of those; I doubt that anyone could say that we have tried to be at odds with the President, but now, he has just gone a little bit too far. I say we must override this veto.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I support the override of this veto.

Yet, I am glad the President attempted this veto. It shows clearly how phony is the Nixon commitment to the environment.

Once again, under the false rationale of fiscal responsibility the President and his special interest friends have indicated where their real priorities lie. When it comes to any possible conflict between public needs—such as clean water—and private interests—the chance that the costs for such controls may be passed on to huge corporations and other special interests—the bias of this administration has been self-evident.

At least the President has not said he is against clean water.

But, for him, the need for clean water is less important than billion dollar handouts to Lockheed and Penn Central, less important than the SST, less important than give-aways to foreign dictatorships and repressive regimes, less important than the highway program which strangles our central cities, and less important than the myriad of costly, unneeded defense boondoggles.

I urge overturn of this absurd veto.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that the veto of S. 2770, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, will be sharply overridden.

The President's veto message talks about the bill's unconscionable price tag. Rather, I suggest, it is the veto which is unconscionable.

Americans are determined that their lakes and their streams will be cleaned up. If we are to do the job, we must be prepared to pay the price. That price, it should be noted, will be a great deal less than the cost of permitting further degradation of our waters.

Given that resolve, the only question is, "How shall the cleanup job be paid for?"

The President's veto simply means that a greater share of the burden will be placed on the hard-pressed homeowner, the person who pays the local property tax. Without the massive Federal help for local efforts contemplated in S. 2770, that local real estate tax will have to do yet another job.

If this is the first step in Mr. Nixon's widely proclaimed campaign to help the homeowner, we can ill afford to receive any more such help.

The demand for environmental cleanup is as soundly based as it is widespread and genuine. As a recently disclosed position paper from the Environmental Protection Agency shows, upholding the veto would be a catastrophe for environmental programs.

Members on both sides of the aisle should join in overriding it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the President's veto of this bill was extremely unwise. I note that he states in his veto message that:

> Legislation which would continue our efforts to raise water quality but which would do so through extreme and needless overspending, does not serve the public interest. There is a much better way to get this job done.

He then said that he was—

> Compelled to veto this bill because its laudable intent is outweighed by its unconscionable 24 billion dollar price tag.

I think in reply to the President that it is appropriate to quote from Mr. Ruckelshaus' own letter which he sent the other day to the President:

> The total amount of contract grant authority contained in the enrolled bill is formulated from the Administration's estimate of construction needs as submitted to the Congress in February of this year. The total estimate amounted to $18.1 billion. The Federal share at 75% would amount to $13.6 billion. This needs estimate did not include any allowance for inflation, nor did it include funds for combined, storm, and collection sewers, or for recycled water supplies. These are project eligibilities newly specified by the enrolled bill.
>
> The total value of construction initiated in the near-term under the enrolled bill is expected to correspond closely to the total value of construction that would have been initiated under the Administration bill. Under the Administration's proposal, communities were free to continue to initiate reimbursable projects, were not constricted by the $6 billion authorization, and could have substantially increased this amount. Reimbursable projects are precluded under the enrolled bill and the $18 billion contract grant authority represents a ceiling, while the Administration's $6 billion proposal represented a floor. With the projected close correspondence in total near-term value of construction starts, the potential inflationary impact upon the entire construction sector would be minimized.
>
> The total amount of contract grant authority contained in the enrolled bill is formulated from the Administration's estimate of construction needs as submitted to the Congress in February of this year. The total estimate amounted to $18.1 billion. The Federal share at 75% would amount to $13.6 billion. This needs estimate did not include any allowance for inflation, nor did it include funds for combined storm, and collection sewers, or for recycled water supplies. These are project eligibilities newly specified by the enrolled bill.
>
> This needs estimate provided to the Congress was constructed to support the commitment of the President in his State of the Union message of January 22, 1970, to "put modern municipal waste treatment plants in every place in America where they are needed to make our waters clean again, and to do it now." This commitment was repeated in the February 1970 Message on the Environment which enunciated funding support for "every community that needs it with secondary waste treatment, and also special, additional treatment in areas of special need, including communities on the Great Lakes." The commitment was re-endorsed in the February 1971 message on the Environment with a statement that we should provide "adequate funds to ensure construction of municipal waste treatment facilities needed to meet water quality standards."

Mr. Speaker, there is no valid reason for vetoing this bill for the reason stated by the President. This price tag is not unconscionable. It is a realistic estimate of the immediate needs of this Nation to prevent the very water pollution that the Council on Environmental Quality only 3 months ago said was still accelerating at an alarming rate. The protection of our natural resources, particularly our waterways which serve our health and wildlife needs and the recreational needs of urban and rural areas cannot in any sense whatsoever be described as unconscionable. That is what the President is saying, however, when he claims that to spend $24 billion over the next several years is unconscionable and amounts to an "extreme and needless overspending."

At this point I want to quote the words of Senator BUCKLEY which are quoted at page 36878 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 17, 1972. In urging an override of the President's veto, Senator BUCKLEY states:

> 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 pro-

viding 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 now take this opportunity once again to comment on the provisions of the conference report (H. Rept. 92–1465, Sept. 18, 1972), on the Federal Water Pollution Control 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.

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, as one of the principal co-sponsors of the Reuss-Dingell clean water package of amendments which were offered during the March 1972 debate in the House on H.R. 11896—the House version of S. 2770. Most of our amendments, or their substance, were adopted either during that debate or later by the House-Senate conferees. I hope, therefore, that my October 4 comments on this legislation as reported by the conferees will help the Environmental Protection Agency, the public, and the courts in the administration, enforcement, and interpretation of this important law.

Perhaps some of my comments may seem in conflict with those of the conferees. That is simply because, in a few cases, the conferees' hurriedly drafted explanation of their language or statement of intention was not consistent with the statutory language itself. It is a fundamental rule of statutory construction that unambiguous statutory language governs over any such an explanation or intention. One example where my comments state, while the conferees' explanation is not consistent with, the statutory language, relates to section 311(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 306 of this Act, no action of the Administrator taken pursuant to this Act shall be deemed a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852); and

(2) nothing in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (93 Stat. 852) shall be deemed to—

(A) authorize any Federal agency authorized to license or permit the conduct of any activity 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 such agency to impose, as a condition precedent to the issuance of any license or permit, any effluent limitation other than any such limitation estblished pursuant to this Act.

In my October 4, 1972, floor comments on this section, I said (p. H9127):

The key words are in paragraph (1) of this section. They are: "A major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." These same words are found in section 102(2)(C) 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 Calvert Cliffs decision requiring AEC or any other licensing or permitting agency to independently review water quality matters. But it does not affect the obligations of those agencies to consider alternatives and other environmental matters, such as esthetics, 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 1969 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 Congressman 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) made some floor statements concerning this section that attempt to give it a far broader interpretation and meaning than the language itself. He implies, at least, that all of NEPA is repealed with respect to EPA. Senator MUSKIE, in his comments that occurred later in the day on October 4 makes nearly the same statements—pages 33708–33709 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Both statements, however, are in conflict with the prepared statement by Mr. JONES which he inserted in the RECORD at page 33751 and which is entitled "The Highlights of the House-Senate Conference Report". That statement says, in regard to section 511(c), as follows:

"ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

"With the exception of construction of publicly-owned waste treatment plants and permits granted for the discharge of pollutants by new sources, no actions taken by the Environmental Protection Agency will be subject to the requirements for environmental impact statements of the National Environmental Protection [Policy] Act (NEPA)."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with that prepared statement. That is all that section 511(c) does.

The term "major Federal actions" has not, and I emphasize the words "has not," become "synonymous" with NEPA, despite contentions by some to the contrary. The only place this term appears in NEPA is in section 102(2)(C) which deals solely with environmental impact statements. It does not appear elsewhere in section 102 of NEPA. Nor does it appear in any other section, subsection, paragraph, or clause in NEPA.

Thus, it is clearly wrong to explicitly or impliedly state that section 511(c)(1) in any way, shape, or form can be construed as a limitation on NEPA insofar as that statute applies to the Environmental Protection Agency. While it may be that some of the conferees intended to wipe out NEPA as far as the Environmental Protection Agency is concerned, it is plain to see that they did not do so in legislative language. What they did not do in legislative language, they cannot try to do on the floor of the House or Senate in so-called "bootstrap" legislative history.

I, therefore, reiterate that my comments as to the meaning of section 511 (c), and those of our colleague, Mr. JONES, in his prepared statement which I quoted above, are the only possible interpretation that can be placed on this section.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this conference report on October 4, Congressman JONES and Senator MUSKIE went beyond the conference report to discuss 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 this legislation on the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency?

Mr. DINGELL. Many existing agencies such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency have important responsibilities in the area 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 who now have little or no legislative authority to take environmental considerations into account.

Mr. Speaker, I totally disagree that this colloquy between Mr. Fallon and myself supports the contentions made by Congressman 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 who 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 section 102 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 disclosure provisions of NEPA and the policy of NEPA would not be applicable to EPA. Clearly, as the third circuit recently determined in *Getty Oil* v. *Ruckelshaus* (4 ERC 1567), environmental impact statements would not be required "at the enforcement stage" because to require such statements at that stage "would do substantial harm to the congressional purpose of obtaining expeditious compliance" with the law. But that does not mean that impact statements and the other provisions of NEPA do not apply to the nonenforcement activities of the Environmental Protection Agency. For example, NEPA does, at this very moment, apply to the Refuse Act permit program, as the court determined in *Kalur* v. *Resor*, 335 F. Supp. 1.

I do not subscribe to the theory that just because an agency like EPA, or the Fish and Wildlife Service, or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Forest Service, has "environmental" objectives or regulatory functions, that those agencies will not make mistakes or take actions that would be in fact detrimental to the environment. Those agencies, like any other agency, must be responsive to the people. Public disclosure of their decisionmaking and the steps leading to their decisionmaking is imperative. NEPA provides for that disclosure not only through the environmental impact statement provision, but in the other provisions of the statute requiring a look at the alternatives, and so forth.

NEPA can work in tandem with all of the laws now administered by EPA. They are not inconsistent. They have the same objectives. They should be supported. They should not be denigrated through postlegislative history. I urge all environmentalists and environmental organizations to insist on this and to make their views known to the Administrator of EPA and others.

I hope that this statement will cause people to stop quoting the above colloquy to support their contentions that are not solidly based in the statute and other facets of the legislative history of NEPA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my earlier comments that section 511(c) of the bill does not in anyway, shape, or form change EPA's responsibility to comply with all provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, except as to section 102(2)(C) as noted in section 511(c)(1) of the bill.

On another matter, I reiterate my comments on the importance of section 101(e) of this bill which encourages public participation in the development, revision and enforcement of various actions taken under this statute. I sincerely hope that the Administrator understands that this applies across the board, including the establishment of the permit program under section 402 of the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for a number of months I have been publishing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the "102 Monitor" issued by the Council on Environmental 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 as to its accessibility and the 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 committee on conference to agree on a compromise measure.

As a manager on the part of the House, I can attest to the fact that all of the provisions of the bill and the differences between the two Houses were thoroughly reviewed before agreements were made. The conference report represents a bill which is superior to that which was passed by either House.

It is unfortunate that the President felt that he had to veto this bill. It is obvious that the only reason is his concern for the task he has of holding the reins on the Federal budget, a concern which we all share.

I believe the action by the managers in the committee on conference in eliminating the word "all" before the word "sums" in section 205(a) and the insertion of the phrase "not to exceed" in three places in section 207 gave the President the authority and the flexibility he needs to control the rate of spending. As a matter of fact, he refers to it in his veto message.

The legislative history in the House when the conference report was under consideration was clear on this point. If the legislative history had been as clear when the conference report was under consideration in the other body as it was yesterday when the other body voted to override the veto, there may not have been a veto in the first place. It would have strengthened our position. I do not want to question their motives but I believe the other body, in not making abundantly clear in its legislative history the same spirit, comments and substance of the House legislative history, left ambiguities as to legislative intent. Also, the Senate's unwillingness 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 I deeply regret 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 the 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, and it passed both bodies by overwhelming votes. I am especially pleased to be a coauthor of this bill. Our committee has been working on the clean water program since 1956, and 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 previous question was ordered.

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]

YEAS—247

Abzug	Clancy	Evins, Tenn.
Adams	Clark	Fascell
Addabbo	Clausen,	Fish
Alexander	Don H.	Flood
Anderson,	Collins, Ill.	Foley
Calif.	Conable	Ford, Gerald R.
Anderson, Ill.	Conover	Fountain
Andrews, Ala.	Conte	Fraser
Ashley	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Aspinall	Corman	Frenzel
Barrett	Cotter	Fulton
Biaggi	Coughlin	Fuqua
Biester	Culver	Garmatz
Bingham	Daniel, Va.	Gaydos
Blatnik	Daniels, N.J.	Gibbons
Boland	Davis, Ga.	Gonzalez
Brademas	de la Garza	Goodling
Brasco	Dellenback	Green, Pa.
Bray	Dellums	Grover
Brinkley	Dennis	Gude
Brown, Mich.	Dent	Halpern
Broyhill, Va.	Diggs	Hamilton
Buchanan	Dingell	Hammer-
Burke, Fla.	Donohue	schmidt
Burke, Mass.	Dorn	Hanley
Burton	Downing	Hansen, Idaho
Carey, N.Y.	Drinan	Harrington
Carlson	Dulski	Harsha
Carney	Duncan	Hathaway
Carter	du Pont	Hawkins
Casey, Tex.	Eckhardt	Hays
Celler	Edwards, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.
Chamberlain	Eilberg	Heckler, Mass.
Chisholm	Esch	Heinz

Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Mass.
Hicks, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lent
Long, Md.
Lujan
McCloskey
McCollister
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKevitt
McKinney
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mailliard
Mallary
Mann
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mazzoli
Metcalfe
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Mizell
Moorhead
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Rangel
Reid
Reuss
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Roy
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Scheuer
Seiberling
Shriver
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Steele
Stokes
Stubblefield
Symington
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thone
Tiernan
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—23

Belcher
Bennett
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Camp
Colmer
Devine
Griffin
Hall
Jonas
Landgrebe
Lennon
McDonald, Mich.
Mahon
Mills, Ark.
Passman
Pelly
Rarick
Rhodes
Schneebeli
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Steed

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rousselot

NOT VOTING—160

Abbitt
Abernethy
Abourezk
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspin
Badillo
Baker
Baring
Begich
Bell
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Cederberg
Chappell
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Crane
Curlin
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Denholm
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dow
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Forsythe
Frey
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hastings
Hébert
Hillis
Hosmer
Hunt
Ichord
Jones, Tenn.
Keith
Kuykendall
Link
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McClure
McCormack
McKay
McMillan
Martin
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Michel
Mills, Md.
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nichols
Patman
Podell
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Runnels
St Germain
Schmitz
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup
Sisk
Skubitz
Snyder
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Van Deerlin
Waggonner
Waldie
Whitehurst
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wyman
Yatron

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. Riegle and Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Forsythe 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. Giaimo with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Burlison of Missouri with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Whitehurst.
Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Archer.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Mayne.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr Delaney with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Dow with Mr. Schwengel.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Sebelius.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Mills of Maryland.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Collins of Texas.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Schmitz.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Link with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Abourezk with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Curlin.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Galafianakis.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Udall.
Mr. McKay with Mr. Breaux.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on the veto message just considered.

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

There was no objection.

PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 726) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 726

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Wednesday, October 18, 1972, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 21, not voting 170, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

YEAS—240

Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Belcher

Bennett
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Byron
Camp
Carlson
Carney
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Celler
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Collins, Ill.
Colmer
Conable
Conover
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Culver
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Dellums
Dennis
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Frenzel
Fulton
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gude
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks, Wash.
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keating
Kee
Kemp
King
Kluczynski
Koch
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lent
Long, Md.
McCollister
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKevitt
McKinney
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mallary
Mann
Mathias, Calif.
Mathis, Ga.
Mazzoli
Metcalfe
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Mills, Ark.
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mitchell
Moorhead
Mosher
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Quie
Quillen
Rangel
Rarick
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Roe
Rogers
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Rousselot
Roybal
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schneebeli
Seiberling
Shriver
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stanton, James V.
Steed
Steele
Stokes
Stubblefield
Symington
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Terry
Thompson, N.J.
Thone
Tiernan
Ullman
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Veysey
Vigorito
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zwach

NAYS—21

Barrett
Biaggi
Buchanan
Dingell
Ford, William D.
Gaydos
Hicks, Mass.
Lujan
McCloskey
Miller, Ohio
Mizell
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Hara
O'Konski
Rodino
Scheuer
Teague, Calif.
Zablocki
Zion

NOT VOTING—170

Abbitt
Abernethy
Abourezk
Alexander
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspin
Aspinall
Badillo
Baker
Baring
Begich
Bell
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Cederberg
Chappell
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Crane
Curlin
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dow
Dowdy
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Forsythe
Frey
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hagan
Haley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hébert
Hillis
Hosmer
Hunt
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Tenn.
Keith
Kuykendall
Kyl
Link
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McClure
McCormack
McDonald, Mich.
McKay
McMillan
Martin
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Michel
Mills, Md.
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nichols
Patman
Peyser
Podell
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roy
Runnels
St Germain
Schmitz
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup
Sisk
Skubitz
Snyder
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Van Deerlin
Waggonner
Waldie
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wyman
Yatron

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISED 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 1,600 additional copies shall 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.

The resolution was agreed to.

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 (31 U.S.C. 841 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.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTESE NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the 92d Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman mean the 91st Congress, as he read it, or is it the 92d Congress, the current one?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is the 92d Congress.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REPORTS FILED WITH CLERK, FILED FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT, AS REPORTS OF 92D CONGRESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the

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 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 order 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.

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 the chairmen of all the standing committees and the subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

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 RECORD 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 rollcall No. 459, to override the Presidential veto on the Water Pollution Act, I was delayed by circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 459, 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 rollcall 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 California (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. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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 prior to the time the Senate passes it I do not know, 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.

So, 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

Streets Act of 1968, benefits to survivors of police officers killed in line of duty, which was agreed upon and which was filed yesterday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair must answer the gentleman in accordance with the language which the Chair used when this matter was before the House on yesterday. At that time the Chair stated, and no specific reference was made to any bill because it had been informally mentioned to the Members who were seeking the rule, that this rule would not be used for any other bill except those dealing with three items. Under that interpretation it would be in order to bring those conference reports upon the day on which they were filed. As the Chair understands his own language and his own informal agreement, which was a part of the history, the Chair would very much 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.

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

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 method of recognizing the gentleman.

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-percent correct in the observation and the decision he has made. That was the agreement at the time, and any contrary interpretation would not be accurate.

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 the correct understanding that was had 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 generous attitude and manner about these matters, like to recognize the gentleman, but under the circumstances I think the Speaker's ruling is the only one available to him.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a question?

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. COLMER. No, I would not say that that was exactly correct. I was not following it too closely, but my recollection is that the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), the minority ranking member on 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 50 Members on the floor 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 public safety 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 gladly 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. I 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. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 461]

Abbitt	Erlenborn	Montgomery
Abernethy	Eshleman	Morgan
Abourezk	Evans, Colo.	Mosher
Anderson, Tenn.	Findley	Moss
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fisher	Murphy, Ill.
Annunzio	Flowers	Murphy, N.Y.
Archer	Flynt	Nichols
Arends	Forsythe	Patman
Ashbrook	Fraser	Pepper
Ashley	Frenzel	Pike
Aspin	Frey	Podell
Aspinall	Galifianakis	Price, Tex.
Badillo	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Baker	Garmatz	Pucinski
Baring	Gettys	Purcell
Begich	Giaimo	Railsback
Bell	Goldwater	Randall
Bergland	Grasso	Rees
Betts	Gray	Riegle
Bevill	Green, Oreg.	Robison, N.Y.
Blackburn	Griffiths	Roncalio
Blanton	Gross	Rooney, N.Y.
Boggs	Gubser	Rooney, Pa.
Bolling	Haley	Rosenthal
Bow	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Breaux	Hanna	Roy
Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Runnels
Broomfield	Harsha	St Germain
Brotzman	Harvey	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Schmitz
Brown, Ohio	Hathaway	Schneebeli
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Schwengel
Burleson, Tex.	Hébert	Scott
Burlison, Mo.	Hillis	Sebelius
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Shipley
Cabell	Hosmer	Shoup
Caffery	Howard	Sisk
Carey, N.Y.	Hunt	Skubitz
Cederberg	Ichord	Snyder
Celler	Jacobs	Springer
Chamberlain	Jones, Tenn.	Steele
Chappell	Kastenmeier	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Keith	Steiger, Wis.
Clausen, Don H.	Kemp	Stephens
Clawson, Del	Kuykendall	Stratton
Clay	Kyl	Stuckey
Cleveland	Kyros	Sullivan
Collier	Link	Talcott
Collins, Tex.	Lloyd	Thompson, Ga.
Crane	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Curlin	Lujan	Thomson, Wis.
Danielson	McClory	Udall
Davis, S.C.	McClure	Van Deerlin
Davis, Wis.	McCormack	Waggonner
Delaney	McDonald, Mich.	Waldie
Dellenback	McKay	Whitehurst
Denholm	McMillan	Widnall
Derwinski	Martin	Wiggins
Dickinson	Matsunaga	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Mayne	Wilson, Charles H.
Dow	Meeds	Winn
Dowdy	Melcher	Wolff
Dwyer	Michel	Wright
Edmondson	Mikva	Wyatt
Edwards, Ala.	Mills, Md.	Wyman
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell	Yatron
	Mollohan	
	Monagan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 231 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

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

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS), I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a report.

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 and hope 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, 1973:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 92-1614)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, 1973, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 9, and 11.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, 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:

"(b) The provisions of this title shall cease to apply on the day after the date of 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 numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "Sec." insert: 203

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

W. D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
JAMES A. BURKE,
MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JACKSON BETTS,
H. T. SCHNEEBELI,
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.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16180) 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, 1973, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment numbered 1: The bill as passed by the House establishes a ceiling of $250,000,000,000 on expenditures and net lending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and directs the President to reserve from expenditures and net lending, from appropriations or other obligational authority heretofore or hereafter made available, such amounts as may be necessary to keep expenditures and net lending during fiscal year 1973 within this ceiling.

Senate amendment numbered 1 also directed the President to reserve such amounts as may be necessary to keep expenditures and net lending within the $250 billion ceiling, but provided that, with certain exceptions, such amounts were to be reserved proportionately from appropriations or other obligational authority available for all programs or activities. The program and activities from which no reservations were to be made were—

(1) interest,
(2) veterans' benefits and services,
(3) payments from social insurance trust funds,
(4) medicaid,
(5) public assistance maintenance grants,
(6) social services grants under title IV of the Social Security Act,
(7) food stamps,
(8) military retirement pay, and
(9) judicial salaries.

Senate amendment numbered 1 also provided that no amount specified in any appropriation, or any activity, program, or item within such appropriation, could be reduced by more than 10 percent.

The conference substitute provides that the provisions of title II of the bill, containing the limitation on expenditures and net lending, will cease to apply on the day after the date of enactment of the bill and no action taken under title II before that day will have any force or effect on or after that day.

Amendment numbered 2: Senate amendment numbered 2 provided that the amounts proportionately reserved by the President pursuant to Senate amendment numbered 1 were not to include appropriations or other obligational authority available for fiscal year 1973 to which statutory spending limitation of 10 percent or more applies. The Senate recedes.

Amendment numbered 3: The bill as passed by the House establishes a temporary joint committee to review operations of the expenditure ceiling established by title II of the bill, and to recommend procedures for improving congressional control of budgetary outlay and receipt totals, including procedures for establishing and maintaining an overall view of each year's budgetary outlays which is fully coordinated with an overall view of the anticipated revenues for that year. Under the bill as passed by the House, the joint committee consisted of 30 members as follows:

(1) Seven members from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and seven members from the Committee on Appropriations of the House, appointed by the Speaker.

(2) One additional member of the House appointed by the Speaker.

(3) Seven members from the Committee on Finance of the Senate and seven members from the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore.

(4) One additional member of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore.

Senate amendment numbered 3 increases

the membership of the joint committee to 32 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 and the 7 members of the Senate chosen from the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations) each House would have two additional members on 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 referred to shall continue as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen. However, the members of the joint committee chosen from the House committees who have been reelected to the House may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

Senate amendment numbered 4 also provides that a vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute 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 contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee, and authorizes expenditures of not to exceed $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), service of a Senator 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 bill which adds a new section to title II of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. Under the new section, whenever the President impounds any appropriated funds, he is to transmit promptly to the Congress and to the Comptroller General of the United States a report containing specified information with respect to the funds impounded. All such reports are to be published in the Federal Register.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment numbered 9: Senate amendment numbered 9 added a new title V to the bill containing three amendments to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Section 501 added a new section to the 1970 Act which established a permanent Joint Committee on the Budget to review all matters relating to the annual budget and information relating to Government expenditures and revenues, and to make reports and recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Congress concerning Government efficiency, spending ceilings, fiscal year estimates of program and project costs, and deviations from basic authorizations of law and appropriations inconsistent with those authorizations. Section 502 amended the 1970 Act to require each Federal agency responsible for carrying out a proposed bill or joint resolution, being reported by a Congressional committee (with certain exceptions), to furnish the committee with cost estimates of the proposed legislation. The Joint Committee on the Budget was to maintain a compilation of, and print, those estimates. Section 503 further amended the 1970 Act by authorizing the Joint Committee to recommend to the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of the Congress to hold joint hearings.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment numbered 10: This amendment added a new title VI to the bill providing that section 203(e)(2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 is amended so that, effective with respect to compensation 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(e)(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 amended this provision to provide that section 203(e)(2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 is amended so that, effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning before July 1, 1973 (and beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, or if later, the date established pursuant to State law), the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State "off" indicator ending any extended benefit period is to be determined without regard to the 120-percent requirement contained in section 203(e)(1)(A) of such 1970 Act.

The Senate amended the House amendment to restore the language of Senate amendment numbered 10 and also to provide that the provisions of title II of the bill are to cease to apply on the day after the date of the enactment of the bill. The Senate recedes and concurs in the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 10.

Amendment numbered 11: Senate amendment numbered 11 added a new title VII to the bill relating to the income tax treatment of unmarried individuals. In general, this amendment provided that all individuals, 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. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
JAMES A. BURKE,
MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JACKSON BETTS,
H. T. SCHNEEBELI,
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 call up the conference report 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, 1973, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House, today.)

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a rather unusual report to bring back to the House. It appears that both sides have won a great victory with respect to the limitation 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 $250 billion for 1 day.

At the end of that 1 day, the Senate language will prevail and that provision will become a nullity. 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 to do exactly what the House 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 him the latitude required to carry it out.

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 law relating to a spending ceiling, unless he could have the latitude that was in the last conference report, or in the House-passed bill, as necessary for him to carry out the directive of the Congress.

However, I think the President takes some degree of hope and encouragement from the fact that both the House and the Senate told him not to let the spending get above the $250 billion ceiling. I would imagine that he would use what is and has been over the years established by and asserted by all of the Presidents of the past, back to Thomas Jefferson, as being a Constitutional right, to withhold and reserve moneys, taking the position that the President does not have to spend every penny that the Congress makes available to him.

Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that since the two bodies, both have said to hold the spending below the $250 billion, that the President may use such an authority as that to try to accomplish his objective. Whether he can or not remains to be seen.

The other provisions of the bill remain the same as in the last conference. The Senate did another unusual thing. Not only did it amend the conference report in the respect that I just mentioned by, in effect, repealing the $250 million spending limit, but they wrote back into the conference report on the floor of the Senate the unemployment compensation provisions which they had originally written in.

So, there was a Senate amendment to a House amendment to a Senate amend-

ment. The only way we can handle that under the rules of the House is for the Senate to recede from its Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. This is what they did.

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 ceiling limitation, that we are in effect affirming the constitutional authority of the President to refuse to spend money appropriated by Congress?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, I am not saying that. I do not think you have to affirm it. If the President has that authority, there is nothing we can do to take it away from him.

Mr. SEIBERLING. We are not changing that?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. We are not changing that one iota, nor could we change it.

I am just saying, not having talked to him, what you may take as the meaning of the fact that both Houses, the Senate as well as the House, passed a provision that required the President to conserve enough to keep the spending within $250 billion.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman, in his presentation did I understand him to say the President would have the power for 1 day, as we had discussed, to veto line items in the appropriations?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, but at the same time we say that anything he does on that 1 day is a nullity. He cannot really do anything under the provision.

This reminds me of the time Mr. Doughton was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and sought to include benefits for the disabled under social security. The House passed it.

We had a great fight within the Ways and Means Committee, but he finally prevailed. The matter got to the Senate. The Senate was adamant. They did not want the disabled under social security.

Finally some of us in the conference suggested that the Senate recede from its position and agree to our position with an amendment that repealed it the day after it went into effect.

This is the second time I know of we have done something like this out of the necessities of the moment.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. I wonder if the gentleman would clarify the unemployment compensation provision in this conference report?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. The unemployment compensation provision in the conference report is the same as the motion we made when last we had 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.

Ms. ABZUG. In other words, if a State has fallen below the 4-percent unemployment it will not be eligible?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. All we are doing is permitting a State to disregard the 120 percent requirement in determining whether the extended benefits program has triggered off. It does not help the State of New York, because the State of New York has dropped below 4 percent insured unemployment in the last few days.

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

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 of order.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. Speaker, may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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 second conference report, 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 with 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 only $200 million. But that is 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 know but 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 $575 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 point of alleviating the condition in States where there was chronic unemployment. That program is still in operation and goes to the end of the year, does it not?

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 until June 30, 1973 of the permanent extended benefits program in those States that maintain a 4 percent insured unemployment rate but fail to meet the 120 percent requirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE 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 conferees did not accept the Senate amendment because it would have been too extreme a departure from the original concept of the "on" and "off" triggers contained in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Act. The amendment which the House has already agreed to is limited to permitting the States 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 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 could 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 amendment 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 conferees, 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 pockets of unemployment in the United States. In the State of Washington that situation exists in and around Seattle, and I think the Senator from Washington is to be commended for making every effort that 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, I note there are seven or eight States covered under the protective program, and among those States not covered are three States, named as California, 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. They would have been 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 unanimous consent. 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 agree with the gentleman, 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 trigger-on and trigger-off device, because what it means is this: That it triggers on if you have 120 percent of the unemployment that you had in the past 2 years. You can have a high rate of unemployment, 7, 8, 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 in that 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 provision in the Magnuson program, we have set up machinery to try to take care of the States where they do need to be given extended benefits. As a former member of the Texas Employment Commission, I recommended and voted for the program that would set up extended benefits. I did not envision, and I do not think the conference meant this type of thing to go on, 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, and I think everybody 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 the States of New York and California, among others, will be discriminated against by the provisions of this bill.

I, for one, intend to vote for the legislation, given the reality that there are a lot of other unemployed people elsewhere who will be penalized if we do not do something for some of them. However, may I ask the gentleman this:

Am I not correct that if we are permitted to work our will on 640, that 640 would then eliminate what those of us in California and New York perceive to be an unfair treatment?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. If I call up H.R. 640, I would on that occasion move to disagree with the Senate on an amendment that deals with this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from California that it is my understanding that the unemployment of covered workers in California has dropped below the 4 percent requirement of this program, not the 120 percent figures.

Mr. BURTON. Well, I do not have the data on that. I think 640 does result in the legislation that this does not. However, I intend to support this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I may have missed this in your earlier explanation, but does not the conference report cover an extension of the national debt from $445 billion to $465 billion?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, it increases the debt ceiling.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Is there some way to vote against the increase of the national debt extension and then vote against this conference report?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. I would not suggest that anybody vote against this conference report. I do not see how anybody can justify voting against an increase in the national debt when we have imposed this increase through our own actions by way of authorization and appropriation.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Will the gentleman yield for an additional question?

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

Mr. PICKLE. If the States listed in the conference report on this bill are extended these benefits, it would just eliminate the 120-percent triggering portion of the bill; would it not?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. PICKLE. And a State must still enter into the program and vote for it, and the funds will be paid on a 50-percent basis?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right. It must have enacted legislation to participate in the permanent extended benefits program.

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RHODES. I would like to ask my good friend from Arkansas if there is anything in the debt limit increase which would not allow the President of the United States to withhold funds which were authorized through the back door in the water bill which the conference report had in it and which was passed over the President's veto. As I understand it, the spending limitation, if it had remained at that debt level, would have been such that the President would have been able to regard such expenditures in about the same way as he did appropriated expenditures and cut the amount.

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

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

I am not as expertly informed as my friend from Arizona is on the provisions of the water bill to which he refers, but if we are authorizing and really appropriating moneys for a project and we are not passing that money out under a formula, then the President might spend less if he wanted to than the Congress made

available. In other words, he could reserve 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. MILLS of Arkansas. There is some question in the minds of some lawyers as to whether the President can so reserve under that circumstance.

Mr. RHODES. So the point I am trying to make is that it seems to me the Congress has told the President to cut his spending to $250 billion. By the action on the debt limit and also by the action on passing this bill over his veto we also tell him we do not care how much he spends.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me state it differently, and I want to make it clear. Both the House and Senate said the President must reserve his spending at not more than $250 billion. The Senate after saying that then put the President in such a straitjacket that he could not exercise the directive that the Congress or the Senate gave him. He needed the flexibility we provided for him in the House bill instead of what both branches told him to do. It is a little incongruous that one branch of the Government will tell the President that he has to do something and then make it utterly impossible for him to carry that branch's directive out.

Mr. RHODES. That is exactly what we have done today. I hope the gentleman is correct and the President will be able to hold spending at $250 billion. I am afraid the back door spending on the water bill—and certainly I favor the rationale of that bill—will make it almost impossible for him to do as we direct him.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I hope that is not the case.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the chairman said. This bill should be supported by all of the Members of the House.

I want to point out that in his statement the chairman did say it is the responsibility of the Congress, because Congress——

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. You can draw the President into it if you want to, because there is only one bill we passed over his veto—or two now. The water bill plus the railroad retirement bill. So I guess the President down at the other end is spending the money if we make it available to him. All I am saying is I do not know how anyone can make him available.

Mr. VANIK. But the point I am making is that when a contract is signed it is signed by a representative of the President and when people are hired they are hired by him, so he must agree with it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is true. However, on occasion, the Congress may be just too liberal in applying other people's money.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether those of us who have consistently through the years voted to keep spending far below what the President'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 to me that there is justification 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 be all by himself 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 followers over on the Republican side have been following the President down the aisle, voting for 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 gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the gentleman 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 a partisan note.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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 demagoguery.

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

Incidentally his main economy action seems to come at the expense of our national security. His "stand up for America" rating is a very modest 22 percent.

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

ECONOMY VOTES IN THE 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks 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 (1971–72) BY REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE D. LONG, DEMOCRAT, SECOND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

1. In four instances, I voted against funds for the SST program, totalling $489.6 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 Government paid almost 14,000 farmers over $20,000 each in crop subsidies. A California company received $698,801, a Texas farmer received $117,012, and a California farmer received $139,263 in crop subsidies for 1971 alone. (June, 1971)

4. Voted against the so-called Welfare Reform 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)

6. Voted against the Agriculture-Environmental Protection Conference Report appropriation of $13.3 billion. (July, 1971)

7. Voted against providing $50 million for the U.S. contribution to the U.N. Development Program, because of mismanagement of the UNDP. From 1965–1969, $100 million was granted to countries which did not need aid. (December, 1971)

8. Voted against a $72.5 million appropriation for the D.C. subway on the ground that the nation's highest-income city should finance its own rapid transit. (December, 1971)

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

10. Voted against the NASA authorization for over $3.4 billion, a $49.9 million increase over the Administration's request. (April, 1972)

11. Voted against providing $3 million in public assistance to mass transit bus companies in D.C. (May, 1972)

12. Voted against a $364 million increase in funds for education because the figure in the bill was adequate in view of our huge national debt. (June, 1972)

13. Voted against the Revenue Sharing Bill, which would cost $30 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 White House from $1,025,000 to $300,000. (June, 1972)

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

16. Co-sponsored an amendment to limit the number of ungraded employees to 95 and the amount of money for salaries to $29.7 million in the Executive Office of the President. (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 again to limit Federal crop subsidies to $20,000 for any person. This would save about $10 million per year. (June, 1972)

19. Voted against providing reimbursement for losses suffered by industry because of the ban on cyclamates. Conservative estimates placed the cost of this legislation at well over $120 million. (July, 1972)

20. Voted against increasing the annuities for Supreme Court Justices' widows, which could cost as much as $51,600 annually. (August, 1972)

21. Voted to eliminate aid to Brazil be-

cause that nation has wasted our aid or diverted it to the wrong purposes. The aid is over $46 million. (August, 1972)

22. Voted to sustain the President's veto of the $30.5 billion Labor-HEW Appropriation Bill because it contained more money than we could afford at the present time. (August, 1972)

23. Voted against the Public Works-Economic Development Bill, which authorized $3.1 billion. (August, 1972)

24. Voted against extending the programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity Act. The bill authorized $4.7 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 $250–500 million annually (and more later on) for the hiring of civilians. (September, 1972)

26. Offered six amendments to the 1973 Foreign Assistance Appropriation Bill to reduce funds by approximately $1 billion, to the 1972 appropriation levels, because of our huge national deficit.

27. Voted against authorizing $14 million in "start-up" monies for the Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center because the nation's taxpayers should not have to pay for civic center for Washingtonians. (October, 1972)

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

29. Voted against spending the taxpayers' money to take over the bus companies in the D.C. metropolitan area. ⅔ of the funds for the take-over would be Federal grants. (October, 1972)

30. Voted against the Conference Report on the Pesticide Control Act because it contained a provision 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. Speaker, 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 bill first came 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 adamant. In the face of that adamancy, 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 history of spending ceilings that when Presidents do not want a ceiling, then the Congress is apparently quite willing to impose one. This was the case with President Johnson.

But now we have a situation where a President has come to us and asked for a limitation on spending? He has said to us, in effect: "We all recognize we are spending too much, so put some obligation on me to reduce this spending and give me authority to carry out this obligation effectively."

Our reaction has been, in effect, to say: "Oh, no, Mr. President—under no circumstances. We are fearful you might carry out our directives." We are glad to give him the obligation, but not the authority to carry it out.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I just wonder if the gentleman is saying that if the President asks for a spending ceiling and the Congress gives it to him, then that is an abdication of congressional responsibility, but that if the Congress forces it on him against his will, that is not an abdication of congressional responsibility.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am sure that we will try to find rationale for some of our inconsistencies—and that probably is one of them.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONABLE. I am disappointed and I know there are many people like me who are disappointed that this spending ceiling has not been accomplished. There is a natural tendency, when you are disappointed, to vote against a conference report of this sort. I wonder if the gentleman would explain what situation we would be in if this conference report is not accepted by the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I expect to come to that later in my remarks. I appreciate the gentleman bringing it up.

Mr. CONABLE. Particularly in view of the parliamentary situation that we find ourselves in.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes.

Before commenting on that, let me make one other very brief comment with respect to today's action.

It seems to me that this Congress comes to a close on a rather sad note, particularly with respect to our fiscal problems.

In the first place, it overrides a presidential veto on a bill that would authorize $24 billion of expenditure in the next 3 years.

Then, it turns around and tells the President that it cannot give him the tools he needs to put some restraint on spending.

We are all protesting, and we will go back home and protest, about taxes, inflation and the debt. Yet today, when we can take action—in not being unreasonable in our demands for the spending of money in an area where the President has sent back a veto, and in giving the President some authority and directive to save money—we threaten to abandon fiscal responsibility in both instances.

Now let me point out exactly what this vote means. Let no one make any mistake about it. If you vote against this conference report—if you are in the majority in that position—you are voting to come back in special session by the 8th of November, because you are leaving the President no alternative but to call us back.

As of today the Treasury has the authority to borrow up to a ceiling of $450 billion. On November 1 its authority to borrow will be only $400 billion. So in voting against this proposal, you will be cutting back by $50 billion borrowing authority that has in large part already been used, and the Government would be unable to pay its bills. No administration could live with that situation.

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

I want the President to go to the American public and say that this Congress, if it rejects this conference report, is acting just as irresponsibly as it did with respect to the water bill, and just as irresponsibly as it did in not giving him the authority to cut spending. They are so irresponsible—they take away the dollars I now have to pay the bills.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, no matter what its views are individually, has no practical alternative but to provide for a debt ceiling of $465 billion until June 30, 1973. Yet in so doing, we all know that this is going to be an inadequate ceiling, because we can only remain within it if we hold spending to $250 billion. And we have already said we are not concerned about that, we have already abdicated our responsibility in that area.

There is every indication, therefore, that this proposal ceiling will be exceeded before the end of this fiscal year, and if it is, we are going to have to come in and vote next time on even more than $465 billion.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am also for the working people of New York and California, and I would just like to know how many other States are involved in the Senate amendment, in doing something about the 4-percent cutoff requirement.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentlewoman would like to have the States that would have been included by the Senate amendment, and which are not included in the House amendment?

Ms. ABZUG. Yes.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and West Virginia.

Ms. ABZUG. I thank the chairman.

The unemployment provisions on this bill as it comes to us from conference help only a handful of States, arbitrarily leaving a large number of others out in the cold. If we agree—as we should and as our conferees obviously did by including this provision—that requiring a State to have unemployment 20-percent higher than in the 2 previous years in addition to having a 4-percent level of employment is artificial and unfair, then why provide relief only to those States which have not yet fallen victim to this irrational standard?

To my mind, it makes no sense to keep a State and its unemployed workers from participating in this unemployment program just because their already high unemployment rate has not become 20-

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 increase requirement with respect not 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 1.—STATES AFFECTED BY THE PROVISION IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT

State	Estimated maximum number of beneficiaries	Estimated maximum total additional costs (thousands)
Alaska	1,100–1,500	$600–$800
Maine	7,000–8,000	3,000–3,500
Massachusetts	49,300	30,000
Michigan	71,400–97,300	40,700–55,400
Nevada	6,700	3,600
New Jersey	80,000–120,000	48,000–72,000
Puerto Rico	33,000–42,000	9,000–11,000
Rhode Island	8,000–9,000	5,000
Vermont	3,600	2,000–3,000
Washington	42,000	17,000
Total (approximate)	300,000–380,000	160,000–202,000
Federal share		80,000–101,000

TABLE 2.—STATES AFFECTED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENT

State	Number of beneficiaries	Costs (Federal and State share) (in thousands)
Alaska	1,100–1,500	$600–$800
Arkansas	2,750	1,000
California	140,000–150,000	80,000–90,000
Hawaii	1,500–2,500	1,000–1,500
Idaho	1,500	350–400
Kentucky	5,000	2,000
Louisiana	6,000–6,500	2,400–2,700
Maine	7,000–8,000	3,000–3,500
Massachusetts	49,300	30,000
Michigan	71–400–97,300	40,700–55,400
Minnesota	11,000–13,000	4,900–5,500
Montana	1,700	435
Nevada	6,700	3,600
New Jersey	80,000–120,000	48,000–72,000
New Mexico	400–600	200–300
New York	170,000–200,000	80,000–120,000
North Dakota	1,200	860
Ohio	12,000–20,000	8,000–10,000
Oregon	11,000–14,000	4,000–5,000
Pennsylvania	22,000–37,600	11,000–18,800
Puerto Rico	33,000–42,000	9,000–11,000
Rhode Island	8,000–9,000	5,000
Utah	1,900	850
Vermont	3,600	2,000–3,000
Washington	42,000	17,000
West Virginia	1,500	450
Total (approximate)	690,000–840,000	350,000–460,000
Federal share (millions)		175–230

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

There has been, Mr. Speaker, some discussion about fiscal responsibility here this afternoon. I propose to support the resolution of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means because I believe that would be the responsible thing to do. However, in connection with responsibility, I would draw to the attention of the Members of the House remarks made by the distinguished leader of the other body—which I have just observed on the ticker—in which he points out that in the 4 years of the present administration Congress has cut the President's budget requests by $20.2 billion and that is, I think, an act of fiscal responsibility on the part of Congress. As the distinguished majority leader in the other body observed, during the 4 years of the present administration the budget deficits have increased $104.3 billion; during that period of time, as I was observing, Congress cut over $20 billion below the President's budget request. So this Congress has been a responsible Congress in terms of its response to the administration's budget proposals, and I hope that we will again be responsible in voting to support the resolution of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Members that we are right back where we started, back where we were when the President brought his request to the Committee on Ways and Means. Members of that committee asked, "Where is it you want to cut that you cannot cut without this specific expenditure ceiling." He would not tell us. Because he would not tell us, the Congress would not give him the authority, and that decision was right.

We have been told so much about the necessity for an expenditure ceiling and, almost simultaneously by the same speakers, that the President already has all the authority he needs to hold expenditures to the $250 billion. I suggest to you that there is a good bit of misleading information in both statements.

The President's proposal which was brought to the floor as the original Ways and Means Committee bill was much more than a mere sense-of-the-Congress resolution to hold down spending. It was a repeal of every expenditure decision made by this 92d Congress. It would have impowered the President to do a great number of things which he cannot do now that the Congress, for sound reasons, has rejected the proposal.

The expenditure ceiling as passed by the House would have delegated to the President unrestrained power to cut social security payments, the Federal portion of welfare payment due to the States, health and education funds directed on a formula basis, and revenue sharing.

Some of us on the Ways and Means Committee urged the administration to tell us their intentions. The response was total silence except for the commitment that revenue sharing would not be cut.

The arrogance of the President's request, coupled with the refusal to say how the power was to be used is worthy of note.

By passage of the debt ceiling increase now pending, we say to the President that if his revenue estimates are accurate and if he spends no more than $250 billion in this fiscal year, we authorize him to borrow sufficient funds to carry the Federal Government through the fiscal year. If revenues go above the estimates, he will have more money to spend or may borrow less than he indicates is his intention. If revenues are less than are estimated, he must reduce expenditures below the $250 billion or seek additional borrowing authority.

There is no question but that the President has discretion in some significant areas of expenditures—to either speed up or slow down the outflow of Federal dollars. Because of the way in which we appropriate funds there is roughly the same amount of money from prior years appropriations—pipeline money—as was requested for this fiscal year. Much of these funds are in the Department of Defense. If the President decides to consider the will of the American people, as expressed by this Congress, he will as the first order of business slow down defense expenditures, for it is in this field that the Congress made the greatest cuts in the President's request for funds. But, it is to be noted that he may ignore that congressional action by speeding up defense pipeline expenditures, even though he got $4 billion less for defense than his request for the current year.

Further, if the President decides to take into account the will of the people, as expressed through their Representatives, he will refrain from slowing down expenditures for such things as water pollution control. The veto override should have been clear. Yet, because of the nature of that expenditure, the President may constitutionally drag his feet and delay critically needed expenditures in this field.

Because of the wisdom finally displayed by the Congress in refusing to grant unrestrained discretion, the President may not now stay within the $250 billion expenditure ceiling by cutting social security payments or railroad retirement payments or, as I have always suspected he intended doing, robbing the school children of America of badly needed Federal funds to finance education. He clearly may—and in my own view should—stay within that ceiling by cutting defense expenditures and delaying low-priority public works.

Since there has been so much talk about fiscal responsibility, it is worth noting that the President has submitted deficit budgets beyond anything ever comprehended by any other President.

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; not a big dent in an 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 dollar tax cut—this time for aid to nonpublic schools.

The Treasury Department submitted evidence to the Ways and Means Committee that 12 percent of the 50 largest corporations in America pay a lower effective Federal income tax rate than does the American wage earner pay in social security taxes alone.

How can we be satisfied with giant deficits, 5 million unemployed, a grossly inequitable and insufficient tax system? This is the administration's view of fiscal responsibility. It is not my own.

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

Authorizing 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 do what is necessary to control spending, because 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; the legislation provides for only an 8-month period, however. What I hope this crisis has shown us is that there is a tremendous need for reform.

Congressional reform is always a topic of interest, and when we speak of reform, we most often think of the seniority system. But our most pressing need at this point in time is reform of our budgetary 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 appropriations measures, exclusive of supplemental and continuing appropriations. This does not provide adequately, however, for a careful weighing of alternative programs and priorities. This is what the Congress needs.

In addition, the fiscal year has become the laughing stock of Capitol Hill. 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 budgetary 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.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have demanded that the elderly of this Nation skrimp and save and watch their pennies in order to sustain the most basic existence. We have asked that the cities and States 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 our 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 commend 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 of various programs which have been enacted by the Congress over the years.

During my visits back in Indiana over the past several weekends protests have reached me from industry and workers against the Congress retreating 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 16, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Retired Teachers' Association and the American Association of Retired Persons, with a combined membership of 4.6 million older persons, wish to express our views with respect to H.R. 16810, the public debt limitation legislation.

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 just such coordination may present the 93rd 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 means of avoiding a difficult decision in the future, are an unsatisfying remedy, the future ramifications of which may adversely affect the delicate system of checks and balances on which our Government is based. We fear that enactment of the principle contained in this legislation, despite any restrictions placed thereon by the Senate, 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, for 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 fiscal viability of the health, education, Administration on Aging and other programs for which we have worked so diligently during the past year could be jeopardized.

Our Associations, therefore, urge the members of the House to reject the Conference Committee's version of H.R. 16810. If any spending limitation is to be enacted into law, our Associations would hope that the executive's power to control spending would be circumscribed so as to exempt from such power Social Security and Medicare benefits, welfare payments, military retirement, civil service and railroad retirement benefits, judicial salaries, interest on the national debt and social service outlays 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. This is the same old story 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. I join with our great chairman, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas in supporting the President's request for an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. VANIK. 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" to extinction any program which he dislikes.

If there is one dollar of waste or error in Federal contracts—and there are bil-

lions—the President's man signs the contract. If there are drones on the public payroll—and there are hundreds of thousands—the President's men hired them and can fire them. If there are disgusting subsidies paid to the undeserving, the President's men order it done.

Early next year, Congress can develop appropriate measures to control inflation and hold down expenditures of the Government and the Federal deficit. Congress must put an end to "inflation" by Executive decree—through which untouchable forces in American can raise prices at will.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 14, 1972.

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

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 201 of Public Law 89–298, 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.
Metlakatle Harbor at Metlakatla, Alaska.
Des Moines River at Ottumwa, Iowa.
Hoonah Harbor, Alaska.
North Shore of Long Island, Suffolk County, N.Y.
Texas City Channel, Texas.
Peyton Creek, Texas.
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts Nos 1, 2, and 3, Mo.
Little Rivert 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 conferees have agreed on a conference report for the highway bill and there is a possibility that there will be a rollcall on that legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I was going to make that announcement, that the conferees have met and 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 subject to the call of the Chair.

The 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 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 5 o'clock p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1819, UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. WRIGHT (on behalf of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) filed the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1819) to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the act:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 92–1616)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1819) to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

That (a) section 207 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1898) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972," and by inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1976"; and by inserting before the period at the end of such section, "required by section 210, and in the case of any real property acquisition or displacement occurring prior to July 1, 1974, such Federal agencies shall pay 100 per centum of the cost of such payments and assistance required by section 305".

(b) Section 211(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(a) The cost to a State agency of providing payments and assistance pursuant to sections 206, 210, 215, and 305, and cost to a person of providing payments and assistance pursuant to section 223(a), shall be included as part of the cost of a program or project for which Federal financial assistance is available to such State agency or person, and such State agency or person shall be eligible for Federal financial assistance with respect to such payments and assistance in the same manner and to the same extent as other program or project costs, except that, notwithstanding any other law in the case where the Federal financial assistance is by grant or contribution the Federal agency shall pay the full amount of the first $25,000 of the cost to a State agency or to a person of providing payments and assistance for a displaced person under sections 206, 210, 215, and 223(a), on account of any acquisition or displacement occurring prior to July 1, 1976, and under section 305, on account of any acquisition occurring prior to July 1, 1974, and in any case where such Federal financial assistance is by loan, the Federal agency shall loan such State agency or person the full amount of the first $25,000 of such cost."

(c) Title II of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"INTERIM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION EXPENSES

"SEC. 222. (a) During the period from July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973, the head of a Federal agency is authorized to pay to a State which is not in compliance with this Act such sums in excess of the first $25,000 of cost as may be necessary to make all payments and provide all assistance required by this Act.

"(b) On and after July 1, 1973, or such earlier date that a State is able, under its laws, to comply with sections 210 and 305, the head of a Federal agency shall (1) not approve any grant to, or contract or agreement with, any State agency, of the kind referred to in such sections, unless such State agency satisfies the head of the Federal agency that the State is taking appropriate measures to repay to the United States an amount equal to the payments made by the Federal agency in carrying out subsection (a) of this section that the State would have paid if it had been in full compliance with such sections after July 1, 1972, or (2) after giving the State agency a reasonable period of time to seek funds to repay the United States the amounts of such payments, deduct sums totaling the amounts of such payments from Federal assistance available under any grant, contract, or agreement (except relocation payments) from the Federal agency, to that State agency, over a period and in a manner that shall not substantially and adversely affect the programs or projects so assisted.".

(d) Section 101(3) is amended by inserting immediately after "means" the following: "a State,".

(e) Section 101(6) is amended by inserting immediately after "personal property from real property" the following: "which he or his personal property lawfully occupies," and by adding at the end thereof the following: "In any administrative or judicial determination as to lawful occupancy, occupancy shall be deemed to be prima facie evidence of lawful occupancy, and the burden of proving unlawful occupancy shall be on the party alleging unlawful occupancy."

(f) Title II of such Act, as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is amended

by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN DIRECTLY BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS

"SEC. 223. (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 Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q), under title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291), under section 301 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241), under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 (12 U.S.C. 1749), or under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (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 and such program or project will result in the forced displacement of any person, the head of the Federal agency furnishing such financial 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 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) prior to the approval of the grant, contract, or agreement by the head of the Federal agency, that decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwellings will be available to such displaced persons within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement in accordance with section 205(c)(3).

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of law, whenever a program or project to be undertaken by a 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), 1715z-1), or under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, as amended (12 U.S.C 1701s), by a Federal agency pursuant to a grant, contract, or agreement will result in the forced displacement of any person, the head of the Federal agency furnishing such financial assistance shall insure 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, decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwellings to such displaced persons in accordance with section 205(c)(3).

"(c) The head of any Federal agency providing Federal financial assistance pursuant to the programs or projects identified in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall insure that relocation payments and other benefits provided under this section reach only displaced persons.

"REMOVAL OF VACANT IMPROVEMENTS

"SEC. 224. No department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government administering any program providing Federal financial assistance shall, for the purpose of assuring compliance with this Act, impose any limitation on the removal of vacant improvements located on real property acquired in connection with such a federally assisted project."

SEC. 2. Section 202(a)(2) of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon a comma and the following: "except that in any case where it is impracticable to determine such relocation expenses the payment shall be for the actual direct losses".

SEC. 3. Title III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1898) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"DONATIONS

"SEC. 307. Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent a person, after he has been tendered the full amount of estimated just compensation as established by the approved appraisal of the fair market value of the subject property, from making a gift or donation of such property or any part thereof or of any of the compensation paid therefor, to a Federal agency, a State or a State agency, as such person shall determine.".

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended title proposed by the House amendment, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments for four additional years, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
JIM WRIGHT,
GEORGE W. COLLINS,
DON H. CLAUSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
LEE METCALF,
LAWTON CHILES,
BILL BROCK,
EDWARD J. GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1819) to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the Act, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendments struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the Senate bill, and the Senate disagreed to the House amendments.

The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the bill and the House amendment to the text of the bill. The committee of conference also recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill with a substitute title.

The differences between the text of the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS

Subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the Senate bill amended sections 207 and 211 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to extend the period of Federal funding indefinitely for the first $25,000 of relocation payments required by those sections. The Senate language also provided for the termination of Federal funding for the first $25,000 of expenses required by section 305.

The House amendment provided for Federal funding through July 1, 1974 in the case of the first $25,000 of section 210 relocation payments and section 305 incidental expenses.

The conferees agreed to provide Federal funding for the first $25,000 of relocation payments required by sections 207, 211, and 223(a) (discussed below) through July 1, 1976, and expenses required by section 305, through July 1, 1974.

INTERIM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION EXPENSES

Subsection (c) of the first section of the Senate bill amended section 221 (b) of the 1970 Act to extend the effective date of the Act until July 1, 1973 (except as it applies to section 210 (3)), or thirty days after the end of the next regular session of the State legislature, whichever is earlier, to give a State legislature extra time to pass legislation enabling it to comply with the Act.

Subsection (d) of that first section added a new companion section 222 to the Act to provide that during the extension referred to above any person displaced by a Federal program in a State not yet in compliance with the Act would be paid the benefits provided under the Act directly by the Federal agency administering the project responsible for displacement. The Senate language also provided that the Federal agency head shall take all reasonable steps to recover the portion of these payments which would have been the non-Federal share if the State would have been in lawful compliance with the Act, and authorized the Federal agency head to deduct any delinquent non-Federal share from future program payments within such State.

The House amendment contained no comparable provision for a formal extension of the effective date, but allowed the head of a Federal agency to advance a State not in compliance with this Act funds as are necessary to make all payments that are required by the Act.

The conferees agreed to a new section 222 which would allow the head of a Federal agency to pay a State not in compliance with this Act funds as are necessary to make all payments and provide all benefits that are required by the Act. The conference agreement further provided that the Federal agency head shall take all reasonable steps to recover the portion of these payments which would have been the non-Federal share if the State would have been in lawful compliance with the Act, and authorized the Federal agency head to deduct any delinquent non-Federal share from future program payments from the Federal agency to the State.

It is the intent of the conferees that this new section 222 allow State agencies to act as conduits for payment of Federal funds in excess of $25,000 for up to one additional year. Nothing contained in section 222 shall be construed to require a State to incur a formal debt obligation in order to receive Federal funds under such section.

DEFINITION OF DISPLACED PERSON

Subsection (e) of the first section of the House amendment limited the eligibility of displaced persons who can receive benefits under the Act to those persons who lawfully occupy the real property from which he is displaced.

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 persons who lawfully occupy the real property from which they are displaced, but puts the burden of proving unlawful occupancy on the party alleging the unlawful occupancy. It is the intent of this section to prohibit unlawful squatters from receiving the benefits of this Act.

ASSISTANCE TO SPECIFIED PROGRAMS

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 to persons displaced by any Federally assisted program or project. The Senate bill further provided that Federal agency heads administering any such program or project would be required to take reasonable and necessary steps to provide payments and other benefits to persons displaced between January 2, 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 to receive payments and other benefits under the Act. In the case of all programs identified in the House amendment, other than section 236 of the National Housing Act, relocation payments and other benefits would not be provided to persons displaced by Federally assisted programs or projects where the recipient of such program or project assistance was not a non-profit organization.

The conference report provides in section 223 that persons displaced by eight specified programs would be eligible for the payments and other benefits of the Act. Under section 223(a) of the conference report, persons displaced by programs or projects where the recipient of Federal program or project assistance is an individual (as opposed to a partnership, corporation, or association) would not be eligible for payments or any other benefits under the Act. The cost of providing payments and other benefits under section 223(b) will be borne entirely by the Federal Government.

Section 205(c)(3) of the Act requires the State agency to provide "assurances" that within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement there will be available decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwellings at rents or prices within the financial means of the families and individuals to be displaced equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced persons.

The new section 223, in expanding coverage of the Act, requires the organization, or State agency, as the case may be, to provide the Federal agency furnishing the financial assistance "assurances" of the adequacy of housing resources in accord with section 205(c)(3) for such programs or projects which will result in the forced displacement of any person.

There is concern that the replacement housing needs for the extended coverage of programs or projects under the new section 223 could create an overlapping demand for housing resources needed by other public programs or projects being undertaken or proposed within a locality, and could result in inadvertently restricting public programs or projects that may be deemed essential to the locality. Therefore, Federal agency administrative regulations should provide that (1) the head of the Federal agency will review the adequacy of housing resources for each program or project covered by this section in light of the competing needs of all other public programs or projects in the locality, and (2) wherever there appears to be a question as to the adequacy of housing resources to meet all relocation needs, the head of the Federal agency, before approving the program or project under review, will obtain recommendations of priority from the appropriate unit of local and state governments.

REMOVAL OF VACANT IMPROVEMENTS

Subsection (c) of the first section of the House amendment added a section 224 to the 1970 Act prohibiting a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government administering any program providing Federal financial assistance, for the purpose of complying with this Act, from imposing any limitation on the removal of vacant improvements located on real property acquired in connection with the Federally assisted project.

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)(2) that payment of actual direct losses of tangible personal property incurred as the result of moving or discontinuing a business or farm 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 House amendment added a section 307 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 his property, from making a donation of the property or any part of the property or any of the compensation paid him for the property to a Federal agency, a State, or a State agency as the person determines.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate accepted the House language.

The conferees agreed that any such donation be considered as an acquisition for purposes of the 1970 Act.

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
JIM WRIGHT,
GEORGE W. COLLINS,
DON H. CLAUSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
LEE METCALF,
LAWTON CHILES,
BILL BROCK,
EDWARD J. GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE CONTROL ACT OF 1972

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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The 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:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

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

SEC. 2. Title IV of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 is amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS

"SEC. 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. Findings 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 support of environmental noise planning and control programs.
"Sec. 419. Development of low-noise-emission products.
"Sec. 420. Authorization of appropriations.

"FINDINGS AND POLICY

"SEC. 402. (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, appliances, 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, it is the purpose of this Act to establish a means for effective coordination of Federal research and activities in environmental noise control, to authorize the establishment of Federal noise emission standards of new products, to provide information to the public of the noise emission and noise reduction characteristics of new products, to encourage and support State and municipal programs for the control of environmental noise through planning and program grants to State and local environmental noise control agencies, and 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) Public participation in the development, revision, and enforcement of any regulation, noise emission standard, program or plan established by the Administrator or any State or municipality under this Act shall be provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator and the States and municipalities. The Administrator, in cooperation with the States and municipalities, within ninety days after enactment of this section, shall develop and publish regulations specifying minimum guidelines 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.

"(b) 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 noise control agency, 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) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

"(b) The term 'person' means an individual, corporation, partnership, or association, and (except as provided in section 413(a)(1) of this Act) includes any officer, employee, department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, a State, or any 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 (49 U.S.C. 1431); or

"(2)(A) any military aircraft, rockets, weapons, or equipment which are designed for combat use; or (B) any aircraft, rockets, launch vehicles, spacecraft, or equipment which are designed for research, experimental, or developmental work to be performed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as determined by the President under section 406 of this Act.

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

"(e) The term 'new product' means a product the equitable or legal title to which has never been transferred to an ultimate purchaser. Products remanufactured or rebuilt by a manufacturer from used products to restore original functions shall be considered to be new products for the purposes of this title and title V of this Act.

"(f) The term 'manufacturer' means any person engaged in the manufacturing, assembling, or importing of new products, or who acts for, and is controlled by, any such person in connection with the distribution of such products, but shall not include any dealer with respect to any new product received by him in commerce.

"(g) The term 'dealer' means any person engaged in the sale or the distribution of new products to the ultimate purchaser who may prepare a product for sale or distribution to the ultimate purchaser: *Provided*, That when such dealer's preparatory or final assembly work involves modifications which increase the noise emission characteristics of such product, such dealer shall then be considered a manufacturer of such product for the purposes of this title and title V of this Act.

"(h) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation—

"(1) between a place in a State and any place outside thereof, or

"(2) which affects trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(i) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(j) The term 'Federal agency' means any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States including the United States Postal Service.

"(k) The term 'environmental noise control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State environmental noise control agency for purposes of this Act:

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of environmental noise;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of environmental noise; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of environmental noise.

"(l) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"(m) The term 'noise emission standard' means a statement of a noise level or other acoustical characteristic which may not be exceeded under specified conditions or method of operation. Such standard shall include the test procedures to be followed and shall be stated in terms of performance rather than design criteria.

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

"(o) The term 'cumulative noise exposure' means the exposure of individuals in defined areas around airports to noise from aircraft operations weighted by time of day."

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATION, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 405. (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, extent, prevention and control of environmental noise;

"(2) conduct and finance research by contract with any person, on the effects, measurement, and control of noise, including but not limited to—

"(A) investigation of the direct or indirect effects of noise on humans (including physiological and psychological effects), and the direct or indirect effects of noise on domestic animals, fish, wildlife, and property, and determination of acceptable levels of noise on the basis of such effects; and

"(B) development of improved methods and standards for measurement and monitoring of noise, in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

"(3) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services (including the drafting of model ordinances) and provide financial assistance to environmental noise control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities:

"(4) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of environmental noise in cooperation with any noise pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the noise is located; and

"(5) establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of noise to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and proposals and to avoid duplication of research, and for other purposes.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Administrator is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of activities pursuant to subsection (a) and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal agencies, with environmental noise control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities, including technical assistance;

"(3) make grants to environmental noise control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions and organizations, and to individuals, for purposes stated in subsection (a) of this section;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training (without fee) for, and make training grants to personnel of environmental noise control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Environmental Protection Agency and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and make available through publications and other appropriate means, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on physical, and human and other effects of varying levels of noise and other information pertaining to noise and the prevention and control thereof; and

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of environmental noise.

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Administrator shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known noise sources.

"(d) In carrying out research pursuant to this Act, the Administrator shall give special emphasis to research on the short- and long-term effects of environmental noise on public health and welfare.

"FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 406. (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 further the policy declared in section 402 of this Act.

"(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 shall comply with Federal, State, interstate, and local requirements respecting control and abatement of environ-

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 determines it to be in the paramount interest of the United States to do so; except that no exemption, other than for those products specified pursuant to section 404 (c)(2) of this Act may be granted from the requirements of sections 408, 511, and 521 of this Act. No such exemption shall be granted due to lack of appropriation unless the President shall have specifically requested such appropriation as a part of the budgetary process and the Congress shall have failed to make available such requested 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 preceding calendar year, together with his reason for granting such exemption.

(c)(1) The Administrator shall coordinate the programs of all Federal agencies relating to environmental noise research and environmental noise control. Each Federal agency shall furnish to the Administrator such information as he may reasonably require, to determine, as provided under section 309 of the Clean Air Act, if 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) Each Federal agency shall consult with the Administrator in prescribing any regulations respecting environmental noise. If at any time the Administrator has reason to believe that a standard or regulation, or any proposed standard or regulation of any Federal agency, respecting noise, does not protect the public health and welfare to the extent he believes to be required he shall request such agency to review and report to him on the advisability of revising such standard or regulation to provide such protection. Any such request shall be published in the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the information on which such request is based. Such agency shall complete the requested review and report to the Administrator within 180 days after the date of the publication in the Federal Register of the request. The report shall be published in the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the agency respecting the revision of its standard or regulation.

"(3) On the basis of regular consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, the Administrator shall compile and publish annually a report to the Congress on the status and progress of Federal activities relating to environmental noise research and environmental noise control. This report shall describe the environmental noise control programs of each Federal agency and assess the contributions of those programs to the Federal Government's overall efforts to control environmental noise.

"NOISE CRITERIA AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

"SEC. 407. (a) The Administrator shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal, State, and municipal agencies, and other appropriate persons, within nine months after the date of enactment of this section, issue noise criteria. Such criteria shall reflect the scientific knowledge most useful in indicating the kind and extent of all identifiable effects on the public health or welfare which may be expected from differing quantities and qualities of noise, and such criteria shall set forth levels of environmental noise the attainment and maintenance of which in defined areas under various conditions are requisite to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate 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 section compile and publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which on the basis of information available to him 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 521 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 compile and provide information on methods and techniques of controlling environmental noise through, among other means, product use control, land use regulation, and construction and building standards. Such information shall be compiled and published to assist State and local governments in establishing and enforcing environmental noise control programs supported under section 418 of this Act.

"(d) The Administrator shall from time to time review and, as appropriate, revise or supplement any criteria or reports published under this section.

"(e) Any report under subsection (b)(1) of this section identifying major noise sources shall be published in the Federal Register. 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. 408. (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 snowmobiles, motorcycles, and recreational vehicles and related equipment).

"(iii) Any motor or engine (including 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 reproduced).

"(vi) Percussion and explosive equipment.

"(2)(A) Regulations proposed under paragraph (1) shall be promulgated not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply to any appropriate new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or in a class identified) in any report published under section 407(b)(1) of this Act on or before the date of publication of such initial proposed regulations.

"(B) In the case of any new product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or is part of a class identified) as a major source of noise in a report published under section 407(b)(1) of this Act after publication of the initial proposed regulations under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, regulations under paragraph (1) of this subsection for such new product shall be promulgated by the Administrator not later than nine months after such report is published.

"(b) The Administrator may publish proposed regulations establishing noise emission standards respecting any new product for which he is not required to establish standards under subsection (a) of this section but for which, in his judgment, noise emission standards are requisite to protect the public health and welfare. Not later than six months after the date of publication of such regulations respecting such new product, he shall promulgate regulations establishing noise emission standards for such new product.

"(c)(1) Any noise emission standard prescribed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section respecting a new product shall set limits on noise emissions from such new product over the useful life of the product (as determined by the Administrator taking into account the range of possible uses for the same type of product) and shall be a standard which in the Administrator's judgment, based on information published under section 407 of this Act, reflects the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology, taking into account the cost of compliance. In establishing such standards for any new product the Administrator shall assure that such standards are compatible with standards under other laws respecting emission of air or water pollutants and safety, including (but not limited to) any standard under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.), or the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.). Any standard prescribed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section may contain provisions respecting instructions of the manufacturer for the maintenance or use of the product.

"(2) After publication of any proposed regulations under this section, the Administrator shall allow the public an opportunity to participate in rulemaking in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) The Administrator may revise any noise emission standard prescribed by him in accordance with this section.

"(4) Any regulation prescribed under this section (and any revision thereof) shall take effect after a period not to exceed two years or such lesser time as the Administrator finds necessary to permit the development and application of the requisite technology, giving appropriate consideration to the cost of compliance within such period. Standards prescribed under this section shall apply to products manufactured on or after the effective date of such standards.

"(5) The Administrator may prescribe regulations defining 'effective date' for the purpose of assuring that products manufactured before the effective date of a regulation under this section were not manufactured for purposes of circumventing the effective date of such regulations.

"(d)(1) On and after the effective date of any standards prescribed under this section, the manufacturer of each new product shall warrant to the ultimate purchaser and each subsequent purchaser that such product is (A) designed, built, and equipped so as to conform at the time of sale with applicable regulations under this section, and (B) free from defects in materials and workmanship which cause such product, under normal use, operation, and maintenance to fail to conform wtih applicable regulations for its useful life, as determined by the Administrator,

taking into account the range of uses for such product.

"(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 agreement is prohibited.

"(3) If a manufacturer includes in any advertisement a statement respecting the cost or value of noise emission control devices or systems, such manufacturer shall set forth in such statement the cost or value attributed to such devices or systems by the Secretary of Labor (through the Bureau of Labor Statistics). The Secretary of Labor, and his representatives, shall have the same access for his purpose to the books, documents, papers, and records of a manufacturer as the Comptroller General has to those of a recipient of assistance for purposes of section 311 of the Clean Air Act, as amended.

"(e)(1) No State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce, with respect to (A) any product manufactured after the effective date of a regulation prescribed by the Administrator under this section or (B) any component incorporated into such product by the manufacturer of such product, any standard setting a limit on noise emissions from such product enforceable against the manufacturer which is not identical to the standard prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) Subject to paragraph (1) of this subsection, nothing in this section shall preclude or deny the right of any State or political subdivision thereof to establish and enforce controls on environmental noise through the licensing, regulation, or restriction of the use, operation, or movement of any product or combination of products: *Provided*, That such control, licensing, regulation, or restriction shall not, in the case of any motor carrier engaged in interstate commerce or any equipment or facility of a surface carrier engaged in interstate commerce by railroad, result in a limit on noise emissions for any carriers, equipment, or facility different than any limit contained in any regulation applicable thereto prescribed by the Administrator under this section or title V of this Act, except that in the case of such carriers the Administrator may by regulation, upon the petition of a State or political subdivision thereof and after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, permit such more restrictive limits on such noise emissions through the application of use, operation, or movement controls or regulations as in his judgment are necessitated by special local conditions.

"(3) If, after promulgation of any standards and regulations under this section and prior to their effective date, a product is manufactured in compliance with such standards and regulations such standards and regulations shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, become effective with respect to such product on the date of such compliance.

"LABELING

"SEC. 409. (a) The Administrator shall by regulation for any new product (or class thereof)—

"(1) identified pursuant to section 407(b)(1); or

"(2) which is sold wholly or in part on the basis of its effectiveness in reducing noise, require either (1) that a notice of the level of noise emission including the relationship to any applicable noise emission standard under secton 408, or notice of the effectiveness in reducing noise (as the case may be) supplied by the manufacturer, be affixed to the new product and to the outside of its container at the time of its sale to the ultimate purchaser, or (2) that such notice of such level or effectiveness supplied by the manufacturer otherwise be given to the prospective user. He shall prescribe the form of the notice and the methods and units of measurement to be used for this purpose. Section 408(c)(2) shall apply to the promulgation of any regulation under this section.

"(b) This section does not prevent any State or political subdivision thereof from regulating product labeling in any way not in conflict with regulations promulgated by the Administrator under this section.

"IMPORTS

"SEC. 410. Any product offered for entry into the United States for which a standard or regulation has become effective pursuant to this title, which is not accompanied by certificate of compliance in the form prescribed by the Administrator, shall be refused entry into the United States. If a product is refused entry, the Secretary of the Treasury shall refuse delivery to the consignee and shall cause disposal or storage of any product refused delivery which has not been exported by the consignee within three months from the date of notice of such refusal under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, except that the Secretary of the Treasury may deliver to the consignee such product pending examination and decision in the matter on execution of bond for the amount of the full invoice value of such product, together with the duty thereon, and on refusal to return such product for any cause to the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury, when demanded, for the purpose of excluding it from the country, or for any other purpose, said consignee shall forfeit the full amount of said bond. All charges for storage, cartage, and labor on products which are refused admission or delivery under this section shall be paid by the owner or consignee, and in default of such payment shall constitute a lien against any future importation made by such owner or consignee.

"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 or delivery for introduction into, commerce of any new product, aircraft, or aircraft engine manufactured after the effective date of noise emission control standards prescribed under sections 408, 501, 503, 511, and 521 of this Act which are applicable to such product, unless such product is in conformity with such standards.

"(2)(A) The 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 prior to its sale or delivery to the ultimate purchaser or during its term of 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, the sale in, the offering for sale in, or the introduction or delivery for introduction into, commerce of any new product manufactured after the effective date of regulations promulgated under option (1) in section 409(b) of this Act (requiring information respecting noise) which are applicable to such product, unless it is in conformity with such regulations.

"(3)(A) In the case of a manufacturer or dealer, the assistance of any person in a violation of paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection or the furnishing of information with respect to a violation of paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection.

"(B) In the case of a manufacturer, the sale in, the offering for sale in, or the introduction or delivery for introduction into, commerce of any new product manufactured after the effective date of regulations promulgated under option (1) in section 409(a) of this Act (requiring information respecting noise) which are applicable to such product, unless it is in conformity with such regulations.

"(4)(A) The removal by any person of any notice affixed to a product or container pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 409(a) of this Act prior to the sale of the new product to the ultimate purchaser, 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.

"(b)(1) The Administrator may after public hearings exempt for a specified period of time not to exceed one year, any new product, or class thereof, from paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5) of subsection (a) of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may find necessary to protect the public health or welfare, for the purpose of research, investigations, studies, demonstrations, or training, or for reasons of national security.

"(2) A new product intended solely for export, and so labeled or tagged on the outside of the container and on the product itself, shall be subject to noise emission standards of the country which imports such product. In no event shall the Administrator allow the export from the United States of any product subject to section 414 of this Act as a product, the noise emissions from which are an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 412. (a) Any person who willfully or negligently violates paragraph (1), (3), (5), or (6) of subsection (a) of section 411 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. In the case of a violation of paragraph (1) or (6) of subsection (a) of section 411 of this Act the fine shall be not less than $2,500 per day of violation. If the conviction is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment shall be by a fine of not more than $50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or by both.

"(b) 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.

"(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought by and in the name of the United States to restrain any violations of section 411(a) of this Act.

"(d)(1) 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 welfare. Such relief may include an order requiring such person to cease such violation, to notify ultimate purchasers of the risks associated with such violation, to make public notice of such risks, to recall any products responsible for such violation, to repurchase any such products, or to replace any such products. Such order may also require the seizure of any such products by the Administrator.

"(2) Any order under this subsection shall be issued only after notice and opportunity

for a hearing in accordance with section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"(e) When authorized by State law—

"(1) The Administrator may, by agreement with any environmental noise control agency with or without reimbursement, authorize law enforcement officers or other officers or employees of such environmental noise control agency to bring civil actions in the appropriate State courts to restrain any person from violating section 411(a).

"(2) The courts of such State may entertain any such civil action.

Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of an environmental noise control agency to commence a 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 where there is alleged 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 where there is alleged a failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act or section 611 of 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 or the citizenship of the parties, to enforce such noise control requirement or to order such Administrator to perform such act or duty, as the case may be.

"(b) No action may be commenced—

"(1) under subsection (a)(1) of this section—

"(A) prior to sixty days after the plaintiff has given notice of the violation (i) to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (and to the Federal Aviation Administrator in the case of a violation of a noise emission control requirement with respect to aircraft under this Act or section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act as amended) and (ii) to any alleged violator of such requirement, or

"(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 any person may intervene as a matter of right; or

"(2) under subsection (a)(2) of this section 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 or, if appropriate, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, if 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 other relief (including relief against an Administrator).

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'noise control requirement' means any prohibition, standard, or requirement under section 408, 411, 501, 503, 508, 511, or 521 of this Act or a prohibition, standard, rule, or regulation issued under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended.

"EMERGENCY SITUATIONS

"SEC. 414. (a) The Administrator or the Attorney General shall file, in a district court of the United States having venue thereof, an action against any product the noise emissions from which are an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health, or against any person who manufactures for sale, sells, or offers for sale, in commerce, or imports into the United States, such product. Such an action may be filed, notwithstanding the existence or nonexistence of a noise emission standard applicable to a product, or the pendency of administrative proceedings initiated pursuant to this Act.

"(b) The district court in which such action is filed shall have jurisdiction to declare such product a product the noise emissions from which are an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health, and to grant (as ancillary to such declaration or in lieu thereof) such temporary or permanent equitable relief as may be necessary to protect the public from such risk. Such relief may include a mandatory order requiring the notification of the original purchasers of such product of such risk, public notice, the recall, the repurchase, the repair, the replacement, or the seizure of such product.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 415. Any judicial review of final regulations promulgated under this Act shall be in accordance with sections 701–706 of title 5 of the United States Code, except that:

"(a) a petition for review of action of the Administrator in promulgating any standard or regulation under section 408, 501, 511, or 521 of this Act or any labeling regulation under section 409 of this Act may be filed only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Any such petition shall be filed within ninety days from the date of such promulgation, or after such date if such petition is based solely on grounds arising after such ninetieth day. Action of the Administrator with respect to which review could have been obtained under this subsection shall not be subject to judicial review in civil proceedings for enforcement except as to whether the administrative and judicial procedures of this Act have been observed;

"(b) if a party seeking review under this Act applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that the information is material and was not available at the time of the proceeding before the Administrator, the court may order such additional evidence (and evidence in rebuttal thereof) to be taken before the Administrator, and to be adduced upon the hearing, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. The Administrator may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file with the court such modified or new findings, and his recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original order, with the return of such additional evidence;

"(c) with respect to relief pending review of an action by the Administrator, no stay of an agency action may be granted unless the reviewing court determines that the party seeking such stay is (1) likely to prevail on the merits in the review proceeding and (2) will suffer irreparable harm pending such proceeding.

"RECORDS, REPORTS, AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 416. (a) Such manufacturer of a new product, aircraft, or aircraft engine to which standards or regulations under sections 408, 501, 503, 511, or 521 of this Act or regulations under section 409 apply shall (1) establish and maintain such records, make such reports, provide such information, and make such tests, as the Administrator may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted 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 the results of such tests and to copy such records, and (3) make new products coming off the assembly line or otherwise in the hands of the manufacturer available for testing by the Administrator, to the extent required by regulations of the Administrator.

"(b) For the purpose of obtaining information to carry out titles IV and V of this Act, the Administrator may issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and documents, and he may administer oaths. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. In cases of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person under this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States and after notice to such person, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Administrator, to appear and produce papers, books, and documents before the Administrator, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(c) Any records, reports, or information obtained under this section shall be available to the public, except that upon a showing satisfactory to the Administrator by any person that records, reports, or information or particular part thereof (other than noise emission data) to which the Administrator has access under this section if made public, would divulge methods or processes entitled to protection as trade secrets of such person, the Administrator shall consider such record, report, or information or particular portion thereof confidential in accordance with the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, except that such record, report, or information may be disclosed to other officers, employees, or authorized representatives of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act. Nothing in this section shall authorize the withholding of information by the Administrator or any officer or employee under his control, from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

"(d) Any communication from a person to the Administrator or any other employee of the Agency concerning a matter presently under consideration in a rulemaking or adjudicatory proceeding in the Agency shall be made a part of the public file of that proceeding unless it is a communication entitled to protection under subsection (c) of this section.

"(e) Any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certifica-

tion 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 monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this Act, shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.

"FEDERAL PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 417. (a) No Federal agency may enter into any contract for the procurement of goods, materials, or services with any person, who has been convicted of a criminal offense under section 412(a) of this Act and who, upon consideration of the gravity of the violation and the good faith of the person charged in attempting to achieve rapid compliance, the Administrator determines should be subject to the prohibition of this section. The prohibition in the preceding sentence shall continue until the Administrator certifies that the condition giving rise to a conviction has been corrected.

"(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 and policy of this Act, the President shall, not more than one hundred and eighty days after its enactment, cause to be issued an order (1) requiring each Federal agency authorized to enter into contracts and each Federal agency which is empowered to extend Federal assistance by way of grant, loan, or contract to effectuate the purposes and policy of this Act in such contracting or assistance activities, and (2) setting forth procedures, sanctions, penalties, and such other provisions, as the President determines necessary to carry out such requirement.

"(d) The President may exempt any contract, loan, or grant from all or part of the provisions of this section where he determines such exemption is necessary in the paramount interest of the United States, and he shall notify the Congress of such exemption.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE PLANNING AND CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 418. (a)(1). The Administrator may make grants to environmental noise control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of planning, developing, establishing, or improving, and up to one-half of the cost of maintaining programs for the prevention and control of environmental noise.

"(2) Before approving any grant under this subsection to any environmental noise control agency within the meaning of sections 404(k)(3) and 404(k)(4) of this Act, the Administrator (when appropriate) shall receive assurances that such agency provides for adequate representation of State, interstate, local, and international interests in its area of jurisdiction. Before approving any grant under this subsection the Administrator shall determine that the recipient in the appropriate environmental noise control agency for the jurisdictions involved in order to minimize overlap and duplication of effort.

"(3) Before approving any planning grant under this subsection to any environmental noise control agency within the meaning of sections 404(k)(3) and 404(k)(4) of this Act, the Administrator shall receive assurances that such agency has the capability of developing and enforcing a comprehensive environmental noise control plan.

"(4) Before approving any grant for purposes other than developing a program under this section to any environmental noise control agency within the meaning of section 404 of this Act, the Administrator shall determine that such agency has the authority—

"(A) to regulate the location, modification, and construction of any facilities within the area of jurisdiction of such agency which may result in the generation of environmental noise; and

"(B) to assure that the use of any product in the area of jurisdiction of such agency will not exceed applicable noise control levels;

"(C) to (i) identify, if appropriate, sources of environmental noise within the jurisdiction of such agency, and (ii) set forth procedures, processes, and methods (including land use requirements and design and construction standards) to control such sources to the extent feasible;

"(D) to acquire, maintain, and operate noise monitoring facilities in the field and otherwise, making public reports of noise emissions and levels of environmental noise disclosed by such monitoring, which reports shall be related to any applicable standards or limitations; and

"(E) to issue abatement orders.

"(b) From the sums available for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section for any fiscal year, the Administrator shall from time to time make grants to environmental noise control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential environmental noise problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies. No agency shall receive any grant under this section with respect to the maintenance of a program for the prevention and control of environmental noise unless the Administrator is satisfied that such grant will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State, local, or other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such grant be made available for the maintenance of such program, and will in no event supplant such State, local, or other non-Federal funds. No grant shall be made under this section until the Administrator has consulted with the appropriate official as designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected.

"(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the total funds appropriated or allocated for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section shall be granted for environmental noise control programs in any one State. In the case of a grant for a program in an area crossing State boundaries, the Administrator shall determine the portion of such grant that is chargeable to the percentage limitation under this subsection for each State into which such area extends.

"(d) The Administrator, with the concurrence of any recipient of a grant under this section, may reduce the payments to such recipient by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and any other costs in connection with the detail of any officer or employee to the recipient under section 403(c) of this Act, when such detail is for the convenience of, and at the request of, such recipient and for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The amount by which such payments have been reduced shall be available for payment of such costs by the Administrator, but shall, for the purpose of determining the amount of any grant to a recipient under subsection (a) of this section, be deemed to have been paid to such agency.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated for this section $5,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-NOISE-EMISSION PRODUCTS

"SEC. 419. (a) For the purpose of this section:

"(1) The term 'Committee' means the Low-Noise-Emission Product Advisory Committee.

"(2) The term 'Federal Government' includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia.

"(3) The term 'low-noise-emission product' means any product which emits noise in amounts significantly below the level of other products in the competitive market for such product at the time of procurement.

"(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 qualify 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)(A) of this subsection;

"(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 on a full-time basis by the United States may receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS–18 of the General Schedule for each 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 5703 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 issuance.

"(5)(A) Any person seeking to have a class or model of product certified under this section shall file a certification application in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

"(B) The Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of each application received.

"(C) The Administrator shall make determinations for the purpose of this section in accordance with procedures prescribed by him by regulation.

"(D) The Administrator shall conduct whatever investigation is necessary, including actual inspection of the product at a place designated in regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A).

"(E) The Administrator shall receive and evaluate written comments and documents from interested persons in support of, or in opposition to, certification of the class or model of product under consideration.

"(F) Within ninety days after the receipt of a properly filed certification application the Administrator shall determine whether

such product is a low-noise-emission product for purposes of this section. If the Administrator determines that such product is a low-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 substitute for any class or classes of products presently being purchased by the Federal Government for use by its agencies.

"(G) Immediately upon making any determination or decision under subparagraph (F), the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register notice of such determination or decision, including 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.

"(d) The procuring agency shall be required to purchase available certified low-noise-emission products which are eligible for purchase to the extent they are available before 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.

"(f) 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, the Administrator 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 repairs, adjustments, 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.

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated for paying additional amounts for products pursuant to, and for carrying out the provisions of, this section, $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $2,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

"(h) 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.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 420. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (other than sections 418 and 419) $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $36,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

SEC. 3. The Clean Air Act is amended to add a new title V as follows:

"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 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 standards for the measurement of aircraft and aircraft engine noise and sonic boom; and

"(2) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate and amend regulations with respect to noise emission standard for aircraft and aircraft engines which he determines are necessary and adequate to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety.

"(b)(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, taking into account the reasonableness of the 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 shall not be promulgated until the Administrator of 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.

"(2) All standards, rules, and regulations prescribed pursuant to section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended, prior to the date of enactment of the Environmental Noise Control Act of 1972 shall remain in effect until amended or revoked by subsequent standards, rules, or regulations promulgated and approved pursuant to this part: *Provided, however,* That the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, within nine months of the date of enactment of this Act, shall review all noise emission standards, rules, or regulations in effect under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended, prior to the date of enactment of the title.

"(c) 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.

"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 Aviation Administration flight and operational noise controls; (b) adequacy of noise emission standards on new and existing aircraft, together with recommendations on the retrofitting and phaseout of existing aircraft; (c) implications of identifying and achieving levels of cumulative noise exposure around airports; and (d) additional measures available to airport operators and local governments to control aircraft noise. He shall report on such study to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce and Public Works of the Senate within one year after enactment of this title.

"(b) 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 part, and shall make recommendations, taking into consideration what is economically reasonable, technologically practicable, and appropriate for the types of aircraft and aircraft engines to which the recommendations will apply. He shall report on such study to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on 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 from any type of aircraft applicable in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of any certificate authorized by the Federal Aviation Act, as amended, or the Department of Transportation Act, as amended. Such Secretary shall insure that all necessary inspections are accomplished, and may execute any power or duty vested in him by any other provision of law in the execution of all powers and duties vested in him under this section.

"(b) In any action to amend, modify, suspend, or revoke a certificate in which violation of aircraft noise or sonic boom standards, rules, or regulations applied to aircraft or aircraft engines existing on the date of enactment of the Environmental Noise Control Act of 1972, is at issue, the certificate holder 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 Natonal 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, and that such amendment, modification, or revocation by the Board is consistent with safety in air transportation.

"SEC. 504. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall not issue a type certificate under section 603(a) of the Federal Aviation Act, as amended, for any aircraft, or for any aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance that affects significantly the noise or sonic boom characteristics of any aircraft, unless such type certificates apply all of the standards promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency prior to the date of issuance of such certificates.

"SEC. 505. No State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any standard respecting noise emissions from any aircraft or engine thereof.

"SEC. 506. Terms used in this part (other than Administrator) shall have the same meaning as such terms have under section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the sole authority to establish aircraft noise emission standards is contained in part A of this title.

"CIVIC AIRCRAFT SONIC BOOM

"SEC. 507. (a) No person may operate a civil aircraft over the territory of the United States, the territorial sea of the United States,

or the waters of the contiguous zone (as defined under Article 24 of the Conservation of the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone) at a true flight mach number greater than 1 except in compliance with the conditions and limitations in an authorization to exceed mach 1 issued to the operator under this section.

"(b) For a research and development flight in a designated flight test area an authorization to exceed mach 1 may be issued if the applicant shows one or more of the following:

"(1) The flight is necessary to show compliance with an airworthiness regulation or is necessary for aircraft development.

"(2) 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.

"(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.

"(c) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 must be made on a form and in a manner prescribed by the Federal Aviation Administrator in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, for an authorization covered by subsection (b) of this section, each application must contain—

"(1) information showing that operation at speeds greater than mach 1 is necessary to accomplish one of the purposes specified in subsection (b) of this section;

"(2) a description of the flight test area proposed by the applicant; and

"(3) conditions and limitations that insure that no sonic boom will reach the land or water surface outside of the designated flight test area.

"(d) An application for an authorization to exceed mach 1 shall be denied whenever the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency finds that such research and development flight or flights will adversely affect public health or welfare or the quality of the environment.

"(e) An authorization to exceed mach 1 is effective until it expires, or until it is surrendered, and shall be terminated by the Administrator whenever he finds that such action is necessary to protect public health or welfare or the quality of the environment.

"(f) Any violation of this section shall be subject to the penalties prescribed under subsection (a) of section 412 of this Act.

"SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

"SEC. 508. No civil aircraft capable of flying at supersonic speed shall land at any place under the jurisdiction of the United States unless in compliance wtih the noise levels prescribed for subsonic aircraft by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and in effect on September 1, 1972.

"PART B—RAILROAD NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS

"SEC. 511. (a) Within nine months after the date of enactment of this title, the Administrator shall publish proposed noise emission regulations for surface carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad. Such proposed regulations shall include noise emission standards setting such limits on noise emissions resulting from operation of the equipment and facilities of surface carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad which reflect the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology, taking into account the cost of compliance. These regulations shall be in addition to any regulations that may be proposed under section 408 of this Act.

"(b) Within ninety days after the publication of such regulations as may be proposed under subsection (a) of this section, and subject to the provisions of section 415 of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate final regulations. Such regulations may be revised from time to time, in accordance with this section.

"(c) Any standard or regulation, or revision thereof, proposed under this section shall be promulgated only after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation in order to assure appropriate consideration for safety and technological availability.

"(d) Any regulation or revision thereof promulgated under this section 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.

"SEC. 512. The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Administrator, shall promulgate regulations to insure compliance with all standards promulgated by the Administrator under section 511 of this Act. 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 and section 511 of this part shall be subject to the provisions of sections 411, 412, 413, 415, and 416 of this Act.

"SEC. 513. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, after the effective date of regulations under this part, no State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any standard respecting noise emissions resulting from the operation of equipment or facilities of surface carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad unless such standard is identical to a standard applicable to noise emissions resulting from such operation prescribed by any regulation under this section: Provided, however, That 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 product as the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation may determine to be necessitated by special local conditions or not in conflict with regulations promulgated under this part.

"SEC. 514. The terms 'carrier' and 'railroad' as used in sections 511, 512, and 513 of this part shall have the same meaning as such terms have under section 22 of title 45 of the United States Code.

"PART C—MOTOR CARRIER NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS

"SEC. 521. (a) Within nine months after the date of enactment of this title, the Administrator shall publish proposed noise emission regulations for motor carriers engaged in interstate commerce. Such proposed regulations shall include noise emission standards setting such limits on noise emissions resulting from operation of motor carriers engaged in interstate commerce which reflect the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology, taking into account the cost of compliance. These regulations shall be in addition to any regulations that may be proposed under section 408 of this Act.

"(b) Within ninety days after the publication of such regulations as may be proposed under subsection (a) of this section, and subject to the provisions of section 415 of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate final regulations. Such regulations may be revised from time to time, in accordance with this section.

"(c) Any standard or regulation, or revision thereof, proposed under this section shall be promulgated only after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation in order to assure appropriate consideration for safety and technological availability.

"(d) Any regulation or revision thereof promulgated under this section 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.

"SEC. 522. The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to insure compliance with all standards promulgated by the Administrator under section 521 of this part. The Secretary of Transportation shall carry out such regulations through the use of his powers and duties of enforcement and inspection authorized by the Interstate Commerce Act and the Department of Transportation Act. Regulations promulgated under this section and section 521 of this part shall be subject to the provisions of sections 411, 412, 413, 415, and 416 of this Act.

"SEC. 523. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, after the effective date of regulations under this part no State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any standard respecting noise emissions resulting from the operation of motor carriers engaged in interstate commerce unless such standard is identical to a standard applicable to noise emissions resulting from such operation prescribed by any regulation under this section: *Provided, however*, That 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 product as the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, may determine to be necessitated by special local conditions or not in conflict with regulations promulgated under this part.

"SEC. 524. The term 'motor carrier' as used in sections 521, 522, and 523 of this part shall have the same meaning as those terms as defined in section 303(a) (14), (15), and (17) of title 49 of the United States Code."

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Administrator any function or personnel of the Department of Transportation with respect to the control and abatement of aircraft noise which the President determines is necessary to carry out section 3 of this Act.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what the intent is in this oft called so-called noise pollution abatement bill, which has been objected to on two occasions before: First, because of the procedure under which it is brought in the waning hours; and second, because of the substance of the bill. What is different about the proposed new amendment before we give unanimous consent to consider the Senate amendment read? I yield for that purpose.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the only difference would be the amount of money. We would go back to the original House amount of $3 million, $6 million, and $12 million. The Senate had $18 million, $36 million, and $50 million. We had agreed on a compromise of $5 million, $10 million and

$15 million, but we would go back to the original amounts which we had when we passed the bill originally.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, is it the gentleman's intention to move that sliding scale, which I think is much too much, as voted in the House version up to 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 certain that the power 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, the 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 amendments 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 not a device to which suddenly industry has agreed, for a fear of a much more harsh anti-noise pollution bill in the 93d Congress and because this does include preemption of the States' rights to each and severally develop anti-noise emission devices of their own?

Mr. STAGGERS. I cannot say what industry's intention may be, but I can say to the gentleman what my intention is in trying to get this bill passed. We have evidence that across America some cities and States are trying to pass noise regulations. Certainly we do not want that to happen. It would harass industry and progress in America. That is the reason why I want to get this bill passed during this session.

Mr. HALL. And of course since it is interstate commerce, it comes from the gentleman's committee and it involves more than interstate commerce in many instances, since it involves aviation compacts and large jet airports, and so forth.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. HALL. One other thing that worries me, and then I shall certainly withdraw my objection to the gentleman having the Senate amendments considered as read, and that is the question of whether or not there is due process and judicial recourse for the citizen civil suits that this bill makes in order, or does the gentleman's amendment take those out?

Mr. STAGGERS. It does not. There is certainly all the recourse in the world for anyone interested.

Mr. HALL. In other words, if some person were arrested and hailed into 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, but, Mr. Speaker, for the time being I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SHORT TITLE

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

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that inadequately controlled 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 include transportation vehicles and equipment, machinery, appliances, and other products in commerce; and

(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 control of which require national uniformity of treatment.

(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 coordination of Federal 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.

(3) The term "product" means any manufactured article or goods or component thereof; except that such term does not include—

(A) any aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance, as such terms are defined in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; or

(B) (i) any military weapons or equipment which are designed for combat use; (ii) any rockets or equipment which are designed for research, experimental, or developmental work to be performed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or (iii) to the extent provided by regulations of the Administrator, any other machinery or equipment designed for use in experimental work done by or for the Federal Government.

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

(5) The term "new product" means (A) a product the equitable or legal title of 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 is manufactured after the effective date of a regulation under section 6 or section 8 which would have been applicable to such product had it been manufactured in the United States.

(6) 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.

(7) the term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation—

(A) between a place in a State and any place outside thereof, or

(B) which affects trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation described in subparagraph (A).

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

(9) 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.

(10) The term "Federal agency" means an executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code) and includes the United States Postal Service.

(11) 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 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, shall comply with Federal, State, interstate, and local requirements respecting control and abatement of environmental 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 determines it to be in the paramount interest of the United States to do so; except that no exemption, other than for those products

referred to in section 3(3)(B) of this Act, may be granted from the requirements of sections 6, 17, and 18 of this Act. No such exemption shall be granted due to lack of appropriation unless the President shall have specifically requested such appropriation as a part of the budgetary process and the Congress shall have failed to make available such requested 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 preceding calendar year, together with his reason for granting such exemption.

(c)(1) The Administrator shall coordinate the programs of all Federal agencies relating to noise research and noise control. Each Federal agency shall, upon request, furnish to the Administrator such information as he may reasonably require to determine the nature, scope, and results of the noise-research and noise-control programs of the agency.

(2) Each Federal agency shall consult with the Administrator in prescribing standards or regulations respecting noise. If at any time the Administrator has reason to believe that a standard or regulation, or any proposed standard or regulation, of any Federal agency respecting noise does not protect the public health and welfare to the extent he believes to be required and feasible, he may request such agency to review and report to him on the advisability of revising such standard or regulation to provide such protection. Any such request may be published in the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the information on which it is based. Such agency shall complete the requested review and report to the Administrator within such time as the Administrator specifies in the request, but such time specified may not be less than ninety days from the date the request was made. The report shall be published in the Federal Register and shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the agency respecting the revision of its standard or regulation. With respect to the Federal Aviation Administration, section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (as amended by section 7 of this Act) shall apply in lieu of this paragraph.

(3) On the basis of regular consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, the Administrator shall compile and publish, from time to time, a report on the status and progress of Federal activities relating to noise research and noise control. This report shall describe the noise-control programs of each Federal agency and assess the contributions of those programs to the Federal Government's overall efforts to control noise.

IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR NOISE SOURCES; NOISE CRITERIA AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 5. (a)(1) The Administrator shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and within nine months of the date of the enactment of this Act, develop and publish criteria with respect to noise. Such criteria shall reflect the scientific knowledge most useful in indicating the kind and extent of all identifiable effects on the public health or welfare which may be expected from differing quantities and qualities of noise.

(2) The Administrator shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies and within twelve months of the date of the enactment of this Act, publish information on the levels of environmenal noise the attainment and maintenace of which in defined areas under various conditions are requisite to protect the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety.

(b) The Administrator shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, compile and publish a report or series of reports (1) identifying products (or classes of products) which in his judgment are major sources of noise, and (2) giving information on techniques for control of noise from such products, including available 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.

(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 under this section of any criteria or information on control techniques shall be announced in the Federal Register, and copies shall be made available to the general public.

NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS FOR PRODUCTS DISTRIBUTED IN COMMERCE

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 falls in one of the following categories:

(i) Construction equipment.

(ii) Transportation equipment (including recreational vehicles and related equipment).

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

(iv) Electrical or electronic equipment.

(2)(A) Initial proposed regulations under paragraph (1) shall be published not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply to any product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or is a part of a class identified as a major source of noise in any report published under section 5(b)(1) on or before the date of publication of such initial proposed regulations.

(B) In the case of any product described in paragraph (1) which is identified (or is part of a class identified) as a major source of noise in a report published under section 5(b)(1) after publication of the initial proposed reglations under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, regulations under paragraph (1) for such product shall be proposed and published by the Administrator not later than eighteen months after such report is published.

(3) 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—

(A) not earlier than six months after publication of such proposed regulations, and

(B) not later than—

(i) twenty-four 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

(ii) in the case of any other product, twenty-four months after the publication of the report under section 5(b)(1) identifying it (or a class of products of which it is a part) as a major source of noise.

(b) The Administrator may publish proposed regulations, meeting the requirements of subsection (c), for any product for which he is not required by subsection (a) to prescribe regulations but for which, in his judgment, noise emission standards are feasible and are requisite to protect the public health and welfare. Not earlier than six months after the date of publication of such proposed regulations respecting such product, he may prescribe regulations, meeting the requirements of subsection (c), for such product.

(c)(1) Any regulation prescribed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section (and any revision thereof) respecting a product shall include a noise emission standard which shall set limits on noise emissions from such product and shall be a standard which in the Administrator's judgment, based on criteria published under section 5, is requisite to protect 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 give appropriate consideration to standards under other laws designed to safeguard the health and welfare of persons, including any standards under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Clean Air Act, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Any such noise emission standards shall be a performance standard. In addition, any regulation under subsection (a) or (b) (and any revision thereof) may contain testing procedures necessary to assure compliance with the emission standard in such regulation, and may contain provisions respecting instructions of the manufacturer for the maintenance, use, or repair of the product.

(2) After publication of any proposed regulations under this section, the Administrator shall allow interested persons an opportunity to participate in rulemaking in accordance with the first sentence of section 553(c) of title 5, United States Code.

(3) The Administrator may revise any regulation prescribed by him under this section by (A) publication of proposed revised regulations, and (B) the promulgation, not earlier than six months after the date of such publication, of regulations making the revision; except that a revision which makes only technical or clerical corrections in a regulation under this section may be promulgated earlier than six months after such date if the Administrator finds that such earlier promulgation is in the public interest.

(d)(1) On and after the effective date of any regulation prescribed under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, the manufacturer of each new product to which such regulation applies shall warrant to the ultimate purchaser and each subsequent purchaser that such product is designed, built, and equipped so as to conform at the time of sale with such regulation.

(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 agreement is prohibited.

(3) If a manufacturer includes in any advertisement a statement respecting the cost or value of noise emission control devices or systems, such manufacturer shall set forth in such statement the cost or value attributed to such devices or systems by the Secretary of Labor (through the Bureau of Labor Statistics). The Secretary of Labor, and his representatives, shall have the same access for this purpose to the books, documents, papers, and records of a manufacturer as the Comptroller General has to those of a recipient of assistance for purposes of section 311 of the Clean Air Act.

(e)(1) No State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce—

(A) with respect to any new product for which a regulation has been prescribed by the Administrator under this section, any law or regulation which sets a limit on noise emissions from such new product and which is not identical to such regulation of the Administrator; or

(B) with respect to any component incorporated into such new product by the manufacturer of such product, any law or regulation setting a limit on noise emissions from such component when so incorporated.

(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 noise (or one or more sources thereof) through the licensing, regulation, or restriction of the use, operation, or movement of any product or combination of products.

AIRCRAFT NOISE STANDARDS

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 emission standards on new and existing aircraft, together with recommendations on the retrofitting and phaseout of existing aircraft; (3) implications of identifying and achieving levels of cumulative noise exposure around airports; and (4) additional measures available to airport operators and local governments to control aircraft noise. He shall report on such study to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce and Public Works of the Senate within nine months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1431) is amended to read as follows:

"CONTROL AND ABATEMENT OF AIRCRAFT NOISE AND SONIC BOOM

"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, the FAA, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and with EPA, shall prescribe and amend standards for the measurement of aircraft noise and sonic boom and shall prescribe and amend such regulations as the FAA may find necessary to provide for the control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom, including the application of such standards and regulations in the issuance, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of any certificate authorized by this title. No exemption with respect to any standard or regulation under this section may be granted under any provision of this Act unless the FAA shall have consulted with EPA before such exemption is granted, except that if the FAA determines that safety in air commerce or air transportation requires that such an exemption be granted before EPA can be consulted, the FAA shall consult with EPA as soon as practicable after the exemption is granted.

"(2) The FAA shall not issue an original type certificate under section 603(a) of this Act for any aircraft for which substantial noise abatement can be achieved by prescribing standards and regulations in accordance with this section, unless he shall have prescribed standards and regulations in accordance with this section which apply to such aircraft and which protect the public from aircraft noise and sonic boom, consistent with the considerations listed in subsection (d).

"(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 submit to the FAA proposed regulations to provide such control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom (including control and abatement through the exercise of any of the FAA's regulatory authority over air commerce or 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 under this paragraph and shall, within thirty days of the date of its submission to the FAA, publish the proposed regulations in a notice of proposed rulemaking. Within sixty days after such publication, the FAA shall commence a hearing at which interested persons shall be afforded an opportunity for oral (as well as written) presentations of data, views, and arguments. Within a reasonable time after the conclusion of such hearing and after consultation with EPA, the FAA shall—

"(A) in accordance with subsection (b), prescribe regulations (i) substantially as they were submitted by EPA, or (ii) which are a modification of the proposed regulations submitted by EPA, or

"(B) publish in the Federal Register a notice that it is not prescribing any regulation in response to EPA's submission of proposed regulations, together with a detailed explanation providing reasons for the decision not to prescribe such regulations.

"(2) If EPA has reason to believe that the FAA's action with respect to a regulation proposed by EPA under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) or (1)(B) of this subsection does not protect the public health and welfare from aircraft noise or sonic boom, consistent with the considerations listed in subsection (d) of this section, EPA shall consult with the FAA and may request the FAA to review, and report to EPA on, the advisability of prescribing the regulation originally proposed by EPA. Any such request shall be published in the Federal Register and shall include a detailed statement of the information on which it is based. The FAA shall complete the review requested and shall report to EPA within such time as EPA specifies in the request, but such time specified may not be less than ninety days from the date the request was made. The FAA's report shall be accompanied by a detailed statement of the FAA's findings and the reasons for the FAA's conclusions; shall identify any statement filed pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with respect to such action of the FAA under paragraph (1) of this subsection; and shall specify whether (and where) such statements are available for public inspection. The FAA's report shall be published in the Federal Register, except in a case in which EPA's request proposed specific action to be taken by the FAA, and the FAA's report indicates such action will be taken.

"(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 such section 102(2)(C), the report of the FAA indicates that the proposed regulation originally submitted by EPA should not be made, then EPA may request the FAA to file a supplemental report, which shall be published in the Federal Register within such a period as EPA may specify (but such time specified shall not be less than ninety days from the date the request was made), and which shall contain a comparison of (A) the environmental effects (including those which cannot be avoided) of the action actually taken by the FAA in response to EPA's proposed regulations, and (B) EPA's proposed regulations.

"(d) 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, testing, and evaluation activities conducted 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;

"(4) consider whether any proposed standard 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

"(5) consider the extent to which such standard or regulation will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(e) In any action to amend, modify, suspend, or revoke a certificate in which violation of aircraft noise or sonic boom standards or regulations is at issue, the certificate holder shall have the same notice and appeal rights as are contained in section 609, and in any appeal to the National Transportation Safety Board, the Board may amend, modify, or reverse the order of the FAA if it finds that control of abatement of aircraft noise or sonic boom and the public health and welfare do not require the affirmation of such order, or that such order is not consistent with safety in air commerce or air transportation."

(c) All—

(1) standards, rules, and regulations prescribed under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and

(2) exemptions, granted under any provision of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, with respect to such standards, rules, and regulations,

which are in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in the exercise of any authority vested in him, by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

LABELING

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.

(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 of the level of the noise the product emits, or of its effectiveness in reducing noise, as the case may be. Such regulations shall specify (1) whether such notice shall be affixed to the product or to the outside of its container, or to both, at the time of its sale to the ultimate purchaser or whether such notice shall be given to the prospective user in some other manner, (2) the form of the notice, and (3) the methods and units of measurement to be used. Sections 6(c)(2) shall apply to the prescribing of any regulation under this section.

(c) This section does not prevent any State or political subdivision thereof from regulating product labeling or information respecting products in any way not in conflict with regulations prescribed by the Administrator under this section.

IMPORTS

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in consultation with the Administrator, issue

regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act with respect to new products imported or offered for importation.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), the following acts or the causing thereof are prohibited:

(1) In the case of a manufacturer, to distribute in commerce any new product manufactured after the effective date of a regulation prescribed under section 6 which is applicable to such product, except in conformity with such regulation.

(2) (A) The removal or rendering inoperative by any person, other than for purpose of maintenance, repair, or replacement, of any 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 by any person.

(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 regulations prescribed under 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(a), 17, or 18.

(b) (1) For the purpose of research, investigations, studies, demonstrations, or training, or for reasons of national security, the Administrator may exempt for a specified period of time any product, or class thereof, from paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (5) of subsection (a), upon such terms and conditions as he may find necessary to protect the public health or welfare.

(2) Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any product which is manufactured solely for use outside any State and which (and the container of which) is labeled or otherwise marked to show that it is manufactured solely for use outside any State; 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), (3), (5), 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. If the conviction is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person under this subsection, punishment shall be by a fine of not more than $50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or by both.

(b) For the purpose of this section, each day of violation of any paragraph of section 10(a) shall constitute a separate violation of that section.

(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought by and in the name of the United States to restrain 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 554 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) who is alleged to be in violation of any noise control requirement (as defined in subsection (e)), or

(2) against—

(A) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency where there is alleged a failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under this Act which is not discretionary with such Administrator, or

(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration where there is alleged a failure of such Administrator to perform any act or duty under section 611 of 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 order 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 (i) 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, or

(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 any 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 interview 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, if not a party, may also 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 other relief (including relief against an Administrator).

(f) For purposes of this section, the term "noise control requirement" means paragraph (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, provide such information, and make such tests, as the Administrator may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted 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 the results of 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) (1) All information obtained by the Administrator or his representatives pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, which information contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purpose of that section, except that such information may be disclosed to other Federal officers or employees, in whose possession it shall remain confidential, or when relevant to the matter in controversy in any proceeding under this Act.

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall authorize the withholding of information by the Administrator, or by any officers or employees under his control, from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

(c) Any person who knowingly makes any 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 monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this Act, shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of 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, as necessary, the noise-research programs of other Federal agencies, the Administrator 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) investigation of the psychological and physiological effects of noise on humans and the effects of noise on domestic animals, wildlife, and property, and determination of acceptable levels of noise on the basis of such effects;

(B) development of improved methods and standards for measurement and monitoring of noise, in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; and

(C) determination of the most effective and practicable means of controlling noise emission.

(2) Provide technical assistance to State and local governments to facilitate their development and enforcement of ambient noise standards, including but not limited to—

(A) advice on training of noise-control personnel and on selection and operation of noise-abatement equipment; and

(B) preparation of model State or local legislation for noise control.

(3) Disseminate to the public information on the effects of noise, acceptable noise levels, and techniques for noise measurement and control.

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.

(2) The term "Federal Government" includes the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States, and the government of the District of Columbia.

(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 qualify 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) (A) of this subsection;

(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 on a full-time basis by the United States may receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS–18 of the General Schedule for each 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 5703 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 issuance.

(5) (A) Any person seeking to have a class or model of product certified under this section shall file a certification application in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

(B) The Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of each application received.

(C) The Administrator shall make determinations for the purpose of this section in accordance with procedures prescribed by him by regulation.

(D) The Administrator shall conduct whatever investigation is necessary, including actual inspection of the product at a place designated in regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A).

(E) The Administrator shall receive and evaluate written comments and documents from interested persons in support of, or in opposition to, certification of the class or model of product under consideration.

(F) Within ninety days after the receipt of a properly filed certification application the Administrator shall determine whether 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 substitute for any class or classes of products presently being purchased by the Federal Government for use by its agencies.

(G) Immediately upon making any determination or decision under subparagraph (F), the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register notice of such determination or decision, including reason 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.

(d) The procuring agency shall be required to purchase available certified low-noise-emission products which are eligible for purchase to the extent they are available before 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.

(f) 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 any time he finds that the noise-emission levels exceed the levels on which certification under this section was based, the Administrator 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 repairs, adjustments, 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.

(g) There are authorized to be appropriated for paying additional amounts for products pursuant to, and for carrying out the provisions of, this section, $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $2,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

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

JUDICIAL REVIEW; WITNESSES

SEC. 16. (a) A petition for review of action of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in promulgating any standard or regulation under section 6, 17, or 18 of this Act or any labeling regulation under section 8 of this Act may be filed only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and a petition for review of action of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration in promulgating any standard or regulation under section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 may be filed only in such court. Any such petition shall be filed within ninety days from the date of such promulgation, or after such date if such petition is based solely on grounds arising after such ninetieth day. Action of either Administrator with respect to which review could have been obtained under this subsection shall not be subject to judicial review in civil or criminal proceedings for enforcement.

(b) If a party seeking review under this Act applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that the information is material and was not available at the time of the proceeding before the Administrator of such Agency or Administration (as the case may be), the court may order such additional evidence (and evidence in rebuttal thereof) to be taken before such Administrator, and to be adduced upon the hearing, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. Such Administrator may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file with the court such modified or new findings, and his recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original order, with the return of such additional evidence.

(c) With respect to relief pending review of an action by either Administrator, no stay of an agency action may be granted unless the reviewing court determines that the party seeking such stay is (1) likely to prevail on the merits in the review proceeding and (2) will suffer irreparable harm pending such proceeding.

(d) For the purpose of obtaining information to carry out this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and documents, and he may administer oaths. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. In cases of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person under this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States and after notice to such person, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Administrator, to appear and produce papers, books, and documents before the Administrator, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

RAILROAD NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS

SEC. 17. (a) (1) Within nine months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall publish proposed noise emission regulations for surface carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad. Such proposed regulations shall include noise emission standards setting such limits on noise emissions resulting from operation of the equipment and facilities of surface carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad which reflect the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology, taking into account the cost of compliance. These regulations shall be in addition to any regulations that may be proposed under section 6 of this Act.

(2) Within ninety days after the publication of such regulations as may be proposed under paragraph (1) of this subsection, and subject to the provisions of section 16 of this

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 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.

(c)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) but notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, after the effective date of a regulation under this section applicable to noise emissions resulting from the operation of any equipment or facility of a surface carrier engaged in interstate commerce by railroad, no State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any standard applicable to noise emissions resulting from the operation of the same equipment or facility of such carrier unless such standard is identical to a 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 product if the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, determines that such standard, control, license, regulation, or restrict is necessitated by special local conditions and is not in conflict with regulations promulgated under this section.

(d) The terms "carrier" and "railroad" as used in this section shall have the same meaning as such terms have under the first section of the Act of February 17, 1911 (45 U.S.C. 22).

MOTOR CARRIER NOISE EMISSION STANDARDS

SEC. 18. (a)(1) Within nine months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall publish proposed noise emission regulations for motor carriers engaged in interstate commerce. Such proposed regulations shall include noise emission standards setting such limits on noise emissions resulting from operation of motor carriers engaged in interstate commerce which reflect the degree of noise reduction achievable through the application of the best available technology, taking into account the cost of compliance. These regulations shall be in addition to any regulations that may be proposed under section 6 of this Act.

(2) Within ninety days after the publication of such regulations as may be proposed under paragraph (1) of this subsection, and subject to the provisions of section 16 of this 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 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 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.

(c)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection but notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, after the effective date of a regulation under this section applicable to noise emissions resulting from the operation of any motor carrier engaged in interstate commerce, no State or political subdivision thereof may adopt or enforce any 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.

(2) Nothing in his 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 product if the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, determines that such standard, control, license, regulation, or restriction is necessitated by special local conditions and is not in conflict with regulations promulgated 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 private carrier of property by motor vehicle as those terms are defined by paragraphs (14), (15), and (17) of section 203(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 303(a)).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 19. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (other than section 15) $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I be assured that the amendment at the desk is the same which I hold in my hand?

Mr. STAGGERS. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the Clerk's copy show the dates as June 30, 1973, for $3 million; June 30, 1974, for $6 million; June 30, 1975, for $12 million in the amended bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. May I assure the gentleman from Missouri that if they do not, they should, because that is our intent.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman's statement that they should is not good enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the section which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) has called attention to

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 19. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (other than section 15) $3 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; $6 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1975.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 as its purpose the control of noise emissions detrimental to the human environment. I and other members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, have thoroughly reviewed this amendment. The amendment retains all principles contained in the House bill and adds certain provisions found in the Senate amendment which we feel clarify and enhance the position of the House. In my opinion, this amendment insures that all interested parties—regulatory agencies, industry, and the public—will bring together their special qualities to free the American people from the noise pollution which jeopardizes their health and welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the principal difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment was with respect to aircraft noise. The House bill left control of aircraft noise in the hands of the FAA while the Senate gave substantial control to EPA. The amendment before the House today combines the best of both. It retains the existing law's provision which provides the FAA with ultimate authority to prescribe standards to regulate aircraft noise. This is necessary to insure that noise control standards will, through the benefit of FAA's expertise, be consistent with the highest degree of aircraft safety.

However, recognizing that it is the overall responsibility of EPA to insure a sound environment, the amendment provides that EPA play a significant role in the development of aircraft noise standards. This role includes the requirement that EPA propose to FAA a broad and

comprehensive range of regulations designed to abate aircraft noise. The FAA, in turn, must respond to the EPA proposals quickly and substantively.

Mr. Speaker, many people feel that noise pollution is the last remaining gap in environmental law. The Congress has, in recent years, responded to our many-faceted environmental problems with legislation to all known forms of environmental pollution except noises. This amendment insures that unlike air and water pollution, the excesses of noise pollution do not become so prevalent as to literally threaten the destruction of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous adoption of the amendment.

NONNAVIGABLE SECTION OF DELAWARE RIVER

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1971) to declare a portion of the Delaware River in Philadelphia County, Pa., nonnavigable.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1971

An act to declare a portion of the Delaware River in Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, nonnavigable

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That portion of the Delaware River in Philadelphia County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, lying between all that certain lot or piece of ground situate in the second and fifth wards of the city of Philadelphia described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the easterly side of Delaware Avenue (variable width) said side being the bulkhead line of the Delaware River (approved by the Secretary of War on September 10, 1940), at the distance of 1,833.652 feet from an angle point on the easterly side of said Delaware Avenue south of Washington Avenue;

thence extending along the easterly side of said Delaware Avenue the following courses and distances, (1) north 0 degree 45 minutes 33.2 seconds west 2,524.698 feet to a point; (2) north 9 degrees 36 minutes 25 seconds east, 2,168.160 feet ot a point; (3) north 13 degrees 26 minutes 45.8 seconds east, 0,239.270 feet to a point; (4) north 20 degrees 12 minutes 52.4 seconds east, 35.180 feet to an angle point in Delaware Avenue;

thence continuing north 20 degrees 12 minutes 52.4 seconds east along the said bulkhead line, the distance of 574.970 feet to a point on the south house line of Callowhill Street produced;

thence extending along the south house line of Callowhill Street produced south 80 degrees 47 minutes 30.6 seconds east, the distance of 523.908 feet to a point on the pierhead line of the Delaware River (approved by the Secretary of War on September 10, 1940);

thence extending along the said pierhead line the following courses and distances, (1) south 17 degrees 52 minutes 48.5 seconds west, 605.262 feet to a point; (2) south 14 degrees 14 minutes 14.7 seconds west, 1,372.530 feet to a point; (3) south 10 degrees 37 minutes 35.3 seconds west, 1,252.160 feet to a point; (4) south 8 degrees 23 minutes 50.4 seconds west, 1,450.250 feet to a point; (5) south 2 degrees 22 minutes 45.9 seconds west, 1,221.670 feet to a point; (6) south 1 degree 4 minutes 36 seconds east, 1,468.775 feet to a point on the north house line of Catherine Street extended, thence extending north 76 degrees 56 minutes 29.2 seconds west, the distance of 555.911 feet to the first mentioned point and place of beginning is hereby declared not to be a navigable water of the United States within the meaning 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 all or any part of the described area.

SEC. 2. This declaration shall apply only to portions of the above-described area which are filled or occupied by permanent structures. No such filling or erection of structures in the above-described area shall be commenced until the plans therefor have been approved by the Secretary of the Army who shall, prior to granting such approval, give consideration to all factors affecting the general 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 well know: my good friends, 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, JACK 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 minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am deeply grateful that the gentleman from Ohio has taken the time to make some observations and comments 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.

JACK BETTS has served diligently as a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means and more recently as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. His legislative skill and success as a Member of the House was preceded by a decade of distinguished service in the Ohio General Assembly where he served as Speaker in 1945 and 1946.

We will all greatly miss JACK BETTS and his lovely wife, Martha, and wish for them much health and happiness in the future.

HON. FRANK BOW

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is the constitutional guardian of the public purse and for a good many years the guardian of the purse strings on this side of the aisle has been my good friend from Ohio, FRANK BOW. As the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, he has been diligent and determined to protect the taxpayers' interests in every spending bill that has come before recent Congresses. It is hard to believe that there will be no more Bow amendments after FRANK retires voluntarily at the close of this session.

I just want to pay tribute to the tremendous contributions which my friend from Ohio has made in the field of fiscal responsibility and in the steadfast support of President Nixon who has entrusted him with a new but equally important responsibility as our Ambassador to Panama, a sensitive and strategic area for the United States.

So while I am sorry to lose an invaluable colleague upon whom I have depended heavily, we say farewell to FRANK with confidence that he will continue to serve the country as ably as he has during the 22 years we have worked together in the House.

Betty and I wish for FRANK and Caroline every good fortune in the future.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Ohio has been distinguished over the years by the caliber of the leaders it has sent to the Congress. That long and proud record has been upheld magnificently by the trio of Ohio colleagues to whom we bid farewell today.

Sixty-nine years of congressional service are represented by the careers of WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, FRANK T. BOW, and JACKSON E. BETTS. The retirement of any one of these three legislators is regrettable. Retirement of two of them is alarming. But to have all three leaving this House at the same time is a calamity, not only to their many friends but also to anyone who is concerned with the need for expertise and dedication in Government.

As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, FRANK Bow is a man dedicated to fiscal responsibiblity. He has been a great example to me and other members of the committee because of his wide-ranging knowledge and his willingness to do the hard day-to-day work required by his influential position. The people of the 16th District of Ohio have had the benefit of his painstaking congressional service for 22 years. I know they are as proud of having FRANK Bow as their representative as we here are of having him for our friend.

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 Fourth District in Ohio, long before that. His absence from this floor, and from the Judiciary Committee where he served as the ranking minority member, will be a great loss to the Congress and the country.

The departure of JACKSON BETTS from these halls means, among many things, that the American worker has lost a friend in Congress. As the second ranking minority member on the Ways and Means Committee, he has operated with quiet effectiveness. His proposals in the area of trade reflect a great concern for the problems affecting the workingman, and his early support of revenue sharing indicate a deep understanding for the fiscal troubles of the States and localities. He has served Ohio's Eighth District for 22 years, and served it extremely well.

Mr. Speaker, it is with true regret that I join with my colleagues today to bid farewell to these three outstanding Members. All are men of influence in this body who greatly deserve the respect in which they are held. I extend my warmest wishes to each for their continued health, happiness, and prosperity.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to three members of our Ohio delegation who are retiring after this session—the Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, the Honorable JACKSON E. BETTS, and the Honorable FRANK T. BOW. All three are senior members of important committees of this Congress, Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Appropriations. They have left their "marks" on all of the major pieces of legislation reported from their respective committees for many, many years. The service of these three distinguished gentlemen represents a cumulative total of 70 years in these legislative halls, a very enviable record indeed. Both the State of Ohio and the Nation will miss their leadership and their guidance in this body.

I sincerely regret their departure, not only as colleagues but as friends, and extend my very best wishes to them and to their families, with a special note of congratulations to our next Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, FRANK T. BOW.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the outstanding Members of the House, the Honorable JACKSON BETTS, who is retiring at the close of this session.

He has distinguished himself as a man of integrity and tremendous ability, and has been an asset to the Congress, to his State, and to the Nation.

I wish to congratulate him upon his many years of dedicated service, and wish him many years of health and happiness.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this last day of the 92d Congress, I am pleased to join with my other Ohio colleagues and the Members of this House in saluting the fine work of two Ohioans who are retiring at the end of this Congress.

Representatives WILLIAM MCCULLOCH and JACKSON BETTS 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 knowing and working with these two gentlemen. BILL MCCULLOCH has been one of the warmest, most compassionate legislators in this Chamber. His service 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 decade. JACKSON BETTS has made numerous contributions to the work of the Ways and Means Committee. I, for one, will certainly miss him, for our 7 years of service together on that committee have been ones of great cooperation and mutual assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to wish each of these great Ohioans the best in the years ahead and to thank them for their years of service. It has been a pleasure knowing each of them and I hope that we will have the opportunity to visit together in the years ahead.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on this last day of the 92d Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to salute and wish Godspeed to a trio of legislators whose contribution to this country and to their home State of Ohio will long be remembered.

Little need be said about the jobs JACK BETTS, FRANK BOW, and BILL MCCULLOCH have accomplished during their long and outstanding service in the House of Representatives. The record reflects clearly the singular and collective contributions of these fine men.

Be it in the arena of international affairs or on the cutting domestic issue of the economy, these men have met their assignments brilliantly. Responsible, imaginative, concerned—all the attributes apply.

It is with much regret that we bid them farewell. As colleagues, we will sorely miss their legislative leadership.

TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE P. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOLIFIELD was allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not proceed for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members, including the California delegation, of course, have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker and my friends, I take this time to say a few words as the dean of the California delegation. Having been here for 30 years, I have had by my side a Member we all know and love, GEORGE MILLER.

GEORGE MILLER has served in this House for 28 years. He will not be with us next year. I just want to say a few words about this remarkable man.

This gentleman has been a State legislator, before coming to the Congress. 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. Then he came to the Congress.

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 new Space and Astronautics Committee 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 achieved a spot in the world which is preeminent. The achievements we have made in space, of course, are important. They will go down in history as among the most glorious 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 the 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 and our engineers 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:

> We 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 then, 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; 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 realize how obsolete 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 originate across the seas, in Japan and 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 these fields, whose potentialities are 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 complete new science, 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 this, 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 get into step with the rest of the world in this area.

GEORGE MILLER has been a good Congressman, and he has been receiving many notices lately. I will not go into all of them.

Mr. Speaker, he has had bridges and bluffs in the Antarctic named for him, and God knows how many other notices there have been of his great accomplishments. I know that there are others in the offing; there are some in Los Angeles. There is going to be a new Museum of Science and Technology named after him.

So, GEORGE, as you leave this body, I want you to know that every Member of the California delegate, Republican and Democrat, is proud of you, and we are proud of the record of accomplishment that you have made.

We are proud of the record of accomplishment you have made. I will not limit it to that, because I think there is not a man in this body who does not have a feeling of deep friendship for you and a feeling of wishing you well in the rich years we know lie ahead of you.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from California, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as this 92d Congress draws to a close I feel that we Californians would be remiss if we failed to extend our special thanks and good wishes to our colleague from Alameda, GEORGE P. MILLER, retiring chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, who is closing out his service with the Congress of the United States.

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, as a member of the State land commission and as executive director of the California Division of Fish and Game.

California is truly a better and more progressive place today because of what GEORGE MILLER did there many years ago.

When GEORGE, with the aid and assistance of that very exceptional woman, Esther Miller, came to the Congress 28 years ago, he was no 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 and, later, served as chairman of the first Subcommittee on Oceanography to eventuate in the Congress as a 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 brandnew Committee 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 and the Nation, but to his peers and the members of his committee. 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 in doing what most people thought was impossible. It has, indeed, put men on the moon and returned them safely—and in the process has produced priceless scientific information, the true value of 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 satellite system, by which we are finding out much we did not know about our planet and the natural resources which may or may not be available to us. It his produced the wide variety of technological innovations which have revolutionized many aspects of the world we live in—industrial, geographical, medical, social, and otherwise.

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 helped create. I do not think it is stretching the truth to suggest that some of the other new agreements in international trade had the trail blazed for them in this scientific area.

GEORGE MILLER was almost solely responsible for the awakening of the Nation to the need for a system of institutional grants to higher education, and while the bills he introduced on this subject did not themselves become law, their effect has been felt and their counterpart institutionalized in other legislation dealing with the problems of higher education.

It was 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 applying 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 concept of an Office of Technology Assessment. That concept is now crystalized. 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 conjunction 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 National Science Foundation in his ever-continuing quest for new scientific knowledge.

The Congress is going to miss GEORGE

MILLER in the future. His kind does not come along very often.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to my friend from Iowa, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

GEORGE MILLER is a hard-working, conscientious man who has dealt with subjects so technical and requiring so much study in special fields as to be beyond the full understanding of most Members of Congress. He has been a hard-working Member, and I think the test of time will show he was one of our great leaders.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I want to join my colleague from California in the tribute he has just paid to one of the outstanding Members of the House who is retiring at the end of this session.

I came into the Congress with GEORGE MILLER in the 79th Congress and served on the Committee on Armed Services with him for many years until he decided to transfer to the newly created Committee on Science and Astronautics.

What the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) said about the career of Mr. MILLER in the House is exactly on point. I know of no one who has dedicated himself more to the advancement of science and research and development and to the space program than has GEORGE MILLER. As the gentleman from California stated, he was far ahead of his time in advocating the adoption by this country of the metric system, and I am certain in a few years the metric system will be used in the United States just the same as it is throughout the world. GEORGE was way ahead of his time on that, as he has been in many things in the field of science.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the gentleman from California yield this time to me so that I might make those comments in reference to Mr. MILLER's career here.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I now yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that the gentleman from California has yielded to me.

I learned to know GEORGE MILLER in the time that we have served mutually in the House. I think the House will miss GEORGE MILLER and a lot of us who got to know him will miss a very good friend.

He has done an admirable job as chairman of a very important committee. Those of us who believe in the space program know that GEORGE MILLER's support of that program was a material factor in making the United States preeminent in the area of space and science.

GEORGE, we will miss you. God bless you and good luck.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the majority leader for his remarks.

I now yield to my friend from California, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply appreciative of the fact that our very distinguished dean, Mr. HOLIFIELD, has taken this special order so that we might incorporate our thoughts into the RECORD on behalf of our very beloved and very distinguished colleague, GEORGE MILLER of California.

I think, CHET, most of the California delegation would agree with what you have said and even expand on it.

The country is losing one of its outstanding leaders in this Congress. Having had a great interest in the area of aerospace and aviation education programs in California myself, I am going to be calling on GEORGE MILLER and the fantastic amount of expertise that he has developed in that field, because we are just on the launching pad of what he has provided in the aerospace field.

He is known for his record of service in the California Legislature, as an administrator in the agencies of California, and in resource management. In my book he is a walking encyclopedia in so many areas that we could literally fill the entire CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a recital of his accomplishments. I want to express to GEORGE my deep appreciation for his continuing willingness to listen to some of the suggestions that I had, but even more importantly than that, for the extraordinary advice and counsel that you gave to this Member when I first came to the Congress. I shall remain eternally in your debt, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California giving me the opportunity to say a few words about one of the dearest friends I have. I had the pleasure of starting out in this Congress and serving with the esteemed gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER, on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. And a few years later I joined the gentleman on the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

GEORGE MILLER is one of those individuals the country owes a great debt of gratitude for his foresight. GEORGE always thought younger than the rest of us. He is youthful in spirit, and youthful in his ideas that he has for the advancement of this country.

It was GEORGE MILLER who created the Subcommittee on Oceanography long before oceanography was in the minds of our Nation. It was his foresight that got that committee started so that the Congress would be ready. It was GEORGE MILLER who shepherded the Committee on Science and Astronautics to man's greatest achievement—that of landing a man on the moon.

I have had the warm pleasure of knowing Mrs. Miller and Hazel, my wife, and myself have enjoyed many pleasant hours with our dear, warm friends, GEORGE and Esther.

This Congress and this Nation is going to miss GEORGE MILLER's services, but his name is certainly not only engraved on our hearts, but it is engraved in the accomplishments he has helped this Nation achieve.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman 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 Astronautics, as others have mentioned, he has received plaudits, 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. But 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 1932 or 1933, 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 astronautics 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 of him as 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 so many who needed help.

Certainly we will miss him and his wonderful helpmate Esther, Mrs. Miller, and we wish them the best kind of retirement possible.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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 HOLIFIELD, and other Members here in regard to my friend Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

He came to the Congress, in January 1945, 2 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 believe there is a Member of Congress who can leave this body after 28 years with a record that will benefit humanity and our Nation more then GEORGE. It has been stated here on this floor many times that his record, scientifically and otherwise, through his work on the Committee on Science and Astronautics is unparalleled. He devoted hours and hours of time, day after day, and week after week—work in scientific study that the ordinary Member of Congress does not realize. The beneficial legislation scientifically and otherwise that GEORGE MILLER has placed

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 is any graduate of any school 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 the rest 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 as time marches on, 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 universities, 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 at Kitty Hawk in 1903 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 wisdom, 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.

So my 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 revere the name of GEORGE MILLER. 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 of 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 "meetric" system, when GEORGE would present it to the committee. But GEORGE 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 affairs.

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 man may well say, as he lies upon 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 say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks.

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 GEORGE for advice and guidance. One half the district consisted of an area that he had ably represented for many years and he generously provided me with assistance on an almost daily basis.

Whatever my question or 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, 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 leader of the largest delegation in the House, including San Francisco, San Jose and the great East Bay area, he has consistenly provided instructive guidance in confronting 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 and 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 an imaginative dream, to a large, technically sophisticated Agency which leads the world in aeronautical achievements and which has succeeded in sending men to and returning them from the moon.

In 1967, he was awarded the Robert H. Goddard Memorial Trophy for his sustained leadership in the formulation and execution of national policy contributing immeasurably 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 National Historical Publications Commission.

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, 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 say this elementary thing. He has 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 when I was a 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 better than 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 wife and 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 when Russia shook America and astonished the world by launching the first sputnik to the time when we placed men on the moon, as John F. Kennedy had promised when he first 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 science 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 leading scientific men of our time. 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 his lovely wife there in yonder dining 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 pay our respects 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 will 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 too long; about 4 years. Those 4 years have been very 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 Beardmore Glacier.

While we were there, the scientists brought forth the second set of fossils, and GEORGE and I had the opportunity to see the little pictures of fish and small flotsam. I happened to be very fortunate 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 have an association again that we have had in the past 2 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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 from 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.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join in this well-deserved tribute to a distinguished gentleman and good friend.

Since we are speaking of geography, we might as well span the continent and go to the State of New York to speak of our distinguished Congressman from California. He has our affection and respect. 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.

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 noted he was dedicated to 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 was always in the forefront of taking 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 ability 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 man, and that is his willingness to be a member of a team, and not always 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 thoroughly understood outside the halls of the Congress, but there is a sort of brotherhood or familyship which exists here. I do not know of any other Member of Congress who better demonstrates this than Chairman MILLER, and that throughout all the years he has been here. We will all greatly miss GEORGE MILLER.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in great sadness to pay tribute to my distinguished and able friend from California, GEORGE MILLER.

I have had the pleasure of calling on GEORGE throughout my 17 years of service in this body. He was one of my early mentors and friends. He sat one seat over from me in the early days of service on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I had the pleasure of serving with him on the Subcommittee on Oceanography and on the Conservation Subcommittee.

I have had the pleasure of benefiting from his tutelage and leadership and guidance on many occasions while he served there and after he had gone.

He has been to me and all of the Members, particularly the younger

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 associate with this great man from California. I shall certainly miss him, as will all of our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I certainly wish my good friend from California every good thing, as always. It is my hope that all of us from time to time will have the privilege and pleasure of seeing him come back to visit with us, so that we may refresh ourselves of his wisdom and goodness and renew our friendship in this body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to GEORGE MILLER, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

GEORGE MILLER has been a pioneer in the most exciting adventure of this century. Others have spoken at length of his outstanding career and I shall not extend my remarks except to say that it has been an honor and privilege to serve with this able and distinguished Member of the House. He has made an imprint on the history of our country which will endure for generations.

GEORGE, as your friend and colleague, I salute you and wish you and Mrs. Miller great abundance of happiness in the coming years.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and my fellow Californian, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, whose long and distinguished career as a Member of this body draws to a close at the end of the session.

GEORGE 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 I might even add integral to—the formulation of legislation upon which the numerous accomplishments of the U.S. 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 us with him to California and GEORGE will, of course, always be remembered here.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, after having served the Congress for nearly 30 years, Congressman GEORGE P. 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 had not sought reelection this fall.

I especially know GEORGE MILLER from having worked with him during my first term 22 years ago on the House Science and Astronautics 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 since becoming 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 Astronautics Committee as well as in the role he has played on the Special Select Committee on Government Research and as Special Adviser to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. For such activities as these, he was 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 contributing immeasurably to the remarkable accomplishments of the United States space effort.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE MILLER—after so many years of distinguished service to both his constituents and 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 returning when we reconvene 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 Astronautics 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 as each feat 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. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues here today in saluting the work of Chairman GEORGE MILLER. One of the saddest things about the last day of Congress is that there are so many friends one has to say goodby to—yet I hope that in the years to come we will have the opportunity to visit and meet again with these retiring colleagues. I, for one, will certainly look forward to such opportunities.

Until such time, I simply want to say that it was a privilege and honor to serve in the same body with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). As chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee he has helped guide the Nation to some of its greatest scientific feats. That an American first walked on the face of the moon can to a very large extent be credited to the support and direction which Chairman MILLER has given to the space program. He has prepared the way for our Nation to move into new areas of research which will open up new marvels and services to mankind 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 lapse in the regular official business of the House. It was impossible in these closing hectic days of the Congress to plan ahead for a time and to notify the Members of our delegation that there would 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 would not have been used otherwise. I know there will be a great many Members who will avail themselves of the permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, who would have been here had they known this time would be available at this particular time.

In closing these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that in my 28 years of association with GEORGE MILLER in the House of Representatives, and with his lovely wife, Esther, I have never known a man and wife who are respected more. I have never known a person I liked better. I have never known a man who had 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 would just put down in writing some of the experiences he has had and write his own story of this tremendous space program he has so ably managed and to which he had dedicated so many years of his life, I am sure that book would be one of the richest experiences in literature any man could read.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want, GEORGE, to wish you and Esther and 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.

FREE ENTRY OF CARILLON FOR UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA

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 read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 7, strike out "bill" and insert: "Act".

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 the Senate amendment numbered 1 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 1, after line 9, insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting immediately after item 907.45 the following new item:

" 907.50	Caprolactam monomer in water solution (provided for in item 403.70, part 1B, schedule 4).	Free	No change	On or before June 30, 1973. "

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after August 15, 1972, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendment made by subsection (a) applied to such entry or withdrawal.

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Senate Amendment No. 2 be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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 importation of a chemical, 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 place of "June 30, 1973."

Caprolactam monomer is produced by only three domestic firms. One of these domestic producers has experienced technical difficulties in its production process of producing caprolactam monomer and is unable to meet its contract commitments. The other two domestic producers, one of which also purchases the chemical from the company in difficulty, are not in a position to make caprolactam monomer available to other consumers.

Thus, the domestic producer who has been experiencing technical production problems has requested that the rate of duty of 1.5 cents per pound, plus 10 percent ad valorem, be temporarily suspended in order that it meet its contract commitments during the period which its plant is not operable.

We are assured that caprolactam monomer is indeed in short supply and the reduction in cost through the suspension of the duty will permit the plants using caprolactam monomer in the production of nylon to continue to operate. However, a bill similar to the Senate amendment was introduced by our colleague, Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia, which provided for a temporary suspension to December 31, 1972. Our amendment accomplishes the same thing. We have checked this bill with the Department of Commerce, and we are informed informally that there would be no objection to this shorter period of suspension from domestic producers.

Thus the motion we make is to concur to the Senate amendment with an amendment reducing the period of the duty suspension from the date of enactment to December 31, 1972.

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. 2 and concur therein with the following amendment:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendments, in the matter which appears below line 6, strike out "June 30, 1973" and insert the following: "December 31, 1972".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 1, after line 9, insert:

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (a) of general headnote 3 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "Except as provided in headnote 6 of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E, except as provided in headnote 4 of schedule 7, part 7, subpart A," and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in headnote 1 of schedule 3, part 3, subpart C, in headnote 6 of schedule 7, part 2, subpart E, and in headnote 4 of schedule 7, part 7, subpart A,".

(b) Schedule 3, part 3, subpart C of the Tariff Schedules of the United States is amended by inserting the following headnote after the subpart caption:

"Subpart C headnote:

"1. Products of Insular Possessions.—(a) Except as provided in subparagraph (b) of this headnote, any fabric of a kind provided for in item 336.50, 336.55, or 336.60, which is the product of an insular possession of the United States outside the customs territory of the United States and which was imported into such insular possession as a fabric for further processing, shall be subject to duty at the rate applicable thereto under item 336.50, 336.55, or 336.60 with respect to the country producing the fabric which was imported into the insular possession.

"(b) If the requirements for free entry set forth in general headnote 3(a) are complied with, fabrics, not exceeding 60 inches in width, provided for in items 336.50, 336.55, and 336.60, which are the product of an insular possession of the United States outside the customs territory of the United States and which were imported into such insular possessions as a fabric for further processing may be admitted free of duty, but the total quantity of such articles entered free of duty during each calendar year shall not exceed the quantities specified below:

"Calendar year and quantity (linear yards)	
1972	2,500,000 (or, if greater, the quantity entered during 1972 before the effective date of this headnote).
1973	2,000,000.
1974	1,500,000.
1975 and each subsequent calendar year	1,000,000."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this is an additional Senate amendment which relates to the duty-free shipments of woolen fabrics from insular possessions. While I feel that this amendment may have some merit, there has not been adequate opportunity to study the situation regarding the duty-free entry of woolen fabrics from the Virgin Islands. The committee has not had a hearing on it, and we ascertained from the Senators on the Senate Finance Committee that they had had no hearings on this matter before acting on the amendment.

I am going to ask the House to recede from this Senate amendment and concur with an amendment. It is an amendment that the State Department is most anxious to have us pass. This is the proposal to prohibit the importation into the United States of Pre-Columbian monumental and architectural sculpture and murals, exported contrary to the laws of the country of origin.

This proposal is a bill (H.R. 9463) that passed the House originally by unanimous consent and came back to us with several amendments attached to it that I do not think the House wants to agree to and I do not want to agree to. So I would like to move that the House recede and concur with an amendment. Before doing that, though, Mr. Speaker, let me

yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

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 consideration of trade legislation it will be a part of that consideration.

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 Secretary of State, by regulation 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 murals within the meaning of pargraph (3) of section 205. Such stone carvings and wall art may be listed by type or other classification deemed appropriate by the Secretary.

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 the regulation listing 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 such exportation 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 to the customs officer concerned at the time of making entry of such sculpture or mural—

(1) the certificate of the government of the country of origin required under subsection (a) of this section;

(2) satisfactory evidence that such sculpture or mural was exported from the country of origin on or before the effective date of the regulation listing such sculpture or mural pursuant to section 202; or

(3) satisfactory evidence that such sculpture or mural is not covered by the list promulgated under section 202;

the customs officer concerned shall take the sculpture or mural into customs custody and send it to a bonded warehouse or public store to be held at the risk and expense of the consignee until such certificate or evidence is filed with such officer. If such certificate or evidence is not presented within the 90-day period after the date on which such sculpture or mural is taken into customs custody, or such longer period as may be allowed by the Secretary for good cause shown, the importation of such sculpture or mural into the United States is in violation of this title.

SEC. 203. (a) Any pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural imported into the United States in violation of this title shall be seized and subject to forfeiture under the customs laws.

(b) Any pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural which is forfeited to the United States shall—

(1) first be offered for return to the country of origin and shall be returned if that country bears all expenses incurred incident to such return and complies with such other requirements relating to the return as the Secretary shall prescribe; or

(2) if not returned to the country of origin, be disposed of in the manner prescribed by law for articles forfeited for violation of the customs laws.

SEC. 204. The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

SEC. 205. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) The term "United States" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(3) The term "pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural" means—

(A) any stone carving or wall art which—

(i) is the product of a pre-Columbian Indian culture of Mexico, Central America, South America, or the Caribbean Islands;

(ii) was an immobile monument or architectural structure or was a part of, or affixed to, any such monument or structure; and

(iii) is subject to export control by the country of origin; or

(B) any fragment or part of any stone carving or wall art described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph.

(4) The term "country of origin", as applied to any pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture or mural, means the country where such sculpture or mural was first discovered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, earlier in the day I was advised by a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that there would be a clean bill numbered H.R. 17222 on the importation of pre-Columbian artifacts and/or sculpture or murals.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Such a bill was introduced, if the gentleman will yield, but I ran into some trouble.

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield, but first I would like to state my question.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am sorry.

Mr. HALL. Is that bill going to be introduced and is the gentleman's amendment identical to that bill and, if so, are we not playing the same tricks on the other body as they are on us, as to nongermane amendments?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No I do not think we will be playing such tricks. The gentleman from Florida and I conferred and I suggested that he introduce a clean bill, which I think is identical with what I suggested here, but it was impossible for us to bring it up by unanimous consent and get it through again.

Mr. HALL. But the gentleman is convinced, then, if I may interrupt—and I do not mean to be rude during the gentleman's explanation, that the importation of pre-Columbian sculpture and murals is germane, and is closely related to the importation of carillons for the University or California at Santa Barbara, duty free?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, if the gentleman wants to make a point of order against it I would have to admit it is not germane to the subject matter of the bill. However, they both have to do with importation of goods. This is more or less a policing operation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has just convinced me, and with glee I hasten to withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. 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 these 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 adopted in the Senate dealing 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 where if a petitioner does not prevail in a countervailing duty case. The respondent, or the defendant in these can appeal if he loses, but a recent court decision has held that a petitioner cannot appeal. There should be judicial review on both sides, and the conference committee agreed on this principal, although we adopted an amendment limiting the retroactive effect of any reversal by the court on appeal to 6 months. The Treasury Department has presented objections on this, and they want to have more time to consider it. They think that the amendment may have imperfections in it, and cause some problems.

Frankly, my own view is that this pre-Columbian act 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 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 proposed by the chairman of the committee. 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

other body was introduced by the senior Senator from Arizona. I am familiar with it.

I, too, am sorry that the conference report is not to be brought up. The merits of this are certainly all on the side of the American petitioner.

It is my understanding—the gentleman from Wisconsin can correct me if I am not right—that the foreign petitioner does have an appeal and the domestic petitioner does not; is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It is not a question of whether you are domestic or foreign petitioner. It is a question whether you are a petitioner—who normally is a domestic producer—or a defendant who is an importer.

Today, if the ruling goes against the importer, he can appeal. If the ruling goes against the American producer, he cannot appeal. The amendment of the Senator from the gentleman's State attempted to remedy this.

In conference we made some modifications but we did grant these people the right to appeal. That is what I was pointing out—this conference report is sitting at the desk.

Mr. RHODES. If the gentleman will yield further so that I may ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Would it be the chairman's feeling that this particular subject could be taken up in the next Congress rather early?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield so that I may respond.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I agreed at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, after having gone to conference on this, along with my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, not to call it up at this time because the Secretary impressed upon me the importance of the timing of this amendment rather than the merit of the amendment—that it was a bad time to bring it up, as he said. Certainly I am for the amendment—make no mistake about that—I agree with everything that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin said. It is fair for any advantage to work both ways. If there is an advantage in appealing from the decision involving the rate of duty—the countervailing duty—then it should go to all parties involved. It should not be a matter of going to just one side. But it is bad timing and that is what is involved here.

I can assure the gentleman I am for this and I would like to get done legislatively those things I am for even though I do not get to do it immediately, as I would like to. In connection with any trade legislation, this is a matter we would have to conclude.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think I can say to the gentleman from Arizona also that the position of the Treasury on this bill was not that it is not a matter that does not have to be cleared up and an equity that must be removed, a matter of the timing.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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 a matter I would think 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 for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this House has worked long and hard for many weeks and many months, and I wonder why at this time of night pre-Colombian art is taken up. It seems to me that a subject of this nature could have been taken up weeks and weeks before now.

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-Colombian art, Aztec art, or Mayan art, but I do oppose taking up art 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-Colombian art is where legislative deals with items stolen in the country of origin, and we are saying that if it is stolen it cannot be brought in.

Mr. CARTER. I would generally agree that that is noncontroversial, but I do think this should have been brought up many weeks ago before this House was ready to adjourn, and desiring the opportunity to conclude its business.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. This passed the House in February 1972.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: Amend the title so as to read: "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."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and concurs therein.

There was no objection.

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

FUTURE REVIEW OF UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we are in the closing hours, we hope, of a sine die adjournment, but there is a problem existing in the other body, and I am in hopes that I can clarify the situation to the satisfaction of those who see a problem existing and want to do something about it at this time. I just discussed the matter with two of our very distinguished friends from the other body, Senator JAVITS from the State of New York and Senator TUNNEY from the State of California. They are very concerned that there will be a greater degree of unemployment within their States some time during the early part of next year, and that if the House had accepted the Senate amendment on unemployment compensation, their States would have been protected, should that situation develop.

Now they will not be protected, as they know, in the event that there is a rise in unemployment in their States under the language that the House has agreed to that is pending before the Senate.

Naturally, fulfilling their responsibilities as Senators to their constituents, they are most anxious that something be done about it. I want to say this about unemployment in New York State and California, or anywhere else.

If we do have a rise in the rate of unemployment within these States or any other States, I want them to know and I want the Speaker to know and I want the public to know that I would be as much interested in trying to do something for the benefit of those people who are unemployed as they or any other Senators would be interested.

If this situation comes about, I think the proper way to do it is to go back to the temporary unemployment compensation program, as my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, earlier suggested, and determine some more satisfactory method of triggering this program into existence and triggering it off, so that we do not have the anomalous situation existing of high levels of unemployment within a State for 3 or 4 years, but because the unemployment rate is not 120 percent greater than it was in the 2 preceding years, even though it may be at an 8-percent rate, because it was at an 8-percent rate in those years, this programs triggers off. To me that is not right.

I would want to assure them that if they have any fears about my own position, they need not have any fears about my desire to take care of the situation.

I wanted to say that while they were present here on the floor.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. The gentleman is mindful of the colloquy we had earlier today. I was not here when the bill, H.R. 16810, was presented to the House. If I had

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 from 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 it 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 that. I am talking about the situation next year. I know the gentleman from Texas would be as sympathetic in that case as I am.

Mr. PICKLE. Yes. The present Magnuson bill for States with chronic unemployment 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.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF U.S. DELEGATION TO 18TH ANNUAL SESSION OF NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 18th annual session, North Atlantic Assembly:

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

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regretfully submit my resignation as a member of the United States Delegation to the 18th Annual Session of the North Atlantic Assembly scheduled to be held in Bonn, Germany, November 18–24, 1972.

I am honored with the appointment but unforeseen developments make it impossible for me to attend the Conference.

Sincerely,

L. C. ARENDS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE U.S. GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 84–689, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Assembly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), to fill the existing vacancy.

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 connection with my statement of 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 insured unemployed?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is correct, 4 percent of the insured 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 1928, 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 of 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 ago as its Congressman, 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 Rizley.

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 the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

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, reservation, or equivocation that there has not been a more stanch 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 can think of one particular instance in this Congress. I do not believe we would have had an acceptable pesticide control bill if it had not been for PAGE BELCHER. The previous pesticide legislation was unsatisfactory and unacceptable. PAGE BELCHER, by diligent work hour after hour after hour, helped to present a pesticide control bill to the House, and subsequently worked in conference to get legislation which is a vast improvement 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 his district, 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 of Representatives.

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 bulwark of strength 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. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

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 Oklahoma has taken this time to pay tribute 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 next year than my very good friend, 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 in the House only two terms less than I have—I came in the 80th Congress and PAGE in the 82d.

We served together on the Committee on Agriculture and he served on the Wheat Subcommittee, a subcommittee which I chaired when he was ranking minority member. As I mentioned, PAGE represented the northern part of Oklahoma and the largest wheat-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 would give small farmers 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 they received for crops.

Our 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 legislativewise, and a few occasions, I recall one in particular, where I was prompted 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." I pointed out that we had much in common, both of us being Members of Congress, lawyers, Sooners, Methodists, and members of many of the same organizations. I then said, "PAGE just made one mistake which I did not: 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." That surprised PAGE and brought a chuckle from the crowd.

In addition to other similarities in our background, PAGE and I are both Taureans, his birthdate 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. We used to play partners in the Congressional Staff Club's weekly sessions. We also played in tournaments together, including the Nationals. We happened to be playing in a tournament at the Sheraton Park 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 quoted:

> 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 important things to do, Carl, is not to overwork yourself and get ambitious too quickly. I personally want you to be able to carry on because I don't 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 Republicans had the majority 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 Policy 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 ego-tripper, not a trivial man. He is a genuinely serious, dedicated, judicious Congressman who has always taken his responsibilities seriously, but has the balance to work into his life a happy family, friends, and other pleasures of living. He is the kind of Congressman who gives genuine substance to a political party and a political body.

As a friend of his, 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 juggernaut whose demands are never entirely fulfilled. PAGE has served here 22 years. He has voluntarily retired; he 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 that I 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 and for whom I have a higher regard than my fine 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 served with PAGE BELCHER for many years on the Committee on Agriculture, and should I be reelected and should the Republican caucus see fit, I will be in the position of endeavoring to fill some very large shoes.

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 BELCHER is still not only a great man, 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.

So, Mr. Speaker, 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.

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. I cannot think of anyone who more richly deserves these tributes than the man about whom we are now speaking, PAGE BELCHER.

Mr. Speaker, so many stories come into my mind about PAGE, because of the very unusual and very pungent and pithy sense of humor with which he was equipped.

I remember on one occasion as a freshman Member of this body asking PAGE, "What do you do when you go home and campaign?"

His reply was simply this: "John, I simply 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 agricultural State, I have every reason 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 included this aphorism: "Never try to explain the previous question. You will certainly get into trouble if you do."

Also he said, "When you speak of a bill be sure you know more about that bill than anyone else does."

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 damn.

Mr. Speaker, PAGE BELCHER was not only a great football player, but he was a great golfer and a master in playing bridge.

Truly the House is losing a great personality, and I regret that PAGE BELCHER is retiring.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman 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 one of the outstanding practical political minds of anyone who has ever served in this great body. He knows precisely what was attainable and what was realistic.

His service on the House Agriculture Committee, including his tenure as its ranking minority member, has left an indelible mark on American agriculture. Everyone involved in agriculture will long remember his contributions.

U.S. farm policy has not always followed the recommendations of Congressman BELCHER and many mistakes have been made that could have been avoided had his preceptive advice been taken and followed up.

Coming from a rural agricultural and heavily forested area, I speak for both myself and my constituents when I say how much we appreciate PAGE BELCHER's support for agriculture and reforestation programs in this the 92d Congress particularly and in all the previous Congresses we have served together as well.

I mention the 92d Congress specifically because I believe in the past 2 years we have been able to come up with the most significant program of reforestation acceleration in the history of the United States. None of this, I might add, would have been possible without the leadership and support of Congressman BELCHER.

Oklahoma is losing a fine and honorable legislator and rural America is losing a strong and effective spokesman. I know all the Members of the House join me in wishing PAGE BELCHER a restful, well-earned retirement.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, 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 1969 as a new Congressman I was looking for friends and advice, and I did not find any anywhere better than PAGE BELCHER.

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. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the members of the Oklahoma delegation and other colleagues in the House in commenting on the distinguished service 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, others have spoken at 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 if carried out in good faith might change the destiny of the world and help to insure 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 agreement.

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 leave that country.

But even here, there are hopeful signs. 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 the Soviet Union which will make it much easier to resolve existing and future political differences between us. I am sure it will be quickly implemented by Congress if the Soviet Union adopts an equitable policy on Jewish emigration.

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 Commerce Secretary Peterson commending the subcommittee and I insert the text of that letter following my remarks:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM MOORHEAD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOORHEAD: I am pleased to advise 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 negotiations leading to this trade agreement have been in progress since President Nixon met with Mr. Brezhnev earlier this year. The details of both the trade agreement and 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 believe you will be satisfied with the terms of the agreement.

With the expected adjournment of Congress today, I recognize that more detailed briefings may not be possible at this time. Please be assured that we shall make every effort to appraise you and members of the Committee of the specific details of the agreement at your earliest convenience and certainly well in advance of the time the Congress considers legislation which ultimately will be needed to consummate the agreement.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

COMMITTEE TO REELECT THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, in the face of continuing Republican silence on the unfolding story of the operations of the Committee to Reelect the President, I rise to commend the Washington Post for its professional courage and commitments to the ascertainment of the truth. Regardless of the committee's activities which are still in dispute or unknown, the facts that are known should cause a feeling of outrage and dismay on the part of Republicans who treasure truthfulness and integrity as basic cornerstones of the Republican Party.

Whatever may be the benefits of political espionage and electronic surveillance, they have no place in operations directed from the White House against the political party not in power.

It is a tragedy that the American people have become so accustomed to secrecy, deception, and suppression of the truth in recent years, that a public outcry has not already forced a complete explanation from the White House. I know Clark MacGregor to be a decent and honorable man. His attack on the Post, however, is an attack on the motives and credibility of those that would publish the truth; it is not an explanation of the activities of the Committee to Reelect the President which he now heads. As this administration declined to question the truthfulness of Ramsey Clark but chose instead to attack his patriotism, so now its practice is to condemn an opponent rather than to answer his charges. I cannot express too strongly my respect for the Post in standing almost alone against the enormous power of an administration which is willing to use that power not only to conceal the truth but to suppress it.

At the very least, the President owes a full disclosure of the part played in the Watergate and Segretti operations by

personnel employed now or previously by the White House and the Committee to Reelect 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 crimes 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 but failed to advise him.

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 Reelect the President, however, are such as to impel 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 and he should resign or 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 faith of our people in our very system of government.

Unless this administration is willing to fully disclose the complete operations of the Committee To Reelect the President with respect to the Watergate incident and the Segretti operation, I suggest that it should be rejected on November 7th as unworthy of the trust of the American people.

I also wish to express my regret on an additional matter—that we adjourn today at a time when the President has said he intends to continue the most devastating bombing attacks in history on the people, villages and culture of Vietnam.

For Congress to adjourn at this time without voting a termination of this bloodshed seems to me an abdication of our duty so long as this bombing continues. Every peaceful cornfield and Thanksgiving dinner table in America will bear the shadow of the awful havoc we are wreaking in countries halfway around the world—countries whose people and children and customs are at least as deserving of peace as ours.

I intend to vote no on the motion to adjourn. I only regret that I have been unable to persuade more of my colleagues to do the same. I am ashamed today to have been so ineffective on the greatest issue of our time. That issue is, purely and simply, What have we Americans become, as a nation, when we kill for pride alone?

It is a misplaced pride which urges that "Peace with Honor" requires carpet bombing by 200 B-52s and the reduction of thatched-roof huts to kindling; that "Peace with Honor" requires the killing and maiming of thousands and hundreds of thousands of women, children and old people whose only offense is that they live along the roads and trails of Indochina.

Today's paper reports that we have destroyed the French Embassy in Hanoi—that the chief of the French Mission is being flown home to Paris with third degree burns over 60 percent of his body. How many Vietnamese women, children, and old people have suffered the same fate or worse? And will continue to suffer and die in the months before the next Congress convenes and can act to control the actions of the executive branch?

It seems appropriate to append the words of Mark Twain on war:

ON WAR

(By Mark Twain)

There never was a just one never an honorable one—on the part of the instigator of the war. I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful—as usual—will shout for the war. The pulpit will object at first, the great dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war and will say earnestly and indignantly.

"It is unjust and dishonorable and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity.

Before long you will see this curious thing: the speakers stoned from the platform and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still as one with those stoned speakers . . . but do not dare to say so. And now the whole nation, pulpit and all—will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesman will invent cheap lies putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked; and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities and will diligently study them and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.

REV. ANDREW B. BOCIANSKI

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, the 22d 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 a mass which is so appropriate 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 parish priest 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, 1900, in Simpson, Pa., the son of Frank and Catherine Wilant Bocianski. He attended St. Thomas College in Scranton, then St. Mary's College and the Seminary of SS. Cyril and Methodius 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 Kingston, at the Church of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary in Scranton, and at St. Stanislus in Nanticoke; then as pastor of Holy Cross in Buttonwood, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in Mayfield, of St. Joseph's in Hudson, then at SS. Peter and Paul in Scranton.

In fact, of course, that recitation does little to show how immensely this distinguished man of God involved himself in all of the life of this community. During those years, Father Bocianski served as president of the Scranton Chapter, Alumni of the Orchard Lake Schools; as a member, Supervisory 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 Sulpician Seminary Century Club; member of the Century Club, Catholic University of America; vice-chaplain, Polish Union of the United States of America; chaplain of the Polish Army Veterans' Association, District XI; spiritual director of the Polish National Alliance, Groups 2911 and 1218; spiritual director of the Polish Women's Alliance, Groups 328 and 618; spiritual director of the Polish Falcons, Nest 214; director of the Diocesan Council Catholic League for Religious Assistance to Poland; director of St. Stanislaus' Institute, Nanticoke; chaplain, Kosciuszko Post No. 207, American Legion, Scranton; treasurer, Friends of Poland Society of Lackawanna County; chaplain and honorary member, General Casmir Pulaski Memorial Committee; 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 Children of Mary, the Boy Scout Troop 70, and the newly formed Cub Scout pack.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will join me, as will all my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, in that mass of thanksgiving on Sunday. In these difficult and trying times, when each day seems to bring new cares, new problems, it is certainly fitting that we should take pause, however briefly, to thank God that He has sent 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 interim nuclear arms agreement with built-in U.S. safeguards, between this country and 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 its own passions and prejudices.

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 and to the taxpayers who support them. I recognized 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 2 years and an 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 some official redress available. But a 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 thousands of MS victims now have 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 liberalizes disability and death pensions; raises dependency and disability compensation to widows and children 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 Medical Care Act, 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 suffering total disability or 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 seek FHA home mortgage financing. This was designed to put a stop to the unwritten law that women should not be extended mortgage credit either 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 revive 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 legislative jurisdiction. The residential 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 both to specific economic punishment and often to physical abuse.

Every Soviet Jew applying for a visa to leave is immediately dismissed from their job, and, if the application 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 rewrites 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 Fall River 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 1 category]

	His	Her	Youth
Vietnam: Would you favor a national referendum on the war?	47	47	62
Which alternative would you vote for?			
(a) The present mining and bombing policy	38	22	14
(b) Immediate and total withdrawal of U.S. forces	31	33	55
(c) Withdrawal by a date certain concurrent with release of U.S. prisoners	52	62	61
(d) Total military victory	12	08	06
Tax reform: Would you favor appointment of a blue-ribbon national commission to conduct a 2-year study of our tax system and recommend needed reforms?	92	81	97
Equal rights: Should the Massachusetts Legislature ratify the proposed U.S. Constitutional amendment granting men and women equal rights?	91	91	99
Education: Which would you support:			
(a) Continued public school financing by local property taxes	30	25	28
(b) State financing of public school system	38	36	42
(c) Increased Federal financing of public schools	55	53	52
(d) Federal income tax credits for private non-profit elementary and secondary education expenses	36	36	40
Power-environment: Would you like to see a New England Regional Power Commission representing the 6 States which would decide power usage, plant sites, and the environmental impact for the whole region?	90	87	77
Day care: Do you favor a Federal program to provide day care facilities?	57	66	66
Health insurance:			
Do you favor a national health insurance program?	73	70	70
Which of several proposed programs do you prefer?			
(a) Complete medical and hospital coverage for everyone financed by payroll tax and employer and Federal matching contributions	50	45	46
(b) Limited coverage financed by 75-25 employer-employee contributions with separate Federal plan for poor and low-income families	12	11	10
(c) Limited coverage with employer-employee or individual financing options and separate State-Federal plan for poor and low income	12	12	8
(d) Limited coverage with individuals granted credit on their Federal income tax liability for health insurance premiums they pay	26	25	12

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 20-percent increase in Social Security benefits and other legislation needed to provide these things for seniors.

Of more immediate importance is the Federal money I was recently 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 Viet Nam, 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 a 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 resulting from restrictions on 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 it 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. 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.

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 actions 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 highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes"

TRAGEDY AVERTED IN RECENT CRISIS AT THE D.C. JAIL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this Congress should end without note being taken for the record of the decisive role which one of our colleagues played in averting tragedy in the recent crisis at the District of Columbia jail.

The gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM) served on the negotiating team which achieved the release of the captives whose lives were threatened, and an end to the disturbance itself.

No one has worked harder for prison reform and to overcome the conditions which the prisoners stated prompted the outbreak of violence.

She was, therefore, in excellent position to plead for reason on the part of the rioting inmates as well as some needed changes in the prison itself.

If anyone ever sees fit to write a book like "Profiles in Courage" concerning Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, a chapter should be devoted to this incident.

In the conduct of her campaign as a Presidential candidate, in the day-by-day fulfillment of her obligation as a representative of the people and in her decisive role in this crisis, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM has demonstrated ability and manifested courage which make her a credit to this House and to our beloved country.

A PERFECT VOTING RECORD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives discloses that my friend, Representative WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Democrat of Kentucky, still holds a perfect voting record. During the second session of this Congress—the 92d—so far we have had 457 rollcalls in the House of Representatives.

Representative NATCHER has never missed a rollcall vote since he has been a Member of the House of Representatives and has never missed a day in Congress. He was sworn in as a Member on January 6, 1954, and during the first 18-year period of his service, which was concluded on December 31, 1971, 2,704 rollcall votes on legislation were held, and, Mr. Speaker, this does not include quorum calls. During this period of time if the quorum calls were added you would find that he was present and answered to his name well over 3,500 times. For instance, during the second sesssion of the 92d Congress we have had 457 rollcalls up to the time that I make this statement concerning BILL NATCHER'S record, and this figure includes rollcall votes, recorded teller votes and quorum calls.

As a Member of Congress, BILL NATCHER 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 BILL NATCHER is 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, 1789, 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 has applied all down through the years, but, Mr. Speaker, BILL NATCHER'S record is a perfect record since he has never mised 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 gentlewoman 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 issue 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 all Indo-China, 2) cutting off funds for military assistance to the Thieu "government", 3) withdrawing all U.S. military forces from Indo-China within 30 days of an agreement about war prisoners; and 4) establishing a coalition government that reflects political and military reality.

Other key issues—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.

ON MILITARY SPENDING

The Abzug Bill against nuclear weapons testing—My Amendment to the Atomic Energy Commission Bill would have totally banned all U.S. nuclear testing.

Other key issues—I voted against funds for the S.S.T.; against subsidizing Lockheed; and against the incredibly wasteful $71 billion Military Spending Bill.

ON JOBS

The Abzug Amendment increased economic development funding for urban areas—I drafted and introduced legislation which increased funding for economic development programs in cities. My amendments were passed by the House of Representatives. (Manhattan and the Bronx are now eligible for Federal funds under this program).

The Bill to extend unemployment benefits—I introduced and fought for a bill to extend unemployment benefits. The House Ways and Means Committee has reported out a bill containing most of the provisions which I recommend.

Unfreezing the wages of low income people—I sponsored legislation to exempt fringe benefits and low-wage workers from the Nixon wage freeze. The legislation was passed by Congress.

Guaranteed pension rights—I am a co-sponsor of a bill which insures pensioners against loss of benefit if an employer goes out of business, and also establishes a system to make pensions portable from job to to job.

Jobs for Vietnam Veterans—I introduced the Veteran Unemployment and Readjustment Act which improves job counseling and hiring for veterans and provides them with job placement services.

Other key issues—I voted *for* the bill creating public service jobs for the unemployed, and for the bill creating a $2.8 billion dollar training program for health-connected jobs.

ON EDUCATION

The Abzug-Chisholm Child Development Act—creating a comprehensive child development program—I drafted and co-sponsored legislation to create a comprehensive child care program that included pre-school education, nutritionally balanced meals, parent participation in day care programs, and full tax deduction for money spent for child care. Most of my proposals were included in the bill which President Nixon vetoed in December 1971. Several of these were also included in a bill that passed the Senate on October 4, 1972.

Restoring $10 million to Bilingual Education—In November 1971, along with Congressmen Yates and Badillo, I succeeded in getting the Nixon administration to release $10 million in bilingual education funds.

Other key issues—I voted *for* $728.6 million in additional Federal Aid to Education *for* emergency aid funds for desegregating school districts; and *against* the bill to postpone busing for racial, sex, religious, or socio-economic balance.

ON HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

Freezing rents in New York City—I drafted the New York City rent amendment to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1971. This bill, which became law, places New York City rent controlled apartments under the Federal Price-freeze guidelines and this is now being tested in the courts.

Co-op housing for the poor and the middle class—I am co-sponsor, together with Congressman Badillo, of a bill to enable low and moderate income families to own their own apartments.

New housing for the elderly—The Housing for the Elderly Act, which I sponsored, authorizes $150,000,000 annually to make loans for construction of housing for the elderly.

Free air rights in Chelsea—At 30th Street and 9th 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 25%—I introduced several bills to reform the Social Security system. The bill, known as H.R. 1, which passed the Senate on October 5, 1972, included numerous provisions suggested by my bills, including:

Increased "widows" benefits from the present 82½% to the full 100% of the husband's entitlement;

Permission for social security beneficiaries to earn up to $3,000 (presently $1,680) annually without loss of benefits;

A "guaranteed" minimum annual payment of $3360 to each aged couple;

Medicare payments for outpatient drugs;

Reduction of the retirement age from 62 to 60;

Reduction of widows' retirement age from 60 to 55.

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 these Irish-American patriots for refusing to testify before a Texas grand jury. I introduced a bill which would allow transfer of grand jury investigations to a location convenient for witnesses, and joined with other members in pressuring the Justice Department to free the men while their case was on appeal. Frank Durkin, attorney for the men, credited my bill in part with helping to get defendants freed on bail.

Northern Ireland—I testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee on the need for full Civil Rights in Northern Ireland, dissolution of the Stormont government, and a plebiscite on unification. I co-sponsored the Bingham and Carey resolution.

Other key issues—I voted *against* funds for the House Internal Security Committee; *against* funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board; and *for* the bill to create an independent corporation to provide legal services for the poor.

ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The struggle for urban mass transit funds—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 a 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:

Reimbursement of localities for funds already spent on pollution abatement (worth nearly $1 billion to N.Y. State);

User charges, requiring industrial users of municipal water treatment plants to pay for the waste they produce and pour into the municipal system;

Citizens' lawsuits 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 WOMENS' 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 for all 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 prohibitions 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. It eliminates limits on the length of hospital stay. It extends coverage to include eye and dental care, prescription drugs and it includes automatic enrollment in supplementary Medicare.

A national program of medical insurance—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 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.

Jobs for ex-addicts—I have introduced a bill to create a National Environment Service Corps to be staffed by individuals convicted of drug violations.

More housing police—I have introduced a bill to provide more housing police in public housing projects.

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 1952.

So outstanding was his work in those positions that the people of Pennsylvania's Third Congressional District determined to send him to be their representative in the House. They renewed their 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 an American melting pot with a variety 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 to see to it 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 was never too busy to give his best efforts to aiding those constituents who came to him for help.

Just as he has served his district, so has JIM worked toward the well-being of the State of Pennsylvania. It has been my privilege to serve with him as a member of the Pennsylvania delegation.

Finally, there is his outstanding record of service to the Nation. As fifth ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, JIM BYRNE has been a part of the major decisions on America's defensive posture since the inception of the Korean war.

He has been a strong proponent of the idea that our Nation's defensive capabilities should always be second to none and he has consistently cast his vote in favor of strategic and conventional forces sufficient to meet the myriad challenges of our times.

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 sponsorship 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. They share our loss 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. YATRON. 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 his district since 1952. His service in these legislative halls has been outstanding and I have tremendous admiration for JIM BYRNE.

As a member of the Pennsylvania Delegation, I know 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. There is no doubt that he has dedicated his life to superb service for his constituents during his 10 terms as a Congressman.

JIM BYRNE is an accomplished man in every sense of the word. He was a dedicated Member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature. In the House of Representatives, a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he has shown depth, good judgment and wise counsel in the concern he has had for America's interests.

Mrs. Yatron joins me 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 well 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 from the House of Representatives by pointing out that his career is one of ceaseless labor here for 20 years.

His career was one performed on a high level for many thousands of Philadelphians and Americans. A career that in 20 years knew no days of slack performance. He is a Congressman's Congressman. He was a constituent's Congressman, as those who saw him during the thousands of hours of service can tell you.

He was for many years a chairman of an Armed Services Subcommittee. He served on three subcommittees of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The Merchant Marine Committee was vital to the interests of the Port of Philadelphia, as vital as his service on the Armed Services Committee was to the maintenance of the Philadelphia Naval Yard's role in our national defense effort.

What the American people do not realize is that Cabinet officers and executive officials are much like Christmas help. They come and go and it is the Congress that plays a great role in making national policy. Congressman BYRNE played a great but unsung role in such policy.

I know him as a companion in arms in many bitter battles including the fight for civil rights.

As a friend, I will miss his daily friendship and companionship here in the House of Representatives.

But, I know all of us will be reminded from day to day that we have gained the most knowledgeable constituent in the United States.

His career has entered a new phase. Ours will, too, as we learn of things we can do for Philadelphia from one of Philadelphia's most illustrious sons, the Honorable JAMES ALOYSIUS BYRNE. We may have lost a Congressman, but we have gained a constituent.

This is not necessarily a sad occasion because he will go on serving his city through the Democratic Party. His career has covered many miles and many turns, as a businessman, Federal Marshal, State and local official and 20 years as a Congressman.

I look forward to his friendship, to working with him for Philadelphia's great future and the future of the United States in Philadelphia. I will merely say goodby and hello to my old friend and say that the Congress and two of its major committees have lost a great deal, while Philadelphia will gain in his more concentrated service in the future.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join with my colleagues and particularly with my fellow Pennsylvanians in paying tribute to JIMMY BYRNE. As this is perhaps the last day we have to serve with him here on the floor of the House, it is a sad occasion—especially since he is my close personal friend.

However, as Congress grinds on in its usual preadjournment melee, I realize that JIMMY may actually be happy to be passing on to calmer and happier personal pursuits. I know that our loss will be the gain of his family and friends in Philadelphia, and we certainly wish him every success.

I have served with JIMMY BYRNE since the first day I came to Congress. I appreciated his guidance during my days as a freshman and have continued to rely on him for exchanging ideas which have guided my thinking on many issues. I will sorely miss his counsel and the fine rapport we have enjoyed.

JIMMY has been a fine legislator and a man of character and guts such as we Pennsylvanians are proud to claim as native sons. He has left the kind of mark on the House which will make it hard to follow in his footsteps.

Keep in touch, JIM, we need you and will miss you.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I feel specially 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 had the pleasure of meeting on the floor of the House was JAMES BYRNE, who, incidently, considerately 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 in a myriad of problems common to all of Pennsylvania. His presence will be sorely missed by all of his friends and in particular by the Pennsylvania delegation. I join with all of JIM's friends in wishing him Godspeed and many years of health and happiness in and during his retirement years.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, JAMES A. BYRNE, a dear friend and colleague of the Pennsylvania delegation will retire at the end of the 92d Congress. With JIMMY's retirement the House will lose one of its finest Members.

We will miss JIMMY for many reasons; for his wit, for his kindness and for his counsel. If ever there was a Member's Member then JIMMY is that man.

JIMMY is always concerned with everyone's problems, the Members, the officers and the employees who love him dearly. He was always there when you needed him.

As a dedicated member of the House Armed Services Committee, JIMMY served during the trying times of the Vietnam conflict, always concerned with his country and his fellowman. As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, JIMMY lead many fights for the merchant seaman and their welfare. Always for equity for all.

I wish JIM and his lovely wife Virginia the very best. May God bless them.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to have this opportunity to join in paying tribute and expressing my high esteem for my dear friend and colleague, Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE from Philadelphia.

Let me say that I have known JIMMY BYRNE for many, many years. He is a man, known for his veracity and rectitude. He has spent many years serving the people of his district. He has been close to them, understanding their problems and concerns. JIMMY has served the city of Philadelphia, the State of Pennsylvania and this Nation for more than just the two decades that he has been a Member of this House.

Although JIMMY leaves the Halls of Congress, I do not think he will leave the field of public service. He is one of Philadelphia's outstanding ward leaders.

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 but to love him.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, 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.

However, JIMMY BYRNE's greatest contribution has been the outstanding service he provided his constituents. During his term in office the people of his district always knew they had a hardworking friend in Washington. He did much for many.

I am proud to have served with JIMMY BYRNE and wish him and his lovely wife, Virginia, all the best.

Mr. BENNETT. 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 a pleasure and 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 economy when it could be secured without imperiling our national security. Our country owes him much; and I wish for him and his lovely wife every happiness in their retirement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to JAMES A. BYRNE. Those of us who have worked so closely with him will remember him for 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.

Mr. MOORHEAD. 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 your State delegation 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.

He has served the people of Philadelphia in an able and efficient manner.

I know of no man who loves this body more and has more respect for the institutions of government than JIMMY BYRNE.

His service on the Armed Services Committee was marked by dedication and concern for the magnitude of the issues which that committee handled daily.

I will miss JIMMY BYRNE and I know his friends on the Pennsylvania Delegation and throughout the House will miss him too.

I am sure that when he returns to his native Philadelphia, he will find the relaxation and contentment that he so richly deserves.

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 cosponsors of H.R. 17072 (Mr. BYRNES 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 93d 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, 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 for each child. The total credit available is reduced by $1 for every additional $20 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 in the bill.

II. REASONS FOR THE BILL

Many low- and middle-income parents who now send their children to nonpublic schools bear a very heavy financial burden. The cost of this education has increased substantially in recent years, and it is expected that this increase will continue. At the same time, the cost of public schools also is rising substantially, and taxes keep increasing to meet these cost increases. As a result, nonpublic school parents must pay for the increased costs of both public and nonpublic schools, even though they relieve the public school of 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 declining enrollments of many nonpublic schools and in the closing of many of them. The school closings prevent those families that are able to pay from providing their children with nonpublic school education.

Nonpublic schools represent an integral part of our society. Nonpublic schools provide a diversity of choice, and also healthy competition for public education. They provide the means for a number of Americans to express themselves socially, ethnically and culturally through educational institutions, and they provide stability to urban neighborhoods by giving parents important reasons to stay in the cities. Through diversity and innovation in education, these schools stimulate other schools to higher quality. Finally, 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.[1]

A key to the diversity and competition of nonpublic schools is that they are sustained by the voluntary actions of parents and others. Individual initiative has formed 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 concluded that any Government assistance 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 tax. Since 1917, the Federal income tax laws have allowed taxpayers a deduction from taxable income for amounts 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 tax gives more assistance than a deduction to lower- and middle-income 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 tax credit provides the same dollar benefit to all taxpayers.

It was also concluded that a credit for tuition best serves its purposes when it is a credit for only a proportion of the tuition paid. Th 50-percent credit provided by this bill insures that the educatonal institution must rely on substantial voluntary support, since with a credit on this basis each parent must use his own funds to a substantial extent if he is to send his child to a nonpublic school. If the school does not meet an important need, parents will not spend their

---

[1] The President's Commission on School Finance estimated that public school operating costs would increase from $1.3 million to $3.2 billion, and capital costs from $4.7 to $10 billion. President's Commission on School Finance, "Schools, People, and Money," p. 55 (1972).

own funds for this purpose and the school must improve or close. Also, with the percentage credit, in many situations 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 increase through the tax credit. 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 education received in such schools. 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 schools.

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 parents with several children in school is recognized in this limitation, however, by reducing the aggregate credit available to a taxpayer, rather than the credit per child.

The schools to which tuition is paid must be nonprofit, tax-exempt institutions (referred to in secs. 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) and 501(c)(3) of the code). This requirement follows existing law. For many years, the income tax laws have provided that for tax benefits to be available to schools (and their contributors) these standards must be met. Moreover, by requiring the qualified nonpublic schools to meet these requirements of the tax law, 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 First Amendment that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. The issue arises, of course, because a substantial percentage of nonpublic school students attend religiously affiliated schools. It is believed that the bill does not in any way violate this amendment. This view is based on an analysis of the court cases dealing with this amendment.

The Supreme Court has ruled that Government assistance to parents for the education of their children is valid even though the children attend religiously affiliated schools and even though the schools may indirectly or collaterally benefit from this assistance (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947); *Board of Education* v. *Allen*, 392 U.S. 236 (1968)). Moreover, the Supreme Court has ruled that Government may give tax relief to religious institutions in connection with the conduct of their religious activities. (*Walz* v. *Tax Commission*, 397 U.S. 664 (1970)). It is believed that these decisions make it clear that the Government may give tax relief to parents who send their children to religiously affiliated schools, whether or not the relief may indirectly benefit the schools. Moreover, by limiting the credit to 50 percent, the bill only assists parents in paying for secular education, and not in paying for religious education.

Furthermore, since 1917, the tax laws have given relief through deductions to persons who support nonprofit educational institutions, whether or not these schools are religiously affiliated. This tax relief has never been questioned by the courts. The credit is only a variation of this established and accepted type of tax relief.

There are only two court decisions (both by lower courts) which have squarely addressed the question of the constitutionality of tax benefits to parents whose children attend nonpublic school. In both cases, the courts held that a tax benefit of this type was constitutional and did not violate the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.[2]

Even though it is believed that the bill is constitutional, because of the questions which are likely to be raised, the bill provides for expedited court review of the constitutionality of the tax credit.

III. GENERAL EXPLANATION

As indicated above, it is important to relieve parents of some of the costs of providing secular education for their children in nonpublic schools. To provide relief, the bill (new sec. 42(a) of the code) allows an individual a credit against income tax for the tuition he pays to a private, nonprofit school for the elementary or secondary education of a full-time student who is a dependent of the individual.

Amount of Credit (sec. 42(b)(1))

The credit allowed under this provision for each is to be 50 percent of the amount of the tuition paid during the taxable year for his education but in no case more than $200. To be eligible for the credit, the amounts must be paid for the elementary or secondary education of a dependent who is a full-time student for a school year. In addition, these amounts must be paid in a taxable year in which the dependent's school year begins or ends. Under the bill, to qualify as full time during a school year, an elementary or secondary student must be a student at one or more private, nonprofit elementary or secondary schools during each of 5 calendar months during the school year (sec. 42(c)(5)). The term "school year" is defined as a one-year 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 education of his dependent son, B, in the school year beginning July 1, 1973, and ending June 30, 1974. T paid $500 of this total amount in September, 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 1973–74 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 the tuition in question. Therefore, where a person is only a conduit, being reimbursed for tuition payment by grant or scholarship or similar gift, he is not entitled to a 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 a taxpayer (and his spouse) increases. Marital status is to be determined under the rules provided in section 143 of the code. The amount of the tax credit is reduced by $1 for every $20 of adjusted gross income of a taxpayer (and his spouse) over $18,000. Under this provision, the aggregate credit available to a taxpayer is reduced, not the credit per child, thereby recognizing the fact that the more children a family has in nonpublic schools the more burdensome is the cost of education to his family. The following table illustrates the effect of this phaseout for various adjusted gross incomes over $18,000.

Adjusted gross income:	*Reduction in credit*
$18,000	0
19,000	$50
20,000	100
21,000	150
22,000 [1]	200
26,000 [2]	400
30,000 [3]	600

[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 Schools (sec 42(c)(2))

To qualify under the bill as a private, nonprofit 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 exempt from tax (under sec. 501(a)). No school can meet these tests 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."[3] It is intended that a school which is integrally a part of a church or other tax-exempt organization must meet these requirements to the same extent as a tax-exempt 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 respect to 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 requirements in their case.

Definition of Elementary and Secondary Education (sec. 42(c)(3))

The bill in using the term "elementary or secondary education" means education beginning at the first grade level and continuing through the 12th grade level. The term does not include kindergarten, nursery, or similar preschool training. It also does not include special courses or attendance at a Sunday school class or retreat or weekend or

[2] *Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty* v. *Nyquist*, — F. Supp. — (No. 72 Civ. 2286) (S.D. NY, October 2, 1972), and *Minnesota Civil Liberties Union* v *Minnesota* (Nos. 379526 and 380252) (Dist. Ct., 2d Judicial Dist., Ramsey Co., Minn., July 6, 1972).

[3] Rev. Rul. 71–447, 1971–2 C.B. 230: *Green* v. *Kennedy*, 309 F. Supp. 1127 (DDC, 1970); and *Green* v. *Connally*, 330 F. Supp. 1150 (D.D.C., 1970), aff'd, sub. nom *Coit* v. *Green*, 404 U.S. 997 (1971)

afternoon religious training, or other similar ancillary activities connected with a nonpublic school. As a consequence of the requirement that a student be full-time, tuition paid for dependents who attend only summer school in nonpublic schools will not qualify for the credit. In the case of special education for individuals who are mentally or physically handicapped, the credit is to be allowed to the extent this education serves as a substitute for elementary or secondary education.

Definition of Tuition (sec. 42(c)(1))

It was recognized that administrative problems could arise if a credit were allowed for "fees" paid to an elementary or secondary school. Often, schools may not issue detailed receipts for minor amounts paid, and an audit of these claimed fees may lead to unnecessary disputes with the Internal Revenue Service. Moreover, in many cases similar fees are charged at public schools and no deductions are to be allowed in these cases.

As a result, the bill provides that tuition includes any amount required for the enrollment or attendance of a pupil in a private, non-profit elementary or secondary school but does not include any amount paid directly or indirectly for meals, lodging, transportation, supplies, equipment, clothing, or other personal or family expenses. The treatment of tuition under the bill is not intended to have any bearing on whether tuition is a personal or family expense under any other section of the code. Items such as admission fees to attend extracurricular activities, such as sporting events, are intended to be excluded. Where the amount paid for tuition is not separately stated and includes an amount for any excluded item, the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is to prescribe regulations for the determination of that portion of the total amount which is attributable to tuition and that portion which is attributable to those items for which a credit it not allowed.

Application of Credit with Other Deductions (sec. 42(e))

It was recognized that in some cases (in the absence of this provision) a payment might qualify for both the tuition credit and a deduction. For example, amounts which qualify for the tuition credit may also qualify as medical expense deductions (sec. 213) or as child care deductions (sec. 214.) To prevent a taxpayer from receiving a double benefit for these payments, the bill provides that any amount taken into account for purposes of the tuition credit is not to be taken into account in determining whether a taxpayer is entitled to a deduction. However, to provide the maximum benefit with respect to these payments, the bill provides for an election, with respect to the tax credit. For example, a taxpayer pays $1,000 during a taxable year for the special schooling of a handicapped child and this amount would otherwise qualify both for the tuition credit and the medical expense deduction (sec. 213); if the taxpayer elects to take advantage of the credit, $400 of this amount cannot be taken into account for the medical expense deduction, whether or not the credit is reduced because the taxpayer's adjusted gross income is over $18,000. It is intended that this election be reflected by whether the taxpayer claims an amount as a credit for tuition or as a deduction on his individual tax return. It also is intended that the taxpayer will be permitted to change this election at any time during the period for which the statute of limitations for his return remains open.

Application With Other Credits and Regulatory Authority (sec. 42 (d) and (f))

Under the bill, the credit for tuition is not to exceed the amount of an individual's tax liability in a taxable year reduced by the sum of most credits allowable under the individual income tax laws (allowable under subchapter A of the code). The tuition credit will not, however, be reduced by the credit for taxes withheld on wages (sec. 31) and the credit for certain uses of gasoline, special fuels and lubricating oil (sec. 39). However, the tuition credit may not offset an individual's tax liability for the minimum tax (sec. 56).

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate is to prescribe regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of this bill.

Examination of Books and Records (sec. 7605(d))

A provision was added to the bill to give assurance that there would be no unnecessary interference with the activities of a church or association of churches where a school is operated in conjunction with it. As a result, the bill provides that the books and records of a school operated in conjunction with a church may be examined by the Internal Revenue Service only to the extent necessary to determine that the school is an exempt educational institution, regularly offers education at the elementary or secondary level and satisfies any State compulsory education laws. In all other respects, the burden then is upon the taxpayer to prove that he is eligible for the tax credit. It is his responsibility, for example, to establish the amount paid and that this amount was paid for tuition, in the same manner as is provided under present law, in verifying charitable contribution deductions.

Judicial Review (sec. 2 of the bill)

Although it is believed that the provisions of this bill are valid legislation under the Constitution, in order to resolve any questions that may arise, the bill provides for expeditious disposition of legal proceedings brought with respect to these provisions. Notwithstanding any other law or rule of law, proceedings to test the constitutionality of this provision may be commenced by any taxpayer of the United States in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia within the 3-month period beginning on the date of enactment. Proceedings under this bill may, at the discretion of the court, be consolidated into a single proceeding.

A three-judge district court is to have jurisdiction over any case brought under this provision and is to hear the case at the earliest practicable date, without regard to whether the taxpayer who brought the action has exhausted any administrative or other remedies provided by law. Any appeal from decisions of the three-judge district court is to go directly to the Supreme Court. It is intended that this provision for expedited judicial review is to be an additional remedy, and that all remedies under present law remain available whether during or after the 3-month period.

Effective Date (sec. 1(d) of the bill)

It was concluded that the credit should first be made avaliable for amounts paid at the beginning of the usual school year, rather than the beginning of the calendar year. This will avoid the unequal treatment of parents who prepaid tuition before December 31 (and therefore would receive no benefit) and those who paid after December 31 and therefore would receive the maximum benefit. As a result, it was provided that the tuition credit is to apply to amounts paid on or after August 1, 1973, and only for school periods beginning on or after this date.

Revenue Effect

It is estimated that the bill will reduce Federal income tax liability annually by $362 million at estimated enrollment and tuition levels for school year 1972–73.

FOREIGN SERVICE GRIEVANCE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 Secretary of State Rogers said in response to a question on ABC's "Issues and Answers" that the State Department has "the best grievance system for employees in the Government" and that the morale of its employees is high. These statements simply do not square with numerous reports I have received on current Foreign Service attitudes, or with my own conversations with Foreign Service personnel. In fact, employee representative organizations in the State Department have been trying unsuccessfully for 2 years to convince the State Department, AID, and USIA to institute a fair and independent grievance system for the Foreign Service comparable to the adverse action procedures to which civil service employees in other agencies are entitled.

These procedures for the civil service, authorized by legislation more than 25 years ago, provide for appeals outside the employee's agency on major adverse personnel actions, with the decisions of the appeals board binding on the head of the employee's agency. In legislation introduced during this Congress, Foreign Service personnel are asking for no more than that which was long ago accorded their civil service colleagues. Secretary Rogers has stated:

> We are perfectly prepared to improve our grievance procedures. We have done it in the past year.

But the interim grievance procedures instituted by the State Department provide only for in-house appeals, and decisions of the grievance panel are not binding on the Secretary of State, who may overrule them.

Evidence of unfair personnel action in the Foreign Service is too plentiful for one to dismiss as merely the concoction of a few malcontents. The two major employee organizations at the State Department, AID and USIA—the American Foreign Service Association and the American Federation of Government Employees—have given detailed testimony in both the Senate and the House about the injustices of the present system.

During the coming month, elections are being held among Foreign Service employees to determine which organization will be the exclusive employee representative under the Executive order for employee-management relations in the Foreign Service. After the exclusive representative has been chosen, the Secretary of State will have a new opportunity to prove that the Department is prepared to improve its grievance procedures by negotiating a fair and independent system with its employees. If these negotiations fail, it will be the responsibility of Congress to guarantee due process for the Foreign Service by enacting grievance legislation.

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 quality carpeting, and the family name "Magee" one to be identified with leadership in all walks of life.

Harry Magee was a civil official, an industrial official, a banking official, business leader, the moving force behind a radio station, who literally gave to his community a portion of all that he owned so that life in Columbia County, Pa., could be even better for those who live 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 fine 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 will be forever held by those who knew him and those for whom he was an inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I present to the House the obituary on 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 Central Pennsylvania, passed away 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 the leadership in management of the company.

Mr. Magee was born in Bloomsburg, on May 31, 1901, and was the son of James H, and Ella G. Magee.

He secured his grade school education in the Bloomsburg Public Schools and was graduated from the Bloomsburg High School Class of 1920. While attending high school he started working at The Magee Carpet Company during the summers, and the Company records indicate his initial date of employment was July 1, 1916. Following graduation from high school he attended Dickinson College, and began his full-time employment in the plant in 1920. In February of 1940 he became President and Treasurer of the Company, a position he held until February of 1961 when he was named Chairman of the Board. Because of mandatory policy, Mr. Magee retired as Chairman of the Board. * * * He continued to serve as 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."

Harry Magee 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 deeded the James Magee Memorial Park to the Town of Bloomsburg. This property is located on West Main Street and was developed by Harry Magee with the installation of lights and sidewalks.

He was instrumental in the formation of Radio Station WHLM, 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, and Coffee House, and directorship with the Farmers National Bank, Bloomsburg Bank-Columbia Trust Company, and the Bloomsburg Hospital. At the time 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 Municipal Authority since its inception, and a director of the Bloomsburg Water Company. He was active in the Bloomsburg Rotary Club for many years, club president in 1939, and an honorary member at the time of his death. He also held membership with the Union League of Philadelphia, the Elks, and was a 33 degree Mason. He was a member of the following Masonic organizations: Washington Lodge F. & A.M. Chapter, Commandery, Mt. Moriah Council-Royal and Select Master Masons, Caldwell Consistory, Irem 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 Hendershott Farm on the banks of the Susquehanna. This site was developed into one of the finest aviation facilities in those early days of aviation in Pennsylvania. He operated the airport under the name of Columbia Airways for a number of years before making the site available to the Town of Bloomsburg.

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, devoted for the most part to the raising of Angus cattle.

In April 1959, Mr. Magee received the Silver Beaver Award from the Boy Scouts of America in recognition of a long period of years as a booster of scouting in the Columbia-Monotur Council.

For the last several years he has served as an active member of the Northeastern Area Anti-Pollution Committee.

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 developing of the Magee Museum on West Main Street and the Magee Transportation Museum on the Millville Road, both museums being continually developed and growing in popularity with the local people and tourists coming into Pennsylvania. Both Museums were extensively damaged in the June floods that were caused by Hurricane Agnes.

In more recent years, he has devoted 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 wife, 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 afternoon at 2 o'clock from 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 Missouri and the Nation well. They have continued the fine tradition of great public servants from the State of Missouri.

BILL HULL has served in Congress for 18 years, and his record of dedication and 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 fine statesman; his friendliness 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 distinction 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 to join in his tribute and their remarks follow.

Mr. FLYNT. 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 DURWARD 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 and unselfishly and with honor and distinction.

BILL, in his work on the Appropriations Committee, and DURWARD, in his work on the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, have performed every task posed them with excellence. Their service to the Congress has always been marked with the dignity and dedication which is characteristic of them.

Their retirement is well deserved, but we shall miss them. Mrs. Flynt and I join with the people of Missouri in wishing both BILL and DURWARD every good wish for many rewarding and pleasant years ahead 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. DURWARD HALL—the watchdog of the House.

I know of no more capable legislator, no one better informed about legislation that has come before the House. Too often—in the press of day-to-day business—we fall into the habit of relying on others for facts about bills under debate. This was never the case with "Doc" HALL; he always knew what was in the bill and never failed to object to provisions in the legislation which he felt were detrimental to the best interests of the American people.

It is fitting that we should pause here in the rush to adjourn and to consider the accomplishments of this man from Missouri. He was never one to yield to the pressures of expediency and always insisted on reason and deliberate 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.

Mrs. Rarick and I join 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 labors, a few can be singled out for truly exceptional work. DURWARD G. HALL is one such Congressman who warrants words of highest praise and honor. A look at his record demonstrates his concern for the welfare of his constituents. Surely 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 him as a Congressman 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 extend this salute 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 evoke nostalgia. An oft anticipated opportunity for 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 "show me" quality will be missing.

DURWARD G. HALL, the nemesis of the first and third Mondays of each month is retiring and I for one am saddened at his departure.

DURWARD 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. Early I chafed. Now 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 one of 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 have benefited. 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 his service during these past 12 years truly exemplary. I, and I am sure I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, wish our friend and colleague well in his retirement.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our colleagues today in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Dr. DURWARD HALL—the watchdog of the House. I know of no more capable legislator, no one better informed about legislation. He took his job seriously and he expected his colleagues to do the same. He always knew the content of the bill under consideration by the House and he never failed to object to provisions in the legislation which he felt were detrimental to the best interests of the American people.

It has been an honor and a privilege for me to serve with "Doc" HALL. He is one of the hardest working Members of the House of Representatives and I admire and respect him for his tireless efforts dedicated to protecting the interests of our Nation. He is a man of strong conviction and firm resolution. There is never any ambiguity of opinion or wavering of viewpoint—you know by his consistent course of action and decision where he stands on any given issue. He defends his position with veracity and sincerity.

The people of Missouri, and particularly those of the Seventh Congressional District which "Doc" HALL represents, have been fortunate indeed to have such an outstanding Representative in the Congress. I welcome this opportunity to express my personal appreciation for both his friendship and his public service. He will certainly be missed and, although I am very sorry to see him leave the Congress, I join with his many friends in wishing for him many years of good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, with a combination of feelings, I bring notice of the departure from the Halls of Congress of our esteemed colleague, DURWARD 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 was 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 a most 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.

As he returns to his home, I 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 let our colleague, Dr. DURWARD G. HALL, know by personal letter how much I value and respect his services as he served here on the 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 practically everything 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 wish to give special attention to his dedication to work and attentiveness to his responsibilities. This House, this Congress and the Government of the United States are all the beneficiaries of his courage, his dedication, his understanding, and his knowledge 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 for our colleague and his loved ones the best of happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, when the 93d Congress convenes on January 3 two familiar faces will be missing from the Missouri delegation, those of our good friends, Doc HALL and BILL HULL.

Since first 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 reform proposals a few years ago, Doc HALL was instrumental in writing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and some of its best features bear the marks of his careful draftsmanship.

BILL HULL's service in the Congress over the last 18 years also reflects great credit on the people of his great State and of his district. He originally was assigned to the Committee on Public Works and then for a brief time served with me on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce committee. His appointment to the Committee on Appropriations in 1964, succeeding its great chairman and his fellow Missourian, Clarence Cannon, demonstrated the high regard that the Missouri delegation and the House had for BILL HULL.

I wish both these distinguished gentlemen the best of everything in their retirement years.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to DURWARD G. HALL who will be retiring at the end of the 92d Congress.

One of the more rewarding aspects of serving in Congress is the opportunity to meet and associate with outstanding men and women from every part of the United States, and I count it as a rare privilege indeed to have had the pleasure of knowing Doc since I came to Washington 4 years ago. His diligent and scrutinizing attention to legislation is a shining example and a valuable lesson to those who will remain behind and for those who have yet to enter into future sessions of the U.S. Congress.

The entire Nation is deeply in his debt for his long years of devoted service. I know that I voice the sentiments of my colleagues, his constituents and a grateful Nation in expressing the hope that Doc will find, in his retirement years, the enjoyment and personal reward that he has earned by his long and dedicated service.

My wife June joins me in extending to Doc and Bettie our warmest good wishes for continued health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining my friend BILL HUNGATE 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 2 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. Often, we have walked the distance 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 losing a fine Congressman, and I want to wish BILL HULL all the best in the coming years.

DURWARD "DOC" HALL and I came to Congress together in 1960, and it is hard to imagine what the House of Representatives will be like without him. His keen eye and quick mind have earned him the well-deserved nickname of the "Watchdog of the House." As one of the few medical men to serve in Congress, "DOC" HALL 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 Missouri on the service of our friend and distinguished colleague, Representative W. R. "BILL" HULL, JR. BILL HULL, the able and outstanding Representative of Missouri's Sixth Congressional District, who is retiring after 18 years of faithful and dedicated service. I have had ample opportunity to observe this gentleman and have always respected him for his kindly manner and untiring dedication to his constituency and country. He has demonstrated many times not only political courage but a high order of selflessness in service to our Nation. It has been my good fortune to know and serve with him in both the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives.

While I know he will be missed by all of the Members of this House, Congressman HULL has earned a well-deserved rest. I wish for him many years of good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I join in these tributes to two members of the Missouri delegation who are retiring at the end of this Congress—the Honorable WILLIAM R. HULL, JR., Democrat, and the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, Republican. While I am sorry to see both of them leave the Congress, because they have each enlivened our proceedings and brought unusual talents to the House, I understand the personal reasons which prompted their decisions to retire and I wish them the best of good luck and happiness in the years ahead.

Their names are so similar in spelling and in sound that there is often great difficulty in the House in hearing whether it is Mr. HULL or Mr. HALL whose name has been called, but of course there has been no problem in differentiating between them because they are so different as individuals. Congressman HULL is a quiet, gently-spoken, effective behind-the-scenes legislator who works hard on legislation through the committee process; Congressman HALL is a highly visible battler in the House for a variety of causes, a born debater whose needle is as sharp as his wit.

Different as they are, they share some things in common: The affection of their colleagues and the status of gentlemen of unusual gallantry.

BILL HULL is one of the most warm-hearted men I have ever met. Doc HALL is one of the most courteous. My votes have often been different from those of BILL HULL and almost always different from those of Doc HALL, but we have differed on issues rather than on the basis of personalities.

All of the Members of the House will miss Congressmen HULL and HALL in the next Congress, but none more so than the members of the Missouri delegation. We have enjoyed their companionship in our delegation meetings and in countless events over the years when we met with groups of Missouri citizens on legislative matters or just socially. BILL HULL always has brought to these gatherings a delightful sense of humor which is warm and affectionate and never at the expense of others; he is deeply loved by his colleagues. Doc HALL, in the political arena, is a formidable spokesman for conservative causes in the House, who does his homework on legislation coming before the House and is always ready to challenge everyone here with whom he disagrees on the issues. But off the floor he is one of the most genial of gentlemen who easily puts aside the political differences to earn the sincere friendship of those with whom he disagrees politically.

I consider both men as my personal friends, and I shall miss both of them here next year if I am privileged to return. They have both made their careers in Congress so much a part of their lives that I am sure they will miss this House as much as we miss them.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to extend my sincere good wishes to a fine friend and loyal colleague, the Honorable W. R. HULL, U.S. Representative from the State of Missouri.

BILL HULL and I have served together on the House Appropriations Committee for many years, and I have witnessed his dedication to the tasks placed before him. His service on the Subcommittees on Agriculture-Environmental and

Consumer Protection and on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare has been noteworthy and commendable. He has been an excellent representative both in the interests of his constituents back in Missouri and for the welfare of the country as a whole. This is an exemplary quality of an outstanding legislator.

I shall miss BILL's companionship, 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, and it is for continued success in the future that I offer BILL my heartiest 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.

"Doc" 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 his position 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 you that "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. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of our colleague BILL HULL 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 be able to spend more time with the people he has represented so well during his years in the Congress.

The good people of the Missouri Sixth Congressional District have been the recipients of 18 years of reasoned and dedicated service by BILL and he has represented their interests admirably. 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 was a guiding force in the policies of our Government. I am a better man for having known and worked with BILL HULL, 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 insight, and 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 Congressman HALL is retiring, 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 is 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 heart 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 scored 100 percent in the Review of the News Conservative Index. And he was one of 31 who scored 100 percent in the voting record just published by the American Conservative Union.

Whether you agree with him or not—and of course I do agree with him, on the great majority of issues—no man of integrity can fail to admire such a record of consistency and principle as DURWARD HALL has established. We will miss "Doc" HALL—and the Nation will miss him. His like are not easy to find in these days of the decline of our once-great Republic.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion with mixed emotions to pay tribute to the Honorable WILLIAM R. HULL, JR., an effective and tireless representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri, an area of some 23 counties with some 440,000 people in the northwest and north central portion of Missouri.

BILL HULL, voluntarily retiring at the end of the 92d Congress after 18 years of service, is going to be sorely missed by the citizens of his district as well as the citizens of the great State of Missouri and of the Nation itself. I, too, am going to miss BILL HULL's leadership and counsel in the Congress. When I was first elected to this body in 1960, BILL HULL was one of the Members of Congress who was most helpful in giving me good advice and direction on how to become an effective Congressman.

BILL HULL, a "man of the soil," was first elected in the 84th Congress. His life-long home has been in Weston, Platte County, Mo., where he is an operating farmer and a small businessman. His dedication to his constituents and his persistent and untiring efforts on their behalf has been the cornerstone and hope for new growth and revitalization in rural Missouri and rural America. BILL was one of the first Congressmen to raise the alarm over the effect of the shift of population from rural America to urban America. His solution along with urging both urban and rural Congressmen to join him to stem the population shift which he characterized as a problem for the cities as well as the counties, towns, and villages, was to introduce the Rural Job Development Act of 1971. Noting then that—

> It is a lot easier to keep people on the land than to force them off through low farm prices and stagnant economies and see them crowd into cities.

BILL HULL's measure would grant incentives to locate in smaller communities. In addition, BILL HULL has expended concerted efforts in securing the means for the area in the Sixth Congressional District to obtain sufficient water supplies for recreational and industrial development. His efforts include the funding for 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 HULL has played a vital role in bringing the new town of Pattonsburg 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 has already attracted more than $330 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 HULL was a member of the House Public Works Committee when it initiated the 1955 Federal Aid to Highways Act.

BILL HULL'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. HULL, JR., a great Missourian.

Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the impending retirement from Congress of DURWARD G. "Doc" HALL, a distinguished Missourian, one of the most important Members of

Congress and one of the American taxpayer's best friends.

For many years now Doc HALL and the redoubtable H. R. GROSS of Iowa have formed a team ceaselessly—and effectively—acting as foes of reckless Federal spending. Americans who have never heard of Doc HALL and H. R. GROSS nevertheless owe them a debt of gratitude every time they open their paychecks or file Federal income tax returns.

Although Doc HALL is not of my party, I am proud to claim him as a fellow Missourian—especially since we are neighbors in Missouri's Seventh and Eighth Districts. Doc has been a good neighbor, both at home in Missouri and here in this House.

Most important, Doc HALL has served his district and his State with dedication and distinction.

Most of you here undoubtedly know that prior to Doc's election to the 87th Congress he had a distinguished military record of 7 years during World War II in the Army Surgeon General's office, rising to the rank of colonel and winning the Legion of Honor with two palms.

Doc's many other political volunteer and professional honors are too numerous to mention but I would be remiss if I did not note that they include being named a fellow in the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Survey.

Many of you also know that Doc HALL is also a licensed riverboat pilot and spends vacation time piloting his houseboat from this area to the Florida Keys. But some may not know that Doc's wife is also a licensed pilot and enjoys taking the helm of the houseboat as much as her husband.

Doc also enjoys fishing and golf and I imagine retirement will find him on the links or fishing Missouri's lakes and streams when he is not sailing the inland waterways.

Doc will also be able to spend more time with his daughter and her husband—himself a distinguished surgeon—and his three grandchildren.

We will wish Doc a long and happy retirement but we will sorely miss him in Congress and so will the American taxpayers.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, whatever else the 93d Congress holds, the Nation will be the poorer because two of our ablest and most beloved Missouri colleagues will not be back. BILL HULL and "Doc" HALL have decided to retire.

Through personal friendship and because I worked with them on problems of mutual interest to and effect on our great State of Missouri, I had a close and satisfying relationship with Congressman HULL and Dr. HALL. But this affinity was the greater because the Fourth Missouri Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, is sandwiched between these two good friends, on the north by BILL HULL's Sixth District and on the south by "Doc" HALL's Seventh District. Nine of the 15 counties in my district adjoin counties that have been represented by one or the other of these retirees.

WILLIAM R. HULL, JR., of Weston, in Platte County, Mo., was elected to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954, and he has served with great distinction in this body continuously through eight succeeding Congresses. Upon coming to Congress, BILL HULL was assigned to the Committee on Public Works, where he served until 1963 when he went on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In 1964 our fellow Missourian, Clarence Cannon died, leaving a vacancy on the Appropriations Committee, of which he was chairman, for which a member of the Missouri House delegation was eligible. That honor went to BILL HULL and he has served that committee with honor for 8 years. There are 25 counties in his district, most of which are agricultural in nature, so it is fitting that BILL has served on the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He has also served on the Labor-HEW Subcommittee.

Dr. DURWARD HALL was elected to the 87th Congress on November 8, 1960, and to five succeeding Congresses. He has been a member of the Armed Services Committee during his entire congressional career. In recognition of the outstanding service and leadership he rendered the House in steering through Congress the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, "Doc" HALL was named ranking minority House member of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

"Doc" HALL is sometimes called "the conscience of the House." He believes that good reason underlies all the rules of this body and that those rules should be obeyed. And I doubt if there is another Member of this body who knows more about the rules of the House and its parliamentary procedures than he.

I am especially indebted to Congressman HALL for some assistance he gave me several years ago in a matter of great importance to my congressional district. The Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base in Grandview was about to be closed, ending the employment of about 800 civilian workers, many of whom were my constituents. Largely because of invaluable assistance from "Doc" HALL we were able to bring about the consolidation of the Air Force Communications Service and Ground Electronics Engineering Installation Agency on the site of the Richards-Gebaur facility. Not only were some 800 jobs saved by this consolidation but several hundred additional jobs became available through this consolidation. Without "Doc" HALL's help we might not have been able to perform this service for our district.

BILL HULL and "Doc" HALL. They are two very different kinds of men. BILL is a retiring kind of person who does his work and serves his constituency in a quiet but effective manner. "Doc," who, by reason of his extensive medical training and practice of the healing arts in both private and military service, is highly knowledgeable in a wide range of scientific matters. He is often called upon for advice and guidance when committees other than his own consider legislation of a scientific nature. He is very articulate in debate and searching in his analysis of any given proposition, possibly because of his scientific background. Yes, they are two different kinds of men but equal in their records of public service. They will both be greatly missed when Congress again convenes next January. I am proud to have known them and served with them in the Congress.

As long as I live, I shall always look back with pleasant memories of those years I was privileged to serve as a fellow Member of the House of Representatives with two men of such rare personal characteristics, men of great integrity, knowledgeable of the procedures to accomplish good legislative results and able in every sense of the word. And most of all down to earth fellow Missourians.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 A. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

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 Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) in tribute to the Honorable W. R. HULL, Jr., of Missouri, and the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL 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. KLUCZYNSKI) 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. REPT. 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 as follows:

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

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972".

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out "the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and the additional sum of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976", and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, the additional sum of $3,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978, and the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 103. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974," of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such year for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in revised table 5, of House Public Works Committee Print Numbered 92–29.

HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 104. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system in rural areas, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $725,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. For the Federal-aid secondary system in rural areas, out of Highway Trust Fund, $425,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(2) 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 small urban system, of the Highway Trust Fund, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(3) For forest highways, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(4) For public lands highways, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(5) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(6) For public lands development roads and trails, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(7) For park roads and trails, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(8) For parkways, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(9) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(10) For economic growth center development highways under section 143 of title 23, United States Code, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(11) For carrying out section 319(b) of title 23, United States Code (relating to landscaping and scenic enhancement), $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(12) For necessary administrative expenses in carrying out section 131, section 136 and section 319(b) of title 23, United States Code, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(13) For carrying out section 215(a) of title 23, United States Code—

(A) for the Virgin Islands, not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(B) for Guam not to exceed $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

(C) for American Samoa not to exceed $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

Sums authorized by this paragraph shall be available for obligation at the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized in the same manner and to the same extent as if such sums were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.

(14) Nothing in the first ten paragraphs or in paragraph (13) of this section shall be construed to authorize the appropriation of any sums to carry out section 131, 136, 319 (b), or chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) Any State which has not completed Federal funding of the Interstate System within its boundaries shall receive at least one-half of 1 per centum of the total apportionment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, under section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, for an amount equal to the actual cost of completing such funding, whichever amount is less. In addition to all other authorizations for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, there are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund to carry out this subsection not to exceed $50,000,000 for such fiscal year for such system.

SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN REPORTS

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Transportation is hereby directed to forward to the Congress within thirty days of the date of enactment of this Act final recommendations proposed to him by the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration in accordance with section 105(b)(2), section 121, and section 144 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 together with those recommendations of the Secretary of Transportation to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget unless these recommendations have been submitted to the Congress prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 106. Subsection (a) of section 101 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) The definition of the term "construction" is amended by striking out "Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce)," and by inserting in lieu thereof: "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the Department of Commerce), traffic engineering and operational improvements,".

(2) The definition of the term "urban area" is amended by inserting immediately after "State highway department" the following: "and appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other".

(3) The definition of the term "Indian reservation roads and bridges" is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'Indian reservation roads and bridges' means roads and bridges that are located within or provide access to an Indian reservation or Indian trust land or restricted Indian land which is not subject to fee title alienation without the approval of the Federal Government, or Indian and Alaska Native villages, groups or communities in which Indians and Alaskan Natives reside, whom the Secretary of the Interior has determined are eligible for services generally available to Indians under Federal laws specifically applicable to Indians."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM

SEC. 107. (a) The second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three years" and by striking out "June 30, 1976", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1979".

(b)(1) The introductory phrase and the second and third sentences of section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking out "1976" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "1979".

(2) 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 approval by Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1976, and 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 2, 1976. Upon the approval by Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimates in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 20, 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 utilized by the Secretary and all other affected heads of Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities for carrying out this title and any other provision of law relating to the Federal highway programs shall encourage the drastic minimization of paperwork and interagency decision procedures 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 103 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 collection and distribution of traffic within such area".

(2) Subsection (d) is further amended by inserting immediately following the next to the last sentence the following new sentence: "Any State not having a designated urbanized area may designate routes on the Federal-aid urban system for its largest population center, based upon a continuing planning process developed cooperatively by State and local officials and the Secretary."

(3) The next to the last sentence of subsection (g) is amended by striking out "1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

(4) Subsection (g) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "This subsection shall not be applicable to any segment of the Interstate System referred to in section 23(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968."

APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 110. Section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (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 (b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No State shall receive less than one-half of 1 per centum of each year's apportionment."

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out "20 per centum" in each of the two places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place the following: "30 per centum" and by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2)".

(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 subsection (b) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one paragraph to the apportionment under the other paragraph if such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of such State and the Secretary as being in the public interest. The total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under either of such paragraphs by more than 30 per centum."

(5) The last sentence of subsection (c) and subsection (f) are hereby repealed.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL-AID RELATIONSHIP

SEC. 111. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of Federal law or any court decision to the contrary, the contractual relationship between the Federal and State governments shall be ended with respect to all portions of the San Antonio North Expressway between Interstate Highway 35 and Interstate Loop 410, and the expressway 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 in Bexar County, Texas (Federal-aid projects numbered U 244(7), U 244(10), UG 244(9), U 244(8), and U 244(11)), shall be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States and the amount so repaid shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for "Federal-Aid Highways (Trust Fund)". At the time of such repayment the Federal-aid projects with respect to which funds have been repaid and any other Federal-aid projects located on such expressway and programed 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 unpaid balance of any amount programed for expenditure on any such project shall be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid highway funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Texas. The amount so credited shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of title 23, United States Code, as amended.

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 (c) of section 108 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "seven years" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten years".

HIGHWAY NOISE LEVELS

SEC. 113. Subsection (i) of section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof 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 approve any project on a Federal-aid system to which noise-level standards are made applicable under the preceding sentence for the purpose of carrying out such standards. Such project may include, but is not limited to, the acquisition of additional rights-of-way, the construction of physical barriers, and landscaping. Sums apportioned for the Federal-aid system on which such project will be located shall be available to finance the Federal share of such project. Such project shall be deemed a highway project for all purposes of this title.

SIGNS ON PROJECT SITE

SEC. 114. The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 114 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "After July 1, 1973, the State highway department shall not erect on any project where actual construction is in progress and visible to highway users any informational signs other than official traffic control devices confronting with standards developed by the Secretary of Transportation."

CERTIFICATION ACCEPTANCE

SEC. 115. (a) Section 117 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 117. Certification acceptance

"(a) The Secretary may discharge any of his responsibilities under this title relative to projects on Federal-aid systems, except the Interstate System, upon the request of any State, by accepting a certification by the State highway department of its performance of such responsibilities, if he finds—

"(1) such projects will be carried out in accordance with State laws, regulations, directives, and standards establishing requirements at least equivalent to those contained in, or issued puruant to, this title;

"(2) the State meets the requirements of section 302 of this title;

"(3) that final decisions made by responsible State officials on such projects are made in the best overall public interest.

"(b) The Secretary shall make a final inspection of each such project upon its completion and shall require an adequate report of the estimated, and actual, cost of construction as well as such other information as he determines necessary.

"(c) The procedure authorized by this section shall be an alternative to that otherwise prescribed in this title. The Secretary shall promulgate such guidelines and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

"(d) Acceptance by the Secretary of a State's certification under this section may be rescinded by the Secretary at any time if, in his opinion, it it necessary to do so.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall affect or discharge any responsibility or obligation of the Secretary under any Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1653(f)), and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.), other than this title."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"117. Secondary road responsibilities."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"117. Certification acceptance.".

MATERIALS AT OFF-SITE LOCATIONS

SEC. 116. Section 121(a) of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof the following: "Such payments may also be made in the case of any such materials not in the vicinity of such construction if the Secretary determines that because of required fabrication at an off-site location the materials cannot be stockpiled in such vicinity."

TOLL ROADS, BRIDGES, TUNNELS, AND FERRIES

SEC. 117. After the second sentence of section 129(b) of title 23, United States Code, insert the following: "When any such toll road which the Secretary has approved as a part of the Interstate System is made a toll-free facility, Federal-aid highway funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5) of this title may be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of that road to meet the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on the Interstate System."

CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

SEC. 118. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "main traveled way of the system," the following: "and Federal-aid highway funds apportioned on or after January 1, 1973, or after the expiration of the next regular session of the State legislature, whichever is later, to any State which the Secretary determines has not made provision for effective control of the erection and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of those additional outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices which are more than six hundred and sixty feet off the nearest edge of the right-of-way, located outside of incorporated cities and villages, visible from the main traveled way of the system, and erected with the purpose of their message being read from such main traveled way,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Effective control means that such signs, displays or devices after January 1, 1968, if located within six hundred and sixty feet of the right of way and on or after July 1, 1973, or after the expiration of the next regular session of the State legislature, whichever is later, if located beyond six hundred and sixty feet of the right of way be limited to (1) directional and official signs and notices, which signs and notices shall include, but not be limited to, signs and notices pertaining to natural wonders, scenic and historical attractions, which are required or authorized by law, which shall conform to national standards hereby authorized to be promulgated by the Secretary hereunder, which standards shall contain provisions concerning lighting, size, number, and spacing of signs, and such other requirements as may be appropriate to implement this section, (2) signs, displays, and devices advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located, and (3) signs, displays, and devices advertising activities conducted on the property on which they are located."

(c) Subsection (d) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"In order to promote the reasonable, orderly and effective display of outdoor advertising while remaining consistent with the purposes of this section, signs, displays, and devices whose size, lighting and spacing, consistent with customary use is to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary, may be erected and maintained within areas adjacent to the Interstate and primary systems which are zoned industrial or commercial under authority of State law, or in unzoned commercial or industrial areas as may be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary."

(d) Subsection (e) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

(e) Any nonconforming sign under State law enacted to comply with this section shall be removed no later than the end of the fifth year after it becomes nonconforming, except as determined by the Secretary."

(e) Subsection (f) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence:

"The Secretary may also, in consultation with the States, provide within the rights-of-way of other roads on the Federal-aid

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."

(f) Subsection (g) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof:

"Just compensation shall be paid upon the removal of any outdoor advertising sign, display, or device lawfully erected under State law prior to the date of enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972."

(g) Subsection (m) of section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(m) There is authorized to be apportioned to carry out the provisions of this section, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, not to exceed $2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, not to exceed $27,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, not to exceed $20,500,000 for the fiscal year 1972, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. The provisions of this chapter relating to the obligation, 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."

(h) Section 131 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(o) No directional sign, display, or device lawfully in existence on June 1, 1972, giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public shall be required by the Secretary to be removed until December 31, 1974, or until the State in which the sign, display, or device is located certifies that the directional information about the service or activity advertised on such sign, display, or device may reasonably be available to motorists by some other method or methods, whichever shall occur first. A State may not refuse to purchase and remove any directional sign, display, or device voluntarily offered to the State for removal by a sign owner if funds are available in the Department of Transportation.

"(p) In the case of any sign, display, or device required to be removed under this section prior to the date of enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972, which sign, display, or device was after its removal lawfully relocated and which as a result of the amendments made to this section by such Act is required to be removed, the United States shall pay 100 per centum of the just compensation for such removal (including all relocation costs)."

URBAN AREA TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 119. Subsection (c) of section 135 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby repealed and existing subsection (d) is relettered as subsection (c), including any references thereto.

CONTROL OF MORE JUNKYARDS

SEC. 120. (a) Subsection (j) of section 136 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Just compensation shall be paid the owner for the relocation, removal, or disposal of junkyards lawfully established under State law."

(b) Subsection (m) of section 136 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(m) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated not to exceed $20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, not to exceed $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, not to exceed $5,000,000 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 relating to obligation, 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:

"§ 142. Highway public transportation

"(a) To encourage the development, improvement, and use of public mass transportation systems operating motor vehicles (other than on rail) on Federal-aid highways for the transportation 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 fringe and transportation corridor parking facilities to serve bus and other public mass transportation passengers. Sums apportioned under section 104(b) of this title shall be available to finance the cost of these projects.

"(b) The establishment 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 134 of this title.

"(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 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 sufficient 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 can be accomplished without impairing automotive safety or future highway improvements, the Administrator may authorize a State to make such lands and rights-of-way available without charge to a publicly owned mass transit authority for such purposes 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 in each such place "project", by striking out "the Federal-aid primary system" in each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "a Federal-aid system (other than the Interstate System)", and in subsection (d) by striking out "Federal-aid primary highways" and inserting in lieu thereof "highways on the Federal-aid system on which such development highway is located".

(b) Section 143(e) 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."

(c) Section 143(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "to demonstrate the role that highways can play".

SPECIAL URBAN HIGH DENSITY TRAFFIC PROGRAM

SEC. 123. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 145 Special urban high density traffic program

"(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund, $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 longer than ten miles.

"(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 routes shall connect with existing routes on the Interstate System.

"(5) Routes designated under this section shall have been approved through the planning process required under section 134 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 which could 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 138 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.

"(9) No more than one route in any one State shall be designated by the Secretary.

"(b) The Federal share payable on account of any project authorized pursuant to this section shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of construction of such project."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"145. Special urban high density traffic program."

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.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

SEC. 129. (a)(1) Chapter 2 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 217. Alaska Highway

"(a) Recognizing the benefits that will accrue to the State of Alaska and to the United States from the reconstruction of the Alaska Highway from the Alaskan border to Haines Junction in Canada and the Haines Cutoff Highway from Haines Junction in Canada to the south Alaskan border, the Secretary is authorized out of the funds appropriated for the purpose of this section to provide for necessary reconstruction of such

highway. Such appropriations shall remain available until expended. No expenditures shall be made for the construction of such highways until 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 authorized under this title all 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 for public use;

"(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of such highways by vehicles or persons;

"(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 undertaken pursuant to this section shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary."

(2) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"217. Alaska Highway."

(b) For the purpose of completing necessary reconstruction of the Alaska Highway from the Alaskan border to Haines Junction in Canada and the Haines Cutoff Highway from Haines Junction in Canada to the south Alaskan border there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $58,670,000 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 the increased authorization of $8,500,000 established by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be available for expenditure only in connection with the construction of a bridge across lock and dam numbered 13 on the Arkansas River near Fort Smith, Arkansas, in the amount of $2,100,000 and in connection with reconstruction of a bridge across the Chickamauga Dam on the Tennessee River near Chattanooga, Tennessee, in the amount of $6,400,000. No such sums shall be appropriated until all applicable requirements of section 320 of title 23 of the United States Code have been completed by the appropriate Federal agency, the Secretary of Transportation, and the State of Arkansas for the Fort Smith project, and the State of Tennessee for the Chattanooga project.

ALASKAN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 127. Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966 is amended by striking out at the end of the last sentence "June 30, 1972 and June 30, 1973." and substituting "June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974."

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION COMMISSION

SEC. 128. (a) Subsection (i) of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof: The Commission shall not later than December 31, 1973, submit to the President and the Congress its final report."

(b) Subsection (n) of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 is amended to read as follows:

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $450,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available to the Commission until expended."

CLINTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

SEC. 129. (a) In order to facilitate interstate commerce by expediting the completion of interstate bridge facilities across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of the city of Clinton, Iowa, the City of Clinton Bridge Commission (hereafter referred to as the "commission"), created and operating under the Act approved December 21, 1944, as revived, amended, and reenacted, is hereby authorized to sell, convey, and transfer to the State of Iowa all of its real and personal property, books, records, money, and other assets, including all existing bridges for vehicular traffic crossing the Mississippi River at or near the city of Clinton, Iowa, and the substructure constituting the partially constructed new bridge which has been designed to replace the older of the two existing vehicular bridges, together with all easements, approaches, and approach highways appurtenant to said bridge structures, and to enter into such agreements with the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa (hereafter referred to as the "highway commission"), and the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois as may be necessary to accomplish the foregoing: *Provided, however,* That at or before the time of delivery of the deeds and 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 funds must have been set aside in a special fund pledged to retire said outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities and interest thereon at or prior to maturity, together with any premium which may be required to be paid 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 provide for the payment of the outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities of the commission as hereinbefore 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.

(b) 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 Bridge Commission on behalf of the State of Iowa, to complete the construction of the new replacement bridge, to repair, reconstruct, maintain, and operate as toll bridges the existing bridges so acquired until the new replacement bridge has been completed, to dismantle the older of the two existing bridges upon completion of the new replacement bridge, and to thereafter repair, reconstruct, maintain, and operate the two remaining bridges as toll bridges. There is hereby conferred upon the highway commission the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such privately owned real estate and other property in the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois as may be needed for the location, construction, reconstruction, or completion of any such bridges and for the operation and maintenance of any bridge and the approaches, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purposes by said State. The highway commission is further authorized to enter into agreements with the State of Illinois and any agency or subdivision thereof, and with any agency or subdivision of the State of Iowa, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision. The cost of acquiring the existing bridge structures, of completing the replacement bridge and of dismantling the bridge to be replaced and paying expenses 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 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, approved August 2, 1946, and the location and plans for the replacement bridge shall be approved by the Secretary of Transportation in accordance with the provisions of said Act, as well as by the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois. The rates and schedule of tolls for said bridges shall be charged and collected in accordance with said General Bridge Act of 1946 and applicable Iowa legislation and shall be continuously adjusted and maintained so as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridges and approaches under economical management, to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds as may be issued by the highway commission as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of 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 any of said bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from said bridges are hereby pledged to such uses. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the highway commission, nor shall any toll be charged officials of the United States while in the discharge of duties incident to their office or employment, nor shall any toll be charged members of the fire department or peace officers while engaged in the performance of their official duties. No obligation created pursuant to any provision of this section shall constitute an indebtedness of the United States.

(c) After all bonds or other obligations issued or indebtedness incurred by the highway commission or loans of funds for the account of said bridges and interest and premium, if any, have been paid, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held solely for that purpose, the State of Iowa shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the State of Iowa in and to those parts lying within Illinois of said bridges to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same, and thereafter the bridges shall be properly repaired, reconstructed, maintained, and operated, free of tolls by the State of Iowa and by the State of Illinois, or any municipality or agency thereof, as may be agreed upon.

(d) The interstate bridge or bridges purchased, constructed, or completed under the authority of this section and the income derived therefrom shall, on and after the

effective date of this section, be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local property and income taxation.

(e) After all of the property, books, records, money, and other assets of the City of Clinton Bridge Commission have been conveyed and transferred to the State of Iowa as contemplated by this section, such commission shall cease to exist, without the necessity for any hearing, order, or other official action.

(f) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section is hereby expressly reserved.

ROUTE 101 IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

SEC. 130. The amount of all Federal-aid highway funds paid on account of those sections of Route 101 in the State of New Hampshire referred to in subsection (c) of this section shall, prior to the collection of any tolls thereon, be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States. The amount so repaid shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for "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 project located on said sections of such toll road and programed for expenditure on any such project, shall be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid highways funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of New Hampshire. The amount so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to said State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of title 23, United States Code, as amended or supplemented.

(b) Upon the repayment of Federal-aid highway funds and the cancellation and withdrawal from the Federal-aid highway program of the projects on said sections of Route 101 as provided in subsection (a) of this section, such sections of said route shall become and be free of any and all restrictions contained in title 23, United States Code, as amended or supplemented, or in any regulation thereunder, with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

(c) The provisions of this section shall apply to the following sections:

(1) That section of Route 101 from Route 125 in Epping to Brentwood Corners, a distance of approximately two and thirty one-hundredths centerline miles.

(2) That section of Route 101 in the vicinity of Sells Corner in Auburn, beginning approximately two and forty one-hundredths centerline miles east of the junction of Interstate Route 93 and running easterly approximately two miles.

FREEING INTERSTATE TOLL BRIDGES

SEC. 131. Section 129, title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 301 of this title, in the case of each State which, before January 1, 1974, shall have constructed or acquired any interstate toll bridge (including approaches thereto), which before January 1, 1974, caused such toll bridge to be made free, which bridge is owned and maintained by such State or by a political subdivision thereof, and which bridge is on the Federal-aid primary system (other than the Interstate System), sums apportioned to such State in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (b) of section 104 of this title shall be available to pay the Federal share of a project under this subsection of (1) such amount as the Secretary determines to be the reasonable value of such bridge after deducting therefrom that portion of such value attributable to any grant or contribution previously paid by the United States in connection with the construction or acquisition of such bridge, and exclusive of rights-of-way, or (2) the amount by which the principal amount of the outstanding unpaid bonds or other obligations created and issued for the construction or acquisition of such bridge exceeds the amount of any funds accumulated or provided for their amortization, on the date such bridge is made free, whichever is the lesser amount."

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 statutes and regulations governing toll bridges over the navigable waters of the United States for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to assure just and reasonable tolls nationwide. The Secretary shall submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation to the Congress not later than February 1, 1974, together with his recommendations for modifications or additions to existing laws, regulations, and policies as will achieve a uniform system of tolls and best serve the public interest.

PARTICIPATION IN TOPICS AND FRINGE PARKING PROGRAMS

SEC. 133. In the administration of title 23 of the United States Code the Secretary of Transportation shall take such actions as he deems necessary to facilitate broad participation by the States in the urban area traffic operations improvement programs and projects for fringe and corridor parking facilities authorized by sections 135 and 137 of such 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, 1893 (27 Stat. 532), as amended, shall apply to any segment of the Interstate System within the District of Columbia.

CORRIDOR HEARINGS

SEC. 135. (a) 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.

(b) The Secretary of Transportation shall permit no further action on the Corporation Freeway, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, until new corridor hearings are held.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 136. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence is amended by striking out "additional mileage for the Interstate System of two hundred miles, to be used in making modifications" and inserting in lieu thereof "there is hereby authorized such additional mileage for the Interstate System as may be required in making modifications".

(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 1972 Interstate System cost estimate set forth in House Public Works Committee Print Numbered 92-29."

(3) The fifth sentence is amended by striking out "due regard" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "preference, along with due regard for interstate highway type needs on a nationwide basis,".

FERRY OPERATIONS

SEC. 137. (a) The last subsection of section 129 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby redesignated as subsection (g).

(b) Paragraph (5) of subsection (g) of section 129 of title 23, United States Code, shall be inapplicable to any ferry operated solely between the States of Alaska and Washington.

METRO ACCESSIBILITY TO THE HANDICAPPED

SEC. 138. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make payments to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority in amounts sufficient to finance the cost of providing such facilities for the subway and rapid rail transit system authorized in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 320) as may be necessary to make such subway and system accessible by the handicapped through implementation of Public Laws 90-480 and 91-205. There is authorized to be appropriated, to carry out this section, not to exceed $65,000,000.

FEDERAL-AID SMALL URBAN SYSTEM

SEC. 139. (a) Subsection (a) of section 101 of title 23, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) After the definition of the term "Federal-aid urban system" add the following new paragraph:

"The term 'Federal-aid small urban system' means the Federal-aid highway system described in subsection (h) of section 103 of this title."

(2) After the definition of the term "urban area" add the following new paragraph:

"The term 'small urban area' means an urban area having a population of less than fifty thousand, and not within an urbanized area."

(b) Section 103 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after subsection (g) a new subsection (h):

"(h) The Federal-aid small urban system may be established in each small urban area at the request of local officials. The system shall consist of arterial and collector routes, exclusive of urban extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, selected by responsible local officials in cooperation with the State highway department based upon anticipated functional usage for the year 1980. Each route of the system shall connect with another route on a Federal-aid system. The provisions of chapters 1, 3, and 5 of this title applicable to Federal-aid primary highways, other than apportionment, shall apply to the Federal-aid small urban system except as determined by the Secretary to be inconsistent with this subsection.

(c) Subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) For the Federal-aid small urban system:

"In the ratio which the population in small urban areas or parts thereof, in each State bears to the total population in such small urban areas, or parts thereof, in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census."

(d) Subsection (a) of section 120 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "the Federal-aid secondary system and the Federal-aid urban system," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the Federal-aid secondary system, the Federal-aid urban system, and the Federal-aid small urban system."

(e) Section 103(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "the Fedearl-aid urban system," the following: "the Federal-aid small urban system,".

TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 140. Subsection (b) of section 140 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out in the second sentence "and 1973," and inserting in lieu thereof ", 1973, and 1974".

TOLL ROAD REIMBURSEMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 141 (a) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 146. Toll road reimbursement program

"(a) Whenever a State has received its final apportionment of sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the Interstate System, the Secretary may permit, notwith-

standing the provisions of section 301 of this title, reimbursement of the Federal share of the actual cost of construction of new toll highways or improvements to existing toll highways, construction of which highways or improvement is begun after July 1, 1972, but not including the cost of toll collection and service facilities, on the same basis and in the same manner as in the construction of free highways under this chapter upon compliance with the conditions contained in this section.

"(b) The Secretary may permit reimbursement of the Federal share of the costs of construction as applicable to a project under section 120(a) of this title from funds apportioned to such State pursuant to paragraph (1) subsection (b) of section 104 of this title whenever the State enters into an agreement with the Secretary whereby it undertakes performance of the following obligations:

"(1) to provide for the construction of such highway in accordance with standards approved by the Secretary;

"(2) all tolls received from the operation of such highway, less the actual cost of such operation and maintenance, shall be applied by the State to the repayment of the actual costs of construction, except for an amount equal to the Federal share payable of such actual costs of a project; and

"(3) no tolls shall be charged for the use of such highway after the Federal share has been paid and the highway shall be maintained and operated as a free highway.

Such agreements may be entered into between the Secretary and a State upon enactment of this section. Reimbursements shall not be made until after the State receives its final apportionment of sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the Interstate System.

"(c) Such highway shall be designated as a part of the Federal-aid primary system, other than the Interstate System, before the payment of any Federal funds under this section, notwithstanding the mileage limitations in subsection (b) of section 103 of this title.

"(d) The Federal share payable of such actual cost of the project shall be made in not more than fifteen equal annual installments, from the funds apportioned to the State pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 104 of this title, with the first installment being made one year after the project agreement has been entered into between the Secretary and the State highway departments or one year after the State receives its final apportionment of sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure on the Interstate System, whichever is last to occur. Such payment shall be applied against the outstanding obligations of the project."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United Sates Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"146. Toll road reimbursement program."

HIGHLAND SCENIC HIGHWAY

SEC. 142. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Forest Service), is authorized to develop and construct as a parkway the Highland Scenic Highway from West Virginia State Route 39 to U.S. 250 near Barton Knob.

(b) The route from Richwood, West Virginia, to U.S. 250 near Barton Knob, via West Virginia State Route 39 and the parkway authorized by subsection (a) of this section, shall be designated as the Highland Scenic Highway.

(c) Such Secretaries are authorized to acquire rights-of-way, lands containing such rights-of-way, and interests in land, including scenic easements, necessary to carry out the purpose of a scenic highway.

(d) Funds available for parkways shall be available for signs on interstate highways, Appalachian highways and other appropriate highways at natural points of access to such geographic area, indicating the direction and distance to the Highland Scenic Highway and to Richwood as "Gateway to the Highland Scenic Highway".

(e) Funds available for parkways shall be available for upgrading that portion of West Virginia State Route 39 designated as the Highland Scenic Highway to appropriate standards for a scenic and recreational highway, including the construction of vistas and other scenic improvements.

(f) Upon construction of the Highland Scenic Highway as authorized by subsection (a) of this section, such road and all associated lands and rights-of-way shall be transferred to the Forest Service and managed as part of the Monongahela National Forest, solely for scenic and recreational use and passenger car travel.

(g) Any parkway authorized in the future to proceed southward in such area shall begin in the immediate vicinity of Richwood, West Virginia.

INCREASED FEDERAL SHARE—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 143. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect with respect to all obligations incurred after June 30, 1973, 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 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 70; Public Law 83-350), is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$600,000".

(b) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 147. Development of a prototype of a national scenic and recreational highway program

"(a) (1) The Congress finds—

"(A) that there are significant esthetic and recreational values to be derived from making places of scenic and natural beauty and historical, archeological, or scientific interest accessible to the public;

"(B) that there is a deficiency in the number and quality of scenic roads, parkways, and highways available to the motoring public;

"(C) that with increased population, greater leisure time and higher percentage of privately owned automotive vehicles, more families than ever are seeking suitable areas in which to drive for pleasure and recreation;

"(D) that the growth of cities and large metropolitan centers has decreased the quantity of open-space and recreational areas available to the general public, especially urban dwellers; and

"(E) that substantial economic, social, cultural, educational, and psychological benefits could be gained from a nationwide system of attractive roadways making possible widespread enjoyment of natural and recreational resources.

"(2) It is therefore the purpose of this section to provide assistance to the States and to other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to develop highways throughout the Nation to satisfy such needs and to prove the actual national feasibility of such a system through direct Federal participation in the improvement and construction of the Great River Road and attendant facilities and to further provide for Federal participation in the celebration of the tricentennial of the discovery of the Mississippi River.

"(b) As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish criteria for the location and construction or reconstruction of the Great River Road by the ten States bordering the Mississippi River in order to carry out the purpose of this section. Such criteria shall include requirements that—

"(1) priority be given in the location of the Great River Road near or easily accessible to the larger population centers of the State and further priority be given to the construction and improvement of the Great River Road in the proximity of the confluence of the Mississippi River and the Wisconsin 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 for scenic purposes, and the construction or reconstruction of roadside rest areas (including appropriate recreational facilities), scenic viewing areas, and other appropriate facilities determined by the Secretary for the purpose of this section.

"(d) Highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this section (except subsection (g)) shall be part of the Federal-aid primary system except with respect to such provisions of this title as the Secretary determines are not consistent with this section.

"(e) Funds appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to subsection (h) shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River on the basis of their relative needs as determined by the Secretary for payments to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(f) The Federal share of the cost of any project for any construction or reconstruction pursuant to the preceding subsections of this section shall be 80 per centum of such cost.

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to consult with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies having jurisdiction over Federal lands open to the public in order to enter into appropriate arrangements for necessary construction or reconstruction of highways on such lands to carry out the purpose of this section. To the extent applicable criteria applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed by the State pursuant to this section shall be applicable to highways constructed or reconstructed pursuant to this subsection. Funds authorized pursuant to subsection (h) shall be used to pay the entire cost of construction or reconstruction pursuant to this subsection.

"(h) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, out of the Highway Trust Fund, for construction or reconstruction of roads on a Federal-aid highway system, not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for allocations to the States pursuant to this section, and there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for construction and reconstruction of roads not on a Federal-aid highway system."

(c) The table of contents of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"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 to determine the feasibility and establishing a national system of scenic highways to link together and make more accessible to the American people recreational, historical, scientific, and other similar areas of scienic interest and importance. In the conduct of such investigation and study, the Secretary shall cooperate and consult 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 to finance the cost of reconstruction and relocation of Route 25E through the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, including construction of a tunnel and the approaches thereto, so as to permit restoration of the Gap and 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 1972".

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 Traffic Safety Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $360,000,000 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, $115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $115,000,000 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 sections 307(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 June 30, 1975, not to exceed $10,000,000 per fiscal year.

RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS

SEC. 203. (a) In addition to funds which may be otherwise 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, $150,000,000 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 obligation for one year in advance of the fiscal year for which authorized and shall remain available for obligation for a period of two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized.

(b) Funds authorized by this section shall be available for expenditure 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 on any Federal-aid system.

(c) 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 under paragraph (1) of section 105 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 is provided in section 402(c) of this title, and the Federal share payable on account of any such project shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost thereof.

BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT

SEC. 204. (a) Subsection (b) of section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "on any of the Federal-aid systems".

(b) Subsection (e) of section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "1972; and" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972,"; by inserting immediately after "1973," the following: "$225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $450,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975,"; 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.".

(c) Subsection (f) of section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is relettered as subsection (g) (including references thereto); and immediately after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f) is inserted:

"(f) Funds authorized by this section shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(1) two-thirds for projects on any Federal-aid system; and

"(2) one-third for projects on highways not included on any Federal-aid system."

(d) Existing subsection (g) of section 144 of title 23, United States Code, is relettered as subsection (h) (including references thereto).

PAVEMENT MARKING PROGRAM

SEC. 205. (a) Chapter 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) Congress hereby finds and declares it 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 of subsection (a) of 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 system, but not included in the Interstate System, as he may find necessary to bring such highway to the pavement marking standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator.

"(c) In approving projects under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to those projects which are located in rural areas and which are either on the Federal-aid secondary system or are not included in any Federal-aid system.

"(d) The entire cost of projects approved under subsections (b) and (f) of this section shall be paid from sums authorized to carry out this section.

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section 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, out of the Highway Trust Fund, the sum of $100,000,000, to be available until expended. Such sums shall be available for obligation at the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized in the same manner and to the same extent as if such funds were apportioned under this chapter. Such funds shall be apportioned on the same basis as is provided in paragraph (2) of section 104(b) of this title.

"(f) Funds apportioned to a State but not required by it for pavement-marking projects authorized by this section may be released by the Secretary to such State for expenditure for projects to eliminate or reduce the hazards to safety at specific locations or sections of highways which are not located on any Federal-aid system and which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials. Funds may be released by the Secretary under this subsection only if the Secretary has received satisfactory assurances from the State highway department that all nonurban area highways within the State are marked in accordance with the pavement-marking standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator.

"(g) Each State shall report to the Secretary in January 1975, and in each January thereafter for three years following completion within that State of the special pavement-marking program authorized by this section, with respect to the effectiveness of the payment-marking improvements accomplished since commencement of the program. The report shall include an analysis and evaluation with respect to the number, rate, and severity of accidents at improved locations, and the cost-benefit ratio of such improvements, comparing a period one year prior to completion of improvements to annual periods subsequent to completion of such improvements. The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress not later than June 30, 1975, and not later than June 30 of each year thereafter until completion of the special pavement-marking program authorized by this section, with respect to the effectiveness of the pavement-marking improvements accomplished by the several States under this section."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"148. Special pavement-marking program."

PAVEMENT-MARKING RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

SEC. 206. (a) In addition to the research authorized by section 307(a) of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to conduct research and demonstration programs with respect to the effectiveness of various types of pavement markings and related delineators under inclement weather and nighttime conditions.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section by the Federal Highway Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

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", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) In addition to the research authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary, in consultation with such other Government and private agencies as may be necessary, is authorized to carry out safety research on the following:

"(1) The relationship between the consumption and use of drugs and their effect upon highway safety and drivers of motor vehicles; and

"(2) Driver behavior research, including the characteristics of driver performance, the relationships of mental and physical abilities to the driving task, and the relationship of frequency of driver accident involvement to highway safety.

"(c) The research authorized by subsection (b) of this section may be conducted by the Secretary through grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals."

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the amendments made by this section by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the Highway Trust Fund, the sum of $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

PROJECT FOR HIGH HAZARD LOCATIONS (SPOT IMPROVEMENTS)

SEC. 208. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the section added by section 2 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 149. 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 $100,000,000, 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 one year in advance of the fiscal year for which authorized and shall remain available for obligation for a period of two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(b) Funds authorized by this section shall be available for expenditure 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 on any Federal-aid system.

"(c) Funds made available in accordance with subsection (b) shall be apportioned to the States in the same manner as is provided in section 402(c) of this title, and the Federal share payable on account of any such project shall not exceed 90 percentum of the cost thereof."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"149. Projects for high hazard locations.".

PROGRAM FOR THE ELIMINATION OF ROADSIDE OBSTACLES

SEC. 209. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 150. Program for the elimination of roadside obstacles

"(a) Each State 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 provide for the replacement, to the extent necessary, of existing sign and light supports which are not designed to yield or break away upon impact. Yielding or breakaway sign and light supports shall be used, to the extent necessary, on all new construction or reconstruction of highways.

"(b) For projects to correct roadside hazards 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 $75,000,000, 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 one year in advance of the fiscal year for which authorized and shall remain available for obligation for a period of two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(c) 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 on any Federal-aid system.

"(d) Funds made available in accordance with subsection (c) shall be apportioned to the States in the same manner as is provided in section 402(c) of this title, and the Federal share payable on account of any such project shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost thereof.

"(e) Commencing in 1974, the Secretary of Transportation shall report to Congress the progress made by the several States 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."

(b) The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"150. Program for the elimination of roadside obstacles."

HIGHWAY SAFETY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMING AND STUDY

SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with interested government and nongovernment authorities, agencies, organizations, institutions, businesses, and individuals, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the use of mass media and other techniques for informing the public of means and methods for reducing the number and severity of highway accidents. Such a study shall include, but not be limited to, ways and means for encouraging the participation and cooperation of 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 subsection (a) of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

(c) The Secretary of Transportation shall develop highway safety pilot television messages of varying length, up to and including five minutes, for use in accordance with the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out subsection (c) of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $4,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION STUDY

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with State and local traffic safety authorities, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of ways and means for encouraging greater citizen participation and involvement in highway safety programs, with particular emphasis on the traffic enforcement process, including, but not limited to, the creation of citizen adjuncts to assist professional traffic enforcement agencies in the performance of their duties. The Secretary shall report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

(b) For the purposes of carrying out this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

FEASIBILITY STUDY—NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF HIGHWAY OPERATIONS

SEC. 212. (a) The Secretary of Transportation shall make a thorough study of the feasibility of establishing a National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations designed to acquire, store, and retrieve highway accident data and standardize the information and procedures for reporting accidents on a nationwide basis. Such study should include an estimate of the cost of establishing and maintaining such a center, including the means of acquiring the accident information to be stored therein. The Secretary 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 authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund.

UNDERPASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 213. (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 rail-highway crossings in, or in the vicinity of, Springfield, Illinois.

(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 $36,000,000 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(d) The Secretary of Transportation shall enter into such arrangements as may be necessary to carry out a demonstration project in Lincoln, Nebraska, for the relocation of railroad lines from the central area of the city in conformance with the methodology developed under proposal numbered DOT-FR-20037. The city shall (1) have a local agency with legal authority to relocate railroad facilities, levy taxes for such purpose, and a record of prior accomplishment; and (2) have a current relocation plan for such lines which has a favorable benefit-cost ratio involving and having the unanimous approval of three or more class 1 railroads and multicivic, local, and State agencies, and which provides for the elimination of a substantial number of the existing railway-road conflict points within the city.

(e) Federal grants or payments for the purpose of subsection (d) of this section shall cover 70 per centum of the costs involved.

(f) The Secretary shall make annual reports and a final report to the President and the Congress with respect to his activities pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

(g) For the purpose of carrying out subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500,000 out of the Highway Trust Fund, and not to exceed $9,500,000 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

(h) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,000,000 in the case of Lincoln, Nebraska, and $1,400,000 in the case of Elko, Nevada, from the Highway Trust Fund, and not to exceed $2,000,000 in the case of Lincoln, Nebraska, and $2,800,000 in the case of Elko, Nevada, from money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for carrying out the provisions of this section.

MANPOWER TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 215. (a) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 402 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "approved in accordance with subsection (a)," the following: "including the development and implementation of manpower training programs, and of demonstration programs that the Secretary determines will contribute directly to the reduction of accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom such funds."

PUBLIC ROAD MILEAGE

SEC. 216. Subsection (c) of section 402 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the third sentence the following: "Public road mileage as used in this subsection shall be determined as of the end of the calendar year preceding the year in which the funds are apportioned and shall be certified by the Governor of the State and subject to approval by the Secretary."

MINIMUM APPORTIONMENT

SEC. 217. Subsection (c) of section 402 is amended by striking "one-third of 1 per centum" in the fifth sentence thereof as amended, and inserting "one-half of 1 per centum."

INCENTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH HIGHWAY SAFETY STANDARDS

SEC. 218. Section 402 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding a new subsection (i), as follows:

"(i) (1) The Secretary shall award, in addition to other grants pursuant to this section, $10,000,000 in grants in each fiscal year to States which he determines, in accordance with criteria which he shall establish and publish, to have attained above average results in carrying out and achieving the purposes of this chapter. Such grants shall be used by recipient States only to further the purposes of this chapter. The amount appropriated in each fiscal year for the purpose of carrying out this paragraph shall be apportioned among the States eligible for grants pursuant to this paragraph in the ratio which the total apportionments to each State pursuant to section 104(b) (1) and (2) for such year bears to the total such apportionments to all such eligible States for such year.

"(2) The Secretary may also award, in addition to other grants pursuant to this section, $10,000,000 in grants in each fiscal year to States which he determines, in accordance with criteria which he shall establish and publish, to have made the most significant improvements in carrying out and achieving the purposes of this chapter. Such grants shall be used by recipient States only to further the purposes of this chapter. No State shall receive in excess of $500,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph.".

HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 219. The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 403 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "In addition, the Secretary may use the funds appropriated to carry out this subsection, either independently or in cooperation with other Federal departments or agencies, for making grants to or contracting with State or local agencies, institutions, and individuals for (1) training or education of highway safety personnel, (2) research fellowships in highway safety, (3) development of improved accident investigation procedures, (4) emergency service plans, (5) demonstration projects, and (6) related activities which 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."

TRANSFER OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT EQUIPMENT

SEC. 220. Section 403 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary may, where he deems it to be in furtherance of the purposes of section 402 of this title, vest in State or local agencies, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, title to equipment purchased for demonstration projects with funds authorized by this section."

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 221. Subsection (a) (1) of section 404 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "Federal Highway Administrator," the following: "the National Highway Traffic Safety Administrator,".

DATE OF ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 222. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 (80 Stat. 736) is amended by deleting "March 1" and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "July 1".

TITLE III

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

SEC. 301. (a) The fifth sentence of section 4 (a) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "The Federal grant for any such project to be assisted under section 3 (other than a project for payment of operating expenses) shall be in an amount equal to 80 per centum of the net project cost."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to projects which were not subject to administrative reservation on or before July 1, 1972.

(c) (1) Section 3 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "No" in the fifth sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (f), no"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Secretary is also authorized, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to make grants or loans to any State or local public body to enable it to assist any mass transportation system which maintains mass transportation service in an urban area to pay operating expenses incurred as a result of providing such service. No financial assistance shall be provided under this subsection unless (1) the Secretary determines that the mass transportation services provided by the system involved are needed to carry out a program referred to in section 4(a), and (2) the applicant State or public body has submitted to the Secretary a comprehensive mass transportation service improvement plan which is approved by him and which sets forth a program, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for capital or service improvements to be undertaken for the purpose of providing more efficient, economical, and convenient mass transportation service in an urban area, and for placing the mass transportation operations of such system on a sound financial basis, and (3) the Secretary determines that the mass transportation services provided by each system involved is being provided by an efficient operation of such system in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The amount of any grant under this subsection to a State or local public body to enable it to assist any mass transportation system to pay operating expenses shall not exceed twice the amount of financial assistance provided from State or local sources for that purpose. The Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary to administer this subsection in an equitable manner. Such regulations shall include appropriate definitions of (A) operating expenses, and (B) the sources or types of State or local financial assistance which may be considered in computing the maximum allowable Federal grant."

(2) The fourth sentence of section 4(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3 (other than subsection (f))".

(3) Section 12(c) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(C) by adding after paragraph (5) a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) the term 'mass transportation system' means any private company or public authority or agency providing mass transportation service."

(c) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(c)";

(2) by striking out "sections 3, 7(b), and 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3 (except subsection (f)), and sections 7(b) and 9";

(3) by striking out "this subsection" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "this paragraph"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) To finance grants and loans under section 3(f) of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to incur obligations on behalf of the United States in the form of grant agreements or otherwise in amounts aggregating not to exceed $400,000,000. This amount shall become available for obligation upon the date of enactment of this paragraph and shall remain available until obligated. There are authorized to be appropriated for liquidation of the obligations incurred under this paragraph not to exceed $100,000,000 prior to July 1, 1973, which amount may be increased to not to exceed an aggregate of $400,000,000 prior to July 1, 1974. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

(d) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "$3,100,000,000" in the first and third sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,100,000,000".

TITLE IV

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX

SEC. 401. (a) Chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 323. Prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex.

"No person shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal assistance under this title or carried on under this title. This provision will be enforced through agency provisions and rules similar to those already established, with

respect to racial and other discrimination, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, this remedy is not exclusive and will not prejudice or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminatee."

(b) The analysis of chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"323. Discrimination on the basis of sex prohibited."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
JIM WRIGHT,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JAMES J. HOWARD,
DON H. CLAUSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
MIKE GRAVEL,
LLOYD BENTSEN,
JOHN S. COOPER,
HOWARD BAKER,
H. A. WILLIAMS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3939) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

With respect to the amendment of the House, the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Section 101 of the Senate bill would provide that title I may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972".

Section 102 of the Senate bill would provide authorizations for the Interstate Highway program through the fiscal year 1980. $3.25 billion would be authorized for each fiscal year from 1974 through 1979 and $257 million for fiscal year 1980.

Section 103 of the Senate bill would approve the use of apportionment factors contained in table 5 in the 1972 Interstate Cost Estimate (House Document 29, 92d Congress) for the apportionment of Interstate funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Section 104 of the Senate bill would extend the time for completion of the Interstate System until June 30, 1980. It would further direct the Secretary to submit to Congress a revised Interstate System cost estimate in January of 1974, January of 1976 and January of 1978 for apportionment of Interstate funds for fiscal years 1976 and 1977, 1978 and 1979, and 1980 respectively.

Section 105 of the Senate bill would authorize funds for the Federal-Aid and Federal domain roads programs for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

The bill changes prior patterns of authorization by eliminating the specific authorization of funds for urban extensions of the primary and secondary systems.

The bill would authorize $950 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for the primary system and its urban extensions with the requirement that $300 million be expended for elimination of roadway dangers as defined in new Section 148 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 and its urban extensions with the requirement that at least $50 million for each of those years be expended for public transportation under the provisions of Section 142 of Title 23.

Appropriations for the urban system authorized for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would be $800 million per year.

The small urban system, which would be established by the bill, would be authorized at $50 million for fiscal 1974 and for $100 million for fiscal 1975.

In addition to the authorizations for the regular Federal-Aid system, the bill also continues at increased levels funds for the Federal domain road program, with funds for parkways and Indian reservation roads and bridges being authorized to be appropriated from the trust fund for the first time. Funds for forest highways and public lands highways will be available from the trust fund in accordance with the practice established in the 1970 Federal-Aid Highway Act. The authorizations for these highways are as follows:

[In millions]

Category:	1974	1975
Forest highways	$50	$50
Public lands highways	25	25
Forest development roads and trails	170	170
Public lands development roads and trails	20	20
Park roads and trails	50	50
Parkways	75	100
Indian reservation roads and bridges	75	100

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:

[In millions]

Category:	1974	1975
Virgin Islands	$2.5	$2.5
Guam	2.0	2.0
American Samoa	.5	.5

For fiscal years 1974 and 1975, each State would receive at least ½ of 1% of total apportionments for the Interstate System. Whenever such amount exceeds the cost of completing the system in any State, the excess amount would be added to primary, secondary, urban and small urban apportionments for such States in the ratio which the respective amounts bear to each other.

In addition, each State would receive at least ½ of 1% of apportionments for the Federal-aid urban system and for the Federal-aid small urban system. Similar authority exists with respect to the apportionment of primary and secondary funds.

This section would amend Section 101 to include traffic operation improvement programs (TOPICS) under the definition of "construction."

The definition of "Indian roads and bridges" would be modified so that Alaska native villages would be eligible for funding under Chapter 2 of title 23.

The definition of "urbanized area" would be changed to allow the Secretary, in cooperation with local officials, to fix the urbanized area boundary.

Section 107 of the Senate bill would permit the establishment of a new Federal-aid small urban system in each urban area of 5,000 to 50,000 population. The system would consist of arterial and collector streets, exclusive of urban extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, selected by responsible local officials in cooperation with the State highway department. The Secretary could delegate authority to the State highway department to approve designation of the system. Guidelines for carrying out this section and other applicable provisions of law would be issued by the Secretary no later than March 30, 1973. The apportionment of funds authorized to be appropriated for the system would be made on the basis of population in small urban areas. The Federal share of the cost of projects would be 70 percent, the same as for the primary, secondary and urban programs.

Section 108 of the Senate bill would declare it to be in the national interest and the intent of Congress that the Secretary should administer the Federal-aid highway program in such a manner as to give the highest priority in all instances to highway safety and to the saving of human lives.

Section 109 of the Senate bill would require the realignment by June 30, 1975 of the Federal-aid primary, secondary and urban systems, based upon anticipated functional usage for the year 1980. The primary system would consist of rural arterial routes and their extensions into or through urban areas; the secondary system would consist of rural major collector routes; and the urban system would consist of urban arterial and collector routes, exclusive or extensions of rural arterial routes through urban areas.

Section 110 of the Senate bill would expand the urban system as presently designated to include collector streets. This section would also amend section 103 of Title 23 to allow area-wide governmental organizations acting for local officials to select the urban system.

Section 111 of the Senate bill would amend subsection (e) of section 103 of title 23 to provide that, at the joint request of a State Governor and the local government concerned, the Secretary could withdraw his approval of 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 withdrawn Interstate mileage for each project would be the maximum Federal cost of any substitute project. If no substitute essential connection is necessary or if the cost of substitute mileage is less than the cost of the original route, the total amount or difference in amount would be available for use only in the urbanized area from which the controversial route was withdrawn, for use on the urban system or for local public transportation purposes under section 142 of title 23, United States Code. Any costs incurred by reason of the development of the project withdrawn would be deducted from such amounts. Any mileage from a route or portion thereof which is withdrawn from designation and not replaced may be redesignated elsewhere as part of the Interstate System.

Costs would be that as of the date of withdrawal. In approving substitute mileage, the Secretary would be required to "assure", rather than "give due regard to", connectivity of Interstate routes and extensions of routes which terminate within municipalities served by a single Interstate route, so as to provide traffic service entirely through such municipalities.

For alternate segments previously designated under existing law, the Cramer-Howard amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, subsection (e)(2) of section 103, would be modified to provide that costs to the United States of substitute mileage in any State must not exceed the cost of original mileage removed from designation in such State. For the purposes of substitution, costs would be determined as of the date of withdrawal of the original segment.

Section 112 of the Senate bill would require the States to notify the Secretary by July 1, 1973, of their intent to build any remaining Interstate segments; otherwise, such segments would be removed from Interstate designation. By July 1, 1974, States would be required to submit a schedule for completing for the system (including alternate segments). For routes added to the Interstate System after December 1, 1968, the above submission of plans, specifications and estimates would be eliminated.

Section 113 of the Senate bill would make no separate authorizations for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas, but instead would provide for such highways under the normal primary and secondary authorizations. Each State would make its own determination as to the amount of funds that would be made available out of its primary and secondary apportionments for urban extensions. The method of apportionment for urban extensions would be revised to reflect this change.

Section 114 of the Senate bill would make available to metropolitan transportation agencies qualifying under section 123 of this bill ½ of 1% of funds apportioned for the Federal-aid systems for the purpose of carrying out section 134 of title 23, relating to transportation planning. Funds would be apportioned to the States on the basis of population and further apportioned to metropolitan agencies in accordance with a formula developed by each State and approved by the Secretary. Funds would be matched in accordance with section 120 of title 23 unless the Secretary determines that the interests of the Federal-aid highway program would be best served without such matching.

Section 115 of the Senate bill would amend section 105 of title 23, United States Code, to give the Governor of each State, rather than the highway department, the ultimate responsibility for overall transportation plans in that State.

Section 116 of the Senate bill would extend from 7 years to 10 years the allowable time period within which actual highway construction should begin 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 it is 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 traffic control devices, from being erected on any projects where actual construction is in progress.

Section 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.

Section 121(a) of the Senate bill would apply to any toll road designated as part of the Interstate System on or before June 30, 1968, and which becomes toll free prior to July 1, 1976. In such situations, funds apportioned for the Interstate System could 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 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 number of changes in the Highway Beautification Act which have been suggested by the Highway Beautification Commission.

First, the present 660 foot limit on the control of signs along the Interstate and primary systems would be eliminated. After January 1, 1973, the 10% penalty could be imposed on States which do not remove signs beyond 660 feet away which are "visible from the main traveled way" and are "erected with the purpose of their message being read from such main traveled way."

Second, since the present 660 foot limitation would be removed, the authority of erecting aproved signs in areas zoned industrial and commercial (now valid within the 660 foot zone) 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 State law would have to be removed no later than five years after they became nonconforming. The original act provided that any signs which were lawfully in existence on September 1, 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 that were non-conforming could not be required to be removed for five years.

Fourth, the present authority of the Secretary to provide standards for the erection along the Interstate System of signs providing specific information for the traveling public would be expanded to include the same authority with respect to other Federal-aid highway systems.

Fifth, just compensation would be paid for the removal of all outdoor advertising signs which have been lawfully erected under State law. This provision would help remove an ambiguity in the original act.

Not to exceed $50,000,000 would be authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund for each of the 1974 and 1975 fiscal years for purposes of outdoor advertising control.

Finally, the Secretary could not require any State to remove any directional signs lawfully in existence on June 1, 1972, until December 31, 1974, or until the State assures the Secretary that the directional information would reasonably be available to motorists by some alternate means.

Section 123 of the Senate bill would amend section 134 of title 23 to (1) require the States take reasonable measures to permit, encourage and assist public participation in the urban transportation planning process and (2) require the Secretary to develop minimum guidelines for such participation. These guidelines must include annual public hearings to review the planning process, plans and programs and opportunity provided for consideration of alternative modes of transportation at such hearings. Noncompliance with these provisions by any urbanized area would result in the Secretary's disapproval of all Federal-aid highway projects within such urbanized area.

Section 124 of the Senate bill would allow urban system funds to any urbanized area within the State on the basis of population, and would be available for expenditure in another urbanized area within such State only where the responsible public officials in both such urbanized areas would agree to such a transfer.

This section would allow urban system funds to be passed through to urbanized areas where local jurisdictions agree to combine together under State law to create a metropolitan transportation agency (or where the State creates a metropolitan transportation agency) with sufficient authority to develop and implement a plan for expenditure of funds allocated to such urbanized area for the urban system and related highway public transportation purposes. Plans would be developed in accordance with the comprehensive coordinated and continuing transportation planning process required by section 134 of title 23.

For purposes of this section, a metropolitan transportation agency would have to meet the following criteria: (1) represent at least 75% of the total urbanized area population, including the central city; (2) be suitably empowered, equipped and organized to carry out projects on the urban system. Projects could be implemented through delegation of authority to participating local governments.

Section 125 of the Senate bill would provide that just compensation would be paid for removing, relocating, or disposing of junkyards which were lawful on the effective date of State compliance legislation.

$15,000,000 would be authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund for purposes of junkyard control for each of the 1974 and 1975 fiscal years.

Section 126 of the Senate bill would amend section 137 of title 23 to allow the imposition of parking fee rates (for fringe parking facilities) necessary to finance the liquidation of bonds or other obligations incurred in financing the local share of constructing such facility, as well as financing the costs of maintenance and operation, which are now authorized by law.

Section 127 of the Senate bill would amend section 138, title 23, regarding parkland preservation to also protect publicly-owned water recreation areas and historic water areas of national, state or local significance, as well as public lands.

Section 128 of the Senate bill would extend authorizations for the highway construction training program for two years through fiscal year 1975. $5 million would be provided for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Section 129 of the Senate bill would permit the use of sums apportioned in accordance with section 104(6)(b) of title I of the bill (highway trust fund) to finance the Federal share of the cost of construction of and acquisition of facilities and equipment for public mass transportation projects, which shall be deemed highway projects for the purposes of title 23 of the United States Code:

Section 130 of the Senate bill would provide authorizations for economic growth center development highways through fiscal year 1975. $50 million from the Highway Trust Fund would be authorized for fiscal year 1974 and $100 million for fiscal year 1975. Section 143 of Title 23 would be expanded to allow the designation of Federal-aid secondary roads as development highways as well as Federal-aid primary roads as now provided by law. Subsection (e) of this section would be amended to provide that the Federal share of the cost of construction of any development highway would be increased by not to exceed an additional 10% of the project cost, except that in no case could the Federal share exceed 95%.

Section 131 of the Senate bill would provide that sums apportioned for the Federal-aid highway systems would be made available for the development and improvement of bicycle transportation, equestrian trails and pedestrian walkways located on or in conjunction with highway rights-of-way.

Funds could be used to finance the Federal share of the cost of constructing separate or preferential bicycle lanes or paths, bicycle traffic control devices, bicycle shelters and parking facilities, pedestrian walkways, and equestrian trails. Projects to be authorized under this program would have to be

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 authorized for carrying out 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.

Funds authorized and appropriated for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, parkways. Indian reservation roads and bridges and public lands highways would also be available for carrying out the provisions of this section at the discretion of the Department charged with the administration of such programs.

No motorized vehicle would be permitted on trails and walkways authorized under this section except for maintenance purposes.

Section 132 would authorize the Secretary to reimburse States after they have received their final apportionment on the Interstate System, for 70% of the construction cost for new toll roads and improvements to existing toll roads. The Federal share would be drawn from funds apportioned to the State for its Federal-aid primary system.

Toll roads built under this program would have to comply with standards approved by the Secretary and would be subject to the same regulations now applicable to other Federal-aid systems. Except for costs of operation and maintenance, all tolls collected from users of these roads would be devoted to retiring obligations incurred by the State for its 30% share.

The Federal 70% share of the cost of toll roads would be payable in not more than 15 equal annual installments from funds apportioned to the State for its Federal-aid primary system. After the Federal share has been fully paid, the highway would be maintained and operated as a free highway as a part of the primary system (or the Interstate System in the case of certain improved toll highways).

Section 133 of the Senate bill would authorize $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for the construction of special highways connected to the Interstate System in portions of urbanized areas with high traffic density. The Federal share for any project under this section could not exceed 90% of the cost of construction.

The Secretary would develop guidelines for designation of routes and allocation of funds to include several criteria. Routes selected could be no more than 10 miles long, would have to serve areas of concentrated population and heavy traffic congestion and meet the urgent needs of commercial, industrial or national defense installations, and would have to connect with existing routes on the Interstate System. Any route selected would have to be approved through the section 134 planning process and could be designated only if the Secretary determines that no other feasible or practicable alternative mode of transportation would be available. Designation of routes would have to comply with section 138 of title 23 regarding parkland preservation and no route could be approved which substantially damaged or infringed upon any residential area. The Secretary could designate no more than one route in each State and would base his designation upon the recommendation of State and responsible local officials.

Section 134 of the Senate bill would authorize $15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975, for the construction of access highways to public recreation areas on Federal lakes.

Section 135 of the Senate bill would make available to the States an alternative to Chapter 1, Title 23, procedures whereby the planning, design and construction of certain types of Federal-aid highways by State highway departments might be facilitated. This alternative procedure would be designed to eliminate project-by-project review by the Federal Highway Administration of Federal-aid primary, secondary, urban and small urban system projects, on the condition that the State meet certain specified conditions outlined in Chapter 1-A.

The State would not be required to submit for Federal review and approval the plans, specifications and estimates for each such project. However, the Secretary would still be responsible for complying with government-wide requirements stipulated by such laws as the National Environmental Protection Act, the Civil Rights Acts, and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act.

Section 136 of the Senate bill would provide that funds authorized for forest highways and park roads and trails would be made available by this section for the purchase of buses as well as for the construction of passenger loading facilities and parking areas, in order to provide interpretive and shuttle transportation services in national parks and forests as an alternative to private automobile transportation.

Section 137 of the Senate bill would amend section 207 of title 23 to permit the acquisition of rights-of-way and related scenic easements from funds available for parkways. Parkways constructed after December 31, 1972, would be deemed to be on the Federal-aid secondary system. The provisions of section 106(a) of title 23 relating to the obligation of funds would apply to funds available for parkways.

Section 138 of the Senate bill would provide for the construction of the Highland Scenic Highway from West Virginia State Route 39 to U.S. 250 near Barton Knob, West Virginia, as a parkway.

Section 139 of the Senate bill would provide for the relocation of Route 25E through a tunnel to be constructed in the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park so as to restore and preserve the Gap as a National Historical Site.

Section 140 of the Senate bill would authorize $58,670,000 for reconstructing the Alaska Highway from the Alaskan border to Haines Junction in Canada, and reconstructing the Haines Cutoff Highway from Haines Junction to the south Alaskan border.

Section 141 of the Senate bill would permit the financing of local public bus transportation planning in addition to the other planning and research purposes indicated in section 307(c)(1) of this title.

Section 142 of the Senate bill would provide increased authorization of $8.5 million to finance the construction of two bridges on Federal dams located in the vicinities of Fort Smith, Arkansas and Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Section 143 of the Senate bill would make several technical amendments to update language and correct typographical errors.

Section 144 of the Senate bill 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 are limited to Federal-aid highway projects.

Section 145 of the Senate bill would increase Federal share payable on account of any non-Interstate project from 50% to 70% with respect to all obligations incurred after June 30, 1973, except for projects for which Federal funds were obligated on or before that date.

Section 146 of the Senate bill would extend until December 31, 1973, the time period for submission of final recommendations by the Highway Beautification Commission to the President and Congress and would authorize 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 highways in the Interstate System: (1) A route from Brunswick, Georgia, to Kansas City, Missouri; (2) extension of Interstate 70 from Cove Fort, Utah, in a westerly direction; (3) a route from Amarillo, Texas, to Las Cruces, New Mexico; (4) a route from Kansas City, Missouri, to Baton Rouge, Louisiana; a route from Waterloo, Iowa, 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 bridges over navigable waters of the United 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 $3 million to carry out a demonstration project in Lincoln, Nebraska, and $4.2 million to carry out a demonstration project in Elko, Nevada, for the relocation of railroad lines from the central city to eliminate a substantial number of railway-road grade crossings within the city.

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 States would be required by future highway safety standards to prohibit persons from operating motor vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquors, narcotics or drugs, to provide effective enforcement of such restrictions, and to provide penalties that would constitute a meaningful deterrent.

Section 204 of the Senate bill would authorize funds appropriated to States for their highway safety programs to be used for the development and implementation of manpower training and demonstration programs which the Secretary determines might help reduce accidents.

Section 205 of the Senate bill would provide that, for purposes of apportioning funds for highway safety among the States, the public road mileage in each State would be determined at the end of each calendar year.

Section 206 of the Senate bill would provide 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 standard on alcohol. 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 for 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 amount available to any State for highway safety programs would be increased from one-third of one percent to one-half of one percent.

Section 208 of the Senate bill would authorize the Secretary to award each year, $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 highway safety 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 an Indian tribe in meeting the non-Federal share of the cost of reservation safety programs.

Section 210 of the Senate bill would provide that the Secretary would be authorized 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.

The Secretary would be authorized to conduct research for making grants or contracts on the effectiveness of administrative adjudication systems in promoting highway safety and in reducing recidivism rates of traffic law offenders by appropriate punishment, training, and rehabilitation.

Section 211 of the Senate bill would modify section 403 of title 23, United States Code in order to make it clear that research funds could be used for grants to or contracts with public agencies, institutions and individuals for all five types of programs listed. The Secretary would assure that no fees are charged for training and education of highway safety personnel.

Section 212 of the Senate bill would authorize the Secretary to transfer to State and local agencies the title to equipment purchased with research funds for demonstration projects.

Section 213 of the Senate bill would add the National Highway Traffic Safety Administrator as an ex officio member of the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee.

Section 214 of the Senate bill would provide that the date on which the Secretary is to make an annual report to Congress on the administration of the Highway Safety Act would be changed from March 1 to July 1.

Section 215 of the Senate bill would authorize grants to States not exceeding $100,000 to provide 70 percent of the share of development of comprehensive plans for emergency medical care for highway accident victims. For fiscal year 1975, $25 million would be authorized to make grants to States for 70 percent of the cost of implementing approved emergency medical care plans.

To be approved, any State plan would have to comply with the highway safety program standard on emergency medical care and also with regulations established by the Secretary on equipment and personnel.

Section 216 of the Senate bill would make available funds apportioned for the Federal-aid systems, except the Interstate System, for the elimination or reduction of hazards at specific locations or sections of highways and at railroad-highway grade crossings, which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials.

Section 217 of the Senate bill would authorize $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for the conduct of research and demonstration programs with respect to the effectiveness of various types of pavement markings under inclement weather and nighttime conditions.

Section 218 of the Senate bill would authorize the following amounts from the Highway Trust Fund:

1. For assistance to the States in carrying out highway safety programs under section 402—$300 million for each of the 1974 and 1975 fiscal years, provided that $25 million of such funds would be available to the States exclusively for the purchase of pavement equipment marking.

2. For highway safety research and development—$125 million for each of the 1974 and 1975 fiscal years.

3. For emergency medical care programs—$5 million for 1974 and $25 million for 1975 fiscal years.

4. For special bridge replacement—$250 million for each of the 1974 and 1975 fiscal years.

Section 301 of the Senate bill would amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to increase the level of participation in projects by the Federal Government. The Secretary is authorized to incur obligations on behalf of the United States in order to make grants or loans to mass transportation systems to pay the operating costs of such systems where such assistance is needed to carry out a program under section 4 of the 1964 Act.

PROVISIONS OF THE HOUSE AMENDMENT

Section 101 of the House amendment would provide that title I may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972".

Section 102 would authorize the appropriation of an additional $8 billion for completion of the Interstate System.

Section 103 of the House ammendment approves the use of the apportionment factors contained in revised table 5 of the 1972 Interstate System Cost Estimate (House Works Committee Print No. 92–29) for the apportionment of Interstate funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1973 and 1975.

Section 104 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation, out of the Highway Trust Fund, of the following sums for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975:

For the Federal-aid primary system in rural areas, $700,000,000; for the Federal-aid urban system, $700,000,000; for the Federal-aid secondary system in rural areas, $400,000,000; for the extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas, $400,000,000; for economic growth center development highways, $150,000,000; for forest highways, $33,000,000; and for public lands highways, $16,000,000.

It would also provide authorizations of $49,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 in addition to all other authorizations for the Interstate System, be apportioned to each of the States which otherwise would receive less than one-half of one percent of the Interstate apportionment for fiscal year 1974 or 1975 so long as such State has not completed Federal funding of the Interstate System within its boundaries.

Use of any funds authorized by this section for highway beautification (sections 131, 136 and 319(b)) or Chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code, would be prohibited.

Authorizations would be provided for the Territorial Highway Program for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 as follows: Virgin Islands, $4,000,000; Guam, $2,000,000; and American Samoa, $500,000.

Sums authorized for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for certain categories of roads administered by the Department of Transportation jointly with either the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, would be as follows:

	1972	*1973*
Forest development roads and trails	$170,000,000	$170,000,000
Public lands development roads and trails	10,000,000	10,000,000
Park roads and trails	30,000,000	30,000,000
Indian reservation roads and bridges	100,000,000	100,000,000
Parkways	20,000,000	20,000,000

Section 105 of the House amendment would require the Secretary of Transportation to forward to the Congress within 30 days of the enactment of this act those reports required under sections 105(b)(3), 121 and 144 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1970. Such reports would contain the Secretary's recommendations to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget unless these recommendations have already been submitted to the Congress.

Section 106 of the House amendment would provide a conforming amendment to the definition of the term "construction" to change the reference to the "Coast and Geodetic Survey" to its current name "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration" and by adding traffic engineering and operational improvements to the definition. The term "urban area" would be amended to require the participation of appropriate local officials in the establishment of the boundaries of an urban area. The definition of the term "Indian reservation roads and bridges" would be amended to make Alaskan native villages, groups, or communities eligible for funding under chapter 2 of title 23.

Section 107 of the House amendment would extend the time for completion of the Interstate System until June 30, 1979, and would further direct the Secretary to submit to Congress a revised Interstate System Cost Estimate in January of 1974 for making apportionments for fiscal years 1976 and 1977 and another cost estimate in January of 1976 for apportionment of interstate funds for fiscal years 1978 and 1979.

Section 108 of the House amendment would add a new paragraph to the present declaration of policy to the effect that, after the completion of the Interstate System, it shall be a national policy to increase emphasis on the acceleration of other Federal-aid systems in order to bring all such systems up to standards and to increase their safety to the maximum possible no later than the year 1990.

Section 109 of the House amendment would state the national policy, that, to the maximum extent possible, the procedures followed by the Secretary and other affected heads of Federal departments, agencies and instrumentalities shall encourage the "drastic" minimization of paperwork and interagency decision procedures and the best use of available manpower and funds so as to prevent needless duplication and unnecessary delays at all levels of government.

Section 110 would expand the Federal-aid urban system to include the collection and distribution of traffic. It would also provide that a State not having a designated urbanized area may designate routes on the Federal-aid urban system for its largest population center, based upon a continuing planning process developed cooperatively by State and local officials and the Secretary. The section also would change the date for removing from designation as part of the Interstate System of those segments for which a State has not submitted plans, specifications and estimates for approval by the Secretary from July 1, 1975 to July 1, 1977. The District of Columbia would be exempted from this provision.

Section 111 of the House amendment would amend the description of the Federal-aid urban system to make the provisions of chapters 1, 3, and 5 of title 23 that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highways application to the Federal-aid urban system unless the Secretary determines them to be inconsistent with this subsection. The provisions of title 23 relating to control of outdoor advertising, junkyard control and scenic enhancement would be, however, made specifically applicable to the Federal-aid urban system and the Secretary may not determine such sections to be inconsistent with subsection 103(d) of title 23, U.S.C.

Section 112 of the House amendment would amend the Federal-aid primary formula to substitute rural population for general popu-

lation. Provision would also be made to establish a minimum of one-half of one percent for each State's apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid urban system. The section would increase the authority of the Secretary to approve the transfer of apportionments from one system to another from 20 to 30 percent. Such transfers may be made, on the one hand, between the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems under sections 104(b) (1) and (2) and, on the other hand, between extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems within urban areas and the Federal-aid urban system. Conforming amendments deleting the last sentence of section 104(c) and repealing section 104(f) would also be made.

Section 113 of the House amendment would terminate the San Antonio North Expressway as a Federal-aid project and provide for the return of any Federal funds transferred to the State of Texas for that project.

Section 114 of the House amendment would extend from 7 to 10 years the allowable time period within which highway construction must begin following the advance purchase of right-of-way.

Section 115 of the House amendment would broaden the authority of the Secretary to fund noise control projects along existing Federal-aid highways.

Section 116 of the House amendment would, after July 1, 1973, prohibit any informational signs, other than official traffic control devices, from being erected on any highway projects where atcual construction is in progress and which would be visible to highway users.

Section 117 of the House amendment would amend section 117 of title 23, United States Code, by broadening its scope to include all Fedral-aid systems except the Interstate System. Upon the request of a State, the Secretary may discharge his responsibilities under title 23 by accepting a certification of the State highway department if he finds that the State: (1) will carry out projects on such systems in accordance with State laws, regulations, directives and standards establishing requirements at least equivalent to those required under title 23: (2) the State meets the requirements of section 302 of title 23; and (3) the final decision by responsible State officials will be in the best overall public interest. The Secretary would be required to make a final inspection of such projects upon completion and require an adequate report of the estimated and actual cost of construction and such other information as he determines necessary. The acceptance of the State's certification by the Secretary may be rescinded by him at any time he determines it is necessary to do so. The procedure provided by this section is an alternative to that otherwise prescribed in title 23 and the Secretary is required to promulgate such guidelines and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the section.

This section would not affect or discharge the responsibility or obligation of the Secretary under any Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, other than title 23.

Section 118 of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 121(a), relating to progress payments to a State for cost of construction, to permit payments to be made for materials which are not in the vicinity of the construction if the Secretary determines that because of the required fabrication at an off-site location the materials cannot be stockpiled in the vicinity of the construction.

Section 119 of the House amendment would amend section 129(b) of title 23 to provide that when a toll road which the Secretary has approved as a part of the Interstate System becomes toll free, apportioned Federal-aid Interstate highway funds may be expended for construction, reconstruction or improvement of such road to standards adopted for the improvement of projects on the Interstate System.

Section 120(a) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 131(a) relating to the control of outdoor advertising by eliminating the present 660 foot limitation on the control of signs along the Interstate and primary system. After January 1, 1974, the 10% penalty could be imposed on States which do not remove signs beyond 660 feet away which are "visible from the main traveled way of the system" and are "erected with the purpose of their message being read from such main traveled way."

Section 120(b) of the House amendment would amend the outdoor advertising effective control provisions and clarifies the present law with respect to signs for the information of the traveling public. It would provide that on or after July 1, 1974, or after the expiration of the next regular session of State legislatures, whichever is later, effective control shall mean that signs located beyond 660 feet of the right-of-way and visible from the main traveled way of the system and erected with the purpose of their message being read from the main traveled way shall be limited to directional and official signs and notices including but not limited to signs and notices pertaining to information in the specific interest of the traveling public, such as, but not limited to, signs and notices pertaining to rest stops, camping grounds, food service, gas and automotive service, lodging, natural wonders, scenic and historic attractions. Not more than three such signs facing in the same direction of travel would be permitted per mile of Interstate primary highway.

Section 120(c) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 131(d) relating to signs in areas zoned industrial or commercial or unzoned commercial or industrial areas. Since the present 660 feet limitation would be removed, the authority for erecting approved signs in areas zoned industrial and commercial (now valid within the 660 foot zone) would be extended for the sake of consistency to areas beyond 660 feet.

Section 120(d) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 131(e) to provide that signs that are not in conformity with State law shall be removed not later than 5 years after they become nonconforming unless the Secretary determines otherwise.

Section 120(e) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 131(f) to expand the present authority of the Secretary to provide standards for the erection along the Interstate System of signs providing specific information for the traveling public to include the same authority with respect to the Federal-aid primary system. A proviso is added that such signs on the Interstate and primary shall not be erected in suburban or urban areas or in lieu of signs permitted under 23 U.S.C. 131(d). Also, such signs shall not be erected where adequate information is provided by signs permitted under 23 U.S.C. 131(c).

Section 120(f) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 131(g) to provide that just compensation be paid for the removal of all outdoor advertising signs which have been lawfully erected under State law. This provision would help remove an ambiguity in the original act.

Section 120(g) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 131(m) to provide authorizations of $50 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for outdoor advertising control.

Section 120(h) of the House amendment would add two new subsections to 23 U.S.C. 131. The first provides that no directional sign, display or device lawfully in existence on June 1, 1972, which gives specific information to travelers shall be required to be removed until December 31, 1974, or until the State in which the sign, display or device is located certifies that such information advertised thereon may reasonably be available to motorists by some other method or methods, whichever shall occur first. The second provides that the United States shall pay 100 percent of the just compensation for the removal (including all relocation costs) of any sign, display or device which is removed prior to the enactment of this Act which after its removal is lawfully relocated and which is required to be removed as a result of this amendment.

Section 121 of the House amendment would repeal section 135(c) of title 23 which provides that sums authorized to carry out that section shall be apportioned in accordance with section 104(b)(3) of title 23.

Section 122 of the House amendment would provide that just compensation would be paid pursuant to this amendment of 23 U.S.C. 136(j), for removing, relocating or disposing of junkyards which were lawfully established under State law.

Subsection (b) authorizes $15 million out of the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for junkyard control.

Section 123 of the House amendment would authorize the use of funds apportioned to each State for the Federal-aid systems to finance the Federal share of the costs of projects for highway public transportation purposes. Included within its scope would be construction of exclusive bus lanes, traffic control devices, passenger loading areas and facilities. Where sufficient land exists within any Federal-aid rights-of-way to accommodate needed rail or nonhighway public mass transit programs without impairing automotive safety or future highway improvements, the Administrator may, if he deems it in the public interest, authorize a State to make such lands available without charge to a publicly owned mass transit authority for such purposes.

Subsection (d) of section 142 of title 23 would be repealed, thereby eliminating the requirement that exclusive bus lane projects must be less expensive and more feasible or prudent than additional automobile lanes. The Federal share of the cost for highway public transportation projects would be the same as that provided for regular Federal-aid projects.

Section 124(a) of the House amendment would expand 23 U.S.C. 143 to allow the designation of any Federal-aid system other than the Interstate System as an economic growth center development highway. Present law now restricts such development highways to Federal-aid primary roads. The economic growth center development highways program is also made a permanent program rather than a demonstration project. The provisions applicable to highways of the Federal-aid system on which such development highway is located shall be applicable to development highways and to funds authorized for such highways except those which the Secretary determines are inconsistent with section 143.

Section 124(b) of the House amendment would amend 23 U.S.C. 143(e) to provide that the Federal share of the cost of construction of any development highway shall be the same as that provided for any other project on the Federal-aid system, on which such development highway is located.

Section 124(c) of the House amendment would make a technical amendment to 23 U.S.C. 143(a) by eliminating language which states that the economic growth center development highway program is a demonstration project.

Section 125 of the House amendment would add a new section to chapter I of title 23 which declares that the authorization of Federal funds or their applicability for expenditure under such chapter shall not infringe on the sovereign rights of the States to determine the projects to be federally

financed, and that provisions of chapter I provide for a federally-assisted State program.

Section 126 of the House amendment would authorize projects for the construction of bike lanes and paths, where motor vehicle traffic would be prohibited, in connection with forest development roads and trails, public lands development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads, and Federal, State and local parks.

Section 127 of the House amendment would add a new section to chapter 1 of title 23 which would authorize $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for the special highways connected to 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.

The Secretary would develop guidelines for designation of routes and allocation of funds to include several criteria. Routes selected would be no more than 10 miles long, would have to serve areas of concentrated population and heavy traffic congestion and meet the urgent needs of commercial, industrial or national defense installations, and would have to connect with existing routes on the Interstate System. Any route selected would have to be approved through the section 134 planning process and could be designated only if the Secretary determines that no other feasible or practicable alternative mode of transportation would be available. Designation of routes would have to comply with section 138 of title 23 regarding parkland preservation and no route would be approved which substantially damaged or infringed upon any residential area. The Secretary would designate no more than one route in each State and would base his designation upon the recommendation of State and responsible local officials.

Section 128 of the House amendment would add a new section to chapter 1 of title 23 to provide for the selection of not more than 10,000 miles of high traffic sections of highway which are on the Federal-aid primary system and connect to the Interstate System. Such sections would be selected for priority of improvement as supplementary routes to extend and supplement the Interstate System by furnishing needed traffic collector and distributor facilities as well as extensions. Such primary routes would be selected in consultation with appropriate local officials and subject to the Secretary's approval and would be improved to Interstate geometric and construction standards or such standards as may be developed cooperatively by the Secretary and the State highway departments. The Federal share of such projects would be the same as the Federal share on other primary routes as provided in 23 U.S.C. 120(a) and the provisions of title 23 which are applicable to the Federal-aid primary system would be applicable to the priority primary routes. Funds authorized or such routes would be deemed to be apportioned on January 1 next preceding the commencement of the fiscal year for which authorized. A report to Congress on selection of routes and their estimated costs would be made on or before January 1, 1974. Three hundred million dollars would be authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for carrying out the priority primary route program.

Section 129 of the House amendment would add a new section to chapter 2 of title 23 to authorize $58,670,000 for reconstructing the Alaska Highway from the Alaskan border to Haines Junction in Canada, and reconstructing the Haines Cutoff Highway from Haines Junction to the south Alaskan border.

Section 130 of the House amendment would provide an increased authorization of $8.5 million to finance the construction of two bridges on Federal dams located in the vicinity of Forth Smith, Arkansas, and Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Section 131 of the House amendment would provide construction funds of $20 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 out of the Highway Trust Fund to be matched on an 80% federal and 20% state ratio. These funds would be applied on those portions of the route on federal-aid highways.

An additional $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 would be authorized out of the General Fund for those sections on Federal lands and will be 100% Federal funds.

The funds would be apportioned to the ten states bordering the Mississippi on a needs basis.

Section 132 of the House amendment would amend the special Alaskan highway authorization in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 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 133 of the House amendment would extend until December 31, 1973, the time period for submission of final recommendations by the Highway Beautification Commission to the President and the Congress and would authorize an additional $250,000 as necessary to carry out the provisions of section 123 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-605).

Section 134 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 across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, by the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa. The Highway Commission of the State of Iowa would be allowed to 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 free facilities and would be maintained under agreements to be reached by the States of Iowa and Illinois. The Clinton Bridge Commission would cease to exist upon conveyance of the bridge structure, property and assets to the Highway Commission of the State of Iowa.

Section 135 of the House amendment would permit the State of New Hampshire to repay all Federal-aid highway funds paid on account of certain sections of Route 101 in the State of New Hampshire prior to the collection of any tolls on such sections. Upon such repayment, the Federal-aid projects for which such funds have been repaid and any other Federal-aid project located on the sections of the toll road involved and programed for expenditure on any such project, would be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid highway funds of the same class which were last apportioned to the State of New Hampshire. Such amount would be in addition to all other funds apportioned to the State and would be available for expenditure in accordance with title 23. Upon repayment of Federal-aid highway funds and cancellation and withdrawal from the Federal-aid highway program of the projects on Route 101, such sections of such route shall become free of any and all restrictions contained in title 23 or in any regulations thereunder with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

Section 136 of the House amendment would permit States which have constructed or acquired any interstate toll bridge on the Federal-aid primary system (other than the Interstate System) including approaches, before January 1, 1974, and which before that date has caused the bridge to be made free, to use funds apportioned to it for the primary system and for extensions of the primary system within urban areas to pay the Federal share of a project of (1) such amount as the Secretary determines to be the reasonable value of the bridge after deducting the portion of such value attributable to any previous grant or Federal contribution in connection with its construction or acquisition, exclusive of rights-of-way, or (2) the amount by which the principal amount of outstanding unpaid bonds or other obligations created and issued for the construction or acquisition of such bridge exceeds the amount of funds accumulated or provided for their amortization on the date the bridge is made free, whichever is the lesser amount.

Section 137 of the House amendment would require the Secretary to undertake a study of existing laws and regulations governing toll bridges over navigable waters of the United States for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to assure just and reasonable tolls nationwide. A report to Congress would be required by February 1, 1974.

Section 138 of the House amendment would direct the Secretary to make a full and complete investigation and study to determine the feasibility of establishing a national system of scenic highways to link together and make more accessible recreational, historical, scientific and other similar areas of scenic interest and importance. In such investigation and study, the Secretary would cooperate and consult 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 would report his findings and recommendations to the Congress by January 1, 1975, including an estimate of the cost of such program. This section would authorize $250,000 from the Highway Trust Fund to carry out this program.

Section 139 of the House amendment would require the Secretary of Transportation to take such action as he deems necessary to facilitate broad participation by States in TOPICS programs and fringe and corridor parking facility projects.

Section 140 of the House amendment would prohibit any court from issuing any order or taking any action to impede delay or halt construction of the Three Sisters Bridge between Washington, D.C., and Virginia. It would further prohibit any approval authorization, finding, determination, or similar action taken or omitted by the Secretary, the head of any other Federal agency, the Government of the District of Columbia, or any other agency of Government relating to the Three Sisters Bridge from being reviewed in any court.

Section 141 of the House amendment would exempt any segment of the Interstate System within the District of Columbia from the coverage of an 1893 Act (27 Stat. 532), as amended, relating to highways in the District of Columbia.

Section 142 of the House amendment would require the Secretary of Transportation to withhold any further action on Interstate Route I-287 between Montville and Mahwah, New Jersey, and on the Corporation Freeway in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, until new corridor hearings are held.

Section 143 of the House amendment would amend paragraph (2) of section 103(e) of title 23, United States Codes, as follows:

(1) The 200-mile limitation on additions to the Interstate System contained in the Cramer-Howard amendment would be eliminated. The mileage would be left open-ended as necessary for making modifications to the System.

(2) The Cramer-Howard amendment would be further amended to provide that the costs to the United States of the aggregate of all substitute mileage and mileage for modifications would not exceed the cost of the aggregate of all mileage which is not to be constructed and is withdrawn as nonessential, as such cost is reflected in the 1972 Interstate System cost estimate rather than the 1968 estimate.

(3) The Cramer-Howard amendment would be amended to require the Secretary in considering substitute routes and modifications to give "preference, along with due regard for interstate highway type needs on a nationwide basis," to routes in States in which other routes were or hereafter are withdrawn and extensions of routes which terminate 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 local officials. Items to be included in the evaluation are listed in the section.

Section 145 of the House amendment would allow ferries from Alaska to travel in international water to reach the State of Washington.

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 to finance the cost of providing necessary facilities to make the subway and transit system being constructed in Washington, D.C. and environs accessible to the handicapped through the implementation of Public Laws 90–480 and 91–240.

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 $200 million for fiscal year 1974 and $360 million for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out section 402 of title 23 and $115 million for each of fiscal year 1974 and 1975 for carrying out section 403 by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

It would further authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $35 million for carrying out section 402 of title 23 for fiscal year 1974 and $45 million for fiscal year 1975 and $10 million for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for carrying out section 307(a) and 403 of title 23 by the Federal Highway Administration.

Section 203 of the House amendment would authorize $150 million for fiscal year 1974 and $225 million for fiscal year 1975 for elimination of hazards of rail-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. Funds authorized would be available for expenditure: (1) two-thirds for projects on any Federal-aid system (other than the Interstate System) apportioned in the same manner as sums authorized to be appropriated under section 105 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970, and (2) one-third for projects on highways not included on any Federal-aid system apportioned in the same manner as provided in 23 U.S.C. 402(c).

The Federal share payable on account of any such project would not exceed 90 percent of the cost.

Section 204 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $225 million for fiscal year 1974 and $450 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 from the Highway Trust Fund for projects on the Federal aid systems. One third would be from the General Fund for projects not included on any Federal aid system.

Section 205 of the House amendment would establish a special pavement marking program. The Secretary would be authorized to approve pavement marking projects on any rural highway other than the Interstate System, in order to bring such highway up to marking standards issued or endorsed by the Federal Highway Administrator. Priority would be given to projects located in rural areas. This section would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund, of $100 million for each of fiscal years 1974 and 1975, to be available until expended. Funds not required in a State for pavement-marking projects could be used for the elimination or reduction of high hazard locations. The Secretary would submit a report to Congress which includes an analysis and evaluation of the number, rate, and severity of accidents at improved locations—beginning January 1975 and each January thereafter for three years following completion of a special pavement marking program within each State.

Section 206 of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund, of $15 million for fiscal year 1974 and $25 million for fiscal year 1975 to conduct research and demonstration programs with respect to the effectiveness of various types of pavement markings under inclement weather and nighttime conditions.

Section 207 of the House amendment would authorize the Secretary to carry out research on (1) the relationship between the consumption of drugs and highway safety, (2) driver behavior, including the characteristics and physical abilities to perform driving tasks, and (3) the relationship of the frequency of driver accident involvement to highway safety. This research would be conducted through grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and individuals. To carry out this research by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration there would be authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund, $15 million for the fiscal year 1974 and $25 million for the fiscal year 1975.

Section 208 of the House amendment would provide for the elimination or reduction of hazards at specific locations or sections of highways which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials by the Federal Highway Administration. To carry out this section, there would be authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 $100 million to be available until expended, except that two-thirds of all funds expended under the authority of this section in any fiscal year would be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund. Two-thirds of the funds authorized by this section would be available for expenditure on any Federal-aid system other than the Interstate System and one-third for projects on highways not on any Federal-aid system.

Section 209 of the House amendment would authorize a comprehensive program by the Federal Highway Administration for the elimination of roadside hazards both on and off Federal-aid highway systems. It would require each state to: (1) conduct a survey of all expressways, major streets and highways, and through streets for the identification of roadside obstacles which may constitute a hazard to vehicles; (2) assign priorities and establish and implement a schedule for their correction.

Beginning in 1974, the Secretary would report to Congress on the progress of the program. The report would analyze and assess each state program, identify those not in compliance with improvement schedules and the Secretary's recommendations for future implementation of the program.

To carry out this section, there would be authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, $75 million, except that two-thirds of all funds expended under the authority of this section in any fiscal year would be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund.

Section 210(a) of the House amendment would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct investigations and studies into the use of mass media and other techniques for informing the public of the means and methods for reducing the number and severity of highway accidents. The study would include ways and means for: (1) encouraging participation and cooperation of television and radio station licensees, (2) measuring audience reaction to current educational programs, (3) evaluating the effectiveness of such programs, and (4) developing new programs for the promotion of highway safety. The Secretary would report to the Congress his findings and recommendations by January 1, 1974.

Section 210(b) of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $1 million for the purposes of carrying out section 210(a).

Section 210(c) of the House amendment would authorize the Secretary to develop highway safety pilot television messages of not more than five minutes for use in accordance with the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934.

Section 210(d) of the House amendment would authorize the appropriation out of the Highway Trust Fund of $4 million for the purposes of carrying out section 210(c).

Section 211 of the House amendment would authorize the Secretary to investigate the means for encouraging greater citizen participation and involvement in highway safety programs, with particular emphasis on the traffic enforcement process, including the creation of citizen adjuncts to assist professional traffic enforcement agencies in the performance of their duties. The Secretary would report to Congress his finding and recommendations by January 1, 1974. To carry out this section there would be authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund $1 million.

Section 212 of the House amendment would direct the Secretary to make a study of the feasibility of establishing a National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations designed to acquire, store, and retrieve highway accident data and standardize the information and procedures for reporting accidents on a nationwide basis. The study would include an estimate of the cost of establishing and maintaining such a center including the means for acquiring the accident information to be stored therein. The Secretary would report to the Congress his findings and recommendations not later than June 30, 1974. To carry out this section there is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund $5 million.

Section 213 of the House amendment would direct the Secretary to carry out a demonstration project in Anoka, Minnesota, 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. To carry out this demonstration project there would be authorized to be appropriated $3 million.

Section 214 of the House amendment would authorize the Secretary to carry out two demonstration projects. The first would be for the elimination or protection of certain public ground-level rail-highway crossings in, or in the vicinity of, Springfield, Illinois. The Secretary would be required to report to the President and Congress with respect to his activities authorized by this

section. To carry out this demonstration project there would be authorized to be appropriated $36 million. The second project would provide for the relocation of railroad lines from the central area of the city of Lincoln, Nebraska in conformance with an approved methodology and plan. The Federal share of such relocation project would be 70%. The Secretary would submit annual reports to the President and the Congress with respect to activities authorized by this section. To carry out this demonstration project, $2.5 million would be authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund and $9.5 million out of the General Fund.

Section 301. 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, except that no apportionment is authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 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 $700,000 for the primary system in rural areas, $425,000 is substituted for $400,000 for the secondary system in rural areas, and no authorization is made 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 House amendment.

The definition of "Indian roads and bridges" is modified so that Alaska Native Villages would be eligible for funding under chapter 2 of title 23. This section makes Federal-aid funds available for Indian reservation roads and bridges, including pedestrian walkways. For example, in certain sections of the State of Alaska, village streets become quagmires during the Spring thaw, and boardwalks must be built if the pedestrian is to escape the mud. During this period of time, the roads are either impassable or passable only with great difficulty, and walks are the primary means of movement about and through the village. Since they actually function as a surrogate for Federal-aid roads, the Committee believes that boardwalks should be eligible in such cases for funding under this section. Similarly unusual or adverse circumstances in other parts of the country may also warrant availability of funds for this purpose.

Section 107 of the conference substitute is the same as section 107 of the House amendment.

Section 108 of the conference substitute is the same as section 109 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 112 of the House amendment.

Section 111 of the conference substitute is the same as section 113 of the House amendment.

Section 112 of the conference substitute is the same as section 114 of the House amendment.

Section 113 of the conference substitute is 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 "1973" is substituted for "1974".

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 118(g) of the conference substitute is the same as section 122(g) of the Senate engrossed bill; except that with respect to the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the limiting language: "out of the Highway Trust Fund" is removed.

Section 118(g) of the conference substitute is the same as section 120(g) of the House amendment, except for the addition of "by the Secretary" immediately after "shall be required" the first time it appears in section 120(g); a purely technical stylistic change regarding the form of the proviso in the House amendment; and the substitution of "directional" for "nonconforming" the first time it appears in that proviso.

Section 119 of the conference substitute is the same as section 121 of the House amendment.

Section 120 of the conference substitute is the same as section 122 of the House amendment, except that no authorization is made for fiscal 1975.

Section 121 of the conference substitute is the same as section 123 of the House amendment.

Section 122 of the conference substitute is the same as section 124 of the House amendment.

Section 123 of the conference substitute is the same as section 127 of the House amendment, except that the new section added to title 23 of the United States Code is numbered 145 instead of 146, and no authorization is made for fiscal 1975.

Section 124 of the conference substitute (relating to priority primary routes) does not correspond to any provision in either the Senate engrossed bill or the House amendment, but states the intent of the Congress to establish priority 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, 1973.

Section 125 of the conference substitute is the same as section 129 of the House amendment.

Section 126 of the conference substitute is the same as section 130 of the House amendment.

Section 127 of the conference substitute is the same as section 132 of the House amendment, except that "June 30, 1975" is not included in the list of dates which is to be substituted.

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.

Section 131 of the conference substitute is the same as section 136 of the House amendment.

Section 132 of the conference substitute is the same as section 137 of the House amendment.

Section 133 of the conference substitute is the same as section 139 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 subtitute is the same as section 145 of the House amendment.

Section 138 of the conference substitute is the same as section 146 of the House amendment.

Section 139(a) of the conference substitute is the same as section 107(a) of the Senate engrossed bill, except that the definition of "small urban area" is changed to be "an urban area having a population of less than fifty thousand, and not within an urbanized 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 103(f) of title 23 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 132 of the Senate engrossed bill except for conforming amendments and except that subsection (c) provides for the designation of the highway as a part of the Federal-aid primary system.

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 be designated as 147; paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of that new section will provide that section 131 shall apply to the Great River Road; and no authorizations are made for fiscal 1975.

Section 145 of the conference substitute is the same as section 138 of the House amendment.

Section 146 of the conference substitute is the same as section 139 of the Senate engrossed bill.

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.

Section 205 of the conference substitute is the same as section 205 of the House amendment.

Section 206 of the conference substitute is the same as section 206 of the House amendment.

Section 207 of the conference substitute is the same as section 207 of the House amendment.

Section 208 of the conference substitute is the same as section 208 of the House amendment.

Section 209 of the conference substitute is the same as section 209 of the House amendment.

Section 210 of the conference substitute is the same as section 210 of the House amendment.

Section 211 of the conference substitute is the same as section 211 of the House amendment.

Section 212 of the conference substitute is the same as section 212 of the House amendment.

Section 213 of the conference substitute is the same as section 213 of the House amendment.

Section 214 of the conference substitute is the same as section 214 of the House amendment, except that a new subsection was added at the end thereof from the Senate engrossed bill regarding the authorization of appropriations from the Highway Trust Fund in the case of Lincoln and Elko, Nebraska.

Section 215 of the conference substitute is the same as section 204 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 216 of the conference substitute is the same as section 205 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 217 of the conference substitute is the same as section 207 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 218 of the conference substitute is the same as section 208 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 219 of the conference substitute is the same as section 211 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 220 of the conference substitute is the same as section 212 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 221 of the conference substitute is the same as section 213 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 222 of the conference substitute is the same as section 214 of the Senate engrossed bill.

Section 301 of the conference substitute is the same as section 702 of the Senate engrossed bill except the Secretary is given direction to determine that mass transportation services are being provided by an efficient operation of the system in accordance with his regulations. The conferees further agreed that the Secretary could incur obligations on behalf of the United States to finance grants not exceeding $400,000,000. Finally, the conferees authorize not to exceed $100,000,000 for liquidation of such obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1973, and provided such amount may be increased not to exceed an aggregate of $400,000,000 prior to July 1, 1974.

Section 401 of the conference substitute is the same as section 301 of the House Amendment with a technical amendment.

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
JIM WRIGHT,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JAMES J. HOWARD,
DON H. CLAUSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
MIKE GRAVEL,
LLOYD BENTSEN,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
HOWARD H. BAKER,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report 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, 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 ask unanimous consent that the statement 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 this point or later.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Later will be fine.

Mr. WRIGHT. I will explain it in connection with the conference report.

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 achieved in the present 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 have 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 among 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 this afternoon 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 passed 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 take 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 1975, for fiscal 1976.

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, but 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

conference report would authorize for mass transit.

Do I understand the gentleman to say that this $3 billion has to be appropriated? In other words, the Appropriations Committee has to act before that $3 billion is made available?

Mr. WRIGHT. All that is done is to amend Public Law 91-453 of the last Congress, the 91st 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 recollect 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 recently 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.

Now, what assurance do we have, to those of us who are interested in providing additional Federal money for mass transit, that we are going to see anything near the sum of $3 billion made available in fiscal 1973, 1974 or 1975 for mass transit?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that the only thing the legislative committee can do is to authorize. We do not have the power to appropriate.

In response to the gentleman's question as to what assurance he may have that those moneys will actually be appropriated, I would simply say that he might rely upon the assurance of the growing demand and clamor for something meaningful to be done for mass transit.

The gentleman might wish to rely upon the good faith of the Secretary of Transportation who has repeatedly expressed his commitment to the needs of mass transit.

The gentleman may rely upon the inclusion in the present bill of authorizations for operating subsidies for existing mass transit, for the very first time in the history of the Congress, for the existing fiscal year and the upcoming fiscal year.

He might rely upon the fact that Senator WILLIAMS, who was the moving force in the Senate for something meaningful for mass transit, wanted this title included, is satisfied with what was done and believes it is the best that could be done.

I believe the gentleman might be satisfied with the fact that everything we have mentioned in this colloquy with respect to mass transit is something new and is in addition to that which was contained in the House bill as passed initially by this body.

Beyond those assurances I know of none I could give to my friend except the growing need and the growing recognition of the need for something effective to be done to assist those communities afflicted with needs for mass transit.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to ask if there is anything different in this authorization for additional mass transit except as to dollars, insofar as the language is concerned, from what existing law provides.

Mr. WRIGHT. So far as the language is concerned, I would respond to my friend that there is no difference with respect to the authorization for construction of mass transit as it was contained in the initial law. We merely add $3 billion to be available after July 1, 1975. This is what those in the Senate desired.

Beyond that, however, I must say to my friend that there is contained in this bill, as I explained 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 facilities.

Mr. MAHON. How will the operating subsidies be financed; by backdoor spending or appropriations?

Mr. WRIGHT. Out of the general fund, by appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. By appropriations or by contract authorization?

Mr. WRIGHT. By contract authority.

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 substantial control.

I should like to know for sure if I am correct in that assumption.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe the gentleman is correct in the assumption 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 working 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) that this bill establishes 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 calls upon 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, I should like to add briefly that I believe the most significant and innovative thing contained in this bill is the inclusion of the House provisions in title II in their entirety. Those provisions will make available $1.1 billion over the next few years for measures expressly designed to make the highways safer.

We lost 55,000 Americans through highway fatalities last year. This is more than the entire number of Americans who have lost their lives in all the years of the Vietnam war.

We have tried very assiduously to isolate and identify the most prominent causes of highway fatalities, insofar as they relate to deficiencies in highway design and operation.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this is truly landmark legislation, and if there is anything we in the House can take pride in, concerning the agreements reached in this conference report, it would be the entirety of title II as it was contained in the House bill for highway safety.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the bill S. 3939, amendments to the Federal Highway Act. I am delighted that the conferees were able to come to an agreement on this last day of the 92d Congress. This bill 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; an increased Federal grant ratio from the existing two-thirds Federal—one-third local contribution to a flat 80 percent Federal—20 percent local share; and an additional $3 billion in capital grant authority for the existing 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 this 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. HARSHA) and the very able assistance of the chief counsel of the committee, Richard Sullivan.

The Senate-passed highway bill contained our urban mass transportation provisions, and therefore was a matter up before the conferees for consideration as I have already stated, and I am delighted that the conferees 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 ceasing to provide the needed transportation of our people by buses and subways.

I would also like to commend the conferees on a very workable compromise that was also worked out on the Cooper-Muskie amendment. Again, this compromise will provide vital assistance for our transportation systems in our large and small cities.

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), as well as the other 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 chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has a long history which may be very important in connection with the clean water bill, and numerous others, and the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, 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 is a set 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 authorized $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 increased 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 suggested that instead 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 being levied instead of 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 and safe 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 think we can reasonably do and offered on the part of the House conferees to do even more.

In the conference we offered to assist mass transit immediately. We offered to agree, 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 immediate obligational authority but take it out of general revenues instead of the trust fund. The Senators are the ones who would not agree to that.

We feel we have an obligation to the House to uphold its position insofar as possible. We feel we have yielded very greatly so far and have done everything we reasonably could to be conciliatory and ameliatory and get a bill.

I recommend to you the passage of this bill.

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:

H. Con. Res. 726. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die.

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

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment with an amendment to the foregoing bill.

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 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 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 for the immediate consideration of 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 provide for the completion 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. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to 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. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CULVER. I have cleared it with Mr. HARSHA, the ranking minority member on the House Committee on Public Works, as well as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) a member of the committee.

Mr. HALL. I know that well. My question was not whether or not he had cleared it with the minority leadership but whether he had cleared it with the committee.

Mr. CULVER. Yes. The answer to your question is affirmative. We have cleared

it with the full Committee on Public Works and with the chairman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, 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.

Mr. HALL. 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. HARSHA, 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. HALL. 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 litle hot hand for over a week now with many importunings and with many backings and fillings and actual information that has not officially appeared before the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

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 526–78 which authorized the Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate bridges for vehicular traffic across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill. The 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 percent 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 Iowa and Illinois. The Clinton Bridge 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 Congress for completing an interstate bridge over navigable waters.

Mr. Speaker, there is in addition one other section in the conference report on the 1972 Federal Highway Act, that is of importance to Iowa and to all the Mississippi Valley. That legislation is funding for improvement of the Great River Road.

I urge the House to approve the conference report and the Great River Road language it contains. The $60 million in 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 development of roadside parks and scenic viewing points and through acquisition of land and scenic easements. This legislation is an example of environmental protection and protective development going hand-in-hand.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation and admiration to the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota. His cosponsorship 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 committee staff. Their cooperation and advice were invaluable in my efforts to secure passage of this legislation. I again urge passage of the pending report and the Great River Road.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further objection, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3822

An act authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to convey its bridge structures and other assets to the State of Iowa and to provide for the completion of a partially constructed bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, by the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate interstate commerce by expediting the completion of interstate bridge facilities across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of the city of Clinton, Iowa, the City of Clinton Bridge Commission (hereafter referred to as the "commission"), created and operating under the Act approved December 21, 1944, as revised, amended, and reenacted, is hereby authorized to sell, convey, and transfer to the State of Iowa all of its real and personal property, books, records, money, and other assets, including all existing bridges for vehicular traffic crossing the Mississippi River at or near the city of Clinton, Iowa, and the substructure constituting the partially constructed new bridge which has been designed to replace the older of the two existing vehicular bridges, together with all easements, approaches, and approach highways appurtenant to said bridge structures, and to enter into such agreements with the State Highway Commission of the State of Iowa (hereafter referred to as the "highway commission"), and the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois as may be necessary to accomplish the foregoing: Provided, however, That at or before the time of delivery of the deeds and 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

funds must have been set aside in a special fund pledged to retire said outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities and interest thereon at or prior to maturity, together with any premium which may be required to be paid 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 provide for the payment of the outstanding indebtedness or other liabilities of the commission as hereinbefore 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 Bridge Commission on behalf of the State of Iowa, to complete the construction of the new replacement bridge, to repair, reconstruct, maintain, and operate as toll bridges the existing bridges so acquired until the new replacement bridge has been completed, to dismantle the older of the two existing bridges upon completion of the new replacement bridge, and to thereafter repair, reconstruct, maintain, and operate the two remaining bridges as toll bridges. There is hereby conferred upon the highway commission the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such privately owned real estate and other property in the State of Iowa and the State of Illinois as may be needed for the location, construction, reconstruction, or completion of any such bridges and for the operation and maintenance of any bridge and the approaches, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation of private property for public purposes by said State. The highway commission is further authorized to enter into agreements with the State of Illinois and any agency or subdivision thereof, and with any agency or subdivision of the State of Iowa, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any lands or property owned by such State or political subdivision.

The cost of acquiring the existing bridge structures, of completing the replacement bridge and of dismantling the bridge to be replaced and paying expenses incidental thereto as referred to in section 1 of this Act may be provided by the highway commission though 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, approved August 2, 1946, and the location and plans for the replacement bridge shall be approved by the Secretary of Transportation in accordance with the provisions of said Act, as well as by the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois. The rates and schedule of tolls for said bridges shall be charged and collected in accordance with said General Bridge Act of 1946 and applicable Iowa legislation and shall be continuously adjusted and maintained so as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridges and approaches under economical management, to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on such bonds as may be issued by the highway commission as the same shall fall due and the redemption or repurchase price of 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 any of said bridge structures. All tolls and other revenues from said bridges are hereby pledged to such uses. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the highway commission, nor shall toll be charged officials of the Government of the United States while in the discharge of duties to their office or employment, nor shall toll be charged members of the fire department or peace officers when engaged in the performance of their official duties. No obligation created pursuant to any provision of this Act shall constitute an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 3. After all bonds or other obligations issued or indebtedness incurred by the highway commission or loans of funds for the account of said bridges and interest and premium, if any, have been paid, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment shall have been provided and shall be held solely for that purpose, the State of Iowa shall deliver deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance of the interest of the State of Iowa in and to those parts lying within Illinois of said bridges to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency thereof as may be authorized by or pursuant to law to accept the same, and thereafter the bridges shall be properly repaired, reconstructed, maintained, and operated, free of tolls by the State of Iowa and by the State of Illinois, or any municipality or agency thereof, as may be agreed upon.

SEC. 4. The interstate bridge or bridges purchased, constructed, or completed under the authority of this Act and the income derived therefrom shall, on and after the effective date of this Act, be exempt from all Federal, State, municipal, and local property and income taxation.

SEC. 5. After all of the property, books, records, money, and other assets of the City of Clinton Bridge Commission have been conveyed and transferred to the State of Iowa as contemplated by this Act, such commission shall cease to exist, without the necessity for any hearing, order, or other official action.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

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.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the committee has taken some action with regard to mass transit. I am disappointed that the mass transit problem is not one that will be answered through the use of the highway trust funds, but I am not going to belabor that point, because it is a dead horse, and this House has spoken with respect to taxing the highway fund for mass transportation, and I recognize the fact that transportation and mass transit 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 mass transit, 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 in the conference report for operating subsidies for fiscal year 1974. The result is that the total tab is $3.4 billion, $100 million for operating subsidies in 1973 and $300 million for operating subsidies in 1974, or a total of $400 million 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 under the mass transit program. I agree with them, and I have no objection to that.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. And the Mass Transit Act of 1970 provided $3 billion over a 5-year period, as I understand, with the result that the conferees have placed in this conference report $3 billion to start in 1975, so that the total authorization for mass transit for 1970 through 1975, and beyond, will be $6 billion, and that amount can be used for operating subsidies and for capital grants, as I understand it.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would correct the gentleman's conclusion only in one respect. Only the amounts to which we have earlier referred—a total of $400 million for 2 years—would be available for operating subsidies. The other amounts are available only for capital grants.

Mr. BOLAND. And as I understand it, all of this, the $3 billion, is authorized for contract authority so in effect in 1975 the Urban Mass Transit Administrator could contract for the whole $3 billion if he saw fit.

He could have done that under the 1970 act, but there were limitations placed on his activities by the Committee on Appropriations. That opportunity will be granted to us again and we will have that authority in 1975 to do precisely 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 in this Nation of ours.

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 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

of every State in the Nation depend upon it. They are looking to us to pass this conference committee report tonight. I very earnestly urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on the conference report.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sincerity and the conviction of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT). I respect as well the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and the 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 not 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 criticality of the need. I think we demonstrated and we were not contradicted in our assertion that we are spending today literally $30 for highways for 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 answer to the critical, instant, here and now need of mass transit systems in our urban areas.

I 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 sought to have this House vote a few days ago was to provide $700 million now out of existing funds—out of money that is there in the highway trust fund—for the needs of mass transit systems. It would merely provide an option to local authorities to buy buses and to build mass transit systems in those cities and communities where the needs are so great.

So how can you now try to sell us on the proposition that we are meeting the problem of mass transit by deferring this, by putting it on the backburner until the fiscal year 1975, which does not begin as we all know until July 1, 1974. It simply defies my comprehension. It is not a satisfactory answer to a critical problem.

We have just concluded in this House over the past several days a very long and sometimes stormy debate on the fiscal crisis confronting our country. What has been the reason? We have all agreed on that whether Democratic or Republican—that it was because we could not establish clearly the most urgent national priorities and still live within our budget and spend the money where it is needed most. That is why we have come to the point where we have tried in one way or another to put a ceiling on Federal spending.

Yet, when I look at this particular conference report, I come to the regrettable conclusion that if we adopt it in its present form, that once again this Congress will have been utterly derelict—utterly derelict—in its duty to try to establish some clear national priorities, and give the cities, to which urban systems highway money would go, the simple option of using that money for other modes of transportation. That would be establishing priorities. It would allow local governments to decide where the need is greatest. Given the infinite demands that are placed on the Federal budget today and the fact that there are only finite resources with which to meet those demands, we simply must try to meet an urgent problem by assigning the right to choose between different modes of transportation. Instead this conference report offers illusory promises of something down the road, when there are funds available here and now by permitting local authorities the option of resorting to the funds available to them now under their allotments for urban highway systems. Much as I respect the gentlemen on this committee, I must of necessity at this late hour take this position that they have come up with a satisfactory solution to the problem.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

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. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN).

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion I can agree in part with what the distinguished acting majority leader says, but since the Federal highway legislation does not expire, the authorization does not expire, until June 30, 1973, I suggest that the better part of wisdom would be to come back in the 93d Congress. I have the same confidence that he has that, given the attention that is now being called to this critical problem, we do have the capacity early in that first session of the next Congress to get out the kind of a bill that would provide funds in the proper manner, rather than waiting for contract financing authority until fiscal 1975.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), a member of the committee.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in 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 conferees could bring back to the House and hopefully save this legislation for enactment during the 92d Congress. This is vitally important to at least 36 States whose highway programs would be in desperate straits by 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 and break faith with those users who have paid and continue to pay into it for the construction and betterment of roads. Yet $3 billion up to 80 percent grant contract authority, and operating subsidy of $100 million for fiscal year 1973 and $300 million for fiscal year 1974 is a steep price to pay out of the general treasury fund to effect a compromise acceptable to the conferees 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, $30 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 established through hearings and 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 project starts that date 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 priorty primary road system. While no one has had an opportunity to see a written conference report it is my understanding that it is congressional intent to establish such a system and that the Secretary 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 valid, the need is there and the program should move forward.

Speaking from my own State's stand-

point I can again assure my colleagues that the need is there for continuing authority. We are one of those 36 States that will be hurt early next year if this bill fails. I can also assure you that the priority primary system is needed in the Arkansas road program.

Another matter of importance still in this conference report of interest to the people of my district is bridge authorization for crossing lock and dam No. 13 on the Arkansas River at Barling near Fort Smith. There are also two other items of concern to the citizens of Arkansas; both are authorizations in the urban extension section to allow possible extensions of the Interstate Highway System to the Little Rock Airport and the Port of Little Rock. I appreciate my distinguished colleague, Mr. MILLS' leadership in making these important needs known to our committee.

But more important than these provincial needs I feel that the overall interest of our Nation would best be served by the acceptance of this conference report. I urge its adoption.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the conferees came back with the best conference report they could get under the circumstances, and I applaud their effort. I certainly do not condemn them for the result.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. I oppose this conference report for a variety of reasons. I will mention two. No. 1, I do not like the idea of contract authority to the extent that is provided for in this conference report.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the contract procedures, but we have established that. It is operating very well. There is no change in the law with respect to the contract authority, so I would hope that we would not oppose this bill because of the contract authority. I do not oppose it. I think the bill is the best that can be done now, and I was hopeful that the gentleman from Michigan had risen to speak in behalf of the conference report, because under the circumstances I think we ought to pass this legislation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sorry that I disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Texas, but I have strong feelings on the contract authority proposal, particularly at this late hour under these circumstances.

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

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has suggested, there is nothing controversial or new in the authorization. We had contract authority in highway bills ever since 1960, so why are we talking about the innovation or some impossibility of financing? We must remember that under these contract authorities the State has to put up a certain amount of money, and, consequently, if they put up that money, they must have the Federal funds from the Central Government to accommodate what they put up.

So there is just nothing new in here. The contract authority has been used time and time again where there is a requirement for the local people to put up money.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman from Alabama is saying. I am not as convinced as he is that it has worked as well as he has indicated, but let me say in addition we have $400 million authorized in this bill for operating subsidies of mass transit lines. I am totally, unequivocally, unreservedly opposed to that proposition. I do not see why on this occasion at this late hour we should inaugurate a program of this potential magnitude. I think it is the wrong program at the wrong time.

As far as I am concerned, when the time comes to vote, I am going to vote against it on this point as well as on one other.

Title III in this conference report was never considered by the House of Representatives. It would not have been germane to our highway bill. Title III was a proposal that came out of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Title III was in the House housing bill coming out of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Title III would not have been germane to this bill when it was considered by the House. Title III was attached to the Senate version of the highway bill, and in conference the title III comes back to us and we are going to consider it and possibly approve it with 1 hour's debate with no opportunity for the House to work its will.

I do not think that is the right way to operate. In my opinion, for that reason among all others, I am going to oppose the bill. It is my opinion that this is the wrong way at the wrong time to consider the highway bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, yield?

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

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 it does too much and he wants 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.

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 is aware, is he not, of the desperate straits into which 36 of our States will be placed if there is no highway bill?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am sure the gentleman from Texas knows my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, and I, both in our leadership, had different viewpoints when this legislation was on the floor and considered by the House. He maintains his 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 positon and I do not think he will change his position, but I do not think we have to move in, in this conference report, $3.4 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.

I am not condemning the gentleman from Texas nor the conferees. I think they faced 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 to differ with my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

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.

Because of the urgent need for extension of our essential highway program and the pressure for adjournment of the Congress, the conferees agreed to a 1-year program, with the understanding that a thorough review of the highway-mass transit legislation would be undertaken early in the 93d Congress. In the course of that review, we shall consider whether an entirely separate fund should be established to provide the mass transit our major metropolitan centers must have.

I believe we need more mass transit facilities to relieve the traffic congestion that is paralyzing our major metropolitan centers, congestion such as we experience daily in Chicago.

I believe also that we must continue our highway programs and extend them into areas of the Nation that have been largely neglected in the past, 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 extensions amount of $400 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 vote for this 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 report and have so stated to my fellow conferees.

For a period of time, I hesitated to sign the conference report and the statement of managers, because of my displeasure over some of its provisions.

The strongest point of disagreement is the 1-year extension of the Interstate System apportionments and the other existing highway programs, instead of the 2-year authorization that was contained in both the Senate and House version.

This should not have been the subject of discussion in the conference, 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 systems. We repeatedly told them that to vacate the 2-year authorization contained in both bills would place the bill in jeopardy, because it would be subject to a point of order, under House rules.

However, due to their insistence, on 1 year and recognizing the fact that State and local government, highway departments, the construction industry, the construction workers, and the communities of America, were all in need of a continuing authorization that would keep the program moving forward, we consented to accept the 1-year authorization.

In turn, I ask the House, at this late hour, to agree with and accept this position.

I do not agree with all of the provisions of the beautification sections. At one point in the conference, we offered to delete the controversial sections and asked for a simple extension of the Beautification Commission, so that they might complete their report and present specific recommendations. This was not accepted by the Senate conferees.

My deepest concern is over the procedural manner in which the Senate brought the controversial operating subsidies for mass transit and title III into what was to have been a routine highway public works conference.

As a result, the Senate had nine conferees from the Public Works Committee and three from the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, thus having the net effect of introducing title III of the Senate bill containing mass transportation at a time when we had neither jurisdiction over nor hearings on, the subject of mass transportation before the House Public Works Committee.

In the House version, at the request of many interested Members, we had the 10,000-mile "priority primary" section and the announced policy of accelerating the construction timetable on all primary and secondary roads in the country, upgrading them to make them safer, replace dangerous outdated bridges, provide major safety program suggestions in title II, railroad crossing improvements, economic growth center development highways, a small urban highway improvement system for communities under 50,000 population, and so forth. These are the major innovative and I believe, constructive provisions that would greatly enhance the safety of our highways and cut down on the over 55,000 traffic deaths that occur each year.

It is regrettable that the House bill was not accepted solely on the basis of its highway provisions.

It is our desire to maintain the integrity of the highway trust fund by maintaining our entrusted fiduciary responsibilities, just as we should uphold the purpose and interest of the airport-airways trust fund.

As to mass transportation, I am pleased to report one thing, that I believe to be very constructive that came out of the discussions in conference. I am of course, referring to something I have been advocating for a long time—the establishment of a third trust fund to handle the operating expenses of mass transit and hopefully, provide the same positive method of finance for that mode of transportation that the Congress, in their wisdom, saw fit to provide for highway and air transportation systems.

There was more argument expressed by more Senators and House Members on the third trust fund concept than I have ever heard, including Mr. MILLS, and other members of the Ways and Means Committee and Senator WILLIAMS of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and other Senate and House conferees.

As a matter of fact, the House offered, as part of their many proposals, the desirability of advancing the "Priority Primary" and third trust fund for mass transit as a package for immediate consideration next year.

Without belaboring the point, I simply ask my colleagues to support the conference, even with its weaknesses for the reasons stated previously. Then let us come back next year, maintain the cooperation and momentum and move toward developing the best coordinated integrated and balanced transportation systems that modern and future technology can provide.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the conference reported Federal aid-highway bill provides both needed assistance for mass transit and an opportunity to reconsider the Nation's total transportation needs next year by limiting the extension for the highway program to 1 year. Its major deficiency, however, is 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, as well as highway projects. It is time that localities had this flexibility in Federal transportation dollars. During the House's consideration of the highway bill, I joined with our colleague from California (Mr. ANDERSON) in sponsoring 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 systems have no alternative but 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 transportation those who depend on public transportation, primarily the elderly and the poor. Presently, States and localities are having to subsidize local transit operators. It is time that the Federal Government did its share.

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 today's bill that $400 million be spent in transit operating subsidies over the next 2 years is a modest as well as necessary one.

Important, too, in this bill is the authorization of an additional $3 billion for mass transit's capital program. This money, to be added to the existing $3.1 billion authorized in the 1970 Urban Mass Transportation Act for the first half of this decade, will be important in both initiating and implementing much needed capital improvement programs.

Both the $400 million operating subsidy program and the $3 billion capital authorization were first included in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972 reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee on September 21. It is gratifying that since this bill has not been voted on by this House these transit provisions have been included in the highway bill. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the conference committee has adopted the House's formula for the distribution of operating assistance funds—one based on revenue passengers served. This means that an allocation of Federal assistance to a locality will reflect the locality's share of the Nation's total transit passengers. I am pleased to note that this formula is one that, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I first proposed in my bill H.R. 13362.

One of the components of the conference committee's bill which I take vigorous exception to is that providing for the initiation of the second generation Interstate System: a 10,000-mile system of new roads to be built to Interstate System standards. This year the Depart-

ment of Transportation submitted for the first time a report on the country's total transportation needs. It would be a grave mistake to start construction of a new Interstate System before there is the opportunity to study the Department's report and develop a total transportation plan which incorporates and coordinates all forms of transportation, including any new road building programs. Furthermore, it is clear that there are much more urgent public transportation needs that should be met before new highway systems are commenced. Yet another aspect to consider is the fact that we have already paved over land equal to the combined area of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Delaware. How many more States are we going to blacktop before we turn to more efficient means for providing mobility in this country?

In conclusion, I would also note that I disagree with the special treatment the bill gives to the Brackenridge Olmos Basin Parkland segment of the San Antonio North Expressway. It is unconscionable that the Congress should legislate to circumvent in this case the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act pertaining to parkland protection. This is particularly reprehensible when a decision has already been handed down by the Federal court ruling that the project does not comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. If every time a segment of the Interstate System cannot meet environmental standards this Congress acts to provide a special exemption, we simply will make a mockery out of our own environmental protection laws.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I am going to ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, before I offer my concluding remarks Mr. PICKLE of Texas wanted to be recognized in a similar fashion as the request which was granted to Mr. CULVER.

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 operating authority of foreign 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:

Senate amendment No. 1:

Page 4, line 24, of the House engrossed amendment, after *"Aircraft,"* insert: "or if he determines that a foreign nation is used as a base of operations or training or as a sanctuary or which arms, aids, or abets in any way, terrorist organizations which knowingly use the illegal seizure of aircraft or the threat thereof as an instrument of policy,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PICKLE moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 8, at the end of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

TITLE II—AIR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1972

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 insure safety to the millions of passengers who use air transportation and intrastate air transportation and to enforce 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 new section:

"SCREENING OF PASSENGERS IN AIR TRANSPORTATION

"SEC. 315. (a) The Secretary shall as soon as practicable prescribe regulations requiring that all passengers and all 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. One year after the effective date of such regulation the Secretary may alter or amend such regulations, requiring a continuation of such screening by weapon-detecting devices only to the extent deemed necessary to assure security against acts of criminal violence and air piracy in air transportation and intrastate air transportation. The Secretary shall submit semiannual reports to the Congress concerning the effectiveness of this screening program and shall advise the Congress of any regulations or amendmets thereto to be prescribed pursuant to this subsection at least thirty days in advance of their effective date.

"(b) The Secretary shall acquire and furnish for the use by air carriers, intrastate air carriers, and foreign air carriers at airports within the United States sufficient devices necessary for the purpose of subsection (a) of this section, which devices shall remain the property of the United States.

"(c) The Secretary may exempt, from provisions of this section, air transportation operations performed by air carriers operating pursuant to part 135, title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations."

(b) 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 III of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following additional new section:

"AIR TRANSPORTATION SECURITY FORCE

"POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITY

"SEC. 316. (a) The Secretary shall 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 insure the safety from criminal violence and air piracy of persons traveling in air transportation or intrastate air transportation. He is directed to delegate this authority to the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration who shall be empowered, and designate each employee of the force who shall be empowered, pursuant to this title, to—

"(1) detain and search any person aboard, or any person attempting to board, any aircraft in, or intended for operation in, air transportation or intrastate air transportation to determine whether such person is unlawfully carrying a dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance;

"(2) search or inspect any property, at any airport, which is aboard, or which is intended to be placed aboard, any aircraft in, or intended for operation in, air transportation or intrastate air transportation to determine whether such property unlawfully contains any dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance;

"(3) arrest any person whom he has reasonable cause to believe has (A) violated or has attempted to violate section 902 (i), (j), (k), (l), or (m) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, or (B) violated, or has attempted to violate, section 32, title 18, United States Code, relating to crimes against aircraft or aircraft facilities; and

"(4) carry firearms when deemed by the Administrator to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section,

and, at his discretion, he may designate and deputize State and local law enforcement personnel to exercise the authority conveyed in this subsection.

"TRAINING AND ASSISTANCE

"(b) In administering the air transportation security program, the Secretary may—

"(1) provide training for State and local law enforcement personnel whose services may be made available by their employers to assist in carrying out the air transportation security program, and

"(2) utilize the air transportation security force to furnish assistance to an airport operator, or any air carrier, intrastate air

carrier, or foreign air carrier engaged in air transportation or intrastate air transportation to carry out the purposes of the air transportation security program.

"OVERALL RESPONSIBILITY

"(c) Except as otherwise expressly provided by law, the responsibility for the administration of the air transportation security program, and security force functions specifically set forth in this section, shall be vested exclusively in the Secretary of Transportation who shall delegate them to 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 a search or 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 inimical 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 shall be deemed to include an agreement that such carriage shall be refused when consent to search persons or search or inspect such property for the purposes enumerated in subsection (a) of this section is not given."

SEC. 26. Section 902(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"CARRYING WEAPONS ABOARD AIRCRAFT

"(1)(1) Whoever, while aboard, or while attempting to board, any aircraft in or intended for operation in air transportation or intrastate air transportation, has on or about his person or his property a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance, or has placed, attempted to place, or attempted to have placed aboard such aircraft any property containing a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) Whoever willfully and without regard for the safety of human life or with reckless disregard for the safety of human life, while aboard, or while attempting to board, any aircraft in or intended for operation in air transportation or intrastate air transportation, has on or about his person or his property a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance, or has placed, attempted to place, or attempted to have placed aboard such aircraft any property containing a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, explosive, or other destructive substance shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(3) This subsection shall not apply to law enforcement officers of any municipal or State government, or the Federal Government, while acting within their official capacities and who are authorized or required within their official capacities, to carry arms, or to persons who may be authorized, under regulations issued by the Administrator, to carry concealed deadly or dangerous weapons in air transportation or intrastate air transportation."

SEC. 27. To establish, administer, and maintain the air transportation security force provided in section 316 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1973 the sum of $30,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year such amounts, not to exceed $30,000,000, as are necessary to carry out the purpose of such section.

SEC. 28. Section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, is amended by adding after paragraph (21) the following:

"(22) 'Intrastate air carrier' means any citizen of the United States who undertakes, whether directly or indirectly or by a lease or any other arrangement, solely to engage in intrastate air transportation.

"(23) '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 of the United States."

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) Powers and responsibilities.

"(b) Training and assistance.

"(c) Overall responsibility."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PICKLE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PICKLE moves to disagree to Senate amendment No. two.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on 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 to protect 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 annually. Much of that travel is by chartered airlines, and the proportion is going up. Transatlantic air charter passengers, for example, increased for 600,000 in 1966 to 2.5 million last year.

Strandings of Americans who have paid hard-earned money for charter travel have also increased greatly and have become a major consumer problem for which there is at present, all too little recourse. In June of this year, for example, some 3,000 Americans were stranded in Europe, and thousands of others suffered financial loss to one degree or another, when a major supplemental airline, Lloyd International Airways, collapsed. As the mail received by every Member of Congress would certainly verify, thousands of tourists and travelers each year pay for travel accommodations, services, and other promises which are only partially lived up to or not received at all.

Responsibility for this situation does not always or entirely lie, of course, with travel agents or travel firms. It may lie with the carrier or ultimate supplier of travel services, particularly the airlines, both scheduled and nonscheduled. The airline industry is already subject to regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, and certain governmental international bodies, and it is incumbent upon these regulatory groups to step up their efforts on behalf of consumers to assure that the airlines provide the services and accommodations for which the traveler is charged and which he is promised.

While travel firms, like most interstate businesses, are subject to regulation in some respects by various Federal agencies, travel agents are not directly regulated at the present time. Given the considerable extent to which travel agents may be and, on occasion, are responsible for disappointment, inconvenience, extra expense, or downright fraud to consumers, travel agents should be subject to Federal regulation through registration and licensing, and that is precisely the purpose and effect of S. 2577, which passed the Senate on June 29, 1972, but has been allowed to die for the duration of this Congress by the House.

The many reputable and responsible members of the travel industry, of course, have nothing to fear from Federal regulation, and I am pleased to note that the American Society of Travel Agents—ASTA—on behalf of its more than 10,000 members, supports this legislation to provide broad new protection for travel consumers.

Mr. Speaker, as an indication of my view that further Federal regulation of travel agents is needed to prevent and provide redress for failures to deliver adequate travel services to consumers, and particularly to call attention to the need to stop the rash of strandings that have become a major problem for travelers, I am today introducing legislation to provide Federal registration and licensing of travel agents. Action on this legislation, which is identical to that passed by the Senate, should be an immediate goal of the 93d Congress when it convenes next year, and I intend to reintroduce it and continue to work for its passage at that time.

SUMMARY OF BILLS DURING 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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 a strategic commodity reserve—or "food bank"—for wheat and such feed grains as corn. Some grain would be purchased and insulated 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 that an 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. exports of grain.

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 wheat from the U.S. market. The need for these huge and sudden purchases was not revealed by the U.S. 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 credit, an increase in the maximum 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 congested cities. The new law mostly 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 passed the most 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. Existing weaker 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 waterways pollution free by 1985. President Nixon vetoed the bill but the Congress overrode the veto.

REVENUE SHARING

Public Law 92– 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 use 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.

FOREIGN AID

Twice, once in 1971 and again in 1972, the Senate voted down foreign aid authorization bills. However, the foreign aid program has been kept alive, at the request of the administration, under bills continuing it on a short-term, scaled-down basis.

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 the program for 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 center program 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 92–463 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 3,200 of these committees and their cost may be about $100 million annually.

Public Law 92– 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 over pesticides which pose a risk to humans and the environment and provides that they be classified into a "general" category and a "restricted" category for use by qualified applicators.

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 because of 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 not extended 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 92–32 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 92–65 provides Federal assistance for projects designed to help rebuild the economy in "distressed" areas.

Public Law 92–41 extends the renogotiation Act for 2 years and includes a provision authorizing the Treasury Department to determine the interest rate on excessive profits by defense contractors.

Public Law 92–394 authorizes funds for the fiscal year starting July 1972, for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Public Law 92–305 establishes a National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases to enhance the Federal Government's role in medical research.

Reorganization Plan No. 1, approved by Congress, combines the Peace Corps, VISTA—the agency for domestic antipoverty workers—and some smaller programs into ACTION, a single agency administering Government volunteer service programs.

FOREIGN FINANCIAL POLICY

Public Law 92–126 extends until June 1974, the operation of the Export-Import Bank, which guarantees and makes loans to promote 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.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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 100 percent of their husband's social security benefits at age 65; eliminates the support requirement for divorced women receiving social security benefits; increases from $1,680 to $2,100 the outside income limitations on those receiving 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

(Mr. 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 ceremony, armed with sincerity but inadequate to serve as more than a recapitulation of past history.

Certainly, this is so as I speak of Bill Ryan. He was a unique Congressman. He was a unique man. And I cannot hope to adequately convey this to those who may some time in the future read these words. But, I can try to in some measure note the mark of this man, so that others will hopefully perceive the extent of our loss, and realize the magnitude of the standard which he has set.

Bill Ryan was unique because he would not compromise. He was imbued with a perpetual sense of outrage, which kept him fighting when the battle was clearly lost. He simply could not accept injustice or inequity; he could not settle for slow and meager progress.

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, were it ever 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 peace—because he could not settle for less, and he would not let anyone else settle for less.

Perhaps, in stating these words, I make Bill sound obstinate, stubborn. He was. He clung to his course despite the counsels to go slow. He insisted on speaking out when he knew that to do so might embarrass others less willing to be equally forthright. For him there really was no other option. Misery or inequity, if not opposed, was thereby condoned.

How does one adequately convey this quality of this man? I do not know. I do know, though, that Bill Ryan stood for integrity without caveat or exception. He was guided by his conscience and his compassion, when these two confronted pragmatism, there was no question which would guide his voice and his vote.

A man who once worked for Bill wrote recently, in the September 28 issue of the Village Voice, something very close to what I, too, saw in Bill:

> For years, using a parliamentary gimmick, he single-handedly kept the House Dixiecrat establishment from passing a bill to name a VA hospital after Rankin (or was it Bilbo?) on the ground that this would dishonor black and Jewish vets. . . . It was moves like that, which could do a Member no earthly good whatever except to keep himself at peace with his conscience, that made Bill inexplicable to most of his colleagues.
>
> That was Bill Ryan, a man of stubborn principle and absolute integrity. It didn't strike me as remarkable that he should be so, at the time I was working for him. He was just my boss, human and sometimes infuriatingly single-minded. Only years later, after I'd come to know political Washington better, did I understand how rare it was that this humane and decent politician should be exactly what he professed to be, nothing more, nothing less.

This single-minded integrity is what so many people saw in Bill Ryan. Nat Hentoff, writing in the same issue of the Village Voice, said:

> His death takes the top name from that very small list of people I cite when asked by students to name someone in politics who hasn't sold part of himself along the way in order to stay in office.

Some might say that Bill Ryan's stubborn integrity limited his effectiveness. When Members junior to him were chairing subcommittees in this bastion of success-through-seniority, Bill was still a junior Member on the committees on which he served. This he owed to his years of consignment to a committee which he little desired, and years of refusal to place him on those committees on which he deeply wanted to serve. Well, Bill owed that to his unremitting devotion to his principles, that is true. And he did in fact annoy some Members of this august body by his continuing demands for the goals he espoused, notwithstanding the country's disinterest in them. This body did not treat Bill Ryan well.

Yet, I think it is Bill Ryan who graced this body by his presence. He fought the battles others talked about, but failed to enter. He insisted upon the hard course of conscience, when others sought easier paths to follow. And, despite all, Bill Ryan loved this Chamber. Bill Ryan was hopelessly in love with democracy, and he had ultimate faith in the ability of this Congress to achieve good, notwithstanding all the proof to the contrary. His life was here, and it is fitting that his death be memorialized here.

So, Bill Ryan did not sacrifice effectiveness in vain. He demonstrated an effectiveness that few can claim. He proved that integrity and the political process need not be alien. He voiced the early warning against HUAC, and today its successor, the House Internal Security Committee, is largely a shell. He stood against the war in the early days, and today this country rejects that war, notwithstanding the Congress' failure to hear the country's voice. He marched and fought for equal rights for all, and today, in the deepest part of every one of us, we know that discrimination and prejudice, no matter how justified or rationalized, are evil.

The battles Bill fought just took longer to win than most, but they were the right battles to fight, and they will be won. In some measure, the New York Times editorial of September 19 caught this sense of Bill Ryan. Entitled "Apostle of Change," the editorial began:

> In a way that few public figures have been able to do, Representative William F. Ryan took positions ahead of his time and patiently persuaded his constituency and elements of the larger society to follow him, winning the warm affection of an increasing circle of friends in the process. He was loved as an immensely sensitive and decent man.
>
> Congressman Ryan liked to be called an "apostle of change" and, as such, he achieved remarkable success. He marched in the South at the side of the blacks burdened by discriminatory laws. He stood in the well of the House, a slight, frail figure with a broad, strong face, to oppose appropriations for the war in Vietnam. He eloquently exhorted Congress to protect both consumers and the environment. He did these things and others before they became the popular things to do.

Jack Newfield wrote, after Bill Ryan died, "Today it feels like someone has destroyed all the trees and grass on the West Side." We all are, indeed, the less for having lost Bill Ryan. So it is with heartfelt feelings that I and my wife extended our condolences to Bill's wife Priscilla, to his children, Bill, Jr., Priscilla, Virginia, and Katherine, to his parents and to his brothers.

Bill Ryan honored us all by his integrity. Hopefully, some day this Chamber can meet the standard he set.

ARTHUR J. ALTMEYER, "FATHER" OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. 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, I have the sad duty today to call to the attention of my colleagues the death of one of this Nation's most influential and progressive social reformers. Arthur J. Altmeyer, often called the "Father" of social security, died at age 81 in Madison, Wis., on Monday, October 16, 1972.

Mr. Altmeyer was a very close and highly valued personal friend of mine, a constituent of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District, and a man with nationally and internationally recognized ideals. For millions of our Nation's retired pepole, his efforts have meant the difference between abject poverty and a living level of support. For this alone, every American, both young and old, owes Mr. Altmeyer an everlasting debt of gratitude.

He was a native of Wisconsin, and

came to Washington at the call of President Roosevelt in 1933 to serve as Chief of the Compliance Division of the National Recovery Administration. A year later, he was made an Assistant Secretary of Labor. At the same time, Mr. Altmeyer became Chairman of the Technical Board of the President's Committee on Economic Security, the same Committee which drafted legislation setting up the social security system. Later, he became a member and then Chairman 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 33d 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 public figure 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 publicly 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 assaulting the problem with concrete proposals embodied now in the social security system. Long before medicare came into being, Mr. Altmeyer was calling for a national health insurance plan. He was a man of wisdom and gifted foresight, who realized long before most people that the wars against poverty, illness, and old age was far more important and beneficial to humankind than military wars abroad. He is one of the few who lived to see his ideals and his dreams transformed into reality on a national basis. For this, we must all be thankful, and for this, we must all be saddened at his passing.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. BYRNES

(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, unfortunately the House of Representatives is going to lose the service of our Republican leader on the Ways and Means Committee, JOHN BYRNES. JOHN has been ranking Republican for some 10 years and in this capacity, he certainly was one of the top 10 Republicans in the House of Representatives in competence and accomplishment.

JOHN was still in his twenties when he was first elected to the Wisconsin State Senate and at the age of 30, was elected majority floor leader and chairman of the senate judiciary committee. Shortly thereafter he was elected to the 79th Congress to begin service in January 1945, and has served on the Ways and Means Committee for 26 years.

His incisive mind, broad 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 arrived at the conclusions reached. When he, Chairman MILLS, and Dr. Woodworth 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. We shall miss him greatly for his leadership, good judgment, and comprehensive thinking.

JOHN still has many productive years and we all wish 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 Schneebeli's and we were together socially quite frequently because of so many interests which we share. My wife and I will be so much at a loss when our friends leave Washington and I know that my wife will miss the deep friendship which she has for Martha Betts, as I will miss seeing my amiable friend, JACK BETTS.

JACK has been a Member of Congress since the 82d Congress in January 1951. Prior to this time he served with distinction as a member of the Ohio General Assembly for 10 years and for 2 years as speaker of the House of Representatives there. His tremendous energies and accomplishments are reflected in the fact that he has been the recipient of five honorary degrees.

JACK has been a very dependable wheelhorse on the Republican side of the Ways and Means Committee and his strength and loyalty were always depended upon by the Members on both sides of the political aisle. Everybody knew where JACK BETTS stood and of his reliability and competence. This degree of confidence was recognized by the fact that he was appointed to serve as the ranking Republican on the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

If there ever was a paragon of virtue and dedication to his work, it was JACK BETTS and we shall all miss him for his wise counsel and reliable good judgment. Mrs. Schneebeli and I particularly will be at a loss with the departure of Martha and JACK BETTS from Washington.

CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER'S LOBBYING

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, it should be with great reluctance and only after extreme provocation that one within a coordinate body should criticize the head of one of the three great branches of Government. Thus, in August 1970, when the Chief Justice noted in a nationally televised speech billed as the first "state of the judiciary" address that there had been a number of proposals for new Federal legislation in the fields of antipollution and consumer class actions which might be better left to the States, I did not take issue with him. I thought at that time that he was merely making the generalized statement that a heavier case load on the courts required an increase in the courts' manpower and tools. Such is so obvious that it goes without saying. The only question arising which could cause alarm about such an innocuous statement is: Why did the Chief Justice bother to say it? Since this seemingly innocent homily has been repeated and constantly used by the special interest lobbies, a reason begins to appear.

As the Houston Chronicle noted at the time, Chief Justice Burger's speech caught the consumer class action bill at a particularly crucial time and on a touchy point. As appeared in Bill Lee's story on August 12, 1970:

> The full commerce committee is on the verge of taking up consideration of the bill, already approved by a subcommittee, and rival consumer class action proposals also will be revived.

Also, as Lee noted, opponents of my approach had long argued it would jam 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 emphasized at this crucial time the Federal courts are "for a limited purpose." He said Congress should examine proposals carefully that would add to the courts' duties and added:

> People speak glibly of putting all the problems of pollution, of crowded cities, of consumer class actions and others in the federal courts. We should look more to state courts familiar with local conditions and local problems.

But State courts act upon Federal questions pursuant to Federal law. And if there is no substantive legal basis for State court action to protect 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 legislative events. But if applied so as to call for a denial of any adequate

remedy to consumers, such apparent generalizations are much more than the innocent truisms that they 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 consider them to be so in 1970, 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 repeated them, has continued 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 relating to 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 is not a solution. But there is no escape 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 was only suggesting that "Congress consider the needs of the courts along with the need for new legislation."

But on this second occasion when Congress was approaching its finale, the Chief Justice's pronouncements need to be considered in context with certain pieces of legislation affording people access to the courts.

Lobbyist Corcoran was quick to exploit the Burger speech for his client's, the drug industry's, advantage. On August 18, 1972, the bill was in the Rules Committee, and Chairman STAGGERS noted some inexplicable delay there, though the bill had met with wide approval in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Perhaps this was because of Corcoran's memorandum, dated August 18, 1972, to Rules Committee members. It said, in part:

The Chief Justice's plea applies most pertinently to H.R. 15003, the Consumer Product Safety bill, now pending before the Rules Committee.

* * * * *

The bill creates some unusual private rights for enforcement of product safety rules (Sec. 24) and private suits to recover personal injury damages in Federal courts regardless of existing jurisdictional requirements of Federal courts (Sec. 23).

* * * * *

This bill would obliterate that historical allocation of jurisdiction between Federal and State courts, and permit ordinary private tort actions to be brought in the Federal courts without any requirement of diversity of citizenship or amount in controversy.

Then on August 31, 1972, Mr. Corcoran sent a more urgent message to the Rules Committee saying:

Chief Justice Burger recently pled with 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. 15003, 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 support for it solicited. For, on September 20, DAVID DENNIS of Indiana, not a member of the committee, successfully offered an amendment to deny Federal court jurisdictions in cases involving less than $10,000. This amendment is directly responsive to the following language in Mr. Corcoran's August 18 memorandum which stated:

In our Federal jurisdictional system, jurisdiction over personal tort actions has normally been left to State courts except where Federal jurisdictional requirements of diversity of citizenship and amount in controversy ($10,000) are met.

The memorandum also attacked other consumer legislation which was asserted to be contrary to Chief Justice Burger's admonition: the consumer product warranty and Federal Trade Commission improvement bill and the Consumer Protection Agency bill. Both were ultimately killed by Republican delaying action. These, together, constituted the most important consumer legislation in Congress in this term.

But the product safety bill was so clearly desirable and had such solid support that it proved too tough to kill. The indomitable Corcoran did not, however, give up easily. He went even further to invoke Chief Justice Burger's influence. Corcoran and the Chief of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Rowland F. Kirks, visited the Speaker of the House to discuss how the product safety bill was in conflict with the principles enunciated in Chief Justice Burger's speech.

Mr. Kirks does not now deny that he accompanied the lawyer-lobbyist in an effort to persuade Representative CARL ALBERT, the Democratic Speaker of the House, to narrow the legal remedies in a pending product safety bill. He conceded that he went to intercede with Mr. ALBERT after Mr. Corcoran had pointed out that the bill would overburden the Federal courts with new cases. Corcoran was representing the drug industry which was leading the fight against the bill, and the bill was nearing enactment.

Mr. Kirks, as reported in the New York Times of October 13, 1972, said he considered the visit a routine effort to inform Congress of 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 the next week.

The Chief Justice did not immediately disassociate himself with any lobbying against the bill though the bill was in a sensitive stage.

Actually, the story 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 agreed to the conference report. The Senate agreed to the conference report on October 14.

Certainly Mr. Kirks was not so insensible of the congressional action 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 he singled out specific 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, and when the bill was at the very time being fashioned in final form for the two Houses to agree upon—that, when all of this conjoined, he did not know that the prestige of his office was being exerted to defeat consumer legislation.

He should not have waited 8 days to disclaim interest in the legislation. Indeed, he did not deny interest; he denied charges that he mettled in consumer 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 letter did not deny that Burger sent Kirks to see ALBERT or 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 Agency bill, 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.

RECORD OF THE 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks a report to my constituents about the record of the 92d Congress:

NEW PROGRAMS HELP STUDENTS FROM PRESCHOOL TO COLLEGE

Young people throughout the nation will benefit from these historic education measures:

Omnibus Education Act of 1972 is the most significant advance for higher education

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 ones, including:

A new system of *Basic Educational Opportunity Grants*, entitling every college student to an annual grant of $1400, less the amount his parents can contribute;

A new program of direct institutional aid for colleges and universities;

Help for occupational and vocational education;

A *National Institute of Education* to develop better ways of teaching and learning at every level—preschool 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 great Congresses in history—and the 32% Social Security increases passed in 1971 and 1972 are but the tip of the iceberg.

Here are some of the many benefits our 20 million senior citizens will realize from Congressional initiatives:

Nutritional meals for those who need them—even shut-ins;

Low-cost transportation;

Job training and employment;

Community centers;

Pre-retirement training;

Health and education services;

Gerontological centers to study 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 20% 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 ACT REFORMS CAMPAIGN SPENDING

At a time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed, the Congress passed the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

This historic act:

Limits 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 $30.1 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 transportation, 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 Weapons: Congress approved a five-year U.S.-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.

A GREAT CONGRESS FOR VETERANS

Many observers are calling the 92nd Congress the greatest Congress for veterans in history. In the past two years, we have passed major laws to educate our veterans, to provide them better treatment in VA hospitals, and to liberalize burial allowances for veterans.

New GI bill

This landmark measure increases educational 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 all national cemeteries; increases burial allowances for veterans who die from service-connected disabilities; provides an additional burial allowance for veterans who do not wish to be buried in national cemeteries.

VA Medical School Act

To help meet the nation's medical manpower shortage—and to improve VA medical care—this pilot program authorizes the establishment of eight new medical schools in veterans' hospitals across the nation.

Veterans medical care

This new act will vastly improve the entire VA medical care system. To ease crowded hospital conditions, veterans with non-service-connected medical problems can now be treated as outpatients. Some families of permanently-disabled veterans or their survivors can also now receive hospital care.

Disabled veterans' benefits

Provides a 10% boost in benefits for disabled 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. This Congress has taken important action to protect the nation's environment.

Water Quality Standards Act provides $24.6 billion to clean up the nation's waters 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 1985.

Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act will help protect man and our environment, while permitting farmers to use pesticides to grow food and fiber.

Wildlife Hunting from Aircraft is prohibited, protecting 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 13th to 22nd place in male life expectancy, from 6th to 21st in infant mortality. Doctor bills and hospital costs have skyrocketed, yet 36 million Americans under age 65 are not covered by private health insurance. Moreover, the nation is suffering from a critical shortage of doctors and other trained health personnel.

The 92nd Congress has taken the initiative to meet the crisis with several important measures:

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 to find cures for cancer.

National Cooley's Anemia Control Act—A national effort to prevent and treat this blood disease which affects some 200,000 persons in the U.S., mostly children.

Multiple Sclerosis Research—Creates a National Advisory Commission to help find the cause of M.S. and develop cures.

Communicable Disease Control 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 programs to aid the severely handicapped and other disabled persons.

Black Lung Benefits—To make it easier for coal miners, stricken by black lung disease, to receive benefits.

CONGRESS FOCUSES ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

In recent years, Congress has passed a host of measures on behalf of the American consumer. Truth-in-lending . . . wholesome meat and poultry . . . truth-in-packaging . . . auto, tire and toy safety . . . 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-fire requirements.

Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 assigns the Federal government a major role in protecting the consumer from unreasonable 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 Automobile "Bumper Bill" directs the Secretary of Transportation to fix minimum standards for bumpers to halt or reduce auto damage in low speed collisions. The 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 provide $150 million over two years for:

Education and counseling, health services and recreational facilities for potential juvenile delinquents and training personnel in the juvenile delinquency field.

Drug abuse

Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. This new law provides over $6 billion to:

Establish a National Institute on Drug Abuse; increase funds for special drug projects 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 countries which allow shipments of narcotics into the U.S. or allow the continued flow of drugs to our servicemen overseas.

Addiction of Servicemen. Another new law requires the military to identify drug-dependent servicemen and to treat them.

Rehabilitation of Addicts. A third measure

creates new programs to encourage the employment of rehabilitation addicts, with special preferences for veterans.

CONGRESS AIDS RURAL AREAS

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.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS TROUBLE CONGRESS

Since January 1969, unemployment in the U.S. has climbed to over 5½ percent. The 1969 dollar has lost 12½ cents in value. The number of Americans on welfare has doubled. 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.) We then passed the Emergency Employment Act authorizing $2¼ billion for transitional public service jobs and special state employment assistance programs. We also earmarked $275 million for additional unemployment benefits and allowances.

Congress also:

Extended the President's authority to establish controls on prices, rents, wages and salaries.

Increased the personal income tax exemption per taxpayer and dependent to $675.

Came to the aid of small businesses by increasing the amounts of Federal loans and guarantees.

Finally, Congress acted to hold down record budget deficits 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 $14½ billion from the Administration's appropriations requests—and the total appropriations this year will again be below the President's budget.

NEW AMENDMENTS 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.

18-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, eleven 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. For example:

Twenty-six states prohibit women from working in certain occupations.

Thirty-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.

To end 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.

WOMEN'S EDUCATION ACT

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1972, I introduced H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act, to redress the serious inequalities in educational opportunities for women.

My belief is that women will be unable to utilize the rights to be conferred by the equal rights amendment unless they have the education required. Accordingly, my bill provides for grants and programs to improve educational opportunities for women from preschool to the adult education or "second career" levels.

For the past several months, 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 indication of the support received, I am including at this point in the RECORD a representative selection of comments. All such viewpoints will be carefully evaluated prior to reintroduction of the bill in the 93d Congress in January. After the bill in reintroduced with revisions, we will seek hearings and adoption.

The comments on the bill follow:

JULY 31, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: This is in response to your letter of May 12 to Dr. Florence J. Hicks, Director of the HEW Women's Action Program, requesting our comments on your proposed bill, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972. 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 an action plan to help us begin solving the problems women face both as HEW employees and as recipients of the Department's many program benefits.

As part of the preparation of its action plan, the Office of Education has established a Task Force to examine all of its present authorities and programs and 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. We will certainly be in a better informed position to comment after the findings and recommendations of the Task Force have been submitted.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Secretary.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for your letter of May 10, 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 cognizance of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. From a personal standpoint and not necessarily an institutional position, however, I find the intent of your proposals in keeping with both Federal and non-Federal efforts to provide equal 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 types of educational activities including vocational and community education programs, without being guided exclusively into old stereotyped occupational fields such as secretarial, clerical 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 seen it. Discrimination against women in vocational education and job training is discussed commencing on page 73.

The Civil Service Commission 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 who 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 touched on 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,

HELENE S. MARKOFF,
Director, Federal Women's Program.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of H.R. 14451, 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 may accomplish little more than the rising of false expectations of equal treatment unless they are buttressed with public action programs that provide practical ways of realizing 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, attractive posters on "Women in Medicine" were sent to student groups and counseling offices in secondary schools throughout the State, and follow-up bro-

chures directed to all high school students are now in preparation. I should think that a more elaborate program of this nature might qualify for funding under your proposed legislation.

Aside from minor typographical errors, H.R. 14451 presents to me a question and a caveat. The question is directed to the two kinds of grants authorized, one by the Secretary of HEW, with many qualifications and conditions specified (Sec. 4(b)) and the other by the Commissioner of Education, with little qualification other than the $15,000 limit (Sec. 7). Why are these kinds of grants so differentiated?

My caveat focuses on Section 4(e)(7), which, at least on my first impression, appears to be a bit of a "joker", given the pervasiveness of sex discrimination throughout institutions across the Nation. As I contemplate the kinds of applicants, be it a trade union or trade organization, an organization such as the YWCA, or a unit of the University, such as Continuing Education for Women, the School of Nursing, or the College of Engineering, I cannot think of any such applicant which does not "discriminate on the basis of sex". Perhaps the language of Section 4(e)(7) might be reworded to exclude applicants who do not have an affirmative action program to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sex.

This letter states my personal views. At the next meeting of the University Commission on the Status of Women, I shall put your proposal on the agenda for full discussion, and I shall then forward to you the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

Again, thank you for considering my comments on this matter.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA K. PUTMAN,
Associate Dean, University of Hawaii School of Medicine.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Kaneohe, Hawaii, September 19, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of the Women's Education Act of 1972, which you have introduced this session. As education representative on the Hawaii State Commission on the Status of Women and as a national officer of the American Association of University Women, I am glad to have this bill in its entirety.

I agree with you completely that women must be prepared through every educational opportunity to assume their full responsibilities, as well as the rights, when the Equal Rights Amendment is effected. Your bill seems to be prepared for this fully and admirably. I am glad to see the inclusion of this provision that "Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting men from participating in any of the activities funded." We are too inclined sometimes, I believe, to see the entire equal rights movement as nothing more than equality for women, whereas it is much more importantly, it seems to me, striving for an equality in rights, opportunities, and responsibilities for all citizens.

With aloha,

DOROTHY B. SHIMER.

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 on to 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 I will do everything in my power to inform others and help to develop a climate of support for the bill.

With respect to the organizations that may be supporting the bill, I would assume that you have used the mailing list of the groups who had worked for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. I would think that Flora Crater would be an ideal contact if you have not already discussed it with her.

It is wonderful to have 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 Relations, National Education Association.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of HR 14451, The 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 it.

As you know, I have long been involved with the problems of the education of young girls and women. The difficulties are many, 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 the country are working in a variety of ways to remedy the difficulties faced by girls and women in our educational system. What they 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 distaff side of our nation's resources have been rapidly growing, but at a time when the nation's schools and colleges are sorely pressed for funds.

Your bill would provide funding for a variety of much needed programs as well as give impetus to the evaluation of current programs, and the development of 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 as women from the Act.

One technical error: Section 4(f) (page 8, line 15) apparently has an omitted word. Should "prior" 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 would give to the girls and women of this nation is tremendous.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER,
Executive Associate.

JULY 24, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for your letter of July 20 concerning HR 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972. I am now in the process of tapping the opinion of our AAUW Committee on Standards in Higher Education regarding it and already have received some very favorable comments.

As you may know, I have been actively interested in this bill, as 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? Aren't we or shouldn't we be concerned about equal education for all?" The answer to such an argument, I believe, is similar to that used to 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 because of the neglect 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 occupation. The U.S. Department of Labor's publication, "Occupational Outlook for College Graduates," is another glaring example and is a disservice to the counselor who must advise women about their career opportunities. APGA recently made a direct request to the publishers of the Strong Vocational Interest Test that its norms for women in professional occupations be examined, revised, and amplified. It is to this kind of need that the Women's Educational 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 my personal opinion as a member 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 extremely favorable and I commend you for your recognition of the needs in this area and for your creative response to them. If possible, please send me 15 additional copies of this bill for distribution to other concerned people.

Dr. Anita Martin, Legislative Chairman of AEA/USA, sent me a copy of her letter to you which included her comments on the bill. I support her suggestions and comments.

I have also been in touch with Mrs. Joy R. Simonson of Washington, D.C., new president of the Interstate Association of Commissions on the Status of Women, suggesting that the IACSW support the bill if possible.

Congratulations on your leadership in many legislative matters, but particularly in behalf of women. It was a pleasure to meet the Vice Chairman of the Hawaii Commission on the Status of Women, Mrs. Saunders, at the second annual conference of the Interstate Association in Minneapolis last month. Best wishes to you for continued leadership and for success with H.R. 14451.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. BETTY J. DURDEN,
Director, Women's Programs and Chairman, Iowa Governor's Commission on the Status of Women.

THE COLLEGE OF GENERAL STUDIES,
CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Please pardon my delay in replying to your letter regarding HR 14451, Women's Education Act of 1972. Our staff of Continuing Education for Women applauds your efforts on behalf of women.

You are absolutely correct when you claim that ERA will provide women with the right to acquire benefits of our society but that they need the education 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 a reality, not only will each 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 of Continuing Education for Women. Of this group, 2,500 completed Developing New Horizons for Women, a group guidance and counseling course. Their aptitude tests indicate outstanding ability. Of this group, 42% (or more than 1,000 women) have ability to achieve beyond 4 years of college. (Only 16% of the general population has this ability!) Yet only one-half of this group of New Horizons students had completed 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 ERA, opportunities for education, and greater awareness of cultural blocks that inhibit developing potential of women.

Without the benefit of foundation or federal funds, our program has made quite a "dent" because women attending our classes go to all parts of the United States, as well as many foreign countries. If funds become available for women's education, it would greatly aid other pioneering efforts springing up all over the country as well as our program. During the past 4 years, we have had requests for assistance from more than 300 colleges.

My only recommendation would be for Section 6. I would suggest that grants be made to colleges and universities rather than the broad classification of "public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and other institutions." Other agencies could work in cooperation with colleges and universities. If the bill were passed as written in Section 6, I foresee that the efforts of colleges and universities which have spearheaded women's education programs will become diluted rather than strengthened. Professional and ethical leadership is needed rather than scrambling for the money!

I would like to have the opportunity to discuss my ideas with you at your convenience any time after August 7th when I return from vacation.

Sincerely,

RUTH H. OSBORN,
Assistant Dean College of General Studies for Continuing Education for Women.

YALE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COEDUCATION,
New Haven, Conn., July 18, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. 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 level, I am acutely 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 Educational Programs. Could you include provision for consultation with appropriate women's groups in the appointment of the Council by the President? Since individuals interpret the needs of women so differently, it is essential to assure that members of such a Council have a real commitment to providing equal opportunities for men and women.

The activities 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 reports which I have written and 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 into "women."

On the same page, lines 7–9, could the phrase "concerning women at all levels of education" be clarified so that it would not be construed to imply support for any program "concerning women," but rather support for programs designed specifically to meet needs of women. My concern here is that educational institutions should not be able to appropriate funds provided through this bill for the support of existing programs, simply because women benefit from these programs. This concern also applies to page 4, line 23, which should perhaps read "which are related to educational programs specifically designed for women."

On page 4, line 3ff, the Bill states that "the Council shall advise the Commissioner and the Secretary concerning the administration of, preparation of, general regulations for, and operations of programs assisted under this Act." Page 4, section 4, line 20, reads "The Council shall be responsible for administration of the programs authorized by this Act and the coordination of activities within the federal government which are related to women's educational programs." It is not clear to me whether the Council shall have primarily an advisory role vis á vis the Commissioner and the Secretary, or whether the Council will itself administer the programs. If both functions are anticipated, perhaps this could be made explicit.

On page 10, Section 8, should a provision be included that payment for services obtained from private agencies or institutions be authorized only if the agencies or institutions involved are non-discriminatory, analogous to page 8, line 107.

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:

Jacqueline Mattfeld, Dean of Academic Affairs, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

Patricia Graham, Professor, Department of History, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Lenore Waitman, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of California, Davis, Calif.

I assume that you are in touch with Bernice Sandler and Alice Rossi.

Sincerely yours,

ELGA WASSERMAN,
Special Assistant to the President.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 9, 1972.

Representative PATSY 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 you introduced, to award grants and contracts for special education programs and activities for women.

Would you please send me a copy of the bill and keep me advised of its progress. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MARILYN S. SWARTZ,
Community Planner.

FERRIS & CO., INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 15, 1972.

Hon. PATSY 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 School have been slow, but currently we are making progress and we hope it will continue.

My enthusiasm for your project is such that I would be quite willing, if my experience would be helpful, to serve as a volunteer on the Commission you are proposing. In this connection, I would be happy to hear 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 WALSH,
Senior Vice President.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.,
September 11, 1972.

Hon. PATSY 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, both overt and subtle. At 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.

Enclosed 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,

LUCILLE H. SHRIVER,
Federation Director.

BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL,
Baltimore, Md., July 14, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: I want to congratulate you and let you know of my support of the

bill you introduced, H.R. 14451, that deals with a national education act for women. I am trying to deal with sexism in my local public school district. Your work has been a source of great help.

If your bill does pass the House of Representatives, it would offer great help to cities such as mine. I would like to work with you in actively supporting the bill and could enlist the support of many women from my district who are working on this very issue.

Therefore, I would like to have a copy of the bill itself and I would like to know when hearings will be held. I think that we can, from our own experience working a local school district, provide you with facts and not rhetoric and perhaps be effective with our own Maryland delegation.

To those of us who are women on local political levels, it is a source of inspiration and support to have women like you on the national level.

Please be assured of my support. If I can be of any help to you on any issue of helping advance the cause of women and ethnic groups, do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

BARBARA A. MIKULSKI.

TUCSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Tucson, Ariz., June 14, 1972.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of H.R. 11451. I am so pleased to see that you acted so promptly and wish you success at the same time as I offer you my support for H.R. 11451.

I will write to my Representative and my very good friend, Senator Fannin.

Please let me know what else I can do. My mind immediately started working on some much needed work shops in the Tucson area. These are young mothers from minority groups that need some help so that they in turn can see how they too can contribute to our society.

I am very interested on the council, once it is established. I would like to serve as a member. Then your ideas can be expressed and they have some meaning. Please keep me informed.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROSITA COTA,
Coordinator Bilingual/Multicultural Project.

JACKSON STATE COLLEGE,
Jackson, Miss., July 8, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: From the July 4, 1972 issue of the Newsletter of the National Coalition of American Nuns I have learned about your introducing Bill HR 14451—the Women's Education Act of 1973.

Our NCAN Declaration of Independence stands proudly beside 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 that you do to establish the National Council on Women's Education programs. A few of us on the NCAN board are college professors who would be willing to serve on the Council.

I am proud to share with you a note that will warm the cockles 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 post.

I do hope that from the Director—Sister Margaret Ellen Traxler—of NCAN you are on our mailing and receiving our news release!

Keep up the good work! We need women like you!

Sincerely,

CLARA L. GRECHOWSKA, Ph. D.,
Professor of MF Language.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1972.

DEAR MS. MINK: I am delighted at your willingness to sponsor our Women's Education bill. I think it will be a good step forward.

For some time I have been interested in the education of women and the availability of library and school materials which give a realistic image of modern women. The enclosed speech gives some of the ideas and I keep collecting information. The most interesting recently is the amounts of taxpayers money spent on sports for boys in the public schools and that for girls. In Minneapolis we spend more to equip one high school's football team than we spend for all the high schools for all girls sports and physical education. I am sure that is almost typical.

If I can help on this in any way, I'll be pleased to do it. I'm president of our local Women's Equity Action League and vice-president nationally. Education is our main objective—or one of four main objectives: education, employment, legislation and taxation.

Again, thanks.

Cordially,

ARVONNE S. FRASER,
Volunteer Staff Assistant.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: The National Women's Political Caucus' Policy Council appreciates your sponsorship of the Women's Education Act of 1973. A bill focusing attention on the special educational needs of women is long overdue. In a broad sense the bill provides still another issue around which women can rally and it is a possible goal for organization and political action.

As you can see in the enclosed material, the Women's Education Act has been included in our proposed Women's Plank for both national party platforms. Women's education and issues of particular concern to women are being raised by our members throughout the country in regional platform hearings. With our testimony we hope to center national attention on those aspects of political reform which are especially important to women.

Thank you for continuing to raise women's issues, not only on the floor of the House, but also as a presidential candidate in Oregon.

Sincerely,

DORIS MEISSNER,
Director.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN,
Evansville, Ill., May 21, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I was most pleased to receive your letter and the copy of your bill, HR 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

I am very favorably impressed with the legislation. It is certainly vitally needed and should do much to help eliminate the effects of sex-stereotyping and discrimination. I will support its passage with enthusiasm and encourage others to do the same.

If you have not already contacted the following women, may I suggest that you send copies of the bill to them?

Dr. Ann Scott, NOW Vice President for Legislation, 50 Willowbrook, Williamsville, New York.

Wilma Scott Heide, President NOW, 96 Irene Drive, Vernon, Conn.

Gaye Crouch, NOW Universtiy Compliance Coordinator, 1531 Packard Ave. #102, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Anne Grant West, NOW Education Coordinator, 453 Seventh St., Brooklyn, New York.

Shirley Roberts, President NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund, P.O. Box 3081, Baton Rouge, La.

With best wishes for success in your efforts, I am

Respectfully yours,

MARY LYNN MYERS,
Compliance and Enforcement Coordinator.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N.Y., June 5, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PATSY: Thank you for sending me a copy of your proposed education 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 would probably allow funding for such programs, the establishment of these centers is essential to the education of women about women.

If we can be of any assistance in getting the bill passed by Congress please let us know.

Sincerely,

BRENDA FEIGEN FASTEAU.

WASHINGTON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
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, will 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 deserving the support of everyone who cares about equality of opportunity in this society.

Sincerely,

JANE P. 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 perhaps, now, through your determination, we will get it. If I can help expedite passage in any way, please let me know.

AUDREY C. COHEN,
President, College for Human Services.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
June 2, 1972.

Representative PATSY T. 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 felt, in my opinion, and there may be difficulties in communicating the extent to which the acculturation process has deprived women of the means to realize their full potential. Therefore, testimony by articulate experts, which I hope will receive wide publicity, is essential in my view. One such expert who comes to mind is Matina

Horner who described women's "will to * * *" so vividly. I believe other experts such as Margaret Hennig of Simmons College, who studied women executives, might also have valuable input. Another aspect which might be explored is the phenomenon of women who have worked in their homes for several years who wish to return to the labor force, but lack confidence and any "experience" cognizable by the business community.

I am sure Dr. Bernice Sandler will have more suggestions on this score, as well as being an excellent witness herself.

With kindest regards and deep appreciation for your efforts on behalf of all women, I am

Yours sincerely,

SYLVIA ROBERTS,
Attorney at Law.

RENO, NEVADA,
August 3, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: As a representative of the Nevada Women's Political Caucus, I am responding to your letter to Ms. Marjorie Da Costa, Co-Chairman, Governor's Commission on the Status of Women.

We of the Nevada Womens' Political Caucus find your proposed Bill very encouraging and of paramount importance to the advancement of women. One of the major obstacles to the self-realization and professional advancement of women in general is certainly the interruption of education at an early and crucial time of life.

Everyone with whom I have discussed this bill has viewed it very favorably. There are a couple of constructive suggestions by President Millicent C. McIntosh of Barnard College, which I would like to add. They are perhaps worthy of consideration in building into a Bill on womens' education a flexibility to assist women returning to school. She says: "Colleges should accept credits from students moving from one community to another. They should be more hospitable to transfers, making it easier to complete degree requirements after long separation from school." She also proposes providing individuals with postgraduate work in off-campus suburban areas.

The Nevada Womens' Political Caucus would like to thank you for your efforts in behalf of all women, and we will be happy to support them in any way we can.

Sincerely,

BETTE C. GROTEGUT.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your innovative legislation. I am particularly interested in the approach you have taken because it has been my impression that we must institutionalize the questions relating to women's role in this society. No amount of pious disclaimers by the educators of this country will bring us to grips with the profound prejudice against women as thinkers and decision makers.

A Bill such as yours will serve the purpose of directing specifically and by law the attention of the academic community to the urgent necessity for examining the entire educational process as it systematically castrates women intellectually and emotionally. It is clear to me that the most important question this country in particular must answer is: Why do we have more women in college than any other country in the history of the world and an appallingly low percentage of women achievers and professionals. Why don't our American women reach for the stars? Your Bill will go far to elucidating the subtle but terrible destructions of motivation that occurs as a girl grows up.

The National Science Foundation has a study that shows that if one examines the top 10% of all high school seniors in this country it can be shown that of those who do not go on to college, 98% are females. God knows how much genius is wasted just in this pool of brains every year. Furthermore, these statistics haven't changed since 1954 when the first such study was made. I often think that if we had not systematically excluded the development of virtually all female genius in the world we might now have a cure for cancer. After all, genius is a rare and unpredictable quality in males or females and we have made it impossible for it to be identified in almost 52% 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 RAINEY.

SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS,
Baton Rouge, La., July 6, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress, Second District, Hawaii, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: I commend you for your interest and your work for the rights of women to acquire education, specifically bill H.R. 14451, the Womens' Education Act of 1972. I am in support of this bill and 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 women; holding conferences, institutes, workshops, and seminars for assisting women to achieve equality of education in order for them to compete for jobs in the market place.

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 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.

Please send information to the following names of interested people at this address: Louisiana State University, School of Home Economics, Baton Rouge, La. 70843:

Dr. Carol L. Engebretson, Professor.
Dr. Harvye Lewis, Professor.
Dr. Eleanor Kelley, Professor.
Dr. Marian Jernigan, Associate Professor.
Mrs. Dee Wellan, Assistant Professor.
Mrs. Ruth Sylvest, Associate Professor.

Thank you for your letter and information.

Very truly yours,

THELMA H. LEONARD, Ed. D.,
Professor and Acting Director.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., August 1, 1972.

Representative PATSY MINK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: I am very much interested in the bill which you have introduced authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to develop non-sexist textbooks, nondiscriminatory vocational education, 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 women trade union leaders and staff in the New York City area, and 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.

Thank you so much, and best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,

BARBARA WERTHEIMER,
Labor Program Specialist.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Little Rock, Ark., June 26, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: First let me commend you for your acumen 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 aware of their potential as useful and productive members of society. My major concern is not finding some indication that would insure all states an opportunity to participate. It is recognized that open applications can be made; however, it may hinder states who need financial help and are not organized yet to marshal the forces needed for writing proposals and/or making application for funds.

It is feasible to include provisions for a secretariat or similar position at the state level who would assume responsibility of statewide coordination of activities related to this legislation.

On behalf of other concerned women in Arkansas, let me say again how much we appreciate what you are doing to help women achieve a recognized status of equality.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. PEGGY PATRICK,
Program Analyst.

SLIPPERY ROCK STATE COLLEGE,
Slippery Rock, Pa., July 24, 1972.

Representative PATSY MINK,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: I would greatly appreciate a copy of the bill you recently introduced, H.R. 14451, Women's Education Act.

My husband and I have been engaged in the study of sexism in textbooks for the past several years and are very pleased to know of your concern in this area. I am including some of the reports we have prepared which may be of interest to you. You may be interested also in knowing that the Pa. Dept. of Education has recently issued a report on sexism in education, the result of a year's study of the entire Commonwealth educational system: kindergarten through graduate school. The Sec'y of Education has accepted the findings and implementation plans of the study group and has recently issued a directive to the school supervisors and administrators to that effect.

I would be grateful if you would suggest ways in which individuals and women's groups could assist you and render support of your bill. I wonder, also, what kind of opposition you anticipate or have, perhaps, already encountered.

Finally, let me commend you on the fine work you are doing in behalf of women and men of the United States.

Sincerely,

DOLORES BARRACANO SCHMIDT.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Atlanta, Ga., August 17, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
301 Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. 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.

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 provide intention of continued support when Federal funds are no longer forthcoming. I have been increasingly distressed with the evidence or response to the profit-motive rather than the people-motive.

This summer I was fortunate enough to be chosen as a participant in one of the H.E.W. workshops in Higher Education and had the opportunity to meet Mrs. Fraser and Mrs. Sandler who spoke of your bill. I promise to solicit support for the bill as I carry out my responsibilities as program chairman for the A.P.G.A. regional convention to be held here in May of 1973. If there is any other way we can support your bill please let me know.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN D. CROUCH, Ed.D.,
Assistant Director, Counseling Center.

EDUCATION STUDY CENTER,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. 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 Bill, your 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 to me that such a provision would discriminate against women, who for reasons such as discrimination in the recent past, formed their own groups to pursue their activities. Let us consider the case of women proposing to examine their own institutions with respect to, say, the training of women for administrative positions. It appears as if section *f* would prohibit the women from incorporating themselves as a private non-profit corporation and pursuing the project independently were the original organization to turn down their proposal. I am wondering, therefore, whether Provision *f* needs to be a mandatory requirement of your Bill.

Sincerely yours,

JOAN C. BARATZ,
Project Director.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-
KANSAS CITY,
Kansas City, June 5, 1972.

PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress, 346–348 Federal Building, Honolulu, Hawaii

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Thank you for your consideration in sending us a copy of your HR 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

Your bill reflects many of the concerns in women's education in which we have been involved. It appears that you have a very thorough and sound approach which hits some of the real issues, e.g. sensitizing pertinent education personnel to women's needs, establishing women's resource centers, and implementing community education programs. Delegating administrative control at the federal level seems particularly beneficial for the accomplishment of the objectives of the Council on Women's Higher Education.

The Continuing Education for Women programs at the University of Missouri-Kansas City has already recognized some of the needs mentioned in your proposals. We have recently established a Women's Resource Service on a modest pilot basis which is described in the enclosed brochures, as are some of our community education efforts.

We certainly hope that there will be positive action taken on your bill and that you will keep us informed of its progress. If there is anything we can do to help you in this area, please let me know.

Best regards,

JANE BERRY, *Assistant Dean.*

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY,
Dallas, Tex., June 8, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for introducing the Bill of Rights for Women's Education. I refer, of course, to H.R. 14451.

The provisions of the bill seem to me to be very well thought out, and I am confident that you have anticipated every means of making it more nearly possible for all women to have the advantage of education. For instance, child care (differentiated from *day* care) can be the factor that decides for many women, and of course the right kind of program for children can be the best thing that could happen to them.

My dear friend and tireless worker for the advancement of women, Mrs. Margaret Brand Smith, who is Chairman of the Texas Governor's Commission of Status of Women, asked my opinion of your bill. With zeal, I could say, "It's great Let's help her get it passed."

We 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. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: We are extremely enthusiatic about your bill and delighted that you have put into it the ingredients necessary to provide equality in and through education for women of this country. If you wish any supporting material to document your proposals, we will be pleased to provide as much as we have. Since 1966 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 for Adults. Although we have served approximately 10,000 women, it is only a small dent in our Los Angeles community. Our restraints have included 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 resources 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 woman. Also, by having the child care centers properly staffed it would be possible to create an environment for both boys and girls to explore talents unrelated to 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 address and telephone numbers where member lists are available are:

National University Extension Association, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 659–3200.

Adult Education Association, 810 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 347–9574.

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 distribtion" 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 LORING,
Director, Department of Daytime Programs and Special Projects.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I heartily approve of H.R. 14451. However, I do have my special pleading to add. I should like specific reference made to encouraging women to succeed in fields typically for men, e.g. math and science. Perhaps such an emphasis can be accomplished by the choice of Commissioners. I should be willing to testify on this point when hearings are held.

Very truly yours,

MARY W. GRAY,
Professor of Mathematics, Chairman, Association for Women in Mathematics.

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Atlanta, Ga., May 8, 1972.

Hon. PASTSY MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: We noted with great interest a recent summary pertaining to your bill H.R. 14451 regarding special education programs and activities for women.

Within the last few years, we at Georgia Tech have placed particular emphasis on programs which would enhance the status of various minority groups. We are pleased to note our success in enhancing the status of women as shown on the attached press release describing our being 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 insure that this aspect of education for women is given proper attention, should your bill be passed.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT P. SHEPPARD,
Associate Dean of Engineering.

UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND,
Tacoma, Wash., May 2, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon 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, relating to the making of grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning women and for other related educational purposes.

I am particularly interested in your Resolution inasmuch as we have recently designed such a program which is now funded by the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is titled Project Upward Mobility, and is conceived to provide for twenty women, ten in each of 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 some time in offices of institutions of higher education located in Region X, and in the Region X office which is located in Seattle.

In order that you may know more about this Project, I am enclosing a copy of the abstract of the proposal. If I can supply other information to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST J. DEROCHER,
Director.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO,
Reno, Nev., May 10, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
U.S. Representative from Hawaii, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: I am most interested in receiving a copy of the Women's Education Act, H.R. 14451, which you have introduced. Will you please inform me as to where I might obtain such a copy.

At the recent meeting of the section on Continuing Education for Women, National University Extension Association in Columbia, South Carolina, I heard about this legislation and the possibility of your being there to discuss the matter with those present. Unfortunately no one with whom I talked had the specific information I would like.

Best wishes and much appreciation to you in your endeavor to assist women in becoming fully-functioning individuals in a fully-fuctioning society.

Sincerely yours,

Miss GRACE M. DONEHOWER,
Assistant Dean.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
EXTENSION ASSOCIATION,
September 15, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK
Member of Congress, 301 Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: Thank you very much for your letter of September 9 and the copy of your bill H.R. 14451. On behalf of the National University Extension Association and its Board of Directors, may I express our thanks and appreciation for your interest and concern in this critical area of educational need; and we will be most happy to work with you in whatever way we can in the fulfillment of your objectives.

I am asking Dr. Robert Pitchell, Executive Director of the NUEA, to respond to you directly in connection with your Bill, and to organize a selected task force of Association members which can respond substantively to its purpose and provisions. We will make every effort to respond in advance of scheduled hearings, in accordance with your request.

Again, our thanks. We will be most happy to do our best to be of whatever help and assistance we can.

Sincerely yours,

ARMAND L. HUNTER,
President of NUEA.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
Des Moines, Iowa, August 30, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. MINK: Thank you for your letter of August 10, which arrived while I was on a short vacation. I have read with interest, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

I think you have done an outstanding job in putting this piece of legislation together. From a perspective of continuing education for women, I can find nothing wrong with the various provisions of the bill. I think it will be hailed in continuing education circles as an excellent step.

I have one serious concern, however, that has to do with the level of funding proposed for the first year. I am concerned that this amount is grossly inadequate to accomplish very much in terms of all the good intentions listed throughout the bill.

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, only small projects were fundable in many locations. (Iowa's total was $168,000.) It is obvious that even four (three state and one private) universities cannot do much in a state with this amount of money in terms of solving problems or educating tinuing education for women:

As hot 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 $20 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 variously engaged in continuing education for women.

Dr. Ray J. Ast, President, Coalition of Adult Education Organizations, Adult Continuing Education Center, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043.

Dr. Alfred W. Storey, President, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., Director, Extension Service, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Dr. Armand L. Hunter, President, National University Extension Association, Continuing Education Service, Michigan State, University, 114 Kellogg Center, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

Dr. Howell W. McGee, Executive Secretary, Association of University Evening Colleges, 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.

DEAR MS. MINK: 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 was almost no federal 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.) MARGE 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. On first reading, I was terribly enthusiastic and decided that I had no criticisms or suggestions. On second reading, I find that I do have some, although I'm not sure that they can be implemented. Basically, my concern is that the power implied in this bill seems to reside in a male dominated system. For instance, in Section 3A, the Council is appointed by the President, in section 3E, the Council is to advise the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to make recommendations to them, in Section 4B, the real power to make grants and contracts rests with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 deal specifically with the powers and duties of the Secretary of the HEW and the Commissioner of Education. I feel that the Bill should contain some checks which will ensure that the President will not stack the Council with extremely conservative, traditional women, and that the Commissioner and the Secretary rely heavily on women consultants in making administrative decisions regarding the use of these funds. Otherwise, the net result of your bill could be to promote innovative programs in "women's education," i.e., secretarial, paramedical and education. The funds could be warmed to the same professional grantsman that command a large proportion of the existing funds for education.

Please keep me informed as to the progress of your bill. Let me know when it is time to write my Congressman to support it.

Sincerely,

LENORE W. HARMON, Ph. D.,
Director and Adviser to the Chancellor on the Status of Women at UMW.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Tempe, Ariz., May 26, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Mrs. Jane Greenwald, Chairman, Arizona Governor's Commission has referred your letter to me as Chairman of the Commission Committee on Education and Counseling and as the person, perhaps, most involved in seminars, colloquia, and the coordination of efforts to achieve equality of educational and counseling opportunities for women at Arizona State University.

I have just been studying your very excellent bill, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972, and certainly wish to do everything in my power to support it and enlist the assistance of others in this effort. Of course, you are all too aware, I am sure, of the problems we have in this state as a result of both of our senators opposing the ratification of ERA. Largely as a result of their stance, a press which published primarily letters opposed to passage, and the fears of the uninformed, our efforts failed and the legislature adjourned without ever bringing the bill out of committee. It is just possible, however, that your bill may not be so threatening to some of those who opposed ERA. I would certainly hope so.

If you have specific suggestions as to whom we might write and reasons legislators might find acceptable in support of the bill, please let me know. Additional copies could be used to advantage, not only with our Counseling Department and the Governor's Commission, but with the AAUW, Delta Kappa Gamma, AWARE, the NAWDC, and numerous other organizations in which I am involved.

I have long admired your contributions to the Congress and your positions in various issues, and am delighted at the opportunity to tell you so.

I hope to hear further from you about the progress of the bill.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE G. NICHOLS,
Professor Department of Counselor Education.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS,
San Diego, Calif., May 4, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: 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 the struggle which women face in education.

At the present time I am director of the Career Opportunities Program in San Diego. This is a project (funded through EPDA Part D) for paraprofessionals working in the schools who are also attending college classes

leading to teacher certification. Seventy-two percent of the program participants are women, many of them mature and heads of households. It is most rewarding to see these women making progress toward their educational and professional goals.

I am confident that your bill will receive the necessary approval. Statistics are published daily which attest to the infinitesimal numbers of women in administration and university positions.

When the "Council on Women's Educational Programs" at the Office of Education becomes a reality, I would like to submit my name for consideration on the council. I realize that these appointments are of a political nature, but I feel that I have first-hand experience and could make a contribution to the council.

Sincerely yours,

MARY L. HEINKEL,
Supervisor, Career Opportunities Program.

GRAND RAPIDS 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 proposed Women's Education Act of 1972 (H.R. 14451). As a woman, a professional counseling psychologist, and a counseling staff member in a community junior college, I have been well 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-deflating 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 women colleagues and I are involved in approaching this educational problem at our own local educational level. We are researching needs which women at various age levels, backgrounds, and experiences 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. New kinds of scheduling are needed and length of course time must be flexible. In fact, new curriculums need to be established for women who seek training at the paraprofessional or professional level. A whole new philosophical approach is needed.

Counseling for women needs to be readily available for women of all ages for the programs and curriculums to be designed are not restricted or limited to "normal college age women" but to all women. Special techniques and special attention need to be given to these women relative to educational planning, career planning, and self-actualization of their human potentials, so that they may actively and fully participate in our American society. Supportive 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 in some ways the efforts of pioneers and we encounter the problems of lack of financial aids for female students, lack of funds to 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 of women in this community.

Provisions in your bill for training women's counselors and their educational personnel and for establishing women's 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 appointees 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 convention in St. Louis and have the privilege of hearing you speak.

In whatever way my training, knowledge, experience, and energy can be used, I offer these in the efforts to obtain equality for all women in American society.

I offer the name of my colleague, Mrs. Winifred Fox who is the other 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,

DR. MERRY ANN GREGORY.

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Memphis, Tenn., September 28, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY 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 AGPA *Guidepost*. I agree that our present education programs must be revamped to meet the needs of the emerging woman in her new role. As a counselor educator, I am particularly interested in courses 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 might serve as models for development of courses along these lines, please let me know.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

PAT H. MURRELL, Ed. D.,
Associate Professor of Education.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SPRINGFIELD,
Springfield, Mo., September 27, 1972.

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 the interest 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 placement, salaries and other rights. America, beset with myriads of knotty social problems can ill afford to ignore and depreciate the creative talents and abilities of a great segment of her society—women.

You may be surprised that I'm male (not a male chauvinist, however) interested in the rights of all Americans.

Should I ever be of assistance to you in your endeavors relating to women's rights, please let me know.

Yours respectfully,

J. TICS ROLLINS,
President, Missouri Personnel and Guidance Association.

APPLIED POTENTIAL,
Highland Park, Ill., September 25, 1972.

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 second career. Although most of our clients have a part or full-time professional career as their goal, many realize that their first step must be a return to school, to update their skills, or become trained in an entirely new field. There are often two major stumbling blocks—the financing and the scheduling. Many colleges and junior colleges have established Continuing Education Centers which permit more flexible scheduling. However, it is still very difficult for the mature woman to find a way to get outside funding for further education. I hope your legislation will have 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 help you bring public attention to the need for legislative action on behalf on the education needs of women.

Sincerely,

CAROLE A. WILK.

VILLA MARIA COLLEGE,
Erie, Pa., September 25, 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 woman.

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.

A bill such as you are 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. JOANN D. PAINTER,
Director of Guidance and Placement.

NEWARK STATE COLLEGE,
Union, N.J., July 20, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon Building,
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 receive 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 Opportunities 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 8) 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. Too 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. However, it seems to me that broad 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 3. (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 which might demand the supervision of a qualified professional, whose salary alone would use up the major portion of this sum.

Finally, I would like to thank you for proposing this bill. Would it be helpful to mention it in EVE's next newsletter, due to come out in early September, asking women from our mailing list of three thousand to write appropriate officials in support of this bill? If so, to whom would it be best for them to address their letters?

Best wishes for successful passage of H.R. 14451.

Sincerely,

BETSEY BROWN,
Director of EVE.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Trenton, N.J., July 19, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: I have read H.R. 14451 and would like to have you consider my reactions and suggestions.

The bill would contribute towards the enhancement of the status of women. However, in its attempt to provide broad authorization, the bill does not address one of the key elements in the enhancing of the status of women; namely, aggressive upward mobility for the already underemployed female clerical force. It might well be that this effort is implied in Section 2, 9(b) and it might be that appropriate regulations would promote such educational programs. However, I would prefer to see legislation which emphasizes training and educational programs for underemployed females. I bring this to your attention because at present most of the activity regarding the status of women focuses on the academic and/or the professional women. I think this is a mistake.

The bill as written is certainly clear and directive in recognizing the need for new and improved curriculums which aid 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,

CATHERINE HAVRILESKY,
Assistant Director, Division of Field Services.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA,
Huntsville, Ala., June 8, 1972.

Ms. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
U.S. House of Representatives,
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 legislature.

Sincerely yours,

REESE DANLEY KILGO, Ph.D.,
Director, Office of Student Affairs, Associate Professor of Education/Assistant Professor of Sociology.

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
Reno, Nev., June 1, 1972.

Hon. PATSY 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, too long has the United States penalized women and, in the process, overlooked the truly significant pool of human resources.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. WHITTEMORE,
Dean.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N.Y., May 25, 1972.

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 degress of education. Coincidentally, the New York State Board of Regents recently issued a position paper on the education of 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 Political Caucus, the National Organization for Women, the New York 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.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N.Y., May 26, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your proposed legislation HR 14451—the Women's Education Act of 1972.

I strongly concur with your observation that while the ERA will provide women with the rights to acquire society's benefits, it will not necessarily give them the means. Your proposed legislation is a dynamic and determined step toward practical implementation of the ERA.

The Women's Unit has long been aware of the great need for the development of comprehensive educational programs for women which would enable women to develop innate skills and talents in nontraditional women's fields such as law, medicine and the vocational sciences. We, thus, applaud your legislative proposal.

The question remains as to the most effective way of implementing the specifics of your legislation—the development of new and improved curriculum—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 its 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 Commissioner of Education.

I welcome the opportunity to add my thoughts to your extensive proposal. Be assured of my continued interest in HR 14451.

Sincerely,

EVELYN CUNNINGHAM,
Director, Women's Unit.

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN,
Little Rock, Ark., June 8, 1972.

Hon. PATSY 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 consider-

ing initiating such a program on a small, experimental scale—funds such as this Act would provide could be most useful here.

Since no Members of the Arkansas Congressional delegation 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 for 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. Her Commission and she personally have 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 sources of Arkansas' young women has surveyed high school students this spring (sample questionnaire attached.) Findings are now being tabulated and analyzed. I feel sure they will effectively document the amount of damage (i.e.—stereotyping and self-limitation) that has already occurred by the teen years. Would you like to have copies of the final report?

With appreciation for your leadership in this important area.

Sincerely yours,

DIANE KINCAID,
Chairman.

OHIO BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES,
Columbus, Ohio, June 13, 1972.

MS. PATSY MINK,
Member of the Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: Thank you for sending a copy of your bill, H.R. 14451, the Women's Education Act of 1972.

We have great need for assistance to women in achieving the educational tools needed to achieve equality of education in order to compete for jobs and other rights.

We will follow the progress of your bill with interest. It is through the efforts of persons such as you, that we are now beginning to move forward with women's rights and opportunities.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

EMILY L. LEEDY,
Director, Women's Services Division.

JUNE 30, 1972.

Hon. MRS. PATSY T. MINK,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. MINK: Congratulations to you for introducing H.R. 14451, the "Women's Education Act of 1972".

Thank you for furnishing me with a copy of the text of the Bill to which I have given careful consideration. I feel it is all inclusive and if adopted will help provide women with the educational tools they need to acquire the benefits of our change in society toward women.

When receiving information such as you provided me with, I cannot help but feel how fortunate we are to have women such as you representing us on the Hill.

May I suggest to you, if you have not already done so, that you contact Mrs. Lucille Shriver, Director, of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women in Washington, with a request that she provide you with the names and addresses of the Presidents of the 53 Federations, 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. If this is possible through the State Magazines the information could filter down to 170,000 members. I feel certain the list will be made available to you as the National Business WOMAN, the Federation's Magazine is subscribed to by individuals, libraries, etc.

It has been a real privilege for me as a Past State President of the New Jersey Federation to meet many women from your State and Mary Ellen Swanton in particular with whom I worked with on elections at National Convention.

Sincerely,

MRS. MILDRED MCLEAN,
Chairman, New Jersey State Commission on Women.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: As a newly appointed commissioner on the Maryland Commission for the Status of Women, may I commend you on drafting and introducing the Women's Education Act of 1972, H.R. 14451.

I am most interested in knowing about the present status of the bill, its chances for passage and what I can do individually and what the Maryland Commission on the Status of Women can do to help pass this bill.

I am personally interested in *textbook bias toward women* and the *pro-ratalist position* that most grade school readers and even high school family living courses project.

It's my hope that the bill would support research into studying sex stereotyping and pro-ratalist bias in public school text, in addition to supporting efforts to change this slant. However, unless people know the extent of the problem, there will not be adequate action taken to change by local school boards.

Sincerely,

NANCY COX.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., August 25, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you so much for your letter of August 10 in which you ask me to comment on H.R. 14451 which was sent to me by Mrs. Betty J. Durden. I feel that this bill has a great deal of merit and would do much to give women greater equality of opportunity. Education is certainly a central factor in achieving such a goal.

Although the proposed legislation would not prohibit participation by men, the main thrust is obviously to give special attention to the problem of women. A criticism might be that women should simply participate on an equal basis with men in furthering their educational goal without special legislation. In other words, there ought not to be any discrimination against women in this respect, but at the same time, there should be no "reverse" discrimination. This sort of criticism seems to me to be invalid at this point of time. Women have not been given equality of opportunity in the past and there is little to indicate that they have achieved it in the present. This legislation would help give women true equality in our society. After this has been achieved, such a bill would no longer be necessary.

As Chairman of the Great Plains States Regional Manpower Advisory Committee (Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas), I recently summarized the recommendations of my ten member committee on the status of women. These recommendations are found on pages four and five of the attached report.

As a person who is vitally interested in the future of Micronesia, I would like to thank you for the strong support you have given to this part of the world in legislation affecting them. I can assure you that they are most appreciative of your efforts. Your name is a household word throughout all of Micronesia.

Please let me know if I can help you in any way.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. ALBERS,
Chairman and Professor.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., August 24, 1972.

Representative PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: The bill you recently authored, HR 14451, authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning women, and for other related educational purposes is a very significant contribution to the woman'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, progress has been slow; expenditure of energy has been great. Resistance to equal rights is deeply rooted, compliance to the latest decrees from Washington have been token at best.

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 as an overload. This situation places faculty women at a disadvantage when their academic performance is compared to their male colleagues who are concentrating more on writing and researching—the reward criteria used at most universities to determine promotion and salary level.

Your proposed bill, HR 14451, will 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.

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.

Letters encouraging support of your bill will be sent to Senators Birch Bayh and Vance Hartke and to Representatives John Myers and John Brademas.

I am looking forward to receiving information of the progress of HR 14451.

Sincerely yours,

JESSIE LOVANO-KERR,
Associate Professor.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
De Kalb, Ill., September 29, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MINK: The membership of Academic Women for Equality (A.W.E.) of Northern Illinois University is appreciative

of your thoughtfulness in sending a copy of your bill, H.R. 14451, to us for examination. We applaud your initiative in constructing and introducing this important and necessary bill to Congress. Our members who have read and examined the bill support its spirit, objectives, and structure and agree that the bill on the whole effectively outlines action for its implementation.

We would, however, like to make a few suggestions in regard to the make-up of the council (Section 3, parts a and b) that is to direct the operations. We feel it desirable that the areas of representation be defined more specifically and concretely, with attention given, of course, 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 industry and hope that the bill receives immediate passage and quick implementation.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR P. GODFREY,
Chairwoman.

COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 5, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of 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 curriculums.

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 against women has been most prevalent, such as law and medical schools.

The Commission strongly supports this legislation as an essential step toward implementing the principles embodied in the Equal Rights Amendment. If we can be of help in moving the bill along, please advise when action on our part will be most beneficial.

Sincerely yours,

ARLINE LOTMAN,
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
Princeton, N.J., July 12, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: I am writing in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession of the Organization of American Historians. I was very glad to receive a copy of your bill, H.R. 14451, and have shared its contents with my committee. We want you to know of our enthusiastic support for the proposed Women's Education Act of 1972.

Our committee is concerned primarily with the furthering of research and teaching in the field of women's history. We feel very strongly that it is important to begin exploring this long-neglected part of our past in order to give men and women of all ages 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 women slights a large part of our population, to be sure; but it also means that we neglect large segments of our history—for instance, the history of the family, or of voluntary organizations—that we would do well to understand. It is also true, as you point out, that educational programs in the area of women's history will be an important influence in enhancing the contemporary status of women in the United States. The measures you suggest in 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 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 all those currently working in women's history would be the Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical profession. You might send a copy of your bill to the CCWHP's chairman, Professor Sandi Cooper, Richmond College—CUNY, Staten Island, New York 10301. In addition, the Rockefeller Foundation recently sponsored a small research/planning conference in women's history. The person in charge was Mr. Peter H. Wood, an assistant director at Rockefeller 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 A 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.

If I can be of any immediate assistance, you can reach me at the above address in Washington (phone: 363-0224) until about September 1, after which I will be back in Princeton.

Yours sincerely,

NANCY WEISS,
Assistant Professor of History.

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
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 and I would like to have a copy of it.

My work as an Equal Employment Officer at this University makes me concerned with the efforts on women of inequities in their education, and with the continued unequal treatment of male and female at all levels of education.

If your office has other related material for distribution, in addition to a copy of your bill, I would appreciate receiving them.

In my limited way I am supporting efforts on behalf of passage of your bill.

Sincerely,

HELEN BATCHELOR, Ph.D.,
Coordinator.

MONTCLAIR STATE COLLEGE,
June 6, 1972.

Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Second District, Hawaii,
Cannon Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for sharing with me the copy of H.R. 14451.

In the interest of sharing with you our concerns for equality of education for women, we are endeavoring to assemble reactions, 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 leter, 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." Undoubtedly you will hear from them in the very near future.

As the President Elect of the Coalition of Adult Education Organizations representing 15 national professional associations, the substance of your letter will be shared with the members of the Board of Directors at their meeting on June 15-16 for the purpose of acquainting the national associations with this women's education effort.

Looking forward to whatever assistance we can render to your efforts. Thank you for your interest and support in this much needed effort for women in our society.

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 recently to the Congress. The thoughts I am presenting are the results of several years of experience in teaching and also my recent contacts with the employment area as chairman of the Louisiana Commission on the Status of Women.

Are we in 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 professional and technical areas that may demand supplementary training for men and women. However, the scientific and technical areas in 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 urgent and demands studies in depth and the results made available for practices and application at an early date. The system of experience statewide Federal control and State development seem to offer a partial answer to experience and research in the

areas of behavioral science including psychology, sociology, human development, and cultural anthropology.

Another need many educators have pointed out is certain centers designated for research and assessed the responsibility of experimenting and studying applications out of effective learning procedures both informal and formal. Crying need and means of evaluating and testing techniques in making recommendations to those in the education field for the use of results and application for the improvement of learning situations.

One question which has arisen many times in the education field is grouping children in the pre-school, elementary, and secondary education. The research that has been developed in the early years of a child's life points up the need for infant and toddler laboratories including parent education in these laboratories.

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 programs; should these community colleges be the chief source for continuing education of the American population.

Special study of education needs and training of administrators, counselors, and teachers of students who have special problems, we find in this area the need for teachers and administrators who understand the retarded and slow learners, children with special physical differences, such as hearing and speech programs, for the emotional health of 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 interests.

I shall continue my interest in the provisions of this Bill HR 14451 and will follow the program in the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. CLARA TUCKER,
Chairman, Commission on the Status of Women.

COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION,
State of Washington, June 6, 1972.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Thank you so much for sending me a copy of House of Representatives Bill No. 14451 concerning the 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 delegation 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 acceptance to such a bill. It seems to me with the fight for rather close federal funds and also state funds these days, that much of the minority concerns and women's concerns are given hearing, but no funds. We are very lucky in this State to have been given an appropriation plus an Executive Director and secretarial assistance for the Women's Council. I will do as you ask in your letter and see that this bill is circulated with the other members of the Washington State Women's Council and to other organizations such as NOW, the various women's commissions at the institutions of higher education, the women's political action group, and any others that come to mind.

The only specific comments that I have regarding the bill have to do with the relationship to the Commissioner for actual distribution of funds. I sometimes feel that 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 women's educational programs would hardly be a drop in the bucket even though I know they are supplementary to other funds that would be appropriated through the Commissioner. $15,000 would certainly be a help to many groups, however it should be increased if possible.

One other little comment that is just picayune, but something which has received great attention in our State, is that we attempt to use a more neutral term than chair*man* 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,
Manchester, N.H., May 5, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINK: Notre Dame College, a four-year liberal arts college for women, is in full support of H.R. 14451 which you introduced. Legislation such as H.R. 14451 will assist those progressive women's colleges similar to Notre Dame to develop programs which will fully explore and implement innovative educational opportunities for women.

We gratefully encourage and support your efforts.

Sincerely,

JEANNETTE VEZEAU, CSC,
President.

DEAR MS. 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 worthwhile effort.

Respectfully,

JESSIE BERNARD.

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY,
Denton, Tex., March 21, 1972.

Hon. PATSY MINK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. 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 professor at Texas Woman's University in Denton, Texas, and have recently been appointed to an ad hoc committee to "study the feasibility" of Women's Studies programs for our school.

It would seem that Texas Woman's University, as the largest woman's university, would be a leader in such programs, but, unfortunately, the opposite is true. The students have begun 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 contemporary issues and speakers that I teach and a professor in the Sociology Department has done similarly, but no entire courses in Women's Studies have been accepted by the Curriculum Committee.

I would greatly appreciate your aid in getting a few courses in Women's Studies established 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. I would also appreciate any related suggestions for 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 MS. MINK: I appreciate your asking my opinion of your bill because it is a measure I consider long overdue. I have felt for some time a need for 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 the double bind of alimony becoming obsolete 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 ideas such as yours and who may be in a position to offer support.

Sincerely,

MS. ELLIE GOODWIN,
Director, Communications Skills Institute.

HON. PAGE BELCHER

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous 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—yea, even the obligation—to labor well nigh a quarter of a century tete-a-tete with the incredible, peerless, formidable, lovable, cantankerous Congressman PAGE BELCHER 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 counter 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 doctrine have I survived to be here this evening, joining in tribute to one who has become a pillar in Congress, one 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 probably 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 ways to get along 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 before which lesser men would have quailed. Why, PAGE, even Ezra Taft Benson at the zenith of his imperturbable inflexibility never once even approximated your doggedness, your tenacity, your 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 come to be viewed as dogmatic, 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 was coming just a bit close 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 went cheerily careening down the highway of his 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 because 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 lucky as to have worked with this gifted man, that his motives always have been gold undefiled. 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, an able man, a driving man—but, oh, such a good man—that is our PAGE.

I, for one, am so mightily proud to have been able to work with him on 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.

I guess one of the most enjoyable parts of what I am saying to you is to convey my understanding that he has decided to remain in these environs in which he has been so dominant and so constructive and so admired for so long. I frankly say Washington would be a far lesser place if he and Gladys should leave, and thank God they are staying, for their counsel, judgment and friendship will continue to be sorely needed by us all.

Let me close off with a sidebar comment—Gladys.

I have talked of PAGE being so big and so rough and tough, but, friends, everyone of us has seen him hunker down like the proverbial dog in the hailstorm when Gladys, irresistible Gladys, has turned and said, "Now PAGE." So in saluting you, PAGE, we know full well we are saluting as well your wonderful lady, who I have reason to believe has been your anchor as well as your rudder, and I rather suspect also your engine, all of these years.

I suppose I am the right one to say one thing more, in light of the way this program has shaped out—a simple parting thought.

May the sun be in your face, may the winds be to your back, may all your breezes be fair and balmy, and may the Lord's hand be on your shoulder as you move down the street a piece but carry forward your devotion to this greatest country on earth.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 92D CONGRESS

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, once more it is time to express gratitude to many colleagues in this House and to take an accounting of what we have accomplished during the 92d Congress. Also, it is time to say farewell to more than 50 of our colleagues who will not be returning to these halls for the 93d Congress. There will be a bumper crop of freshmen next year.

The Democratic Party, which controls the Congress, has an outstanding legislative record to take to the people this November. In the next few minutes, I would like to note for Members the great amount of significant legislation enacted during this session. Fuller summaries are provided in a report which is appended as part of my remarks.

In addition, brief summarizing of legislation passed in the first session is noted for Members. Fuller explications are found in my report for that session printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 36, page 46179.

In recent years, we passed and sent to the States a proposed Amendment to the Constitution to provide equal rights to all citizens regardless of their gender. After much debate through several years, we authorized enforcement powers to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—Public Law 92–261. We extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission (H.R. 12652), thus continuing our commitment to equal opportunity for all Americans regardless of race.

In the first session the House enacted legislation to establish a Consumer Protection Agency (H.R. 10835) but the Senate failed to enact a similar bill (S. 3970). We passed the Consumer Products Safety Act, to establish an independent regulatory commission charged with protecting consumers against unreasonable product hazards. We enacted the Auto Safety Act, to insure the production of safer cars which will require less costly repair work.

During this session we enacted the Education Amendments Act of 1972, authorizing additional funds for many of our Federal aid programs for education.

Mr. Speaker, we have been especially active in passing legislation to improve the environment. If there is one area in which this Congress can take a greater measure of pride than another, it lies here. The American people have awakened to the environmental dangers from abuse and neglect. We in Congress, sharing that awareness and empowered to act to protect the general welfare, have responded with an outpouring of legislation over the past few years. This session we passed the National Environmental Data System Act, to provide for pooling and sharing information on environmental research and techniques to insure a better environment. We enacted a Pesticide Control Act to regulate the production and sale of dangerous pesticides which, while controlling insects, damage human, plant, and animal life. We passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, to authorize massive funding of water pollution programs already on the statute books. Our waters are choked and dying from pollution. Either we are going to spend the money necessary to reclaim them or we are going to suffer the consequences. The President has threatened to veto this legislation. We passed the Noise Control Act, to supplement efforts to abate noise, which adversely affects people.

We sent to the President the Marine Mammal Protection Act, authorizing a 15-year moratorium on the killing or capturing of water mammals, some of which are threatened with extinction, and we authorized the President to seek a moratorium treaty on the killing of polar bears, also threatened with extinction. We enacted a Federal Animal Damage Control Act, to provide for more selective control of predatory animals. Some of these animals, while troublesome, are threatened with extinction. Man should not blithely upset the balance of nature. We continued to enact legislation setting aside recreational areas in the country, thus insuring for future generations places in which they can enjoy natural wilderness and beauty, or to which they can go to get away from the hubbub of city life.

Mr. Speaker, we took final action on the Federal Election Campaign Act, which regulates expenditures for political advertising and provides for full disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures.

We have enacted legislation to insure that Americans will have adequate and quality health care available to them. During this session we enacted the National Sickle Cell Anemia Control Act to combat a disease which particularly afflicts black Americans; the National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung, and Blood Act, to concentrate research on diseases af-

flicting these parts of the human body; the Communicable Diseases Control Amendment Act to continue programs aimed at controlling the spread of such diseases, including venereal disease; the National Cooley's Anemia Control Act, establishing a program to combat this killer disease which afflicts about 50,000 Americans; the National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis Act, to promote efforts at devising means for controlling this dreadful crippler and killer; the Emergency Medical Services Act, to support efforts for providing immediate medical care for persons in auto accidents, or suffering heart attacks, or struck by some other medical problem requiring immediate attention if death is not to result; and Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments, to continue programs aiding those who are handicapped.

The President vetoed congressional efforts to provide temporary public employment for those unemployed. We did, however, receive his approval on other manpower training and regional development bills passed this session including: Continuation of the Manpower Development and Training Act; and the Rural Development Act, authorizing a comprehensive program to improve job opportunity, income, and the quality of life in rural America. The House also passed the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendment of 1972, extending regional development programs and establishing a public works impact program to provide immediate, useful work to the unemployed and underemployed. This bill was passed by the Senate as we moved toward adjournment with no certain guarantee that it would obtain Presidential approval given the President's adamant opposition to public jobs for the unemployed. All we can say to those unemployed and wishing to work is that Congress has tried but has been met with iron resistance from the White House.

Mr. Speaker, in a historic action Congress approved a revenue-sharing bill which will provide more than $30 billion over a 5-year period to State and local governments to supplement their sorely tested budgets. The President wanted this money to be appropriated without Federal controls, a giveaway to which the Congress wisely refused to accede. For one who preaches fiscal responsibility, it is amusing to find the President requesting Congress to cough up such a large share of Federal revenue to State and local governments with no accounting to the National Government for its use. While it is true that State and local governments need financial assistance, it is not true that we should just hand the money over and show no interest in how it is spent.

We also approved three bills to raise or maintain the public debt ceiling, as the administration continues to operate at a high deficit. The most recent action engendered bitter debate in the Congress because of the President's request that we authorize him a $250 billion spending ceiling.

Some in Congress, including myself, considered this an abrogation of our power over the purse. More than any President in our history, Mr. Nixon has seen fit to ignore congressional directives and to impound funds appropriated by the Congress. His action thwarts the Congress' 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's implementation of this authority 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, missiles. He requested congressional approval of this agreement and we gave it, but only after extensive debate and making it clear that the United States must maintain parity with the Soviet Union in levels of intercontinental strategic forces.

During the first session, the House passed the President's proposal for reforming that welfare program which provides aid to families with dependent children. This program has proven expensive over the years and it tends to perpetuate people on welfare as well as encourage some small amount of cheating. The President's proposal would have guaranteed an adequate income to those families needing welfare and having no adult in the family able to work. On the other hand, it provides for a workfare program for those families with able-bodied adults in them who could work. The Senate declined to authorize the President's proposal and instead authorized a study of it. Conferees dropped the entire matter from the bill when they could not resolve differences.

This bill also provided for changes in social security, medicare, and medicaid programs to make them more workable, financially secure, and helpful to those benefiting from them.

Tied to that bill was a 5-percent 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 needed increase for social security beneficiaries but then tried to grab credit for passage after reluctantly signing the measure into law. This action was typical of his practice of faulting 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 transportation facilities in this country including: Assistance to the National Rail Passenger Corp.—Amtrak; the Federal-Aid to Highway Act, authorizing completion of the Interstate Highway System; and 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 not always agreed with our decisions and has vetoed some significant pieces of legislation. It is no fluke that his vetoes have been directed at legislation which benefits Americans who most need assistance; those on retirement pensions, 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 why deprive those most in need?"

In 1970, the President vetoed the following list of bills:

H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW Appropriations Act for Fiscal 1970 (sustained), on the grounds that it contained funding which was "excessive in a period of serious inflationary pressures" and pinpointed the following increases as particularly unacceptable: impacted areas' aid, grants for vocational education, funds earmarked for poor children, college construction grants, college student loan funds, and hospital construction grants;

H.R. 11102, Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970 (overridden), with the President claiming that the bill would "significantly restrict Presidential options in managing Federal expenditures," (money for Lockheed, yes; for hospital construction, no);

H.R. 16916, 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 for Fiscal 1971 (sustained), for the same old tired reasons noted in earlier veto messages;

S. 3637, the Political Broadcast Spending Act (sustained), on the grounds that it unfairly discriminated against the broadcasting industry in an attempt to curtail campaign expenditures and because of the need to overhaul Federal election campaign regulation law (which we did in passing P.L. 92-225);

S. 3867, 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 persons to be doctors in order to relieve a shortage 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 employees was inflationary but, it was not inflationary in an election year as the President signed a similar bill this year (P.L. 92-392);

S. 578. Federal Firefighters Retirement Benefits Act (pocket veto), on the grounds that "there is no demonstrated need for permitting Federal firefighters to retire at an

earlier than normal age," but, that was in 1970 and, by 1972, an election year, the President was singing a different tune as he signed this proposal into law (P.L. 92-382);

During this Congress the President has been at it again:

S. 575, Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971 (sustained), which again included provisions for giving work to those not employed but which the President considered an ineffective approach to job opportunity and possibly giving rise to false hope (that is, "stay in the unemployment line"; if you can still collect benefits);

H.R. 2600, Increased Retirement Benefits to Totally Disabled D.C. Firemen and Policemen (pocket veto), because it gave unwarranted special benefits to a particular group of retirees and set an unfortunate precedent (*i.e.*, no extra money for the *totally disabled*);

S. 2007, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971 (sustained), because it contained "provisions altogether unacceptable to this administration," and particularly because it provided for a child care program he characterized as laudable but fiscally irresponsible, administratively unworkable, and a weakener of the family structure (much talk about the work ethic but no programs to help mothers who might want to work);

H.R. 13918, Authorization of Funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (no attempt to override), because he wanted only a one-year authorization (which was subsequently voted by Congress);

H.R. 15417, Labor-HEW Appropriations Act for Fiscal 1973 (sustained), again because it was purportedly inflationary;

H.R. 15927, Temporary 20 Percent Increase in Railroad Retirement Benefits (overridden), because it would jeopardize the fiscal integrity of the railroad retirement system and hasten its bankruptcy (but Congress intends to see to this problem next year).

These vetoes give us a clear picture of where the President's priorities lie and it is for each Member of the House and each American to determine whether he agrees or disagrees. For my part, I disagree.

Before concluding it is appropriate to express my gratitude to some of the many persons who have assisted in the business before this great House. I begin, of course, with you, Mr. Speaker. We have benefited from your gracious presiding over the House. Through the years it has always been a great pleasure to work with you and we look forward to additional years under your leadership.

To my counterpart on the other side of the aisle, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, my thanks again for his cooperation and pleasant opposition as leader of the minority party.

To my good friend, THOMAS "TIP" O'NEILL, his deputies and assistant whips, their counterparts on the Republican side, and to the officers of the House I extend a heartfelt thanks. As Members know our great Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, retired this year after many years of service to us all. We wish him well in his retirement, which is richly deserved.

I would also like to express my appreciation and gratitude to the following list of people:

Committee chairmen, Members and their staffs.

Donn Anderson, Charlie Melody, Bob Yesh and their staff of pages.

Jack Russ and his pages.

Gil Udell and his staff at the Document Room.

The Doormen.

The staffs of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The Official Reporters.

The Legislative Counsel.

The House Physician, Dr. Rufus Pearson and his staff.

Finally, unlike others I could name, I would like to thank rather than curse the members of the press who follow the Congress and report on our activities. We may not always agree with what they say but where would we and the American people be were they not here to record our work.

To all Members, and their families, good luck in the elections and let me be among the first to wish you a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

REPORT ON THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS SUBMITTED IN BEHALF OF HALE BOGGS, HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted 10 bills concerning the agricultural resources of this Nation.

Three of these laws are designed to improve rural living conditions by making credit available to farmers and farm organizations. Public Law 92-133 permanently extends the authority to insure loans under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Public Law 92-173 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make insured emergency loans of the type previously authorized to be made as direct loans under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Public Law 92-181 provided further for the farmer-owned cooperative system through which credit is made available to farmers and ranchers. It also extended the operations of the cooperative system to provide for housing loans to rural residents and for loans to others providing services upon which farming operations are dependent, in order to provide a modernized system to meet current and future rural credit needs. This act is part of a broad rural development program which aims at encouraging farm families to stay in rural areas and urban citizens to move to rural areas.

Five of the bills enacted in the first session are aimed at improving the market and establishing quotas for specific crops. Public Law 92-42 is designed to expand agricultural exports by removing the restrictions on foreign market promotion activities for domestic wine. Public Law 92-120 added California peaches to the list of commodities for which paid advertising provisions may be included in marketing orders under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Public Law 92-138, extended the Sugar Act of 1948 for 3 years and adjusted the production quotas for foreign and domestic producers. Public Law 92-62 amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act to set new criteria for apportionment of acreage allotments among new peanut farmers. Public Law 92-144 permitted the transfer across county lines, in the same State, of Virginia fire-cured tobacco type 21 and Virginia sun-cured tobacco type 37 allotments, which previously could be transferred only from one farm to another in the same county. Public Law 92-1 extended the time for the proclamation of marketing quotas 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 the lease and transfer of burley tobacco allotments within counties.

In order to protect the health of the livestock on American farms, Congress enacted Public Law 92-152, which expands the authority of the Secretary 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 local laws on national forest land.

Eight additional laws were enacted during the second session.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT AMENDMENTS (S. 1838, PUBLIC LAW 92-231)

Public Law 92-231 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 opportunity for a hearing be provided in a 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 92-233)

Public Law 92-233 amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act to make permanent an existing provision exempting all potatoes for processing 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. 3104, PUBLIC LAW 92-331)

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 92-288)

Public Law 92-288 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 services to the owners of the 317 million acres of private, 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 $5 to $20 million. It increases the appropriation authorization for sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Clark-McNary Act of June 7, 1924, from $20 to $40 million. This legislation provides for cooperation with the States in 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. 1379, PUBLIC LAW 92-300)

The National Forest Volunteers Act (Public Law 92-300) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish volunteers for the national forest program similar to the already existing volunteers for the national park program. The duties 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, and encourage individual participation in the effort to improve the Nation's environment.

EMINENT DOMAIN POOL ALLOTMENTS (S. 1545, PUBLIC LAW 92-354)

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 area." It applies to allotments for extra-long staple cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, farm base acreage allotments for upland cotton, and domestic allotments for wheat.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE FOR FARMERS UNDER AGE 21 (S. 1139, PUBLIC LAW 92-357)

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.

PEAR 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; to authorize any 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 representation on any agency selected 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 proposed regulation. On September 25, 1972, the Senate pased 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—title II of 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 RIGHTS AMENDMENT (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 October 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 1923. 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—38—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. 1746; 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 16, 1971, the House passed H.R. 1746, a bill which authorized the EEOC to seek 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 bill amended by the conference committee, 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 with 15 or more members, instead 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 except 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 fair employment practices commission, 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 make 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 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 adjudication if the contractor has satis-

fied Federal requirements in the same plant within the previous year.

EXTENSION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION AND ADDITION TO ITS JURISDICTION (H.R. 12652)

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has rendered invaluable service to the President and to Congress by investigating complaints of denials of civil rights, by studying widespread denials 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. Under its present statute the Commission 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 appropriations for the Commission 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.

NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERAL JURY SELECTION (H.R. 2589, PUBLIC LAW 92–437)

The 90th Congress passed the Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968 to assure nondiscrimination on account of race or economic status 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 provide the information needed to make sure that Federal juries represent a cross section of the population. Public Law 92–437, passed this Congress, requires pro futura that questions of race and occupation be answered in filling 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 increasing by $900 million—from $2.2 to $3.1 billion—the amount of loans, 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 potentials of the Small Business Administration—SBA. Several initiatives in the House resulted from the overall effort of Congress to provide greater SBA funding and improved programs related to SBA's 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 programs 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 (H.R. 10792, PUBLIC LAW 92–320; H.R. 15692, PUBLIC LAW 92–385)

Public Law 92–320 recognized the need for higher funding and loan ceilings in various SBA programs to meet disaster related emergencies while in approving Public Law 92–385 we continued congressional efforts to reduce the numerous bureaucratic paperwork delays 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 loan assistance at a reduced interest rate for 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 procedures, reducing the number of Federal agencies involved in disaster relief, and increasing agency authority where necessary.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT (S. 3337, H.R. 16732, PUBLIC LAW 92–)

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 members of minority races and other persons whose participation in our free-enterprise economy has been hampered by social or economic disadvantages.

S. 3337 authorizes loans for small businesses owned by "disadvantaged" persons. Increased assistance is also authorized for all small business investment companies. Such assistance can help small businesses everywhere to get off the ground.

The legislation will help stimulate the private sector to invest more heavily in promising business situations where minority individuals undertake the tribulations of running a business but lack adequate access to capital to get the business successfully operating or expanded to its full potential.

COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY (H.R. 15989, S. 3726, PUBLIC LAW 92–412)

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." The report is to be submitted to Congress not later than 60 days after the beginning of each regular session. The Council has a staff headed by an Executive Director appointed by the President. The Director is mandated by this legislation to keep various pertinent committees of the House and Senate "fully and currently informed regarding the activities of the Council." The legislation authorizes to be appropriated $1.4 million for fiscal 1973 for the establishment and initial operations of the Council.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATION (S. 3824, PUBLIC LAW 92–411)

In late June Congress sent H.R. 13918 to the President, authorizing $65 million for fiscal 1973 and $90 million for fiscal 1974 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—CPB. On June 30 the President vetoed H.R. 13918 because, according to his veto message, the funding authorization amounts were "unwarranted in light of the serious questions yet unanswered by our brief experience with public broadcasting."

In August the House agreed to a bill (S. 3824) providing for a 1-year—fiscal 1973—funding authorization of $65 million. The bill became law—Public Law 92–411—on August 29.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT (S. 3524, H.R. 14384, PUBLIC LAW 92–)

A 5-year extension of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act was approved by the Senate August 11 and by the House October 11. This program, which provides Federal aid for fishery research and development projects, was due to expire June 30, 1973. The existing program has been funded for 7 years and has achieved substantial results benefiting every State in the Union. All the States and the territories have received Federal funds through this program. S. 3524 also increases the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for fishery resources development in time of disaster.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, though Congress took no final action the first session, the House did pass the Consumer Protection Act of 1971 (H.R. 10835) designed to provide within the Government representation and protection of consumer interests.

Legislation has cleared Congress this session and is summarized here for the benefit of Members.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT (S. 3419, H.R. 15003)

One of the most important pieces of consumer-oriented legislation to come to a vote in Congress was the Consumer

Product Act (S. 3419) designed to expand the Federal role in protecting consumers against unreasonable product hazards. It creates an independent regulatory Commission charged with protecting consumers against unreasonable product hazards; 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 authority provided by these laws was scattered among approximately 30 Federal organizations. In its final report 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.

This bill creates an independent Consumer Product Safety Commission with five members appointed for 7-year terms. It transfers to the Commission functions under three 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 such standards are not feasible, to ban the product from the marketplace; to obtain equitable relief in the courts to protect the public from products which pose imminent hazards to health and safety; and to administratively order 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 the following consumer products; tobacco and tobacco products; motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment; economic poisons; drugs, devices or cosmetics; food; and articles subject to tax 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 SAVING ACT

(S. 976, H.R. 11627)

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: First, 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 supplement the Secretary's existing powers under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to establish motor vehicle safety standards. In arriving at appropriate bumper standards, the Secretary is 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 comparing automobiles on the basis 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 if consumers can compare the true costs and risks of owning different makes of automobiles, manufacturers will compete to produce vehicles less susceptible to damage and more easily repaired.

Title III directs the Secretary to establish demonstration projects to determine the feasibility of using diagnostic procedures to test for compliance 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. 10835, S. 3970)

In the first session, the House passed the Consumer Protection Act of 1971 providing extensive coverage for American consumers through representation and protection for consumer interests. The Senate considered a similar measure, the Consumer Protection Organization Act of 1972 (S. 3970) but could not come to a resolution despite three cloture votes. Major differences between the two bills were that the House-passed measure would have permitted the Consumer Protection Agency to intervene only in formal agency proceedings; prohibited the Agency from intervening in State and local proceedings; and did not provide for planning and program grants to the States.

The House consumer legislation authorized programs of consumer education and information; procedures for handling consumer complaints and making those complaints available to the public; a limited amount of product testing in connection with the consumer representation and safety functions and the dissemination of test results; and studies of household product safety. All Federal agencies would have been required in taking actions within their responsibility to give consideration to the interests of consumers. H.R. 10835 contained provisions prohibiting the disclosure of trade secrets and other confidential information, and requirements for fair and equitable procedures in implementing the objectives of the measure.

Title I established within the Executive Office of the President an Office of Consumer Affairs, with a Director and Deputy Director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Office would have been delegated the responsibility for aiding the President in coordinating Federal programs affecting consumers, assuring that consumers' interests were observed in setting policy and operating programs, making recommendations to the President and Congress on improvement in consumer programs, investigating consumer problems not being dealt with by other Federal agencies, aiding consumer education and counseling programs, aiding research on consumer matters, providing technical assistance to State and local governments on consumer matters, working with private enterprise in the promotion and protection of consumer interests and publishing a consumer register or other publication in nontechnical language.

Title II created a Consumer Protection Agency with an Administrator and a Deputy Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Agency would have been authorized to represent consumers in formal proceedings conducted by other Federal agencies and in certain court suits. It would have been empowered also to intervene as a party in or institute a court review of a proceeding by another Federal agency in which it participated. The Administrator could have requested another Federal agency to initiate a proceeding or take an action in the interest of consumers. The Agency would have been required to encourage and support testing of consumer products by other Federal or non-Federal agencies and to study a system of tagging products to inform consumers of pertinent information.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT FUNDS (H.R. 5066, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

Authorizations for the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953 were approved by the House April 28, 1971, and by the Senate June 16, and again June 19, 1972. For fiscal year 1973 a sum of $4 million was authorized. The 1953 act authorized the Secretary of Commerce to set Federal standards to reduce the flammability of

fabrics for wearing apparel and certain household articles such as curtains, upholstery, and bedding. The Senate included an amendment encovering children's sleepwear under the act.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted three major bills to foster or continue economic development and municipal government reform in the District of Columbia. The first of these, Public Law 92–196, the District of Columbia's revenue bill, authorized a Federal payment to the District of $173 million. This authorization represented, at that time, the most generous Federal payment to the District government's budget ever voted by the Congress, exceeding that of the preceding fiscal year by $47 million. The District of Columbia Revenue Act also authorized continued funding of Washington's Metro mass transit system. The second, Public Law 92–25, demonstrated the continued desire of Congress to provide the District of Columbia with an efficient, effective, and responsive municipal government. This law extended the operational life of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia—established by the 91st Congress. The Commission's recommendations for improving the organization and operation of the District government were made available to the Congress in a special report (H. Doc. No. 92–317). The third was the much praised progressive electoral reform bill for the District of Columbia: Public Law 92–220.

During the second session the Congress continued to execute its constitutional and statutory responsibilities for the Nation's Capital. The second session we passed major bills related to the government, economic health, public safety, and general welfare of the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET (H.R. 12529, PUBLIC LAW 92–344)

Acting expeditiously, we approved the fiscal 1973 District of Columbia Appropriations Act (H.R. 15259). Public Law 92–344 provided for a record Federal payment of $185.5 million. This direct congressional appropriation represents over 20 percent of the revenues to be realized in the District of Columbia budget for fiscal 1973. In recent years the House has supported a trend favoring increased Federal payments to the District of Columbia budget.

WASHINGTON METRO TRANSIT BOND GUARANTEE (H.R. 15507, PUBLIC LAW 92349)

Congress also approved H.R. 15507, guaranteeing the principal and interest on bonds issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. Public Law 92–349 also increases the direct congressional funding authorization for Metro from $216 to $270 million. The value of the bonds ultimately guaranteed by this law could approach $1 billion.

Public Law 92–349 insures the continued development of Washington's Metro mass rapid transit system. This action reaffirms our hope that a large part of the Metro subway system will be operating in downtown Washington in time to convey the massive influx of visitors expected in the Capital for the 1976 bicentennial celebration of the Nation's birth.

METRO BUS SYSTEM ACQUISITION ACT (S. 4062, PUBLIC LAW 92—)

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. 15580, PUBLIC LAW 92–410)

We passed H.R. 15580, 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 assured that the District of Columbia will continue to attract experienced men of high educational attainment. The salary increases also assure the continued high levels of morale and motivation demonstrated by the Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments in recent years.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT (H.R. 15965, PUBLIC LAW 92—)

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 10 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 CIVIC CENTER ACT (S. 3943, H.R. 16645, PUBLIC LAW 92—)

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 for property acquisition and initial construction costs. 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 COUNCIL MEMBERS COMPENSATION ACT (H.R. 11773, PUBLIC LAW 92—)

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. 10751)

On October 14, the House passed H.R. 10751 to establish the Pennsylvania Avenue Bicentennial Development Corporation and to provide for the preparation and carrying out of a development plan for certain areas between the White House and Capitol in furtherance of the purposes for which the Pennsylvania Avenue Historic Site was designated.

H.R. 10751 creates a public corporation which would be governed by 15 member board of directors. It establishes a seven member advisory board composed of tenants and owners of real property located within the development area. The corporation will prepare a development plan for the area and submit the plan to the Secretary of the Interior. If the plan is approved, it will be transmitted to Congress for approval. Authorizations of $1 million are appropriated for plan development.

EDUCATION

The Education Amendments Act of 1972 (Public Law 92–318), passed by the House during the first session, has been described as the most significant advance in Federal support for higher education since passage of the Land Grant College Act over a century ago. This act includes new programs of direct aid to financially unstable institutions and grants to students from both low and middle income families.

The Child Nutrition Act of 1972 (H.R. 14896), amending the National School Lunch Act in order to expand and strengthen child nutrition programs extends the nonschool food programs and school breakfast programs for 3 years and puts Federal funding of the school lunch and school breakfast programs on a more stable basis.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACTS OF 1972 (S. 659, PUBLIC LAW 92–318)

The Education Amendments Act of 1972 authorizes $18.5 billion in Federal aid for post-secondary education over a 3-year period in extending present higher education programs and creating new ones. Included are programs to provide approximately $1 billion annually in general aid to colleges and universities and to provide basic grants to needy students. Also included is an amendment related to busing and school desegregation.

Title I provides a 3-year extension of existing student aid programs; establishes a new program which entitles each college or university student to $1,400 a year, minus what his family can be expected to contribute; and creates a National Student Loan Marketing Association to buy, sell, and warehouse guaranteed student loans, and thereby stimulate new capital for such loans.

In title X, in the area of institutional aid, the act authorizes: $1 billion annually in direct aid to public and private institutions; $40 million annually in emergency grants to institutions in severe financial distress; and grants to institutions in the amount of $300 per veteran enrolled and an additional $150 for each veteran participating in a special remedial veterans program.

The act prohibits, in title IX, sex discrimination in all federally assisted education programs, except for undergraduate admission to private institutions, public institutions with a traditional policy of admitting only students of one sex, and military academies. It author-

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 operate post-secondary occupational education programs. It creates, in title III, a National Institute of Education within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to support, conduct and disseminate the products 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 $95 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 18, 1972, the House passed the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, H.R. 13915. This bill redirects $500 million in emergency school aid funds and places limitations and prohibitions on the use of busing and other remedies for school segregation. The Senate did not act on the bill.

CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 14896, PUBLIC LAW 92–433)

The Child Nutrition Act of 1972 amends the National School Lunch Act to assure that adequate funds are available for the conduct of summer food service programs for children from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and from areas in which there are high concentrations of working mothers. It contains other provisions for expanding and strengthening the child nutrition programs.

It extends the summer nonschool food assistance program for children through fiscal 1975, and increases the annual appropriation authorization from $32 million to "such sums as are necessary"; authorizes the use of $25 million of Section 32 funds during the period May 15, to September 15, 1972, for the summer nonschool food programs; extends the school breakfast program through fiscal year 1975; and authorizes the use of section 32 funds to reimburse schools at the rate of 8 cents per meal in each State in fiscal 1973. In addition, the act establishes new eligibility requirements, providing free lunches for all children below the Federal poverty level and making it possible for children from families with incomes up to 50 percent above the poverty level to receive reduced price lunches; authorizes $40 million for food equipment assistance for fiscal years 1973–75; recinds the statutory authority of the USDA to regulate the sale of food items in competition with programs authorized under the Child Nutrition Act 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 programs and the school lunch program; 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 environmental 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 damages to our environment from inadequate planning and protection of the past. We must devise policies that 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 environmental 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 pure water and providing money to local areas 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. Wilderness areas and wild and scenic rivers are being 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 92d Congress, we enacted 12 bills of major importance to protect and preserve our environment. Public Law 92–60 authorized a continuation of the saline 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 92–60 to continue programs of research, development, and demonstration of processes for the conversion of chemically contaminated water for beneficial use. Public Law 92–27 amended 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 Resources. The Council has responsibility to assess the Nation's water resources, review, and establish standards and procedures for Federal water resource development, and 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 Federal 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 the first session was passed in the House in October and the Senate in November. The date this time was extended to January 31, 1972.

Public Law 92–125 established a National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere and authorized the Commission to develop background information and recommend water resources programs. Public Law 92–159 provided prohibitions and penalties for the hunting and shooting of animals, fish, and other wildlife from aircraft. Public Law 92–195 provided for the protection of wild horses and burros, setting penalties for anyone selling, harming, killing, or harrassing wild horses or burros.

Public Law 92–219, the Fishermen'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 92–167, the Small Reclamation 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 Congress the opportunity to assimilate, organize and offer plans for the future in the entire range of the environmental field. Although the committee 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 which come under their jurisdictions. 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. 56, PL 92–)

In response to the vital need for coordinated information services concerning the environment, Congress approved H.R. 56 providing for the establishment within the executive branch of the 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 gathered from the Federal Government, State, and local governments, private institutions—including educational institutions, and foreign sources. Data is to be made available to Congress and to Federal, State, and local governments without charge and to private individuals and groups at a reasonable rate.

Presently, 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 appointment of a National Environmental Data System Coordinator to serve full time to: First, administer and manage the operations of the data system under the guidance of the Council on Environmental Quality; second, institute a study to evaluate and monitor the methods on information technology and utilize new and improved techniques for accomplishing the purposes of the act; third, utilize knowledge developed during the study to develop criteria and guidelines to govern selection of data, including the development of predictive ecological models; and 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.

FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PESTICIDE CONTROL ACT (H.R. 10729)

A complete revision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act was passed by the House November 9, 1971, and the Senate amended, September 26, 1972. H.R. 10729 provides for regulating the manufacture and use of pesticides such as DDT which have been of assistance to farmers and homeowners, but often a hazard to health and the environment. The act requires approval by the Environmental Protection Agency of new pesticides and empowers the agency to suspend their use if they are later found harmful. Over 60,000 different pesticide products would be divided into two categories of use, general and restricted, with highly toxic pesticides in the restricted category available only by certification.

Use of pesticides to kill harmful insects and other pests prevents crop losses estimated at $20 billion each year. However, there are also about 75,000 cases of pesticide poisoning causing about 1,000 deaths each year. In fact, a court suit brought by private environmental groups has forced the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct hearings on whether the use of DDT should be forbidden altogether. Under the bill, States would be permitted to enforce their own pesticide laws if they were tougher than Federal standards. Provision is made for the Federal Government to pay users and manufacturers for stocks on hand if a pesticide, after first being approved by the Agency, is later ordered withdrawn.

H.R. 10729 specifies that restricted pesticides may be used only under the supervision of a certified pesticide applicator or subject to other regulatory restrictions. New procedures are set for the EPA Administrator to register or suspend registration of all pesticides. A Committee on the National Academy of Science is required to advise on scientific matters. Penalties for violations of the act are set at up to $5,000 per violation. Violation by private applicators would be punishable by fines of up to $1,000. Open-ended authorizations for fiscal year 1972 through 1974 are set for the act's administration.

RELIEF FOR PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ORDERS (H.R. 16071)

Provision was made in legislation passed by the House August 16, 1972, for a new title to the Public Works and Economic Development Amendments of 1972 which directly answers some of the problems due to enforcement of Federal environmental orders. The new provision provides relief for those individuals and enterprises adversely affected due to such orders. For individuals, the legislation would authorize $100 million for unemployment compensation to workers at 60 percent of their former weekly wage for a period not longer than 78 weeks, provided the person had worked 26 of the preceding 78 weeks in the plant affected. Temporary mortgage or rental payment assistance would also be available to such individuals for periods of up to 1 year, and such individuals could also receive relocation expenses if they find jobs elsewhere. A 30-year, 3-percent loan is provided to those enterprises which may be forced to close, or must reduce the number of their employees, as a result of environmental orders.

INCREASING APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR NACOA (H.R. 5280)

In October, the House approved H.R. 15280, 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 of the United States and to advise the Secretary of Commerce with respect to implementing the purposes of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

WATER RESOURCES AND WATER POLLUTION

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT EXTENSION (S. 3122, H.R. 12741, PUBLIC LAW 92–240)

Public Law 92–240 extended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act through June 30, 1972. Since June 30, 1971, the programs of the act have been carried out under the authority of two temporary resolutions while Congress completed action on S. 2770—see below. Public Law 92–240, in addition to extending the act, provided an additional authorization of $30 million, for the period ending June 30, 1972, for research, investigations, training and information programs. It also authorized additional funds to permit the States to continue the planning of their programs in an orderly system. Finally, authorizations were increased to $2 billion, an increase of $1.65 billion for the grant program for waste treatment facilities.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (S. 2770, H.R. 11896)

The need for adequate water and sewage facilities remains one of the most pressing problems facing this Nation's urban and rural communities. Local sources of revenue continue to be severely taxed and, although many communities are making efforts to raise needed revenues, the demand for Federal grants-in-aid increase. Communities cannot hope to attract new industries unless they provide ample water and sewer systems. The Federal Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1966 developed a foundation for water pollution control, but the appropriated funds for environment improvement have seldom been sufficient to match the required needs.

In passing S. 2770, however, we authorized massive funding for a program designed to clean the Nation's waters by 1985, authorizing $24.6 billion for this purpose.

In addition to 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 controlling pollution. By January 1, 1983, the "best available technologies" must be in operation for reducing polluting activities. The overall goal is to have clean waters by 1985.

Violations could result in fines up to $25,000 per day and a year in prison for a first conviction, and up to $50,000 per day and 2 years in prison for any subsequent convictions.

Title I sets as a national goal by July 1, 1983, a quality in our waters which will protect fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and provide for recreation in and on our waters. It is also national policy: First, that the discharge of pollutants in toxic amounts be prohibited; second, that Federal financial assistance be provided to construct publicly owned waste treatment works; third, that areawide waste treatment management planning processes be developed and implemented to assure adequate control of sources of pollutants in each State; fourth, that major research and demonstration efforts be made to develop the technology to eliminate the discharge of pollutants

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, and to impose fines for violations.

To help meet the standards which will become effective in two phases over the next 11 years, the measure authorizes $18 billion in 75 percent Federal matching funds to build municipal sewage treatment plants and $800 million for low-interest loans to industry.

Of the $18 billion earmarked for municipal plants, $5 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 an unspecified amount to reimburse municipalities for plants already built.

Finally, utility plants which discharge heated water must conform to the 1977 and 1963 requirements. However, if the Environmental Protective Agency decides that the level of discharge is not harmful to water life it could waive these requirements. It could also order more stringent requirements on thermal polluters to bring the discharges to the point that water life is not affected. Although the President vetoed the bill, Congress overrode his veto resoundingly.

COASTAL ZONE AND ESTUARINE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS (S. 3507, H.R. 14146, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

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 Nation's coastal zone is defined as 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 authority of the 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 the 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 designation of areas of particular concern within the coastal zone; an identification of the means by which the State proposes to exert control over the land and water uses, including a listing of relevant constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, regulations, and judicial decisions; broad guidelines on priority of uses in particular areas, including specifically those uses of lowest priority; and a description of the organizational structure proposed to implement the management program, including the responsibilities and interrelationships of local, areawide, State, regional, and interstate agencies in the management process.

Management program grants are not to exceed 66⅔ percent of the costs of the program in any 1 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 grants, a State must reasonably demonstrate 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. After an initial grant has been made to a coastal State, no subsequent grant is to be made unless the Secretary finds that the State is satisfactorily developing a 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 development grant under this section 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 are to revert to the Secretary to be added by him to funds available for such grants.

The Secretary is also authorized to make annual administrative grants to any coastal State for not more than 66⅔ percent of the costs of administering the State's management program. Grants are also to be allocated to States with approved programs based on rules and regulations set by the Secretary, provided that no annual administrative grant be made in excess of 10 percent nor less than 1 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out the act's purposes.

To receive administrative grants a State must have: First, coordinated its program with local, areawide, and interstate plans applicable to areas within the coastal zone existing on January 1 of the year in which the State's management program is submitted to the Secretary and second, established an effective mechanism for continuing consultation and coordination between the management agency designated, and with local governments, interstate agencies, regional agencies, and areawide agencies within the coastal zone to assure the full participation of such local governments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of the act.

The Secretary is authorized to establish a Coastal Zone Management Advisory Committee to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy concerning the coastal zone. The Secretary is also authorized to make available to a coastal State grants of up to 50 percent of the costs of acquisition, development, and operation of estuarine sanctuaries for the purpose of creating natural field laboratories to gather data and make studies of the natural and human processes occurring within the estuaries of the coastal zone. The Federal share of the cost for each such sanctuary is not to exceed $2 million.

The act authorizes to be appropriated a total of $9 million for fiscal 1973 and for fiscal years 1974 through 1977 sums as may be necessary for management program development grants; a total of $30 million for fiscal 1973 and sums as necessary for fiscal years 1974 through 1977 for administrative grants; and sums not to exceed $6 million for fiscal year 1973 for grants for costs of acquisition, development, and operation of estuarine sanctuaries. For other incidental administrative expenses, $3 million is authorized for fiscal year 1973 and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

MARINE PROTECTION, RESEARCH, AND SANCTUARIES ACT (H.R. 9727)

The House and Senate passed the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1971 which vests 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 are provided 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 into the ocean, 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 AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (H.R. 15627)

Late in the session, the House approved H.R. 15627 amending the Oil Pollution Act of 1961 in order to implement the 1969 amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, approved in 1954. This legislation, which expands the penalty provisions of the act, is necessary in order to reflect changes 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 land. 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 the navigable waters of the United States 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-

vironment. In addition, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish and operate marine traffic systems 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 navigable waters and their resources 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 serious accidents or casualties; second, control vessel traffic in areas which he determines to be especially hazardous, or under conditions of reduced visibility; third, establish procedures and standards for the handling 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 imprisonment, or both, is established for violations of the act.

Rules and regulations are established for protection of the marine environment through the 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 protection.

The main thrust of the legislation 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 was obvious that action 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 coastal accidents. 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.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS (H.R. 12749, PUBLIC LAW 92–273)

In 1952 the Federal saline water conversion program was begun, with Congress authorizing $2 million in appropriations for a 5-year program of research for converting sea and brackish water into fresh water. Administration of the program was vested in the Secretary of the Interior, who created an Office of Saline Water within the Department. Up to and including fiscal year 1972, $239,088,000 had been authorized for this program.

Public Law 92–273, signed by the President April 17, 1972, authorizes $26,871,000 in appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for the saline water conversion program. The legislation also establishes authorized limits for reprograming, or transfers, within the total amount authorized.

While progress on saline water conversion has been slow, the program has been sustained and has produced significant improvements in process technology. As alternative sources of water supply become progressively more expensive, desalting becomes an even more viable alternative. The present program, in addition to basic research on sea and brackish water sources, also reflects a desirable emphasis in the field of converting geothermal brines.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT, AUTHORIZATION OF INCREASED APPROPRIATION (H.R. 14106, S. 3384, PUBLIC LAW 92–396)

The Water Resources Planning Amendments of 1972 authorized an additional $3,500,000 in annual appropriations for the Council on Water Resources to carry out functions assigned to the Council by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. Of this amount, $2,500,000 is earmarked for the program to assess water resources and needs. One national assessment has been made and the Council places a second assessment during fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Previously, the Council was financed from appropriations for agencies which are Council members. This authorization is for fiscal year 1973 only, pending a review of the Council's activities, which the Interior Department is expected to make in the near future. The Council estimates that about two-thirds of these funds will be transferred to cooperating agencies for their assessment work. The other $1 million will be used by the Council to direct and coordinate river basin plans.

As Members know, the Water Resources Council: First, assesses national and regional water supplies and needs; second, coordinates various Federal, regional, State, and river basin water programs; third, administers a Federal grant program to assist States in water resource planning; and fourth, administers a Federal grant program to river basin commissions to pay the Federal share of the cost of operating the commission.

DAM SAFETY INSPECTION (H.R. 15951, PUBLIC LAW 92–367)

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 State Governors and to notify Governors during inspections of any hazardous conditions. By July 1, 1974, the Secretary is required to issue a report to Congress to include an inventory of all dams, a review of inspections and recommendations and a suggested national program for dam safety regulation. More than 29,000 non-Federal dams would be included in the program. The review would not include however those dams under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the International Boundary and Water Commission, or the Federal Power Commission. The estimated cost of the program is $90 million.

FEDERAL LOANS FOR LOCAL IRRIGATION SYSTEMS (H.R. 9198)

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. 9198 amends Public Law 84–130 of July 4, 1955, which provides that irrigation districts and other qualified borrowers may receive loans from the Federal Government with which to design and construct already authorized irrigation distribution systems on Federal reclamation projects. While Public Law 84–130 did not authorize any work, it did provide for an optional method of implementation. It was believed at that time that irrigation districts could design and construct 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. 9198 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 obliged borrowers to acquire and convey 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 assured without going through the real estate conveyance and reconveyance procedure. Hence, the borrower and the United States are saved substantial sums of money by relieving the requirement for preparation of extensive legal descriptions and conveyance documents. H.R. 9198 also allows existing distribution system loan contracts to be amended to reflect changes in the programs authorized by this legislation, both with respect to the role of municipal and industrial water supply and the conveyance of right of way. On the whole, H.R. 9198 will amend the present system to simplify administration, save money, and enable broader realization of the benefits of the original legislation.

FEASIBILITY STUDIES OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENTS (S. 3959)

Both Houses authorized the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain potential water resource developments by passing S. 3959. Authorization was included for six studies at Federal reclamation projects. This authority is required to permit the orderly continuation of the Bureau of Reclamation's program of investigations

leading to recommendations for authorization of water resource development projects.

NOISE POLLUTION

NOISE CONTROL ACT (H.R. 11021, S. 3342)

On February 29, 1972, the House gave authority to an expanded and coordinated Federal effort to control noise, which presents a growing threat to the health and welfare of the American people. H.R. 11021 has three primary purposes. First, it authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate existing Federal noise research and control programs, and to publish criteria and control-technology documents relating to noise. Second, it supplements existing Federal authority to regulate the noise characteristics of major sources of noise, and authorizes Federal noise-labeling requirements for them. Third, it directs all Federal agencies to administer their programs in such a manner as to minimize noise.

Other provisions authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish noise emission standards for new products in the following four categories if they have been identified as major noise sources and if noise emission standards are feasible: construction equipment; transportation equipment; motors or engines, or equipment of which motors and engines are integral parts; and electrical or electric equipment. The Administrator is directed to establish noise emission standards for other new products for which such standards are feasible and necessary.

The Administrator is to issue regulations requiring informative labeling of any product which emits noise capable of adversely affecting the public health or welfare, or which is sold wholly or in part on the basis of its effectiveness in reducing noise.

Civil penalties of not more than $25,000 are provided for each violation of any of the prohibitions relating to the sale of any product which does not conform with a noise emission standard.

H.R. 11021 authorizes the Environmental Agency Administrator to remove or render inoperative any device incorporated in any product in 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.

Citizen 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. 1478, PUBLIC LAW 92–)

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 environment. The Council on 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.

The legislation requires that certain chemical substances be tested for their environmental and public health effects and that the results of these tests and the intended uses of the chemical substance be furnished to the Environmental Protection Agency 90 days in advance of the commercial production of that substance. The EPA could require testing of existing substances if those substances are believed to pose unreasonable threats to human health or the environment. The Agency would also be empowered to restrict the use or distribution of a chemical substance during the premarket screening period, or at any later time, to the extent necessary to prevent unreasonable risks to human health and the environment.

District courts of the United States are empowered to restrain the uses or distribution of a chemical substance if an imminent hazard exists. Products which violate provisions of the act are liable to seizure by order of district courts. The act also requires reports by manufacturers or processors of chemical substances to aid the Administrator in carrying out his functions under the act. A Chemical Substances Board is established to advise the EPA Administrator on matters pertaining to chemical substances. The Agency is authorized to conduct research of its own on chemical substances and to monitor those substances in the environment. Finally, citizens are afforded the opportunity to bring suit to enjoin certain violations of the act and to require the Administrator to perform mandatory duties.

MINERALS AND MINING

MINING AND MINERALS POLICY ACT (S. 635, H.R. 6788, PUBLIC LAW 92–)

The need to provide for a more adequate national program of mining and minerals research, through the establishment of mining and minerals research centers, is recognized by Public Law 92– . The Mining and Minerals Policy Act provides for such a national program of mining and minerals research by establishing mining and mineral research centers to promote, encourage, and stimulate the training of mining and mineral scientists, engineers, and technicians.

First, the new act will stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research and development in exploration, extraction experiments, processing, production and training of mineral engineers and scientists in the fields of mining, mineral resources, and technology. Appropriations are authorized for fiscal 1973, and each succeeding year thereafter, for participating States to assist in establishing and maintaining a mining and mineral resources research institute at tax-supported schools of mines and tax-supported colleges or universities conducting research in the minerals engineering field. Federal money will be matched, dollar for dollar, by non-Federal funds. Two or more States could cooperate in the designation of a single institute to serve more than one participating State. A total of $5 million is authorized for fiscal 1973, and for each of the 4 succeeding years, for the institutes to meet expenses of specific research and demonstration projects of industrywide application. Criteria is to be established for use of funds by participating States and their institutes. States must also establish planning and directive programs in addition to research and investigations. Second, the act authorizes appropriations for grants to or contracts with educational institutions, foundations, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or private foundations for research in any aspect of mining and mineral programs. Third, the Secretary of Interior is directed to cooperate with other Federal agencies, State agencies, and private institutions to eliminate duplication and to coordinate mining and minerals research programs. Additionally, the act contains a provision that any patents or processes developed as a result of grants pursuant to this act will be available to the public unless such disclosure would not be in the interest of national defense. The President is authorized to establish a clearinghouse for cataloging current and projected mineral research activities and an advisory committee.

The estimated maximum annual Federal expenditure for the program is $50,500,000 for the first year, increasing to $48,500,000 in the fifth year. In the sixth year and subsequent years, the maximum authorized expenditure would be $45,500,000 annually. The estimated cost is based upon maximum participation of all the States.

CONSERVATION OF STRIP COAL MINING AREAS (H.R. 6482)

In October, the House passed H.R. 6482, providing for the regulation and conservation of strip coal mining areas in the United States. The bill, while not abolishing strip mining, places the burden of proof on an operator to demonstrate that he can reclaim the land before he can obtain a permit from the Interior Department. The reclamation plans must describe the best land use prior to mining, and the proposed future use. It must also provide for the preservation of top soil and for both temporary and permanent vegetation after strip mining to prevent soil erosion.

The need for a strong domestic mining industry was reaffirmed by Congress when it passed the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970. The critical energy situation facing the Nation and the significant role coal plays in the supply of energy has played a significant role in congressional action this year. We directed our attention to means for regulation and control of surface coal mining rather than an outright prohibition. However, the wasteful and unnecessarily destructive practices of the past can no longer be tolerated. The fact persists that there is every reason to believe

that the percentage of surface mining will contrive to increase even as technology advances. It should be emphasized, however, that any adverse conditions of strip mining are not only intolerable, but are unnecessary.

H.R. 6482 seeks to avoid any unnecessary damage of past operations and at the same time adequately provide for the control of future surface coal mining operations. The objectives of the legislation are: first, to encourage a nationwide effort to regulate coal mining surface operations in order to present their adverse environmental effects; second, to return lands already damaged by coal mining surface operations to productive and useful purposes; third, 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 mined lands; and fifth, to encourage a nationwide effort to abate the adverse surface environmental effects resulting from surface operations of underground coal mining. The legislation applies to all coal mining operations, the products of which enter into or affect interstate commerce. Controls and restrictions of H.R. 6482 are to be applied uniformly to all States, thereby avoiding the inequities of existing State laws.

ENERGY LEGISLATION

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS (H.R. 5065, PUBLIC LAW 92–401)

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 pipelines in residential and commercial areas.

As cleared the new legislation not only extends the deadline for all States to enact legislation providing penalties for violation of natural gas pipline safety standards, but makes it mandatory for the Transportation Secretary to pay to the States grants-in-aid of up to 50 percent of the cost of State safety programs and up to 50 percent of the costs of State enforcement of Federal interstate pipeline safety standards.

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 1973. This extension should provide sufficient time for these States to act. Although minimum safety standards have been established by the Department of Transportation, many of the same concerns that led to the 1968 act remain: uncertainty over the condition of the pipeline system, inadequate monitoring of compliance with standards, gaps in the regulatory pattern, expanding 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 72, PUBLIC LAW 92–322)

Congress passed a resolution granting extending until September 1, 1974, the interstate compact to conserve 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 the States have been limited to activities related directly 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 preserves 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 the 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 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.

AUTHORIZATION TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO ISSUE OPERATING LICENSES FOR NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS (H.R. 14655, S. 3543, PUBLIC LAW 92–307)

A system by which operating licenses for nuclear power service could be issued for temporary service was approved by the House and Senate this session. Public Law 92–307 adds a new section to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to issue the temporary operating licenses for those nuclear power reactors whose electrical energy is needed to meet energy needs in its service area, provided the Commission determines that the plant can be operated on a temporary basis safely and with adequate protection of the environment.

Under the new authority, the Commission is authorized to issue a temporary license to operate the reactor under these circumstances even though the full-term license is being contested by interested members of the public. The temporary license, however, would not deprive the parties interested of a full review of the health and safety and environmental matters which may be contested. All substantive requirements of law applying in the issuance of license must be satisfied.

Such interested parties are to be given an opportunity initially to express their views on the petition in the form of affidavits, with a hearing to be held on the petition under expedited procedures which the Commission deems appropriate.

The new law is designed to be responsive to the Commission's requests, as it is to be responsive to the concerns of interested members of the public. At the same time, we are providing a temporary means of meeting emergency situations when certain areas of the country face a low peakload reserves areas.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATIONS (S. 3607, H.R. 14990, PUBLIC LAW 92–314)

During the second session, Congress authorized appropriations of $2,403,475,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1973. For operating expenses, a total not to exceed $126,400,000 is authorized for the high energy physics program category. For plant and capital equipment, a total of $492,995,000 is authorized. The second category includes construction, acquisition, or modification of facilities, including land acquisition and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction.

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, provided 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 represented an increase of $399,663,000, 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 1956 providing for effective 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 makes 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 knowingly to participate in using an aircraft for any of these purposes. Violators of the act are subject to a $5,000 penalty 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. Where no agency is given specific 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 articles 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.

MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT (H.R. 10420, S. 2871, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

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, porpoises, walrus, sea otter, and the manatee. This legislation gives the Commerce Department authority to grant exemptions, after public hearings, if such exemptions are in line with the policy of preserving 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 implements. 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 needed to allow our 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 stated that since 1930 the blue whale, largest and most intelligent mammal on earth other than man, has decreased by approximately 99 percent. Finback whales during the past 40 years have gone from 400,000 to 100,000. Polar bears are in imminent danger of extinction.

This legislation provides us with time to study the impact of pollution on the sea and its inhabitants, while allowing us to consider alternatives to commercial operations that strip the ocean of marine life. There is no question that we need some control of marine 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 PROPERTIES (H.R. 10325, 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 enactment of Public Law 92-432 provides more flexibility to the General Services Administration, whose responsibility it is to dispose of Federal surplus land and to convey such property for wildlife preservation use. To encourage public participation in surplus property sales to the most feasible extent, the General Services Administration is authorized to offer surplus property at reasonable credit terms in many instances. Proceeds from the sale of surplus real property are then placed in a "land and water conservation fund" available for this purpose. The disposition of Federal real property whether by further Federal use, disposal for local use by public bodies or nonprofit institutions, or public sale, contributes to the Federal Government's financial resources as well.

LAND ACQUISITION (H.R. 10384 PUBLIC LAW 92-)

Both Houses sent to the President a measure releasing certain restrictions on the acquisition of lands for recreational development and for the protection of natural resources at fish and wildlife areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

TUNA FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT (H.R. 12207, PUBLIC LAW 92-444)

On September 29, 1972, the President signed legislation authorizing a program for the development of tuna and other latent fisheries for resources in the Central and Western Pacific Ocean. In passing the legislation, Congress authorized the Secretary of Commerce to institute a 3-year program for the development of such fisheries resources. To accomplish this purpose, the bill authorizes to be appropriated a total of $3 million. The Department of Commerce must submit a report on the program, with proposals and accomplishments, to both the President and Congress by June 30, 1976.

FEDERAL ANIMAL DAMAGE CONTROL ACT (H.R. 13152)

Legislation was passed by the House July 17, 1972, to limit abuses of predator control programs and to reduce loss of livestock and poultry, especially in the West where such damage often is costly for ranches and farmers. As the country's environmental awareness has increased during the past few years, it has become even more apparent that no longer can we use control methods that are nonselective and place in jeopardy nonoffending animals, predators, and nonpredators alike. All wildlife species have value, even those which are predators, which in the balance of nature require an appropriate level of presence.

This legislation approaches the problem of attempting to provide some degree of protection to livestock from predators by prohibiting the use of those control methods which are extremely hazardous, while permitting the use of other control methods which are selective and concentrated on the offending animal in its individual capacity. It adopts a logical and scientific basis of individual control and management of predators given the situations involved. H.R. 13152 not only restricts the use of poisons, but develops a comprehensive predator control research program.

The Secretary of Interior is authorized to establish a research program to assist in the development of predator control methods consistent with principles of wildlife management and environmental quality, to make an inventory of predatory animals, to disseminate information, and to conduct demonstration projects. Financial aid to the States is authorized in order to assist in the conduct of control programs, during which the use of poisons is to be prohibited, except 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 through research and actual 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 or safety, preservation of species threatened with extinction, prevention of damage to natural resources, or prevention of major damage to domestic livestock.

Penalties of up to $10,000 and 1 year in prison, or both, for violations are authorized. Finally, $9.5 million is authorized in annual appropriations for fiscal 1973. Of this $1.5 million is to be allotted to 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 $8.5 million in annual appropriations is authorized.

MORATORIUM ON THE KILLING OF POLAR BEARS (H.R. RES. 1268)

On September 19, 1972, the House passed House Joint Resolution 1268 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 is to 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 1268, with an amendment indicating that the treaty, rather than calling for an immediate and appropriate moratorium on the killing of polar bears, should 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 and in any 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, with an estimated count of only 500 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.

H.R. 12186 amends the present law to provide for increased penalties, together with a requirement for less specific criminal intent, to serve as a deterrent to future violations of the act and make more effective the prosecution of alleged violators. Penalties are increased as follows: first offenders convicted of a violation under the act would be subject to a $5,000 fine or 1 year in prison, or both; second time offenders convicted under the act would be subject to a $10,000 fine or 2 years in prison, or both. The bill also provides that one-half of any criminal fine, not to exceed $2,500, would be required to be paid to the persons giving information leading to a conviction.

Under the legislation 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 the act, whether knowingly or not. Any Federal agency head who has issued a lease, license, permit or other agreement authorizing the grazing of domestic livestock on Federal lands to any person who is convicted of a violation of the act will be required immediately to cancel such agreement. Finally, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, as in the present law, to issue a permit for the taking, possession, and transportation of the bald or golden eagle for scientific or exhibition purposes and when necessary to protect wildlife, agricultural, or other interests, but only if there is a 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.

JELLYFISH APPROPRIATION (H.R. 16074)

H.R. 16074, passed by the House in October, extends for an additional 4 years the Federal program providing for the control, or elimination, of jellyfish and other such pests in the coastal waters of the United States. Recognizing that jellyfish cause a complex problem involving large bodies of water, with no easy solution, we passed this legislation to afford time and funds necessary to further study the complicated life history of these animals and to continue and discover a solution for effective control of problems surrounding the existence of these pests. The maximum costs to the Federal Government over the 4-year extension of the program is estimated to be $400,000 per year.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS (S. 2454, H.R. 16563, PUBLIC LAW 92–)

On October 12, the Senate cleared for the President S. 2454, passed by the House October 11, extending a 3-year pilot youth conservation program and increasing annual authorizations to $150 million from $3.5 million. S. 2454 establishes a Youth Conservation Corps for U.S. residents between the ages of 15 and 19, to be administered by the Secretaries of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. The Secretaries are authorized to establish a pilot Federal-State cost-sharing program for State administration of activities of the Corps, and they are directed to prepare an annual joint report on the program's operation.

NATIONAL PARKS

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS CEILING ON THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM (S. 2601, PUBLIC LAW 92–272)

P.L. 92–272 increases the appropriations ceiling for the national park system. Title I of the act increases ceilings for land acquisition in eight areas, as recommended by the Department of Interior. Title II increases ceilings for development in three areas; and title III authorizes boundary revisions in nine areas.

For some time the Interior Department and Congress have been concerned about the means for increasing appropriation ceilings and selected kinds of boundary changes in units of the national park system. It is believed that certain criteria should be employed for future increases, or boundary changes. This act, while limited to 18 projects, is intended to apply to future similar omnibus measures. By doing so, it is hoped that individual hearings on separate projects will be eliminated and any changes combined under one act.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENTS (S. 1893, H.R. 6730, PUBLIC LAW 92–347)

Final action was taken in the second session on restoration of the golden eagle program when Congress authorized a $10 annual camping permit for entrance into national parks, monuments, historic sites, and battlefields. The program had expired in December 1971. In amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (Public Law 88–578) Congress provided for an indefinite extension of permits administered by the Department of the Interior and by the Department of Agriculture for national recreation areas.

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 $100 for violations of permit 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 the revenue anticipated, the program has generated substantial revenue for the Federal Government in its effort to expand outdoor resources throughout the country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A VOLUNTEER SYSTEM FOR AGRICULTURE AND FOREST PROGRAMS (S. 1379, P.L. 92–300)

Congress approved a valuable extension of the environmental education system by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program of volunteers in the national forests program. Volunteers are to be used in interpretive activities as needed along the historic trails and to provide their skills in the development and presentation of visitor programs in connection with interpretive trails, visitation centers, information stations, and amphitheaters. They are to assist in the youth programs operated by the Forest Service including the Youth Conservation Corps, Job Corps, and Neighborhood Youth Corps. In some cases, the volunteers may construct or refurbish special projects, for example parts of the National Trail System. Although the volunteers would work without compensation, the Secretary of Agriculture could provide for incidental expenses, such as transportation, uniforms, lodging, and subsistence. Volunteers would not be considered Federal employees.

NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND WILDERNESS

During the first and second session of the 92d Congress, the following legislation was passed establishing or altering national parkland, national recreation areas and national recreation areas and national wilderness areas: Public Law 92–237, establishing the Buffalo National River, Ark.; Public Law 92–154, expanding boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park in Utah; Public Law 92–207, establishing the Capitol Reef Park in Utah; Public Law 92–155, establishing Arches National Park in Utah; S. 141, creating the Fossil Butte National Monument in Wyoming; Public Law 92–395, designating the Lincoln Back Country and parts of the Lewis and Clark National Forests as National Wilderness; Public Law 92–230, designating the Pine Mountain and Prescott and Tonto National Forests as National Wilderness; Public Law 92–241, designating the Sycamore Canyon and Prescott National Forest as National Wilderness; Public Law 92–260, establishing the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area; Public Law 92–275, establishing the Gulf Island National Seashores; Public Law 92–364, designating certain lands in the Cedar Keys National Wildlife Refuge in Florida as National Wilderness; Public Law 92–400, establishing the Sawtooth National Recreation Area; Public Law 92–330, establishing the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge; Public Law 92–408, establishing the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge in California; S. 1852, establishing the Gateway National Seashore in New York and New Jersey; Public Law 92–465, modifying boundaries of the Santa Fe, Gila, Cebola, and Carson National Forests in New Mexico; Public Law 92–476, designating the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness; Public Law 92–478, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the most feasible means of protecting and preserving the Great Dismal Swamp and the Dismal Swamp Canal; H.R. 5838, designating certain lands in the Lava Beds National Monument in California as wilderness; Public Law 92–475, designating certain lands in the Lassen Volcanic National Park, California, as wilderness; S. 1497 authorizing certain additions to the Sitka National Monument in the State of Alaska; S. 3129, creating the Longfellow National Historic Site; H.R. 9859, establishing the Cumberland Island National Seashore

in Georgia; H.R. 15597, authorizing additional funds for acquisition of interests in land within Piscataway Park in Maryland; H.R. 13067, providing for administration of the Man-A-Lago National Historic Site in Florida; H.R. 8756, establishing the Hohokam Pima National Monument in Arizona; H.R. 6446, providing for addition of the Minam River Canyon to the Eagle Cap Wilderness and Wallowa and Whitman National Forests; H.R. 11449, providing that the United States disclaim any interest in certain land in New Mexico; 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. 1928, designating a segment of the St. Croix River in Minnesota and Wisconsin as part of the national wild and scenic rivers system; H.R. 16444, establishing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area; S. 1441, designating the Flat Tops Wilderness, Routt, and White River National Forests; S. 1473, creating the Kosciusko National Historic Site; S. 1198, authorizing a review of the Indian Peaks Area in Colorado as to suitability for preservation as a wilderness.

FORESTRY 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 unused land potentially available for tree planting programs. Not only is technical expertise 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.

Public Law 92-288, signed by the President May 5, 1972, supplements existing cooperative forestry programs between the Federal Government and the States. The act broadens the present scope of the Cooperative Forest Management Act by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to assist the States in the protection, improvement, and planting of trees and shrubs in urban areas, communities, and open spaces. Present authority limits the program to protection of trees and forests in nonurban, forested areas. The legislation increases from $5 million to $20 million the authorization for assistance to the States for implementing the program of forestry assistance to landowners.

It increases from $20 million to $40 million the authorization for appropriations to implement cooperative forest fire protection programs. The Federal Government has cooperative agreements with all States for forest fire programs.

NATIONAL REFORESTATION PROGRAM (H.R. 13089, PUBLIC LAW 92-421)

That reforestation is needed in our national forest system is evidenced by the fact that forestry experts estimate that our country is about 5 million acres behind in tree seeding and planting. This is one of the reasons that the Congress approved in 1972 the Accelerated Reforestation of National Forests Act which establishes a Supplemental National Forest Reforestation Fund. H.R. 13089 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 reforesting 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 at all its levels. Herein summarized are bills passed by the Congress, or the House, during the 92d Congress concerned with first, employees of the Federal Government, second, congressional-executive relationships, third, structure and reorganization of executive departments, fourth, the operation of Congress itself, fifth, Federal campaign and election law, sixth, the Federal judiciary, seventh, intergovernmental relations and eighth, weights' and measures' standards; to name some of the areas.

At the beginning of each part of this section of the report are summarized in brief laws enacted during the first session, followed by more detailed summaries of actions taken during the second session.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, legislative matters affecting Federal employees have been of considerable import during the 92d Congress. Several public laws were enacted during the first session of the 92d. These included equality of treatment for married women employees of the Government with respect to receiving the same benefits as do married male employees (Public Law 92-187, H.R. 3628), provision for overtime pay for intermittent and part-time General Schedule employees (Public Law 92-194, H.R. 8689), and pay adjustments for Federal employees at 5.5 percent January 1, 1972, under the Economic Stabilization Act (Public Law 92-210, H.R. 10881). Final action is pending for other bills which passed the House during the first session. Among these are the repeal of employees training act reporting requirements (H.R. 134, July 19, 1971) and the liberalization of the civil service retirement system with regard to cost-of-living increases (S. 1681, amended, May 17, 1971; Senate asked for a conference April 4, 1972).

During the second session, Congress has enacted additional legislation.

PREVAILING RATE PAY SYSTEMS (H.R. 9092; PUBLIC LAW 92-392)

The House, on July 28, 1971, passed H.R. 9092, which would establish an equitable statutory system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for Federal prevailing-rate (blue-collar) employees.

The Senate acted on the bill during the second session and the measure was signed into law August 19, 1972—Public Law 92-392. More than 800,000 blue-collar Federal employees have had their wage rates set under a system which had been established and administered by the executive branch. We in Congress agreed with the unions that all Federal employees should have their salary systems covered by statute. Under the law the 140,000 employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces will be included in the prevailing rate system as they have not been in the past. President Nixon had vetoed a similar bill January 1, 1971.

RETIREMENT—ADOPTED CHILD (S. 2896; PUBLIC LAW 92-243)

It was brought to the attention of Congress that an inequity existed with regard to adopted children of civil service annuitants and their ineligibility for survivor benefits. Public Law 92-243, approved March 9, 1972 (S. 2896), provides that a child who lives with and for whom a petition of adoption is filed by an employee or member, and who is adopted by the surviving spouse of the employee after his death, be included within the definition of "child" for purposes of eligibility for a survivor benefits.

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. The President signed Public Law 92-382 August 14, 1972. President Nixon had vetoed a similar bill January 4, 1971. Public Law 92-382 authorizes heads of Federal departments and agencies to permit Government firefighters with 20 years of service to retire at age 50 or to retire after 25 years' service regardless of age. It is expected that this law will benefit approximately 9,500 Government employees.

SUPREME COURT ANNUITIES (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 employees health insurance plans. As passed the bill would provide that the Government's contribution

amount to 75 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. The bill was in conference when the session ended. Senate conferees argued that the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 intended that all fringe benefits, such as health benefits, would be a negotiable item in collective bargaining and Congress should not legislate in this area for postal workers. House conferees argued that the Government's contribution to health insurance premiums should cover all Government employees, including postal workers.

CONGRESS

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT (H.R. 10243)

Mr. Speaker, during the second session Congress responded to the serious physical, biological, and social problems facing the Nation. Such problems result from the increasing pressures of population, the rapid consumption of natural resources, and the deterioration of the human environment—natural and social. As a means of providing legislative resources to anticipate these diverse and often conflicting pressures we passed H.R. 10243, to establish an Office of Technology Assessment.

The Office, as an agency of the legislative branch, would have two basic responsibilities; to provide an early appraisal of the probable impacts—both positive and negative—of the applications of technology; and to develop other coordinate information which may assist the Congress in determining the relative priorities of programs before it. The Office would first, identify existing or probable impacts of technology or technological programs; second, establish cause-and-effect relationships wherever possible; third, determine alternative technological methods of implementing specific programs; fourth, determine alternative programs for achieving requisite goals; fifth, make estimates and comparisons of the impacts of alternative methods and programs; sixth, present findings of completed analyses of the appropriate legislative authorities; seventh, identify areas where additional research or data collection is required to provide adequate support for the assessments and estimates described, and eighth, undertake such additional associated tasks as the appropriate authorities may direct.

The Office would be composed of a policymaking body called the Technology Assessment Board and an operational unit to be headed by a Director. The Board would have 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 chairmen of committees, the Board, or the Director, in consultation with the Board. Assessments shall be 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 Office is given 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 research and development in 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 Director of the Congressional Research Service 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 election law and 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 rapidly ratified and 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 electorate—numbering around 11 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 16 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 92–178. Deferred until 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, final 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. 382, H.R. 11060, PUBLIC LAW 92–225)

Early in the second session the House approved the conference report on S. 382, the Federal Election Campaign Act. The President signed it into law February 7, and it became operative 2 months later on April 7. Public Law 92–225 is the first comprehensive overhaul of Federal campaign regulation law since 1925.

Under the new law candidates for Federal office and those political committees which operate in their behalf are limited to spending the greater of either $50,000, or an amount arrived at by multiplying the resident voting age population for the office in question by 10 cents for broadcast, newspaper, magazine, and billboard political advertising and for paid telephone campaigning. The law contains a cost-of-living provision, which increases the spending ceiling for candidates by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the year preceding an election over the base year, which is 1970.

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 are aware, with the exception of the 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 for the House chose to spend 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 the lowest unit rate for the period for which they purchase time on radio and television. 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.

During periods of time 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 limitation 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 an advertisement, 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 past this was not true 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 media limitations to State and local elections. It 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.

Most provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as amended, were repealed by Public Law 92–225. 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 or holding contracts with the Government from making, or being solicited for, campaign contributions or providing other things of value; to permit bank loans to candidates so long as those are made in accordance with applicable banking laws and regulations and in the ordinary course of business; to permit corporations and labor unions to communicate political information to their stockholders and members; to permit corporations and labor unions to engage in nonpartisan registration and get-out-the vote campaigns aimed at their stockholders and members; and to permit them to establish voluntary groups to solicit contributions from their stockholders and members but to prohibit any coercion or threat in connection with such soliciting.

Title III of Public Law 92–225 requires that all campaign contributions and expenditures in primary, general, special, or runoff elections; nominating conventions or caucuses; elections for selection of delegates to a national nominating convention; presidential preference primaries; and elections for delegates to a national constitutional convention must be reported to appropriate supervisory officers. Candidates for the House report to the Clerk of the House; those for the Senate to the Secretary of the Senate; and those for President or Vice President, or other officers, to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Committees organized in support of these candidates report to the appropriate supervisory official. Committees which expect to receive or spend in excess of $1,000 a year in support of a candidate for Federal office must register with the appropriate supervisory officer. Candidates and their committees must file periodic contributions and expenditures reports with the appropriate supervisory officers whose duty it is to make these available to the public as soon as possible and to publish an annual report detailing the sums spent and received.

Copies of periodic reports are also filed with the Secretary of State, or his equivalent, in each State. In addition, the costs of national nominating conventions must be reported to the Comptroller General.

These disclosure provisions will provide for the first time an accurate accounting of money received and spent in all elections for Federal office. Loopholes which existed in the Corrupt Practices Act have been closed. The public will now 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 OEO 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 92–225 a misunderstanding arose regarding the intent of that provision of the act barring corporations or labor unions holding government contracts from making direct political contributions. Some people felt that this ban 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 did not intend 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 cannot. The Senate refused to act on this bill.

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

During the first session, the Congress approved an extension, to April 1, 1973, of the President's authority under the Reorganization Act of 1949 to submit Reorganization Plans to the Congress—Public Law 92–179. In addition, the Congress approved Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971, which consolidated a number of volunteer programs such as Peace Corps, VISTA, and foster grandparents which were scattered among various departments and agencies, into a new independent agency called Action.

Early in the second session, the House Committee on Government Operations, which exercises jurisdictional authority over the general subject of 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 structure by creating four new "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 some degree of control over Federal advisory bodies. An intensive investigation by the Special Studies Subcommittee during the 91st Congress revealed that there were as many as 3,200 interagency 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, accountability 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 House Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee and by the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. Its purpose is to regulate the proliferation of advisory committees in the Government, to insure greater accountability on the part of such bodies both to the public and to the Congress, to prescribe standard administrative and operational 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 proposals for action 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 a Committee 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 also would require that: first, congressional committees considering legislation to establish advisory committees follow certain stated guidelines to insure that their membership is properly balanced and that such committees are adequately funded and staffed; second, heads of agencies in which advisory committees are operating 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, 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 depository 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. 3240, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

Amendments to the Transportation Act of 1940 were 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 billing and 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 remain in military service 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, as well as a bonus for judge advocates who 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. 8699, PUBLIC LAW 92-238)

In addition to his strictly judicial duties the Chief Justice of the United States has heavy administrative responsibilities with inadequate staff assistance. Accordingly, Congress approved 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. MAGISTRATE (H.R. 9180, PL 92-239)

Public Law 92-239 authorized temporary transfer of U.S. magistrates from one court district 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 tremendously in the past decade. 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 more than 9,000 in 1971. Certainly we need more judges. But we also need to change the boundaries of the circuits—possibly we need more circuits. Our judicial circuits presently cover vast areas in which population has increased greatly in past decades. And yet, with one exception, we have not changed the boundaries of our judicial circuits since the Court of Appeals Act of 1891.

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 16 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.

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 those boundaries it considers necesary 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 $270,000 is authorized in appropriations for the work of the Commission.

LOWERING QUALIFYING AGE FOR FEDERAL JURY SERVICE TO 18 (S. 1975, PL 92-269)

After the 26th amendment lowered the voting age to 18 the minimum age required for Federal jury service was still 21. In the second session the Congress passed S. 1975—Public Law 92-269—which lowers the age for service on Federal juries to 18. S. 1975 also provides that master jury wheels 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 wheels by the same date from other sources which include the names of 18-year-old citizens. S. 1975 requires that qualified jury wheels be refilled from master jury wheels within the following month, by October 1, 1973. S. 1975 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 92-428)

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 full-time 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.

TERRITORIES

GUAM AND VIRGIN ISLANDS DELEGATES TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (H.R. 8787, PL 92-271)

The final congressional approval of H.R. 8787 on March 28, 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 human 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 territories require direct representation to meet conditions in each territory. The enactment of Public Law 92-271 places the responsibility for the furtherance of the legislative objectives of these territories upon the popularly elected Delegates.

As approved, Public Law 92-271 states that the Delegate from each territory shall receive the same compensation, 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 centum 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 for the development of tuna and other latent fisheries resources in the Central, Western, and South Pacific Ocean. Specifically, the bill was enacted to encourage development of a "skipjack tuna" 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. 860, PL 92-257)

Public Law 92-257, approved March 21, 1972, promotes the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by authorizing an appropriation of $3.1 million to the Trust Territory economic development loan fund. This law increases the fund from $1.9 million to $5 million, and sets the conditions for making loans from the fund.

BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION (H.R. 13694; S. 3307)

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was created by joint reso-

lution of the 89th Congress for the purpose of developing 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 or executive agency heads, and 17 members 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 Commission's roster the Secretary of the Treasury, eight public members—to be representative of youth, elderly citizens, racial and ethnic minorities, the creative arts, useful crafts, and learned professions—and four members of the Federal judiciary to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States. The first session of the 92d Congress also increased the authorization for appropriations for fiscal year 1971 from $373,000 to $670,000.

Public Law 92-236 authorized appropriations for fiscal year 1972 of $4,300,000, of which not to exceed $2,400,000 was to be used for grants-in-aid. This law also authorized the Commission to prepare and distribute historical and commemorative materials to contribute to public awareness of the forthcoming bicentennial; to plan for competitions and provide awards for contributions to the bicentennial effort; to provide a central clearinghouse for information on the bicentennial; and to make grants of up to $45,000 for 2 successive years to each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to assist in the establishment or implementation of Bicentennial Commissions.

Legislation to further amend Public Law 89-491, the statute which created the Bicentennial Commission, came before the House on June 19 of this year in the form of H.R. 13694. The bill authorized appropriations of $6,712,000 for fiscal year 1973, of which not to exceed $2,400,000 was to be used for the second year of the grants-in-aid program to the States. The measure also authorized grants to nonprofit entities of up to 50 percent of total cost to encourage bicentennial programs and projects, provided that the Commission could accept donations or bequests earmarked for specific nonprofit entities for bicentennial programs and award such funds to the intended recipient on the condition that the recipient match the combined value of the grant for the program; authorized the President for the period of 1 year to waive certain existing limitations of law with regard to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, the acquisition and disposition of property, and the expenditure of grant funds; and, finally, authorized the Commission to hire 10 additional supergrade employees to carry out its functions. However, a number of Members questioned the leadership, operations, and present direction of the Commission and the bill failed of passage under suspension of the rule.

Further questions were raised about the operations of the Commission and its leadership in a series of newspaper articles in July and September 12 the chairmen of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, announced that he would submit an amendment to H.R. 13694 to authorize only interim funding for the Commission while his staff conducted a study of its operations and functions. Accordingly, on September 28, H.R. 13694 was amended to authorize $3,356,000 for the Commission, to remain available until February 15, 1973. The amended version of the bill also struck out the authority of the President to waive provisions of existing law with regard to making of contracts and acquisition of property, and the authorization for ten new supergrade positions.

The Senate passed a bill, S. 3307, which was similar to the original House version of H.R. 13694, on August 10. It was amended on the Senate floor to provide that future public members of the Commission be more evenly divided among the two political parties, to cut the additional supergrades authorized from 10 to five, and to require a monthly report of the Congress relative to the use of certain authorities—with regard to making contracts—granted to the Commission. In addition, two nongermane amendments relating to Federal elections were adopted on the Senate floor.

As Congress moved toward adjournment the Senate accepted the modified authorization approved by the House on September 28, clearing the measure for the President's signature.

HEALTH AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 92d Congress several significant health care 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 authorization 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 professions.

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 Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health to marshal the Nation's resources and launch an all-out attack against cancer.

Significant congressional actions during the second session include:

DRUG ABUSE OFFICE AND TREATMENT ACT OF 1972 (S. 382, PUBLIC LAW 92-225)

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 560,000 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 attributed to addicts who seek 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 abuse prevention, rehabilitation, and education programs in the area of dangerous drugs. This office will also fund research efforts leading toward 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, maintaining, coordinating, and evaluating projects to deal with drug abuse.

NATIONAL SICKLE CELL ANEMIA CONTROL ACT (S. 2676, PUBLIC LAW 92-294)

On May 16, 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 affects black Americans. Approximately 1,000 black infants are born each year with sickle cell anemia, and it is estimated that between 25,000 and 50,000 individuals are today afflicted with it. These citizens often die before the age of 20; few survive beyond age 40; and most are disabled before death.

To help combat this disease this act provides for appropriation authorizations over a 3-year period of $115 million. The bill also provides a national program for screening individuals with the sickle cell trait and counseling them, particularly in regard to marriage, for in the event that people with this trait marry, the probabilities are one in four that a child born to them will have the sickle cell trait. In addition, the act provides for further research into the diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of this disease.

NATIONAL HEART, BLOOD VESSEL, LUNG, AND BLOOD ACT OF 1972 (S. 3323, PUBLIC LAW 92-423)

Mr. Speaker, diseases of the heart and blood vessels cause more than half of all deaths each year in the United States. If these diseases could be eliminated, the average Americans life span would be increased by about 11 years. Passage of Public Law 92-423 by the Senate and House will help to conquer the Nation's No. 1 killer—heart disease.

It should be noted that three types of cardiovascular disease—heart attacks, strokes, and peripheral vascular diseases—have reached epidemic proportions in this country. For example, approximately 1.2 million Americans suffer heart attacks each year; stroke kills more than 200,000 citizens every year; and peripheral vascular diseases disable more than 150,000 individuals each year.

Public Law 92-423 enlarges the authority of the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Health Institute and establishes a 10-point program for it. Some of these programs include: First, the establishment of public and professional programs relating to all aspects of blood, heart, and lung disease; second, research into the causes and prevention of these diseases; and third, establishment of programs for study and research into these disease.

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, $1.38 billion has been authorized.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASES 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 House followed suit 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 of diseases. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is granted the authority to transfer funds from one program to another, thereby assuring him of the needed flexibility in administering such programs as tuberculosis, measles, or venereal control.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS, METABOLISM AND DIGESTIVE DISEASES (H.R. 13591, PUBLIC LAW 92-305)

H.R. 13591, Public Law 92-305, amends the Public Health Service Act to designate the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases. No new authorizations for appropriations were required by this action. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did estimate, however, that it would cost about $26,000 in additional administrative expenses.

This act does not represent simply a change of name, but recognition that there is a critical need to expand research and training in the field of digestive diseases. At the present time, there are only 700 physicians in the United States who have been certified as specialists in digestive diseases, while health statistics reveal that nearly 13 million Americans suffer from chronic digestive diseases. The fourth highest death rate among Americans is caused by cancer of the digestive tract and other digestive diseases. Through the enactment of this law greater emphasis will now be placed on combating digestive diseases.

NATIONAL COOLEY'S ANEMIA CONTROL ACT (H.R. 15474, PUBLIC LAW 92-414)

Mr. Speaker, Cooley's anemia is a genetic disorder that affects children primarily. It is characterized by the imperfect formation of hemoglobin and red blood cells. Children with Cooley's anemia often have enlarged spleens and livers, and their bone growth is uneven, often leading to facial features characteristic of Mongoloids. There is no known cure for this disease, although the administration of blood transfusions lengthens the lives of the approximately 50,000 individuals afflicted with Cooley's anemia. The disease is almost always fatal, with those afflicted having an average life span of 20 years.

With the passage of H.R. 15474—Public Law 92-414—a 3-year program has been established to accomplish several major goals. First, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to establish a program of grants and contracts for screening, treating, and counseling citizens with Cooley's anemia. These programs should help minimize the possibility of children inheriting the disease from those who carry the Cooley anemia trait.

Second, H.R. 15474 authorizes grants and contracts for research in diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of the disease. Finally, Mr. Speaker, this act authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop and disseminate information on Cooley's anemia to the public and various health professions. Through these programs means can be found to control and eradicate this disease.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS ACT (H.R. 15475)

Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1972, the House passed H.R. 15475, which calls for the creation of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the causes of and cures for multiple sclerosis. This progressive disease of the nervous system, Mr. Speaker, generally strikes adults between the ages of 20 and 40. It is estimated that about 250,000 persons are afflicted with this disease. The Senate passed an amended version of this bill on September 26, 1972.

Multiple sclerosis, Mr. Speaker, attacks the brain and spinal cord and forms scars—scleroses—at the sites of the damage. This damage results in the symptoms of the disease, which may include shaking or tremor, extreme weakness, progressive paralysis, and visual disorders. Persons afflicted with this disease, for which there is no known cure, have an average life expectancy of between 13 and 25 years.

H.R. 15475, as passed by the House, provides for the establishment of a nine-man Commission to determine how this disease may be combated. Five members of the Commission shall be members of the existing advisory council to the National Institutes on Neurological Diseases and Stroke, and four members shall be selected by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from the public. The National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis is to make recommendations within one year and shall cease to exist 30 days after making its final report. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this Commission will provide the direction needed to find the cure for a disease that strikes down people in the prime of their life.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ACT (H.R. 15859)

Mr. Speaker, on October 2, 1972, the House passed H.R. 15859, the Emergency Medical Services Act. This act will help to save the lives of thousands of American citizens who suffer heart attacks, are involved in automobile accidents, or suffer other medical emergencies but die before they reach a hospital for lack of emergency medical facilities. For example, 55,000 people die every year in automobile accidents; 16,000 children die every year in accidents; and 275,000 citizens die every year from heart attacks before they reach a hospital. It has been estimated that as many as 35,000 of these deaths could be prevented by the availability of emergency medical services.

H.R. 15859 provides new authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to support the development and expansion of emergency medical services and training throughout the Nation. The Secretary is granted authority to let grants and contracts for: First, planning and feasibility studies; second, the establishment and initial operation of emergency medical systems; and third, their 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. 8395)

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 Act.

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 to assist States 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 this Commission will be to educate the public about these problems so steps can be taken to resolve them.

EXTENSION OF COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970 (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.

EXTENSION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS ACT (H.R. 16676)

H.R. 16676 extends for 1 year the Community Mental Health Centers Act. This act stimulated the development of community-based mental health centers throughout the Nation. Under the authority of this act, the National Institute of Mental Health has funded 493 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 facil-

ities for the mental health of children will be continued.

EMERGENCY HEALTH PERSONNEL ACT OF 1972 (S. 3858, H.R. 16755)

S. 3858 (H.R. 16755), the Emergency Health Personnel Act, established within the Public Health Service a National Health Service Corps. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to designate areas of the country that have critical health manpower shortages and to then assign Corps personnel to these areas. Corps personnel will provide care and service to all persons within such areas regardless of the ability of individuals to pay for them. In addition, the bill authorizes the Secretary to conduct recruiting programs at medical and nursing schools and to offer scholarships to students who, upon the completion of their studies, will become commissioned officers of the National Health Service Corps.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted Public Law 92–213, concerning disaster loans, planning grants, and new community assistance. Public Law 92–213 extends the period for emergency implementation of the national flood insurance program to December 31, 1973, and includes church properties among those eligible for coverage. It increases the authorization for appropriations for comprehensive planning and open-space land grants and extends the deadline for communities to meet the planning requirement 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 OF AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH INTEREST RATES ON INSURED MORTGAGES (S.J. RES. 250, PL 92–335)

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. This legislation also extends the authorizations for appropriations for the model cities program for water-sewer and neighborhood facilities grant programs, and for the open space land program.

HOUSING PROGRAMS EXTENSION (H.J. RES. 1301)

In October 1972 action was concluded on a joint resolution to extend existing housing and urban development programs through June 30, 1973. This extension became necessary when it became impossible to complete consideration of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1972. The resolution extends the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development relative to insurance of loans and mortgages under the National Housing Act.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Speaker, while neither the House nor the Senate passed a major measure affecting immigration during the First Session, the House has passed two bills during this session.

VISA AVAILABILITY (H.R. 9615)

H.R. 9615, a bill to make additional special immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, passed the House on March 16, 1972.

This measure is intended to remove two inequities 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 of the eastern hemisphere 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 7,500 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.

HIRING OF ILLEGAL ALIENS (H.R. 16188)

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 employees who hire illegal aliens.

This legislation aims to deter the illegal alien by eliminating his incentive for employment. The graduated three-step procedure against those hiring illegal aliens would consist of a warning for the first offense, a civil penalty of not more than $500 per alien for a second offense, and a fine of $1,000 and/or 1-year imprisonment for each alien for a third offense. The Attorney General is also required to exercise due process in administrative hearings of such cases.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

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 law provided for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaskan 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 a 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 assist them 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 (S. 659, PUBLIC LAW 92–318)

Public Law 92–318, the Education Amendments of 1972, amended several education acts. Of relevance to Indians is title IV, "Indian Education," the provisions of which were passed by the Senate on October 8, 1971, as the Indian Education Act of 1971 (S. 2482).

Title IV provides for:

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.

LABOR

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 to June 30, 1972, the reporting date for the Commission on Railroad Retirement, created to study the railroad retirement system.

Additional congressional action has been forthcoming during the second session.

NLRA EXTENSION TO NONPROFIT HOSPITALS (H.R. 11357)

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-95 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:

> To self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and the corollary right to refrain from any and all of such activities.

Employers would also be granted the rights guaranteed most other employers: to invoke the Act against unfair labor practices engaged in by unions.

LABOR-HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 15417)

On August 16, 1972, the President vetoed H.R. 15417, a bill appropriating funds for fiscal 1973 for the Department of Labor and the Department of 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 provision in H.R. 16654 exempts businesses employing three or fewer employees.

MINIMUM WAGE (H.R. 7130)

Congress failed to resolve differences over H.R. 7130 and it died with adjournment. Earlier this year the House voted to raise the minimum wage of workers covered under the act. The measure, as passed by the House, included provisions for a minimum wage for nonagricultural workers covered prior to the 1966 amendments of $1.80 an hour during the first year and $2 thereafter: a minimum wage for nonagricultural workers covered by the 1966 and 1972 amendments of $1.70 an hour during the first year, $1.80 during the second year, and $2 thereafter. 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 delivering certain types of advertising material and husband and wife teams in nonprofit educational institutions who serve as resident house parents for orphans lodged and boarded.

The House version provided for the employment of youths under 18 and full-time students under 21 at wage rates not less than 80 percent of the applicable minimum or $1.60 per hour—$1.30 per hour in agriculture—whichever is higher, with such employment in accordance with applicable child labor laws and subject to standards by the Secretary of Labor to insure that opportunities for other workers are not hindered.

The Senate version extended coverage to an additional 7.5 million persons including Federal, State, and local civil service employees, but not persons serving in the armed services; to domestic household workers, but not babysitters; to certain agricultural workers, and to retail and service establishment employees working in chain stores.

The Senate version postponed the maximum minimum wage of nonagricultural workers covered prior to the 1966 amendments for an additional year and agricultural workers for an additional 2 years. The Senate voted to increase the minimum hourly wage of nonagricultural workers covered prior to the 1966 amendments to $2 an hour during the first year and $2.20 2 years later, nonagricultural workers covered by the 1966 and 1972 amendments to $1.80 an hour during the first year, $2 the second year, and $2.20 thereafter. Agricultural workers would have gotten $1.60 an hour during the first year, $1.80 during the second year, $2 during the third year, and $2.20 thereafter. These provisions were to take effect 60 days after enactment.

H.R. 7130, as passed by the Senate, also included provisions for minimum hourly wages and increases for certain employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; extended the equal pay provisions for previously exempted executives, administrative or professional employees, and outdoor salesmen; repealed minimum wage and overtime exemptions for certain employees such as motion picture theatre employees; and repealed overtime exemptions for certain workers such as parts men and mechanics in auto, truck, and trailer dealerships, and catering food service employees.

Finally, the Senate version included provisions relating to: Tips, child labor, employment of illegal aliens, liquidated damages, age discrimination in government employment, a minimum hourly wage rate of $1.70 for Canal Zone workers covered under the act, and present provisions of the act concerning youth employment and employing students part time in educational institutions.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKER'S COMPENSATION ACT (S. 2318, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

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 on the job in certain areas of employment. The present act, enacted in 1927, generally provides a Federal compensation program for injuries or death arising from employment on the navigable waters of the United States. Because this legislation was the only Federal control over private employment in workmen compensation matters, the statute over the years has been extended to cover employees of the District of Columbia and other areas of Federal interest.

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 nonappropriated fund agencies such as post exchanges, and in work on the Outer Continental Shelf. The law is amended by S. 2318 specifically to provide injury compensation benefits to these other areas of employment. Benefits will now extend to workers receiving injuries while working in navigable waters beyond the U.S. limits. S. 2318 not only improves benefits and extends coverage, but improves administration.

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 owners of U.S. Government securities which are lost, stolen or damaged (S. 1181; Public Law 92–19). The granting of such relief is an act of justice on the part of the Government to those who have invested their savings in their Government.

It would be difficult to overestimate the threat which drug abuse poses to the health, welfare, and public order of our country. In the first session of the 92d Congress the House passed an amendment (H.R. 8389) to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 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 92–13) increasing the 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 right of privacy of others by defining obscene matter, passed the House in July, 1971. H.R. 8805 establishes definitions of "obscene" matter that would be nonmailable to minors 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 provides mail patrons with a means not to receive unsolicited "potentially offensive sexual material." The Senate did not act on this bill.

During the 1960's, 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, but 48 percent of all arrests for serious crime are of young people in this age group. Arrests of persons in no 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 lawlessness. The 92d Congress during its first session passed The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act Amendments of 1971 (S. 1732; Public Law 92–31), 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.

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE (H.R. 45)

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 Justice. 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 model laws together with recommendations on juvenile justice; it would devise and conduct seminars and workshops on juvenile delinquency; it would provide a short-term 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 rec-

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; to contract with public or private 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 living allowance.

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 U.S. Judicial Center, plus 15 persons having training and experience in the various areas of juvenile delinquency.

On September 13, 1972, the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency approved H.R. 45 for consideration by the full Judiciary Committee, but the Senate did not debate the bill and it died with adjournment.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT (H.R. 15635, PUBLIC LAW 92-381)

Public Law 92-381, approved by the President August 14, 1972, provides assistance to elementary and secondary schools, community 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 local programs, technical assistance for them, and information services. Local grants will be for the purpose of funding coordinated youth service systems. A local grantee, however, will have the responsibility for finding out those services available within its community which can assist in preventing delinquency, and to coordinate programs so that a youth 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, so that they can be helped to utilize existing facilities. The emphasis is to help a child before he or she becomes delinquent, with preventive effort directed toward attempts to identify these young people most likely to become delinquents.

The new law also requires that funds made available by Congress be concentrated in areas which have the highest rates of youth crime, youth unemployment, and school dropouts. Authority in the 1968 Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act was retained for construction grants for community based special purpose or innovative facilities, limited to 10 percent of available funds. Funding was authorized at $75 million annually for 2 years, fiscal 1973 and 1974.

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS (H.R. 9323, PUBLIC LAW 92-420)

This session final action was taken on legislation amending the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to permit the use of methadone in 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 therapy which are designed to control, but not necessarily eliminate, a narcotic addict's dependence on addicting drugs. "Treatment" henceforth includes control of dependence, through the use of synthetics such as methadone, in addition to elimination of dependence. Public Law 92-420 authorizes confinement and treatment in an institution and supervised aftercare in the community, in addition to the medical, educational, social, psychological and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services authorized in the 1966 act to protect the public and benefit the addict by eliminating his dependence on addicting drugs.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS ACT OF 1972 (S. 2087, H.R. 16932, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

An amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to provide benefits to survivors of public safety officers who die in the performance of duty, was cleared for the President's signature. S. 2087 directs the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to pay a $50,000 death gratuity to survivors of certain public safety officers 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 and volunteer firemen, 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 either in the apprehension of a suspect or a criminal, or the protection or guarding of suspects, prisoners, or material witnesses, or trying to prevent a crime. The $50,000 death benefit would not be subject to Federal income taxes.

S. 2087 is designed to meet the immediate financial needs of the officer's survivors and, at the same time, to upgrade and improve employment potential in the professions of law enforcement and firefighting. It is an important step in encouraging qualified and outstanding persons to serve as policemen or firefighters.

MANPOWER TRAINING, JOB OPPORTUNITY, AND REGIONAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted into law four bills concerned with manpower training, job opportunity, and regional and rural development. These included Public Law 92-54, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, which provided for approximately 150,000 public service jobs in recreation, education, health, housing, public safety, and environmental improvement; S. 575, the Public Works and Appalachian Regional Development Act amendments, which would have authorized funds for accelerated public works projects and regional development programs, but was vetoed by the President; Public Law 92-65, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971, which authorized funds for public works, business loans, employment opportunities, and regional development; and Public Law 92-12, the Rural Telephone Bank Act, which provided for supplementary financing to meet the growing capital needs of rural telephone systems.

Three measures of importance merit our attention during this second session.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT AMENDMENTS (S. 3054, PUBLIC LAW 92-277)

In April 1972, action was completed on the Manpower Development and Training Act amendments to extend the authority and provision for funding under the original act for 1 year. Programs under the act are currently funded at about $750 million and these programs have almost 150,000 enrollees. This legislation enables contracts to be entered into assuring the continuation of such programs as skill centers, opportunities industrialization centers and institutional and on-the-job training programs through 1973.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 12931) S. 3462, PUBLIC LAW 92-419)

In August 1972 Congress cleared the Rural Development Act to provide 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 together in one piece of legislation, including education, research, credit, and other financial assistance, planning, and environmental protection.

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 rural residents to acquire, establish, or operate small businesses and to make and insure rural business and industrial loans, including pollution abatement and control loans. In addition, FHA loans are authorized 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 funding ceiling is increased from $100 million to $300 million and rural water and sewer planning grant authority is increased from $15 million to $30 million annually. Top priority for rural water and sewer loans and grants is to be given to areas with populations of 5,500 or less. Title I defines "rural areas" for most purposes as communities of 10,000 or fewer inhabitants and establishes planning guidelines for FHA grants which require that proposed projects serve areas not likely to decline in population. Grants of up to $10 million annually are authorized for the preparation of comprehensive rural development plans.

Title II amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to include the conservation and utilization of land as well as water under the act. Title II authorizes Federal cost sharing for water quality management, land utilization, agricultural waste management, and water shortage. It also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into

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 organizations carrying out plans for conservation of rural community water supplies, water quality management, control and abatement of agriculture-related pollution, disposal of solid wastes in rural areas, and storage 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 departments and 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. 16071)

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 amendments is 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 an annual $500 million "public works impact" program to provide immediate useful work to the unemployed and underemployed. The bill would authorize 80 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 mililon a year to carry out planned programs. Three others 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 staff and other nongrant technical assistance to local governments and in performing project notification and review functions under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 Coordination at the multistate level would be promoted through a requirement that Districts provides copies of plans to regional commissions, which would have to take them into consideration in preparing their own programs.

The population maximum of communities eligible for growth center designation and special assistance would increase from 250,000 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 10 major laws concerned with monetary, banking, tax, and fiscal policies. They included: Public Law 92-5, which raised the permanent debt ceiling to $400 billion, increased the temporary addition to the debt limit to $30 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 reduces 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 individual income taxes, repealing certain excise taxes, and providing for other changes in our tax laws, including the adoption of a tax credit or deduction for political contributions; Public Law 92-221, which broadens the authority for the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration to supervise and grant insurance protection for Federal and State credit unions; Public Law 92-8, which extended the standby authority for regulation of interest rates, prices, wages, salaries, and rents—the Economic Stabilization Act—to June 1, 1971; Public Law 92-15, which extended the same authority to June 1, 1973; Public Law 92-210, which broadened and extended until April 30, 1973, the Economic Stabilization Act, under which President Nixon imposed the wage-price freeze August 15, 1971, and subsequently established phase two of his stabilization program; authority to control interest rates, finance charges, and corporate dividends was added to authority already given the President, as was authority to impose single industry controls, to provide for the delegation of authority to stabilization boards, commissions, and committees—the Pay Board and the Price Commission—and to establish enforcement machinery for phase two; 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 Company Act of 1940 to provide that mutual fund shareholders must be systematically informed of charges to be deducted from projected payments and given notice of rights of withdrawal.

During the second session, the Congress enacted additional major laws of importance to the American people.

STATE AND LOCAL FISCAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 14370)

In an historic action, the 92d Congress gave its final approval to the principle of Federal revenue sharing with the passage of Public Law 92- , which will provide Federal payments to localities for high-priority expenditures, encourage the States to supplement their revenue sources, and authorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes. Payments are to be made in installments, but not less often than once each quarter. Funds received by units of local government may be used only for priority expenditures, defined as first, ordinary and necessary maintenance and operating expenses for public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor or aged, and financial administration; and second, ordinary and necessary capital expenditures authorized by law.

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 $30,236,400,000 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 efforts, multiplies this product 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 population, one-third on the basis of urbanized population, and one-third on the basis of population inversely weighted for per capita income, and second, $1.8 billion divided among the States, one-half on the basis of individual income tax collections by State governments and one-half on the basis of the general tax effort of the States and local governments. Of the amounts allocated to each State for any entitlement period, the State government is entitled to one-third, with the remaining portion allocated among the units of local government of that State.

The law also amended title XI of the Social Security Act to impose a limitation on grants for social services under

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 with fiscal year 1973. Each State 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 provisions which reflected 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 preceding a taxable 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 under title II of the Social Security Act; in addition, social security benefits were tied to the cost-of-living index, which will automatically trigger 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 a ceiling of $250 billion during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The Senate balked at giving the President carte blanche authority to cut spending where he chose. In a compromise conferees proposed that social security and other retirement payments, veterans' benefits, judges' salaries, and several other items be exempt from the President's cutting authority. His power to cut in other areas can, however, go as high as 20 percent of appropriated funds. The Senate rejected the compromise and the measure was returned to conference. As passed and sent to the President, the bill contained no provision for a spending ceiling of $250 billion.

REVALUATION OF GOLD (S. 3160, PUBLIC LAW 92–268)

Also during the second session, Congress passed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps necessary to establish the price of gold at $38 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 realinement of the values of many national currencies.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted five major measures concerned with the national defense and foreign affairs of the United States. They included Public Law 92–126, 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 $3.5 billion to $10 billion and its aggregate transaction authority from $13.5 billion to $20 billion; to extend the Bank's life through June 30, 1974; to relax the ban on Bank credit transactions by applying it only to exports destined to countries engaged in armed conflict with the U.S. Armed Forces, and to any other country if the President determines the transaction to 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 which have entered, or 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 or to the jurisdiction of other parties to the convention with respect to international measures of control in force for such parties; to authorize the Secretary of State to assent to giving effect to a proposal of a party to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, notwithstanding any objection thereto by other parties; to empower the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating and the Secretary of Commerce, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, jointly to issue the necessary regulations to implement enforcement proposals which enter into force with respect to the United States and to cooperate with officials of other parties to the convention in implementing such proposals; to provide a legislative basis for foreign enforcement officers taking action with respect to American vessels pursuant to such proposals; and to authorize American enforcement officers to take action with respect to foreign vessels pursuant to such proposals.

Also enacted during the first session of the 92d Congress was Public Law 92–129, which contains provisions extending the President's military induction authority from July 1, 1971, to July 1, 1973; granting the President discretionary authority to end undergraduate student deferments as of summer 1971, and to grant divinity students statutory deferment; providing that the alternative service requirement for conscientious objectors shall be assigned and numbered by the Director of Selective Service; providing a $2.38 billion increase in pay and allowances for military personnel; providing a 2.5 million active duty strength level for fiscal year 1972; providing for the termination of hostilities in Indochina; providing for the identification and treatment of drug and alcohol dependent persons in the Armed Forces; and providing for the appointment of certain regular, temporary, and reserve officers to be made subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

Also passed was Public Law 92–156, which authorized appropriations for the procurement of certain weapons, for research and development in the weapons field, and to authorize personnel strength of active duty and Reserve units of the Armed Forces; and Public Law 92–145, which authorized certain construction at military installations.

During the first session of the 92d Congress the Senate ratified 14 treaties. These included an agreement providing for the reversion of the island of Okinawa to Japan; an additional protocol to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America which expresses the understanding of the United States concerning territories and territorial claims, transit and transport privileges, nonuse of nuclear weapons, and the definition of "nuclear weapons;" a Mexican-United States boundary agreement regarding the location of the international boundary along the Rio Grande River and off both coasts; an International Wheat Agreement consisting of the Wheat Trade Convention of 1971 and the Food Aid Convention, 1971, and established to continue international cooperation in wheat trade; conventions and amendments regarding pollution 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 and other ships; a treaty on extradition between the United States and Spain which lists 23 extraditable offenses, including aircraft hijacking and offenses relating to narcotic drugs; action rescinding the Bryan-Chamorro Treaty of 1914 regarding a Nicaraguan canal route; an agreement with Mexico concerning traffic in stolen archeological properties; the Nice Agreement on Trademarks; a tax convention with France; a convention regarding the unlawful seizure of commercial aircraft; a double taxation convention with Japan; the Locarno Agreement on International Design Classifications; and a convention on the enlargement of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

We have passed additional legislation this session.

AZORES BASE AGREEMENT (S. RES. 214)

On March 3, 1972, the Senate voted acceptance of the Azores Base Agreement—Senate Resolution 214—which provided that new agreements between the United States and Portugal for military bases in Portugese territory or for foreign assistance from the United States would be subject to Senate approval. The measure also required the approval of both Houses of Congress for U.S. economic assistance to Portugal.

INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS (S. 596, H.R. 14365, PUBLIC LAW 92–403)

The House gave its approval to a bill—S. 596, H.R. 14365—on August 14 which requires the executive branch to submit to Congress the texts of all international agreements. The Senate had given its unanimous consent to the measure on

February 16 whereupon the State Department, which had until that time opposed the legislation, then told Congress that the administration would no longer oppose the bill.

WAR POWERS (S. 2956, H.J. RES. 1)

On August 14 the House also passed, in amended form, a Senate war powers bill—S. 2956—affirming the war powers of Congress and the President. The measure received Senate approval on April 13 by a 68 to 16 rollcall vote. The Senate version codified the limited circumstances under which the President, without congressional approval, might commit U.S. Armed Forces to combat or to situations where combat was likely. Troops so deployed on Presidential authority alone would have to be withdrawn after 30 days unless congressional approval was granted through legislation. The House version of the measure would require only that the President report to Congress whenever he committed troops to hostilities or ordered overseas troop buildups prior to obtaining congressional approval. A conference committee was appointed to resolve the differences between two versions of the bill but failed to reach a resolution.

Related to this legislation is a House War Powers measure—House Joint Resolution 1—which also provides that the President seek appropriate consultation with Congress prior to committing U.S. troops to conflict situations and enumerates three specific instances when the President must report to Congress the reasons for authority for and scope of the action undertaken. The measure passed the House on August 2, 1971. After Senate passage of S. 2956 on April 13, 1972, the Foreign Relations Committee reported House Joint Resolution 1 adversely a week later.

STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATIONS RESOLUTION (H.J. RES. 1227, S.J. RES. 241; PUBLIC LAW 92-443)

On August 18 the House passed, on a 329 to 7 rollcall vote, a strategic arms limitation resolution—House Joint Resolution 1227—which, like its Senate counterpart—Senate Joint Resolution 241—approves the acceptance by the President of the interim agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms.

Debate was lengthy in the Senate. By a vote of 76 to 15 further debate on the resolutions was closed and subsequently an amended version of House Joint Resolution 1227 was passed by a vote of 88 to 2.

The Senate amended the administration-sponsored resolution by striking certain language and adding additional items including amendments urging the President to seek a future treaty which would not limit the United States to levels of intercontinental strategic forces inferior to limits provided the Soviet Union, modifying amendments to this proposal, and an amendment stating U.S. policy that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States should seek unilateral advantage by developing a first strike potential.

The House voted acceptance of the Senate version of the resolution on September 25 and the measure was sent to the President.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 16029, S. 3390)

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 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 withdrawal of American troops from Indochina. Amendments were also adopted which struck language calling for the United States to withdraw from Indochina by October 1, 1972, and and amendment striking language 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 26th and sent to conference.

STATE-USIA 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. 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 Foreign Policy which will study 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 for Congress 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 express their own 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.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS (H.R. 15883)

Congress passed H.R. 15883, revising the Federal kidnaping law to make it a Federal crime to kidnap a foreign official, a foreign visitor designated an official guest of the Government, or members of their families, and to make it a Federal crime to murder them. Assault on such persons is also designated a Federal crime, as is damage to real or personal property owned by foreign governments. Intimidation or harrassment of them is made a misdemeanor. In addition, H.R. 15883 eliminates the death penalty as punishment for violating the Federal kidnaping law. This is in line with the Supreme Court's decision this year on the death penalty.

FISHERMEN'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 Foreign Relations 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 country.

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.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON CLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS (S. RES. 299)

The Senate agreed to a resolution—Senate Resolution 299—on August 15 establishing a special, ad hoc select committee of the Senate to examine the secrecy, classification, and confidentiality of Government documents committed to the Senate or any of its Members. The committee will propose guidelines on this matter and is required to report by mid-February of next year.

NAVAL 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 Italy for a period not exceeding 5 years. 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 be construed as a U.S. commitment to the defense of the countries receiving such loaned vessels.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION PARTICIPATION (S. 2010, H.R. 8750, PUBLIC LAW 92-247)

On October 20, 1971, the Senate passed legislation—S. 2010—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 act directs the President to instruct U.S. officials with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association to vote against loans or fund utilization for the benefit of any country: First, nationalizing or expropriating or seizing property owned by U.S. citizens or business interests of which not less than 50 percent is beneficially 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 been entered into in these situations, thereby eliminating the need for such reprisal 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 APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION (H.R. 5014, S. 748, PUBLIC LAW 92-246)

Similar language was added in an appropriatons authorization—S. 748, H.R. 5014—to the Inter-American Development Bank Act. Passed by the Senate on October 19, 1971, and by the House on February 1, 1972, the measure contained the same directives and authority as contained in legislation concerning the International Development Association with regard to loans or funding to nations seizing U.S. property, nullifying contracts, imposing discriminatory taxes, or ignoring drug traffic, production, or processing. The amendment to the IADB was signed into law—Public Law 92-246—on March 10.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK FUNDS (H.R. 5013, S. 749, PUBLIC LAW 29-246)

The language of Public Laws 92-246 and 92-247 was also included in legislation—S. 749, H.R. 5013—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 of last 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 Asia region and that these special resources would be expended only for the procurement of U.S. goods and services. The measure was signed into law—Public Law 92-245—on March 10.

POW/MIA INCOME TAX EXEMPTION (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 26. 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. 2945, PL 92-365)

On July 17 the House passed a measure—S. 2945—approved by the Senate on December 10, 1971, which permits the President to appoint to the service academies, in addition to those he is currently empowered to name, the sons of those designated in a "missing status" in the Vietnam conflict. The measure was signed into law—Public Law 92-365—on August 7.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION (H.R. 15495, PL 92-436)

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 conference. These amendments, such as a prohibition on the use of funds for weather modification, a policy declaration regarding persons volunteering for experimental projects receiving Federal research funds, and a fund cutoff provision regarding armed forces in 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 but also prohibited the use of these funds for aid to 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, and expressed the sense of Congress that U.S. contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency should be reduced through negotiations with member nations to not more than 31.5 percent of the total contributions.

TREATIES ENACTED DURING THE 2D 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 Convention on the Kidnaping 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 then ratified three treaties on June 13. These consisted of 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 confirmation on August 11 when a convention prohibiting illegal transfer of cultural property, a double taxation convention with Norway, and a convention calling for the establishment of an International Organization of Legal Metrology were ratified. A few days earlier, on August 3, the Senate approved by an 88 to 2 rollcall vote the ABM Limitation Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union.

On September 18 the Senate, by a unanimous vote of 69 yeas, agreed to Resolution of Ratification of Protocol To Amend the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

On October 3, the Senate ratified four treaties: the Convention for the Supression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation; the Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries relating to amendments to the convention; 11 amendments to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea; and an agreement between the United States and the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil concerning shrimp.

On October 6, the Senate ratified the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND WELFARE

Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 92d Congress, we enacted three major pieces of legislation affecting the welfare of our citizens. These were Public Law 92-40 which extended provision of the Social Security Act authorizing temporary assistance to U.S. citizens returning destitute to this country; Public Law 92-5 which provided an across-the-board 10-percent social security benefits increase, retroactive to January 1, 1971; and S. 2007 which extended programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, created a separate Legal Services Corporation, and established a comprehensive child development program. The President, however, vetoed S. 2007, objecting to the child development provisions in the bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS—H.R. 1

H.R. 1, passed by the House during the first session, would revamp 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 disabled persons qualifying for social security or railroad retirement benefits after 2 years of disablement;

To tie premium increases in the supplementary medical insurance program to increases in social security or railroad retirement benefits and to otherwise preclude such increases;

To finance increases 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 and an opportunities for families program as substitutes for present AFDC programs;

To insure States that their welfare costs will not increase due to enactment of H.R. 1;

To provide for a tax credit for the elderly.

Special mention is in order on FAP and OFP. They are the administration's proposal for revamping the most controversial of Federal welfare programs, that which assists families with dependent children where the father is absent and the mother is needed at home to care for the children. Through the

years it has been found that this program tends to perpetuate certain persons on welfare, to encourage fathers to abandon their families if they cannot adequately provide for them, and to keep families in a state of near poverty. It has long been suggested that something be done about this and the House agreed in passing H.R. 1.

FAP would continue to guarantee an adequate standard of living for those families with dependent children and no adult able to work. OFP would enable and require those adults able to work to receive training, find jobs, and earn money without total loss of benefits; in short, to climb out of the 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 bilk the public by living on welfare when they could work.

Under these programs family assistance benefits would be computed at a rate of $800 for the first two members, $400 for the next three, $300 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 this proposal could receive $2,400 a 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 provisions for mothers with dependent children, 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, and disabled.

In both the Senate and House version of H.R. 1, widow's benefits are raised from 82½ to 100 percent of a deceased husband's benefit. While the House bill raised the social security earnings limit to $2,000, the Senate provides an earnings limit without loss of benefits from $1,680 to $3,000 a year.

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 entitling him to social security shall have a minimum benefit of $200.

Finally, 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 desirability of eliminating such test;

Second, to provde 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 extend until June 30, 1975, the period that Puerto Rico may implement the so-called freedom-of-choice provision under the medicare program;

Fifth, to provide that eyeglasses, dentures, hearing aids, and podiatric services be made available under medicare;

Sixth, to make women eligible to receive social security benefits at age 60, and in the case of widows 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 otherwise eligible for medicare;

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 to 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, in re savings provisions regarding certain State expenditures for social services;

Nineteenth, relating to determination—for medicare purposes—of per capita 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 to support their children;

Twenty-fourth, in re rental charges for a family occupying low rental housing dwelling;

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 are 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 whether such child is receiving more than half the support from the taxpayer;

Twenty-eighth, making $800 million available for child care services to State and local governments;

Twenty-ninth, to provide supplemental service income for the aged, blind, and disabled;

Thirtieth, relating to eligibility of recipient of assistance for aged, blind, and disabled;

Thirty-first, putting limitation on spend down requirement under medicaid;

Thirty-second, to include occupational therapy under outpatient rehabilitation services;

Thirty-third, providing carryover of social service contracting of up to $15 million;

Thirty-four, to require subsequent action of the Congress prior to effectuating sections 508 and 509, relating to eligibility for food stamp program;

Thirty-fifth, to require study by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of question of availability of clinical psychologists 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.

Because of the late commencement of Senate action on H.R. 1, the original social security benefits increase contained in the House version of the bill, was taken from it, increased, and attached to the temporary debt ceiling increase voted in late June. This action is summarized below.

In one of its final actions the Congress approved a conference version of H.R. 1. The welfare reform proposals of both Houses were dropped from the bill, because neither House was willing to accept the other's version. The many costly Senate amendments were also deleted leaving the bill in its final form similar to the House-passed version, but without the FAP and OFP 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 beneficiary of 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 1972.

The administration balked at this increase and tried to prevent its attachment to the debt ceiling bill. Congress

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 enclosure began with 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 fairer 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.

In addition, the act 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 $10,800 for 1973 and $12,000 for 1974. Starting in 1975 the base will increase as required to pay for additional automatic increases in benefits.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT BENEFITS INCREASE—H.R. 15927, PUBLIC LAW 92-460

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 passed H.R. 15927, providing a temporary 20-percent increase in retired railroad workers' annuities. This increase is comparable to the increased social security benefits available September 1972, under the Social Security Benefit Increase Act (Public Law 92-336).

H.R. 15927 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 philosophy that those who can least afford it should suffer most the consequences of inflation.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1971—H.R. 12350, PUBLIC LAW 92-424

Congress passed H.R. 12350, to extend the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity through fiscal 1974, and to authorize $4.75 billion over a 2-year period in antipoverty funds. Congress had passed a similar measure, S. 2007, in the first session. It was vetoed by the White House, which objected to its child development provisions among others.

The act creates a new environmental action program, requiring employees to work on projects that would not have otherwise 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 not less than 10 percent of the enrollment opportunities in Project 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 Action from being used to finance activities designed to influence the outcome of any election, voter registration project or the salary of any employee engaged in such activities. The act also provides that contracts and agreements 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 funded under the act but administered by other Federal agencies.

BLACK LUNG BENEFITS ACT—H.R. 9212; PUBLIC LAW 92-303

A much needed liberalization of eligibility standards for benefits to coal miners stricken with black lung disease, 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 providing disability benefits retroactively to orphans of deceased miners, and permits dependent parents, brothers, and sisters of a deceased minor 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, until July 1, 1975, at which time the industry will 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 would 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 to the contrary.

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 original legislation, the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act enacted in 1969, provided coverage only to underground miners.

Employers under this legislation are prohibited from discriminating against miners solely because they had pneumoconiosis or another respiratory ailment.

Finally, the statute authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue grants for the construction of pneumoconiosis treatment facilities and directs him to initiate research on devices to test for the presence of black lung disease.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR AGING (H.R. 14424, S. 887, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

As sent to the President, H.R. 14424 amended the Public Health Service Act—Public Law 78-410—to establish a National Institute for the Aging within the National Institutes of Health. It also amends the Community Mental Health Centers Act—Public Law 88-164—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 to authorizing 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.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS (H.R. 15657, S. 4044, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

Amendments to the Older American Act of 1965—Public Law 89-73—were contained in H.R. 15657 which extends and expands the program of Federal grants through fiscal 1975 for programs assisting the elderly. Existing Federal programs of assistance to State and local agencies are revised to encourage them in the improvement of services to the aged, and newly established programs are directed to the problems confronting the aged in the areas of housing, transportation, employment, education, and preretirement counseling. Local and State organizations will be encouraged to coordinate and develop comprehensive and community-based programs of assistance to the elderly. In addition, special demonstration projects are provided in transportation, housing, employment, and education. A National Advisory Council on Aging is established through this legislation to advise and assist the President on matters relating to the special needs of persons considered to be elderly. Finally, a National Information and Resource Center for the Aging is established to serve States and local communities.

TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Speaker, during the first session the Congress enacted one bill concerning transportation. This was Public Law 92-174, which amended the Airport Development and Revenue Act to clarify congressional intent on priorities for airway modernization and airport development.

During the first session the House passed H.R. 4354, which amends title 23 of the United States Code to permit operation of buses of a width of up to 102 inches on the Interstate System; the Senate refused to act on H.R. 4354.

Congress has been more active in this area during the second session.

ASSISTANCE TO THE NATIONAL RAIL PASSENGER CORPORATION (H.R. 11417, PUBLIC LAW 92-316)

On June 22, Congress completed action on legislation to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970. The amendment limits compensation to officers of the National Rail Passenger Corporation—Amtrak—to a rate not to exceed level I of the executive schedule. It requires

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 requires 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 law to require 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.

It gives Amtrak emergency authority to use the tracks and other facilities of any railroad, and it authorizes the development of experimental or expanded service beyond the basic Amtrak system. The experimental authority is limited to those experiments and expansions that are justified by marketing studies.

The amendment makes provision for the protection of employees affected by termination of discontinuance of service, related to Amtrak operations.

It authorizes an additional $225,000,000 for grants to Amtrak to assist it in carrying out the activities listed in the act, and $2,000,000 annually to aid in the establishment of international routes between the United States and Montreal, Vancouver and Nuevo Laredo. Loans made to Amtrak are guaranteed under the act, with a $50 million upper limit on the aggregate amount of loans outstanding through June 30, 1973. Thereafter the limit is $200 million.

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 (H.R. 1004, PUBLIC LAW 92-338)

Congress enacted Public Law 92-338 which amends 49 U.S.C. 320(b) to permit 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 (S. 979, PUBLIC LAW 92-348)

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 of 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 transportation systems.

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 1973, $126 million for fiscal year 1974, and $92.9 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 AMENDMENTS (S. 473, PUBLIC LAW 92-359)

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 certain movement of containers and containerized cargo by barge in foreign commerce. The amendment vests in the Federal Maritime Commission exclusive regulation over rates and charges for barge transportation between U.S. ports when the following conditions are met:

First, the container or containerized cargo is moving 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 subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission; 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. 15375, PL 92-)

Congress passed legislation amending the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973. The total 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. 3939, H.R. 16656)

Congress failed to reach final agreement on the Federal-Aid 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 separate appropriation for the rural and 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 Interstate System, to be apportioned to each of the Interstate apportionment for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 so long as such State has not completed Federal funding of the Interstate System within its boundaries.

Sums authorized 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; Indian reservation 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.

ANTIHIJACKING LEGISLATION (S. 2880, H.R. 16191)

S. 2280, amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to improve the curtailment of aircraft hijacking. It brings into force as a matter of U.S. law the security provisions of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, and it creates new sanctions through which the United States 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 for 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 which continues air commerce between itself and 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, evoke or impose conditions on operating authority of the airline or airlines of a nation that fails 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.

S. 2280 also sets a penalty for air hijacking of death if certain conditions are met and at no less than 20 years under other conditions.

AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT ACT (S. 3755, H.R. 14847, P.L. 92-)

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. Under the provisions of S. 3755, any State or one of its political subdivisions is prohibited from levying or collecting any charge on persons traveling in interstate, overseas, or foreign transportation by air for a period of 18 months after enactment of the bill.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

During the first session the Congress enacted two major bills which reflect our continuing concern for Americans who have fought for their country. By passing H.R. 943 (P.L. 92-95) we protected home mortgages in case of their quadriplegic veterans in case of their deaths by providing Government-backed mortgage protection life insurance for such service-connected disabled veterans who purchase specifically adapted housing. In addition, in the first session, we authorized in H.R. 3344 (P.L. 92-66) the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to make direct home loans to veterans. This program will supplement the GI loan guarantee law in counties where commercial credit is tight.

The record of the second session reflects particularly this Congress' concern with the special problems veterans of the Vietnam conflict have.

VIETNAM ERA VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 12828, S. 2181)

This important legislation passed the House on March 6, 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 modified slightly on the floor' The existing educational assistance programs for veterans was the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-358). This program was designed to pay 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 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 $175 to $200—14 percent—while the Senate's 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 law there is an inevitable delay in the veteran's receipt of his allowance at the outset of his educational program. In addition both measures extend to wives and widows the right to pursue correspondence courses, and authorize apprentice or other on-job training programs for wives, widows, and children.

In the Senate version, there are provisions directing all Federal departments and agencies and all contractors and subcontractors of the Federal Government to give employment preference to otherwise qualified disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam war.

As it emerged from conference, H.R. 12828 incorporated the rate increases contained in the House-passed version and included the Senate provision regarding employment preference for veterans.

VETERANS DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT (H.R. 9265 S. 2108)

During the first session on July 19, 1971, the House passed H.R. 9265 by a rollcall 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 trend 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 legislative authority to treat all drug dependent ex-servicemen 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 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 services, rehabilitative services and readjustment medical counseling for certain veterans.

Another difference is that the House bill provides for VA treatment of active duty servicemen who do not voluntarily consent to VA treatment 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 civilly or criminally committed to the VA by a U.S. district court while the Senate version does not.

Attempts were uderway 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.

SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN (H.R. 10670, S. 3905; PUBLIC LAW 92-425

On September 21, 1972, 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 House agreed on September 12 to the 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 retirees could assure an income of up to 50 percent of their retirement pay for their dependents under the retired serviceman's family protection plan—RSFPP—established by Congress in 1954. The costs and complexities of this program had prevented all but 15 percent of existing retirees from enrolling. Under the new legislation, future retirees would be ineligible to join RSFPP; those presently enrolled may continue with it, or may drop RSFPP and join the new plan, or continue under the old plan and join the new one.

This new legislation would enable service personnel to provide benefits to their survivors of up to 55 percent of their re-

tirement income. For such coverage the retiree would pay 2½ percent of the first $3,600 of his annual income plus 10 percent of the remainder. Benefits provided on death would depend upon the amount of income at retirement. The act also specifies that beginning at age 62, benefits paid to the surviving spouse would be reduced by the amount of social security benefit received as a result of the deceased's active military service. Additionally the legislation provides for the adjustment of annuities according to changes in the Consumer Price Index. The spouses of service personnel eligible for retirement who die while still on active duty would also be covered by this legislation, receiving 55 percent of what the deceased's retired pay would have been had he or she retired. The act also establishes a program to guarantee a minimum annual income of $2,100 per year to current widows of military retirees.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 12674)

H.R. 12674 will alleviate the crisis which now exists with regard to the space available in national cemeteries. No additional national cemeteries have been established since 1950 and those which exist are gradually being closed because they are filled to capacity. Every veteran should have the right to be buried in a national cemetery within a reasonable distance of his home. This legislation will consolidate the administration of various Federal cemetery systems under the Veteran's Administration and orders the Administrator to make and report to Congress, within 30 days of the convening of the next session, a comprehensive study of the criteria which should govern the future of the national cemetery system. The only cemeteries which would not be transferred to the VA from the Department of the Army would be those which are located in national parks and operated by the Department of the Interior, those located at the three military academies, and those located at the U.S. Soldiers' Home in Washington, D.C., and the U.S. Naval Home located in Philadelphia.

This act would continue the American Battle Monuments Commission under the VA to administer and maintain American military cemeteries, monuments, and memorials on foreign soils. 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.J. 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 nonprofit 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 $75 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 any nonprofit and 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.

VETERANS' MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM (H.R. 10880, PUBLIC LAW 92-)

Both Houses approved legislation to improve veterans' medical assistance programs, calling for expenditures over 5 years of $497 million, with $85 million designated for fiscal 1973. The Veterans' Health Care Expansion Act of 1972 is designed to extend hospitalization to wives and children of totally disabled veterans and to widows and children of those killed in war and those who die of service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 10880 authorizes outpatient care for all veterans and for dependents and survivors previously mentioned when it is necessary to obviate the need for hospitalization. There are also provisions for a liberalization of VA nurse pay for overtime, night, holiday, and Sunday work.

The Administrator is required by the act to provide for no less than an average 98,500 operating VA hospital beds during each fiscal year, and an average daily patient census of not less than 85,000. Nursing home care beds to be operated by the VA are increased from 4,000 to 8,000. Per diem rates payable to State soldiers' homes are increased and grants to State homes for construction, remodeling, on alterations of existing facilities are increased from 50 to 65 percent.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the annual authorization and appropriation acts constitutes one of the major items on the agenda of Congress each year by financing the entire spectrum of the Government's activities. These acts, together with supplemental appropriations to meet emergency needs, serve as the financial check by the people's representatives.

For the benefit of Members, this report summarizes in tabular form those authorizations and appropriations for the second session of the 92d Congress.

Concern for the economy has dominated our consideration of these measures. Congress has made a consistent effort to stem inflation by economizing on Government expenditures wherever possible. At the same time, the necessity has been recognized to fund adequately programs meeting our pressing social problems and national defense needs.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

Bill	Administration request	Amount passed by House	Amount passed by Senate	Final amount approved
FISCAL YEAR 1972				
H.R. 12067, fiscal 1972		Dec. 8, 1971	Feb. 4, 1972	Public Law 92-242, Mar. 8, 1972
Foreign assistance:				
Foreign Assistance Act	$3,085,218,000	$2,162,555,000	$1,939,221,000	$2,230,721,000
Foreign military sales	510,000,000	510,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000
Peace Corps, int'l finance, instit., etc	747,417,000	330,906,000	737,314,000	558,716,000
Total	4,342,635,000	3,003,461,000	3,076,535,000	3,189,437,000
		Mar. 14, 1972	Mar. 15, 1972	Public Law 92-256, Mar. 21, 1972
Fiscal 1972, supplemental: H.J. Res. 1097, urgent supplemental	957,476,059	957,476,059	957,476,059	957,476,059
		Apr. 26, 1972	May 1, 1972	Public Law 92-306, May 27, 1974
H.R. 14582, 2d supplemental	4,775,261,477	[1] 4,124,453,358	5,063,517,439	[1] 4,347,698,270

Footnotes at end of table.

Bill	Administration request	Amount passed by House	Amount passed by Senate	Final amount approved
FISCAL YEAR 1973				
		Mar. 23, 1972	Mar. 28, 1972	Public Law 92-342, July 10, 1972
H.R. 13955: Legislative branch	$433,627,004	$427,604,764	$514,722,880	$513,787,980
		May 18, 1972	June 15, 1972	
H.R. 14989, State, etc.:				
Department of State	569,848,000	524,825,750	570,670,169	553,621,750
Department of Justice	1,776,225,000	1,765,578,000	1,765,578,000	1,765,578,000
Department of Commerce	1,332,925,000	1,309,074,000	1,472,421,000	1,363,919,500
The Judiciary	199,531,600	186,753,600	191,499,600	188,408,600
Related agencies	825,797,000	800,873,000	820,549,000	809,400,000
Total	4,704,326,000	4,587,104,350	4,820,717,769	4,681,017,850
		May 23, 1972	June 14, 1972	Public Law 92-383, Aug. 15, 1972
H.R. 15093, Housing and Urban Development, etc.:				
Department of Housing and Urban Development	4,133,205,000	3,711,088,000	4,464,186,000	4,034,065,000
Veterans' Administration	11,822,898,000	11,877,278,000	11,906,620,000	11,903,322,000
Space Science, etc	4,217,082,000	4,130,124,000	4,212,564,000	4,188,564,000
Total	20,173,185,000	19,718,490,000	20,583,370,000	20,125,951,000
		May 24, 1972	June 16, 1972	Public Law 92-398, Aug. 22, 1972
H.R. 15097:				
Department of Transportation and related agencies	[2] 2,909,181,095	[2] 2,791,614,095	[2] 2,906,994,095	[2] 2,867,937,095
		June 7, 1972	June 14, 1972	Public Law 92-344, July 10, 1972
H.R. 15259, District of Columbia:				
Operating expenses	722,814,000	716,124,000	714,984,300	712,331,800
Debt service	28,144,000	28,144,000	28,144,000	28,144,000
Capital outlay	149,930,000	131,394,000	81,754 100	94,281,000
Total	900,888,000	875,662,000	824,882,400	834,756,800
		June 15, 1972	June 27, 1972	Amounts totaling
H.R. 15417, Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Department of Labor	3,006,401,000	3,002,288,000	2,975,786,000	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	24,214,557,500	25,494,226,500	28,005,174,500	30,538,919,500
Related agencies	106,365,000	106,665,000	173,970,000	[3]
Total	27,327,323,500	28,603,179,500	31,354,930,500	
		June 13, 1972	June 28, 1972	Public Law 92-369, Aug. 10, 1972
H.R. 15418, Department of Interior:				
Department of Interior	1,732,112,000	1,726,716,000	1,736,082,100	1,732,761,600
Related agencies	788,228,000	802,841,700	814,840,700	816,173,700
Total	2,520,340,000	2,529,558,200	2,550,922,800	2,548,935,300
		June 22, 1972	June 23, 1972	Public Law 92-351, July 13, 1972
H.R. 15585, Postal Service, Treasury Department, etc.:				
Treasury Department	1,691,677,000	1,675,977,000	1,670,018,000	1,671,018,000
Postal Service	1,424,039,000	1,410,000,000	1,410,000,000	1,410,000,000
Executive Office of President	187,521,000	179,446,000	179,446,000	179,446,000
General Government	1,763,366,000	1,791,722,000	1,797,722,000	1,797,363,000
Total	5,066,603,000	5,057,145,000	5,057,186,000	5,057,827,000
		Sept. 25, 1972	Oct. 3, 1972	
H.R. 16754, Military construction	2,661,384,000	2,280,784,000	2,337,726,000	2,323,403,000
		June 26, 1972	June 30, 1972	Public Law 92-405, Aug. 25, 1972
H.R. 15586, Public Works—AEC:				
Water resources	2,433,476,000	2,401,167,000	2,496,301,000	2,446,854,000
Atomic Energy Commission	2,657,092,000	2,615,860,000	2,650,745,000	2,633,410,000
Related agencies	398,490,000	420,700,000	424,560,000	434,650,000
Total	5,489,058,000	5,437,727,000	5,571,696,000	5,504,914,000
		June 29, 1972	July 27, 1972	Public Law 92-389, Aug. 22, 1972
H.R. 15690, Agriculture, Environmental Protection, etc.:				
Agriculture programs	6,179,628,400	5,961,685,400	6,235,914,800	6,200,669,200
Rural Development	750,286,000	899,303,000	1,084,786,000	1,026,436,000
Environmental programs	2,934,160,000	2,944,684,000	2,984,985,000	2,951,648,000
Consumer programs	3,088,103,000	3,091,338,500	3,255,370,000	3,255,729,500
Total	12,952,177,400	12,897,010,900	13,561,055,800	13,434,032,700
		Oct. 14, 1972	Oct. 2, 1972	
H.R. 16593, Department of Defense:				
Personnel (active and retired)	28,017,243,000	27,440,505,000	27,499,584,000	27,499,584,000
Operation and maintenance	21,634,944,000	21,001,245,000	21,198,613,000	21,110,624,000
Procurement, R.D.T. & E	29,938,597,000	26,132,398,000	25,865,038,000	25,759,368,000
Other	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
Total	79,594,184,000	74,577,548,000	74,571,698,000	74,372,976,000
		Sept. 19, 1972	Oct. 3, 1972	
H.R. 16654, Labor-HEW:				
Department of Labor	3,006,401,000	2,963,288,000	2,967,034,000	2,967,034,000
Department of HEW	24,214,557,500	26,488,495,500	27,417,615,500	27,417,615,500
Related agencies	106,365,000	151,665,000	154,270,000	154,270,000
Total	27,327,323,500	29,488,495,500	30,538,919,500	[4] 30,538,919,500
		May 4, 1972	May 5, 1972	Public Law 92-301, May 18, 1972
H.J. Res. 1174:				
Dollar devaluation	Open-ended	1,600,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,600,00,0000
		Sept. 21, 1972	Sept. 28 1972	
H.R. 16705, Foreign Assistance:				
Economic aid	1,412,593,000	1,197,275,000	1,217,110,000	[5]
Military assistance	2,151,000,000	1,932,500,000	[5]	
Other foreign assistance	1,599,431,000	1,065,380,000	1,606,787,000	
Total	5,163,024,000	4,195,155,000	2,823,897,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

APPROPRIATION BILLS—Continued

Bill	Administration request	Amount passed by House	Amount passed by Senate	Final amount approved
		June 30, 1972	June 30, 1972	Public Law 92-337, July 1, 1972
Fiscal 1973, supplemental:				
H.J. Res. 1238: Disaster relief	$100,000,000	$200,000,000	$200,000,000	$200,000,000
		Aug. 15, 1972	Aug. 16, 1972	Public Law 92-393, Aug. 20, 1972
H.R. 16254: Disaster relief	1,569,800,000	1,587,300,000	1,587,300,000	1,587,300,000
		Oct. 11, 1972		
H.R. 17034, 1973: Supplemental	3,573,953,325	3,565,048,825	5,266,690,610	4,933,415,610

[1] Includes $170,000,000 in House-approved appropriations for Amtrak; these funds were not made available until authorizing legislation was signed into law.
[2] Figure does not include $131,181,000 advance fiscal year 1974 appropriation for Washington Metro Area Transit Authority.
[3] Vetoed, Aug. 16, 1972.
[4] Gives the President the authority to cut any item in the bill up to a maximum of 13 percent until the bill would not be reduced to less than $29,300,000,000.
[5] Action deferred on military assistance and Bangladesh relief until authorizing legislation completed.
[6] Final action on bill deferred and a continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 1331) passed extending spending at fiscal 1972 levels until Feb. 28, 1973.

AUTHORIZATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1972

Bill	Administration request	Passed by House		Passed by Senate		Final approved		
		Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Public law	Date	Amount
[S. 3108] [H.R. 12604], H.R. 15495, Military procurement	$23,272,971,000	June 27, 1972	$21,318,788,250	Aug. 2, 1972	$20,521,671,000	92-436	Sept. 26, 1972	$20,943,847,000
H.R. 13188, Coast Guard	135,660,000	Apr. 11, 1972	141,820,000	June 1, 1972	145,880,000	92-343	July 10, 1972	[1] 158,380,000
H.R. 13324, Maritime	525,860,000	do	555,860,000	July 26, 1972	556,044,000	92-402	Aug. 22, 1972	556,044,000
H.R. 14070 [S. 3094], NASA	3,379,000,000	Apr. 20, 1972	3,428,950,000	May 11, 1972	3,444,150,000	92-304	May 19, 1972	3,444,150,000
[S. 3511], H.R. 14108, National Science Foundation	[2] 647,418,000	Apr. 25, 1972	[2] 673,800,000	June 26, 1972	[3] 720,000,000	92-372	Aug. 10, 1972	[3] 696,900,000
[S. 3526], H.R. 14734, Foreign Relations:								
State Department	563,354,000	May 17, 1972	648,354,000	May 31, 1972	648,354,000	92-352	July 13, 1972	648,354,000
USIA	200,249,000		200,249,000		200,249,000			200,249,000
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	[3] 20,000,000		22,000,000		22,000,000			22,000,000
Peace Corps	([4])		88,027,000		93,027,000			88,027,000
Narcotics control					42,500,000			42,500,000
Total	785,603,000		848,603,000		1,006,130,000			1,001,130,000
[H.R. 14990], S. 3607, Atomic Energy Commission:								
Operating expenses	2,068,430,000	July 7, 1972	2,110,480,000	May 25, 1972	2,110,480,000	92-314	June 16, 1972	2,110,480,000
Plant and capital equipment	656,420,000		492,995,000		492,995,000			492,995,000
Total	2,724,850,000		2,603,475,000		2,603,745,000			2,603,475,000
S. 4018, Omnibus River and Harbors and Flood Control	([5])	Oct. 2, 1972	269,199,000	Sept. 27, 1972	592,922,300			[6] 291,000,000
Military Construction H.R. 15641, [S. 3448]	[7] 3,047,961,000	July 20, 1972	2,567,334,000	Aug. 4, 1972	2,539,304,000			2,549,525,000
S. 3390, H.R. 16029, Foreign Aid:								
Security assistance	2,151,000,000	Aug. 10, 1972	2,031,000,000	Sept. 26, 1972	1,722,500,000			
Economic assistance	100,000,000		100,000,000		100,000,000			
Total	2,251,000,000		2,131,000,000		1,822,500,000			

[1] Public Law—figure for Coast Guard authorization includes $12,500,000 additional for bridge alterations (passed by House and Senate, but not reflected in their figures).
[2] Figures for H.R. 14108 does not reflect an additional $7,000,000 in foreign currencies.
[3] [H.R. 13336].
[4] Open-ended [H.R. 14149].
[5] Open-ended.
[6] This figure constitutes only the project authorization section of the bill.
[7] The administration request initially included an additional $399,400,000 for Army construction of facilities at Safeguard antiballistic missile sites. The House Armed Services Committee did not consider Safeguard construction as a part of H.R. 15641, but transferred the request to the defense procurement authorization bill, H.R. 15495.

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 konwledge as 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 22 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 counsellor 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 PIRNIE

Mr. Speaker, before this Congress is finally gaveled into history, I want to say a few words of appreciation for the distinguished gentleman from New York, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, who is retiring voluntarily after 14 years of splendid service to the Congress and a lifetime of dedication to his country.

AL PIRNIE, 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

convenes because two score of our Members are leaving us voluntarily even before election day. I might observe that the House will be a very different place if only because the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, DURWARD G. HALL, is retiring.

I do not know how many times I have tried to talk 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 been successful. Yet 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 and in scrutiny of legislation—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 task of defending those rights for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his legendary 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 in personal relationships. We hope that we will continue to see him often between fishing expeditions and the other things he has planned for the future.

I believe that without Doc HALL's vigilance and courage of conviction over the past 12 years we would have enacted many more bad laws and wasted many millions of dollars more than we have, 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 end of 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 perhaps even in our own memories, 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 great objectives of equal opportunity, justice, and civil liberties, guaranteed to us in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

As I have stated 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 action. It has not been a Congress willing to assume a subordinate position to the executive branch, nor yet fearful of coming to terms with the unprecedented and unique issues which have come before it. We have not legislated behind a curtain; many Members have cast votes out of the strong conviction of conscience, unintimidated by fear of reaction from right or left, from Pennsylvania Avenue or from the judicial branch.

The 92d Congress has operated in curious and vexing times; we have had to throw out the rule books. Not only is the political order changing, but simultaneously, the economic order, the sociological order, the systems and mores formerly used to measure and weigh are no longer valid. Given that kind of challenge we have produced much constructive and balanced legislation, albeit with great difficulty. We are better off as a Nation than we were 2 years ago. We have enacted education bills, health bills, environmental bills, social security increases, equal rights for women, the 18-year-old vote, consumer bills, pollution bills, bills to put millions back to work and bills to brace up our weakened economy. Many of these measures have had bipartisan support in both bodies. We hope the President will take an equally constructive view and join with us in this mammoth effort to act for America by signing those bills now on his desk or on their way to the White House.

Our work is the product of many hands. I recognize and am grateful for the help and cooperation of the leaders, the committee chairmen, the Members on both sides of the aisle, the minority leadership, the officers and staff members, all of whose in-put has been necessary to the end result.

The distinguished majority leader, HALE BOGGS, has my deepest gratitude. He has been my strong right arm during the past 2 years and my first term as Speaker. I have felt almost lost during his absence, so accustomed were we to working together on the complex and voluminous legislative duties of this body. Only when I served as lieutenant to former Speaker John McCormack, have I felt closer to anyone in the conduct of the business of the House. The many hours that HALE gives to Members have not been surpassed by any Member or leader. HALE's willingness to go to Alaska on behalf of a new Member of Congress—to fly over its wilds in this unpredictable season of the year—when we were in the trying days of closing of the session—are evidence of the concern which he has for his colleagues. He is always loyal to his party; he is a Democrat by conviction but above this, his service through the years has shown him to be a patriotic Member who puts his country above every other consideration.

Most of us know HALE's fine family His good wife, Lindy, is truly a leader not only among women but among people. His son, Tommy, who is one of the strongest and most decent young men I have ever known, and his two wonderful, beautiful and intelligent daughters, Barbara and Corinne are all part of a family which is outstanding for the way in which it has accommodated to the rigors of Congressional life. The BOGGS family serves as an example for all families in congressional life and in Government. They have made great contributions as individuals, they have been cooperative with each other and with the people with whom they have worked in so many important efforts over many years.

The BEGICH family, too, are much on our minds while we hopefully await word of HALE and NICK's rescue in Alaska. They are a young family—NICK's delightful 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 a 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 careers.

The leadership is deeply in the debt of Majority Whip THOMAS "TIP" O'NEILL and his hard-working assistant deputy whiys, JOHN MCFALL and JOHN BRADEMAS, as well as all the assistant whips. Their organization, their personal energy and dedication 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 elated us both by their abilities and their loyalty.

The Republican leadership, too, have shown me many courtesies. I deeply appreciate the assistance of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. FORD, and the very able minority whip, Mr. ARENDS. Although we view legislation from a different frame of reference, they are patriotic Americans dedicated to serving their country, and have so demonstrated, particularly in their positions on national defense and foreign policy measures.

The Members of the House, its officers and employees all have bent every effort, many driving themselves hard to finish our business, by working long hours, willingly undertaking the myriad tasks which increase with every passing year. As have Speakers for more than 40 years, I have relied heavily upon the counsel of our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. Lew is noted for the precision and reliability of his rulings and his judgment; I have again benefitted from the accumulated expertise of his years of service and his prodigious memory.

A few weeks remain which I know Members are eager to use campaigning. Thereafter, I hope they, their staffs and all those who labor in the great Capitol complex, will get some well-earned rest and relaxation. Take with you the assurance of my deep regard and appreciation for your friendship.

I include at this point in the RECORD a

summary of some of the legislative accomplishments of the 92d Congress.

A 32 PERCENT SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE LEADS LIST OF ELDERLY BENEFITS

This has been one of the great Congresses in history from the point of view of older Americans—and the 32 percent social security increases passed in 1971 and 1972 are but the tip of the iceberg.

Here are some of the benefits that our 20 million senior citizens will realize from congressional action;

Nutritional meals for those who need them;

Low-cost transportation;

Employment opportunities;

Community centers;

Preretirement training;

Health and education services;

Gerontological centers to study the variety of problems facing older persons;

A new National Institute of Aging to conduct research on the aging process and the special health problems of older persons.

It is interesting to note that 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.

REVENUE SHARING LEGISLATION AIDS STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Congress this year enacted an historic $30.1 billion revenue sharing bill, aimed at relieving the financial distress of State and local governments. The appropriation is for 5 years, with this year's total set at $5.3 billion, retroactive to last January 1.

State governments are to receive one-third of a State's total appropriation, and the other two-thirds will be distributed to local governments within the State.

In passing the revenue sharing bill, Congress included provisions to insure that the money is spent for high priority items. Expenditures are to be limited to:

Public safety—including law enforcement, fire protection, and building code enforcement;

Environmental protection—including sewage disposal, sanitation and pollution abatement;

Public transportation—including transit systems, streets and roads;

Health;

Recreation;

Libraries;

Social services for the poor and aged; and

Financial administration.

In addition, revenue-sharing funds can be used for ordinary and necessary capital expenditures authorized by law.

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 13th to 22d in male life expectancy, from sixth to 21st in infant mortality. Doctor bills, hospital costs have skyrocketed, yet 36 million Americans under age 65 are not covered by private health insurance. Moreover, the Nation is suffering from a critical shortage of doctors and other trained health personnel.

The 92d Congress has taken the initiative to meet this crisis with several important measures:

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 to find cures for cancer.

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, mostly children.

Multiple sclerosis research—Creates a National Advisory Commission to help find the cause of MS and develop cures.

Communicable Disease Control 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:

Omnibus Education Act is the most significant advance for higher education since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act over a century ago. This measure extends all existing aid to higher education program as well as creating many new ones, including:

A new system of basic education opportunity grants which will entitle every college student to an annual grant of $1,400, less the amount his parents can reasonably contribute;

A program of direct institutional aid for colleges and universities to use as they see fit;

Aid to occupational and vocational education;

A national institute of education to develop new and better methods of teaching at every level—preschool through graduate level;

Expanded Headstart program broadens eligibility for participation in this voluntary day care program to include children of working families as well as the poor.

National School Lunch Act amendments provides free and reduced price meals for needy children.

Vietnam veterans education assistance provides a major increase in aid for education and vocational rehabilitation to returning veterans.

1971 ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT AIMS AT SPENDING REFORM

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 was designed to control campaign spending—at a time when the costs of campaigning have skyrocketed—and to require public disclosure of campaign contributions.

The key provisions of this historic act:

Limit to 10 cents per voter—or $50,000—the amount of advertising spending for television, radio, newspapers, magazines, billboards and automatic telephone equipment. No more than 60 percent of the entire media budget can be spent for broadcasting purposes.

Require broadcasters, newspapers, magazines, and so forth, to sell advertising to candidates at the lowest going rate for the comparable time and space.

Require political committees to report income of $1,000 or more, expenditures of $100 or more, and contributions or loans in excess of $100. Names and addresses of contributors must also be reported.

Authorize supervisory officers for collection of campaign reports.

Define more strictly the roles of unions and corporations in campaigns.

Limit the amount a candidate or his family can contribute to his own campaign—$50,000 for presidential or vice presidential campaign—$35,000 for senatorial campaign—$25,000 for U.S. House campaign.

NEW AMENDMENTS BROADEN RIGHTS

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. For example:

Twenty-six States prohibit women from working certain occupations;

Thirty-seven States have fair employment practice laws, but only 15 prohibit discrimination in employment based on sex.

Some communities still have dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers.

To end such discrimination, the equal rights amendment says:

> Equality of right 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; 38 are required.

ECONOMY, UNEMPLOYMENT, INFLATION WERE CONCERNS OF 92D CONGRESS

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.

Unemployment climbed to nearly 6 percent. The 1969 dollar lost 12½ cents in value by 1972. The number of Americans on welfare doubled. The stock market, after dropping nearly 300 points, never reached its 1969 high. Business was off, profits were down and Government revenues dropped sharply.

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 $2¼ billion to provide transitional public service jobs and special State employment assistance programs. We also ear-

marked $275 million for additional unemployment benefits and allowances.

In the area of the overall economy, Congress:

Granted the President authority to instruct the Federal Research Board to regulate credit—at a time when interest rates had climbed to the highest point since the Civil War.

Extended the President's authority to establish controls on prices, rents, wages, and salaries.

Raised personal income tax exemption to $675 in 1971.

Came to the aid of small business by increasing the amounts of loans and guarantees provided by the Federal Government.

Finally, Congress acted to hold down record budget deficits by cutting the fat out of the administration's budget, while seeking to meet the Nation's genuine needs. During the past 3 years, Congress has cut a total of $14.5 billion from the administration's appropriations requests and the total appropriations this year will again be under the President's budget.

A GREAT CONGRESS FOR VETERANS

Many observers are calling the 92d Congress the greatest Congress for veterans in history. In the past 2 years, we have passed major laws to educate our veterans, to provide them better treatment in VA hospitals, and to liberalize burial allowances for veterans.

New GI bill—This landmark measure increases educational allowances for Vietnam veterans by 25 percent. Full-time students will now receive:

Single students; $220 a month;

Married students; $261 a month;

Married and one child; $298 a month;

Each additional dependent; $18 a month.

National Cemetery bill—This law:

Transfers to the VA responsibility for administering all national cemeteries.

Increases burial allowances for veterans who die from service-connected disabilities.

Provides an additional burial allowance for veterans who do not wish to be buried in national cemeteries.

VA Medical School Act—To help meet the Nation's medical manpower shortage—and to improve VA medical care—this measure authorizes eight new medical schools in veterans' hospitals across the Nation.

Veterans' Medical Care—This new act will vastly improve the entire VA medical care system. To ease crowded hospital conditions, veterans with nonservice-connected medical problems can now be treated as outpatients. Some families of permanently disabled veterans or their survivors can also now receive hospital care.

Disabled Veterans' Benefits—Provides a 10-percent boost in benefits for disabled veterans.

DRUGS, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ARE TARGETS OF NEW LEGISLATION

Every public opinion poll taken in recent years shows that drug abuse and crime are major concerns of the American people—in every part of the Nation. The 92d Congress continued to face up to these mounting problems in several significant areas:

CRIME

The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. This major bill places all responsibility for juvenile justice in the Department of Justice—and all other responsibilities and services within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In addition, the bill provides $150 million over 2 years to:

Provide educational services in schools and other local educational agencies.

Provide counseling, health services and recreational facilities for potential juvenile delinquents.

Provide money to educational agencies to train personnel in the juvenile delinquency field.

Provide money to counsel parents.

DRUG ABUSE

The Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act. This bill establishes within the Executive Office of the President an office to coordinate all Federal activities related to drug abuse treatment, education, research and training. The bill also provides more than $6 billion through fiscal year 1975 to:

Establish a National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Increase funds for special projects under the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Provide grants to states to develop new drug abuse programs.

Establish a Council for Drug Abuse Strategy.

Require federally funded health facilities to provide needed treatment for drug addicts.

Foreign Shipments of Narcotics. The Foreign Assistance Act Amendments of 1971 gives the President power to suspend foreign aid to countries which allow shipments of narcotics into the U.S. or allow the continued flow of drugs to our servicemen overseas.

Addiction of Servicemen. The Selective Service Act Amendments of 1971 requires the military to identify drug-dependent servicemen and to treat them.

Rehabilitation of Addicts. The Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1972 authorizes special programs to encourage the employment of rehabilitated addicts and addicts in certain treatment programs, with special preference for veterans.

CONGRESS CONTINUES TO FOCUS ON CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS

In recent years, Congress has passed a host of measures on behalf of a once-ignored segment of our society—the American consumers. Truth-in-lending—wholesale meat and poultry—truth-in-packaging—automobile safety—tire safety—toy safety—fair credit reporting—these are just a few of the laws enacted to protect every man, woman and child in the marketplace.

The 92d Congress has extended and expanded this record.

The Flammable Fabrics Amendments of 1971 requires every manufacturer to certify that his product, fabric or related material for sale meets stringent anti-flammable requirements. This law was passed in response to the fact that an estimated 3,000 to 5,000 deaths and 250,000 injuries occur every year from burns associated with flammable fabrics.

The Consumer Product Safety Act of 1972 assigns to the Federal Government a major role in protecting the consumer from unreasonable risks of death, injury or illness resulting from the use of consumer products. A new independent regulatory commission will be vested with the authority to:

Collect and disseminate information on consumer product-related injuries.

Establish mandatory safety standards and remove products from distribution when necessary.

The Automobile "Bumper Bill" directs the Secretary of Transporation to set minimum standards for bumpers to eliminate or substantially reduce damage to automobiles in low-speed collisions. The bill also outlaws 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 $24.6 billion to clean up the Nation's waters 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 1985. This bill was passed on a presidential veto.

Federal Environment Pesticide Control Act gives the Federal Government increased powers over the testing, selling and the 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, protecting certain wild birds, fish and other animals from being shot.

CONGRESS AIDS RURAL AREAS

Passed the first Federal act which provides for Federal standards for the control and abatement of noise pollution 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. ROSENTHAL (at the request of 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.

(The following Members (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 R. FORD, today, for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRIFFIN, today, for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN, today, for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOCH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAREY of New York, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS, 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 estimated 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. MADDEN 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 his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNGATE, and to include extraneous matter on S. 2770.

Mr. DINGELL, and to include extraneous matter on the veto of the Water Pollution Act just previous to the vote.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KEATING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MYERS 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. BROYHILL of Virginia in five instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN in five instances.

Mr. MCCOLLISTER in three instances.

Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. SHRIVER in five instances.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. ARENDS in 10 instances.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in 10 instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RANDALL in 20 instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in five instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mrs. MINK in four instances.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mrs. CHISHOLM in six instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in five instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. PATTEN in eight instances.

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in 10 instances.

Mr. FASCELL in five instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in 10 instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in five instances.

Mr. CORMAN in two instances.

Mr. MOSS in six instances.

Mr. DENT in 10 instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. O'NEILL in five instances

Mr. YATES in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. DULSKI in six instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. DELLUMS in 10 instances.

Mr. FLOOD in 10 instances.

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in four instances.

Mr. CONYERS.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1467. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to personal exemptions in the case of American Samoans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10638. An act for the relief of John P. Woodson, his heirs, successors in interest or assigns;

H.R. 11091. An act to provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11773. An act to amend section 389 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia to exclude the personnel records, home addresses, and telephone numbers of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia from the records open to public inspection.

H.R. 15475. An act to provide for the establishment of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treatments for multiple sclerosis;

H.R. 16071. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965;

H.R. 16654. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16925. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority 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 reenlist, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17034. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 17, 1972:

H.R. 3786. An act to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.;

H.R. 5066. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 to carry out the Flammable Fabrics Act;

H.R. 7093. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8273. An act to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H.R. 8395. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10384. An act to release certain restrictions on the acquisition of lands for recreational development and for the protection of natural resources at fish and wildlife areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 10880. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery;

H.R. 11563. An act to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, to waive employee deductions for Federal employees' group life insurance purposes during a period of erroneous removal of suspension;

H.R. 11032. An act to enable the blind and the otherwise physically disabled to participate fully in the social and economic life of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12186. An act to strengthen the penalties imposed for violations of the Bald Eagle Protection Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12674. An act to amend title 38 of

the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12807. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administration Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government;

H.R. 12828. An act to amend chapters 31, 34, and 35 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and persons; to provide for advance educational assistance payments to certain veterans; to make improvements in the educational assistance programs; and for other purposes;

H.R. 13158. An act to name a bridge across a portion of Oakland Harbor, Calif., the "George P. Miller-Leland W. Sweeney Bridge";

H.R. 13895. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to revise the pay structure for nonsupervisory positions of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14911. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave without limitation, to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an additional Deputy Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15375. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicles Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973:

H.R. 15461. An act to facilitate compliance with the treaty between the United States of American and the United Mexican States, signed November 23, 1970, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15597. An act to authorize additional funds for acquisition of interests in land within the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland;

H.R. 15735. 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 educational purposes;

H.R. 15763. An act to amend chapter 25, title 44, United States Code, to provide for two additional members of the National Historical Publications Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15657. An act to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15965. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, to provide certain revisions in the retirement benefits of public school teachers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 16675. An act to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 to extend for one year the programs of grants for State and local prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs for alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

H.R. 16804. An act to rename the Mineola Dam and Lake as the Carl L. Estes Dam and Lake.

H.R. 16883. An act relating to compensation of members of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education;

H.R. 17038. An act designating the Oakley Reservoir on the Sangamon River at Decatur, Illinois, as the William L. Springer Lake;

H. J. Res. 733. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to certain boundary agreements between the States of Maryland and Virginia;

H. J. Res. 748. A joint resolution amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the 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, hospitals, and other nonprofit health service institutions affiliated with the Veterans' Administration to coordinate, improve, and expand the training of professional and allied health and paramedical personnel; to develop 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.R. 10638. An act for the relief of John P. Woodson, his heirs, successors in interest or assigns;

H.R. 11091. An act to provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11773. An act to amend section 389 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia to exclude the personnel records, home addresses, and telephone numbers of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia from the records open to public inspection; and

H.R. 15475. An act to provide for the establishment of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the cause 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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker entertain a unanimous-consent request that the call of the roll be vacated.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker does not have that authority under the Constitution.

If there are any Members in the Chamber who have not answered and the Speaker can identify them, he will have them recorded. The Speaker does have that authority, but he does not know of any such Members.

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

[Roll No. 462]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Abourezk
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Baker
Baring
Begich
Belcher
Bell
Bergland
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Bolling
Bow
Brasco
Bray
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Caffery
Carey, N.Y.
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chappell
Chisholm
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Clay
Cleveland
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Colmer
Conable
Conover
Cotter
Crane
Curlin
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Denholm
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
du Pont
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Forsythe
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Goldwater
Goodling
Grasso
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Haley
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Hicks, Wash.
Hillis
Hogan
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Jacobs
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keating
Keith
Kemp
King
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lent
Link
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McKay
McKevitt
McKinney
McMillan
Mailliard
Martin
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Michel
Mikva
Mills, Md.
Minish
Minshall
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nichols
Nix
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Podell
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Runnels
Ruppe
St Germain
Sandman
Saylor
Scherle
Schmitz
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Steele
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Terry
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Tiernan
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Ware
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Zwach

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in assuming that when the House adjourns tonight it adjourns to meet on January 3, 1973, at 12 o'clock?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

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 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. 11021. 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 House Concurrent Resolution 726, the Chair declares the second session of the 92d Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 47 minutes 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. 1524. 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., nonnavigable; and

S. 3822. An act authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to convey its bridge structures and other assets of the State of Iowa and to provide for the completion of a partially constructed bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, 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 thereupon 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. 16074. 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 PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 20, 1972:

H.R. 1467. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to personal exemptions in the case of American Samoans, 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 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. 16071. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965;

H.R. 16074. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out jellyfish control programs until the close of fiscal year 1977;

H.R. 16654. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

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.R. 16925. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority 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 reenlist, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17034. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

On October 25, 1972:

H.R. 1. An act to amend the Social Security Act, 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 human environment, and for other purposes;

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 13, 1972:

H.R. 2895. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the National Firefighting 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. 5838. 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, Oreg., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7378. An act to create a Commission of the Federal Court Appellate System of the United States;

H.R. 9198. An act to amend the act of July 4, 1955, as amended, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems;

H.R. 10243. An act to establish an Office of Technology Assessment for the Congress as an aid in the identification and consideration of existing and probable impacts of technological application; to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; and for other purposes;

H.R. 13825. An act to extend the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe, band, or group;

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. 1263. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 30, 1972, as "National Sokol Day."

On October 14, 1972:

H.R. 12652. 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. 13533. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the reimbursement of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from urban renewal; to provide for reimbursement of public utilities in the District of Columbia for certain costs resulting from Federal-Aid system programs; and to amend section 5 of the Act approved June 11, 1878 (providing a permanent government of the District of Columbia), and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1257. Joint Resolution to authorize an appropriation for the annual contributions by the United States for the support of the International Agency for Research on Cancer.

On October 17, 1972:

H.R. 11948. An act to amend the joint res-

olution authorizing appropriations for participation by the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law.

On October 18, 1972:

H.R. 2118. An act for the relief of the estate of Amos E. Norby;

H.R. 9676. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the State of Tennessee for the use of the University of Tennessee;

H.R. 13780. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property in Canandaigua, New York, to 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 effective enforcement of the provisions therein prohibiting the shooting at birds, fish, and other animals from aircraft;

H.R. 16870. An act to amend the Sockeye Salmon or Pink Salmon Fishery Act of 1947 to authorize the restoration and extension of the sockeye and pink salmon stocks of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1301. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages under the National Housing Act.

On October 19, 1972:

H.R. 9756. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H.R. 10655. An act to designate certain lands in the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., as wilderness.

On October 20, 1972:

H.J. Res. 984. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for United States participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

H.R. 14370. An act to provide fiscal assistance to State and local governments, to authorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes, and for other purposes; and

On October 21, 1972:

H.R. 8756. An act to provide for the establishment of the Hohokam Pima National Monument in the vicinity of the Snaketown archeological site, Arizona, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10420. An act to protect marine mammals; to establish a Marine Mammal Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10556. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land in Georgia to Thomas A. Buiso, the record owner of the surface thereof;

H.R. 10638. An act for the relief of John P. Woodson, his heirs, successors in interest or assigns;

H.R. 10729. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11032. An act to enable the blind and the otherwise physically disabled to participate fully in the social and economic life of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11563. An act to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, to waive employee deductions for Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance purposes during a period of erroneous removal or suspension;

H.R. 13067. An act to provide for the administration of the Mar-A-Lago National Historic Site, in Palm Beach, Fla.;

H.R. 14128. An act for the relief of Jorge Ortuzar-Varas and Maria Pabla de Ortuzar;

H.R. 15965. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, to provide certain revisions in the retirement benefits of public school teachers, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16987. An act to amend the act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1973 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

On October 23, 1972:

H.R. 9727. An act to regulate the transportation for dumping, and the dumping, of material into ocean waters, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10384. An act to release certain restrictions on the acquisition of lands for recreational development and for the protection of natural resources at fish and wildlife areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior;

H.R. 12186. An act to strengthen the penalties imposed for violations of the Bald Eagle Protection Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13694. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended;

H.R. 15597. An act to authorize additional funds for acquisition of interests in land within the area known as Piscataway Park in the State of Maryland; and

H.R. 16883. An act relating to compensation of members of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.

On October 24, 1972:

H.R. 12828. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and persons; to provide for advance educational assistance payments to certain veterans; to make improvements in the educational assistance programs; and for other purposes;

H.R. 15883. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for expanded protection of foreign officials, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 748. Joint resolution amending title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the 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, hospitals, and other nonprofit health service institutions affiliated with the Veterans' Administration to coordinate, improve, and expand the training of professional and allied health and paramedical personnel; to develop 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.

On October 25, 1972:

H.R. 5066. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 to carry out the Flammable Fabrics Act;

H.R. 11091. An act to provide additional funds for certain wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11773. An act to amend section 389 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia to exclude the personnel records, home addresses, and telephone numbers of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia from the records open to public inspection;

H.R. 14542. An act to amend the act of September 26, 1966, Public Law 89-606, to extend for 4 years the period during which the authorized numbers for the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Air Force may be increased, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14989. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15280. An act to amend the act of August 16, 1971, which established the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, to increase the appropriation authorization thereunder;

H.R. 15375. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973;

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 establishment of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treatments for multiple sclerosis;

H.R. 15641. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15735. 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 educational purposes;

H.R. 15763. An act to amend chapter 25, title 44, United States Code, to provide for two additional members of the National Historical Publications Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16675. An act to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 to extend for 1 year the program of grants for State and local prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs for alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

H.R. 16754. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 733. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to certain boundary agreements between the States of Maryland and Virginia.

On October 26, 1972:

H.J. Res. 1331. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7117. An act to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to expedite the reimbursement of United States vessel owners for charges paid by them for the release of vessels and crews illegally seized by foreign countries, to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the collection of claims against such foreign countries for amounts so reimbursed and for certain other amounts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9554. An act to change the name of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16593. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and

On October 27, 1972:

H.R. 1467. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to personal exemptions in the case of American Samoans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3786. An act to provide for the free entry of a four octave carillon for the use of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.;

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. 7093. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Osage Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8273. An act to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

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. 12807. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government;

H.R. 13158. An act to name a bridge across a portion of Oakland Harbor, California, the "George P. Miller-Leland W. Sweeney Bridge";

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. 14911. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status to accumulate leave without limitation, to amend title 10, United States Code, 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. 16804. An act to rename the Mineola Dam and Lake as the Carl L. Estes Dam and Lake;

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.R. 16925. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority 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 reenlist, 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; and

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.

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 the tax laws applicable to Guam, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16074. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out jellyfish control programs until the close of fiscal year 1977; and

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 ADJOURNMENT

The President announced his disapproval of the following bills with memorandums 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 create 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 would produce results unrelated to real needs and 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 this purchase 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 some day they may be useful 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 question of whether 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, State or regional problems. The centers would also train environmental professionals and carry out a comprehensive education program.

Research is a vital part of our effort to come to grips with the environmental 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 that each 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 competence 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 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 as well. To the extent 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 is clearly 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 acquisition of this forest area would 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 the Congress. As I 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.

Some of these bills have presented 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 just a few days before the Presidential election would be politically very damaging.

However, 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 services are not available, and 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 $2 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 considered 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. 16654)

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 my budget for fiscal year 1973, I requested that the Congress provide an increase of $2.1 billion over fiscal 1972 funds for the HEW programs contained in this bill. On top of that generous 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. 16654 contains authority for the overspending to be held to $535 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 manpower matters. My 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. 16654 is as unwarranted as the version I vetoed last August.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (H.R. 16071)

This bill would unnecessarily add vast new authorizations for Federal programs which have been shown to be ineffective in creating jobs or stimulating 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 stimulation would be inflationary.

The bill would stimulate increased 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 benefits provision would fragment and undermine our basic Federal-State unemployment insurance system and its costs would be essentially uncontrollable. The proposed pollution control facilities loan program has only vague and unspecified objectives.

AMENDMENTS TO THE MINING AND MINERAL POLICY ACT (S. 635)

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 $40 million annually, have provided a flexible and efficient means of meeting minerals problems 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 and 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. 4018)

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 a number of objectionable features such as authorizing ill-defined and potentially costly new programs, and limiting my authority to establish criteria and standards to measure the feasibility of water resources 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. MARSHALS (H.R. 13895)

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 preferential 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 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.

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 and Executive Order 11508.

Also, the bill deals inconsistently with the serious problem of burial benefits for the Nation's veterans and war dead. It commissions a study of this problem at the same time it preempts 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 would be unwise to commit additional Federal resources as proposed by this bill.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE EXPANSION ACT OF 1972 (H.R. 10880)

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 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 purports 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 divert this 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 organiza-

tional 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 and would also require duplications 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. In addition, I submitted a proposal to broaden the highly successful Foster Grandparents Program. The Administration will continue its vigorous pursuit of both 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 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 also 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 carried out in 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.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 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 product or service by, for use in, or for sale or lease to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pursuant to section 2(b)(2) 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 notice of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and Forest Service acquired lands at Dworshak Dam and Reservoir project, Idaho, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 505a, 505b; 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. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee of conference. Conference report to accompany H.R. 16810 (Rept. No. 92-1614). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on minority small business enterprise (Rept. No. 92-1615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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 anticompetitive impact of oil company ownership of petroleum products pipelines (Rept. No. 92-1617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Select Committee on Small Business. A report on the inadequacy of Petroleum supplies and its repercussions on small business (Rept. No. 92-1618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3939 (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. 92-1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 17222. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of certain pre-Columbian monumental or architectural sculpture 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 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. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 17226. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

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:

H.R. 17229. A bill for the relief of M. Gy. Sgt. Nelson R. Pratt, U.S. Marine Corps (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 17230. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Madera County, Calif., to Mrs. Lucille Jones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act. section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with 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.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

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.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are 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.

Year: 19_____ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

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 "employee" 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".—(*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]

PAGE 1 ◄

A. Ted E. Amick, 1616 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Howard S. Anderson, 409 Tennessee Avenue, Alexandria, Va. 22305.
B. Society of American Florists, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery County, Maryland, Lawyers Association, c/o George Ballman, Citizens Building, Kensington, Md. 20795.

A. James C. Barr, 1156 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Federal Credit Unions, 1156 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. George T. Beemer, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Society of American Florists, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

A. Arthur A. Benson II, 1020 Commerce Tower, Kansas City, Mo.
B. Save Our Soils, Pattonsburg, Mo.

A. A. Tracy Bird, Post Office Box 22476, Denver, Colo. 80222.
B. Sports Car Club of America, Post Office Box 22476, Denver, Colo. 80222.

A. Neal R. Bjornson, 30 F Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Richard W. Bliss, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Rodney A. Bower, 1126 16th Street NW., 200, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW, Room 200, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Bun B. Bray, Jr., 6628 Van Winkle Drive, Falls Church, Va. 22044.
B. National Association of Supervisors, 2300 South Ninth Street, Suite 511, Arlington, Va. 22204.

A. Brown, Vlassis & Bain, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.
B. Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Navajo Nation (Arizona) 86515.

A. W. F. Broxterman, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1775 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Phelps Dodge Corp., 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Charles M. Chadwick, 5100 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Sports Car Club of America, Post Office Box 22476, Denver, Colo. 80222.

A. Coalition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Danzansky, Dickey, Tydings, Quint & Gordon, Suite 1010, Bender Building, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. United Insurance Company of America, One East Wacker Street, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Bankers Life and Casualty Co., 4444 Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60630.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Potters Industries, Inc., Industrial Road, Post Office Box 14, Carlstadt, N.J. 07072.

A. James A. Dorsch, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dean W. Drulias, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Bruce Dunton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.

A. Emerson Electric Co., 8100 Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. 63136.

A. Ronald C. Frankis, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Benjamin W. Fridge, 1900 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Susan Fridy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Arthur E. Gabler, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Apartment Association, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Council of Independent Laboratories, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. James M. Hacking, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. John F. Heilman, 1221 Massachusetts, Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.

A. Barbara Heller, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Richard A. Hennegas, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Hourihan, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Prince Georges County Bar Association, Upper Marlboro, Md.

A. Valerie Howard, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Kennedy & Leighton, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Keppel III, 1209 North Taft Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Sports Car Club of America, Post Office Box 22476, Denver, Colo.

A. James D. Klink, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Paul R. Knapp, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.

A. Laurence London, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.

A. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.

A. Thomas J. Mader, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. John J. L. Matson, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Ocean Industries Association, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 304, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute for Imported Steel, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Alfred P. Slaner, 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. John J. McNamara, 8100 Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. 63136.
B. Emerson Electric Co., 8100 Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. 63136.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Capital Holding Corp., Commonwealth Building, Louisville, Ky.

A. Graham T. T. Moliton, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 403, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55440.

A. Barbara B. Morgan, 720 West Glebe Road, Apartment 1-A, Alexandria, Va. 22305.
B. National Association of Supervisors, 2300 South 9th Street, Suite 511, Arlington, Va. 22204.

A. Charles Morgan, Jr., 410 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Walgreen Drug Stores, 4300 Peterson Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60646.

A. National Apartment Association, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. National Association of Supervisors, Federal Government Association of Federal Supervisors, 2300 South Ninth Street, Suite 511, Arlington, Va. 22204.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco Inc., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. ELBA Systems, Inc., 5909 East 38th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Neuro-Research Foundation Inc., 35 Chestnut Place, Brookline, Mass. 02146.

A. Clara F. Northup, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Apartment Association, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Koch Refining Co., Post Office Box 3596, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association, 318 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Nathaniel Polster, 2128 Wyoming Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10027.

A. Joseph L. Racine, 8100 Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. 63136.
B. Emerson Electric Co., 8100 Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. 63136.

A. Ann Roosevelt, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Stuart Philip Ross, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Prince Georges County Bar Association, Upper Marlboro, Md.

A. Rouss & O'Rourke, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V. Balderas 36, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.

A. Betty Seitz, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Society of American Florists, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Albright Title & Trust Co., 100 North Main Street, Newkirk, Okla. 74647; American Title Ins. Co., 150 SE. Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33131; Chelsea Title & Guaranty Co., 1300 Bacharach Boulevard, Atlantic City, N.J. 08401.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Emerson Electric Co., 8100 Florissant, St. Louis, Mo. 63136.

A. John Silard, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Coalition on National Priorities, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Gilbert Simonetti, Jr., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of CPA's, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. Sports Car Club of America, Box 22476, Denver, Colo. 80222.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Estate of Margaret Solomon, c/o Franklin C. Latchman, One Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. Cyrus C. Tichenor III, 8607 Queen Elizabeth Boulevard, Annandale, Va. 22003.
B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va. 23220.

A. John W. Vardaman, Jr., 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Richard W. Warden, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.

A. Robert Y. Wheeler, Box 185, Tilden, Tex.
B. Ernest G. Herman, 9538 Brighton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210.

A. Thomas E. Wheeler, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Wayne W. Whiffing, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Apartment Association, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.

A. Williams, Connolly & Califano, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Wyatt, Saltzstein & Halliday, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

* 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 quarterly reports were submitted for the calendar quarter 1972:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are 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.

Year: 19_____ ≺

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

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 "employee" 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".—(*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]

PAGE 1≺

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "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.—(i) *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.

(ii) *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.

(iii) *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.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (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.

(ii) *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.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

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. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") 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.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

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:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Sothoron Kirby Able, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

A. John G. Adams, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Midland Enterprises, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,483.49. E. (9) $7,483.49.

A. Gibson T. Ahlgren, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $460. E. (9) $77.

A. George Alderson, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Alderson, Catherwood, Ondov & Leonard, 105 East Oakland Avenue, Austin, Minn. 55912.
B. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.

A. Willis W. Alexander, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) $1040. E. (9) $1,423.69.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW. No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Unon AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
E. (9) $6,000.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42 Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $8,363.62.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $2,066.76. E. (9) $2,066.76.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $888.67. E. (9) $888.67.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $6,918.03. E. (9) $6,918.03.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) $42,455. E. (9) $42,455.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $54,372.31.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $86,735.50. E. (9) $1,723.38.

A. American Hotel and Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $2,795.51. E. (9) $2,925.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,956.99. E. (9) $3,679.81.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md. 21054.
E. (9) $2.

A. American Land Title Association, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $3,109.51.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $744.20.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
E. (9) $2,434.20.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
E. (9) $27,877.74.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago Ill. 60606.
E. (9) $3,220.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
E. (9) $1,340.37.

A. American Optometric Association, in care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $3,930.52. E. (9) $3,930.52.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,231.80. E. (9) $1,928.75.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,009. E. (9) $9,302.

A. American Physical Therapy Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,146.16. E. (9) $5,146.16.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015.
E. (9) $4,978.52.

A. American Postal Workers Union AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,229,484.90. E. (9) $75,289.43.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1750 Old Meadow Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
E. (9) $1,249.98.

A. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 620, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $2,450.86. E. (9) $1,019.27.

A. American Surveys, Embassy Square, Suite 901, 2000 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 1 World Trade Center, Suite 1109, New York, N.Y. 10048.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $230.74.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
D. (6) $31,998.06. E. (9) $31,998.06.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $79,288.36. E. (9) $3,659.11.

A. Ted E. Amick, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $750.

A. John Anderson, 4111 Franconia Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 2007 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capitol Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW. No. 403, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence A. Arata, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $12,500.

A. John C. Archer, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $300.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $6.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $5.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Suite 302, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $262.80.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp., 464 Ellis Street, Mountain View, Calif. 94040.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the American Importers Association, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery County, Md., Lawyers Association, care of George Ballman, Citizens Building.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $125.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Puerto Rican Government, Economic Development Administration, GPO Box 2350, San Juan, P.R. 00936.
D. (6) $150.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $12,499. E. (9) $517.25.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. State Farm Mutual Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill., 61701.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $117.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,350.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) $45. E. (9) $41.25.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Suite 607, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Association for Broadcast. Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Association for the Advancement of Invention & Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (6) $1,450. E. (9) $1,945.30.

A. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $10,686.60. E. (9) $10,686.60.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $395.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va. 22207.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 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.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, in care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $301.

A. Donald L. Badders, 910 South Michigan, Room 530, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $270.16. E. (9) $280.46.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Carl E. Bagge, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $419.44.

A. Charles W. Bailey, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
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.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $5,425. E. (9) $1,061.42.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $91.94. E. (9) $110.

A. Donald Baldwin, Suite 906, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $100.

A. Ernest L. Barcello.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,925. E. (9) $148.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $165.50.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, Suite 400, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London EC3A 8ET, England.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $4,853.97.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Oreg. 97205.
B. Association of Oregon & California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Courthouse, Roseburg, Oreg. 97470.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $47.55.

A. Weldon Barton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,092.48. E. (9) $66.34.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Record Industry Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Lucius D. Battle, 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Independent Terminal Operators Association, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. A. David Baumhart, Post Office Box 553, Lorain, Ohio 44052.
B. Green Olive Trade Association, 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $14.52.

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. (6) $1,498.28.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $1,504.48.

A. John H. Beidler, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $3,013.60.

A. Thomas S. Belford, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $150.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $4,808.17.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass. 02178.

A. Robert L. Bevan, 1120 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $360.09.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,748. E. (9) $310.25.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Almalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Diana Washbon Bird, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $613.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Laurel Hill Cemetery Association, Clayton, Mo. 63105.
E. (9) $23.39.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co., 12th Street at Hill, Los Angeles, Calif. 90054.
E. (9) $63.31.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Paul Revere Corp., Worcester, Mass. 01608.
E. (9) $62.62.

A. Lydia Bitter, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $195.

A. Brent Blackwelder, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Richard W. Bliss, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $475.

A. Jerald Blizin, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $344.70. E. (9) $71.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Cigar Manufacturing Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,875.01.

A. Becky Bogard, 2600 Virginia Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $100.

A. Frederick B. Bond III, 1730 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association c/o Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $27.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
D. (6) $1,916.66. E. (9) $160.42.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Albert D. Bourland, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 814, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,701.03.

A. Rodney A. Bower, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Room 200, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Edward L. Bowley, 817 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO.
D. (6) $6,446.50. E. (9) $929.13.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,443.13. E. (9) $725.84.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Room 122, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles G. Bragg, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $1,345.15. E. (9) $400.79.

A. Charles R. Bragg, Book Hill Road, Essex, Conn.
B. Northeast Utilities Service Co., Selden Street, Berlin, Conn.

A. Edward J. Brenner, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. Association for the Advancement of Invention & Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.

A. Parks C. Brinkley, The Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $16.50.

A. David A. Brawdy, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $350.

A. Michael D. Bromberg, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. William J. Brooks, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Joe B. Browder, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,220.

A. Brown, Vlassis & Bain, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. 85004.
B. Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Navajo Nation (Arizona) Indian Tribe, 86515.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW.
D. (6) $300.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Housing Producers, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Franchise Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. St. Paul Title Insurance Corp., 1650 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, Mich. 48084.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $135.54.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. Richard L. Bullock, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Hearst Corp., 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Parcel Post Association, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $700.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
E. (9) $679.60.

A. George Burnham IV, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Steel Corp., 600 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
D. (6) $299. E. (9) 271.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $229.26.

A. Burwell, Hansen & McCandless, 700 Federal Bar Building West, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) 43.09.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1106, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.

A. Charles S. Caldwell, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,550. E. (9) $544.

A. John H. Callahan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $240.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Securities Industry Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,235.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200, 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $101.53.

A. Charles Argyll Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $270.40.

A. Charles O. Campbell, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Marvin Caplan.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,834. E. (9) $144.55.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Room 505, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $289.75.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 200036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $375.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11232.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,368.31.

A. Charles R. Carlisle, Suite 903, 1701 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.
D. (6) $2,115. E. (9) $1,701.24.

A. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 706 Raleigh Building, Post Office Box 2776, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.

A. Elizabeth S. Carpenter, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., 10022.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $160.75.

A. John R. Carson, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Alaska Interstate Co., 2200 Post Oak Tower, 5051 Westheimer, Houston, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $10,700.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
E. (9) $2,917.75.

A. James B. Cash, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $62.30.

A. Frank R. Cawley.
B. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Frank R. Cawley, 511 Wilson Plaza Building, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Agricultural Publishers Association, 511 Wilson Plaza Building, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $43.64.

A. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., Room 400, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $605.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Post Office Box 445, Mbabane, Swaziland.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $480.73.

A. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Cordage Institute, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $937.50.

A. James W. Chapman.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,411.

A. William C. Chapman, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,173.85.

A. Leslie Cheek III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Lowell T. Christison, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20056.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $57.72. E. (9) $28.50.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $60,798.02.

A. Richard W. Clark, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $188.85.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 6, Pittsburg, Kans. 66762.

A. Jacob Clayman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $562.90.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticuit Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $15.30.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $2.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 1075 Central Park Avenue, Suite 224, Scarsdale, N.Y. 10583.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $3.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Brands, Inc., 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $58.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky. 40201.
E. (9) $58.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Liggett & Myers Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020.
E. (9) $58.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lorillard, Division of Loews Theatres, Inc., 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $58.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Philip Morris Inc., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $58.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102.
E. (9) $58.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $185. E. (9) $37.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $59.25.

A. Coalition for A National Population Policy, Suite 1010 Bender Building, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $7.21.

A. Coalition To Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,483.50. E. (9) $2,864.13.

A. Grover C. Cobb, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Jeffery Cohelan.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $900.

A. David Cohen, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $183.

A. Timothy A. Colcord, 1620 I street, NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National BankAmericard Inc., 555 California Street, San Francisco, Calif., 94126.
D. (6) $6,873.24. E. (9) $7,614.37.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10005.
E. (9) $773.14.

A. William J. Colley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,355. E. (9) $1,078.64.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $475.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street, NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., 10017.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street, NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street, NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street, NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $525.

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) $68.75.

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 Financing, care of Langdon P. Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Committee for Modern, Efficient Transportation, Suite 808–10, 910 7th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,460. E. (9) $1,099.64.

A. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $852,864.86. E. (9) $140,513.85.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $174.50.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, 1285 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $200.

A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $6,949.76. E. (9) $4,666.56.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $61.20.

A. John A. Connor, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

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.

A. Jack T. Conway, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $2,812.50.

A. Cook & Franke S. C., 660 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $10.95.

A. Howard Lee Cook, Jr., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,248.13. E. (9) $899.48.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $99.36.

A. J. Milton Cooper, Suite 401, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $755.41.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1025 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $259.15.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $15.35.

A. Cooperative League of the USA, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $825.

A. Darrell Coover, 1625 I Street NW., No. 812, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $296.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, c/o Langdon Cook, President, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, 1800 K Street NW., Fourth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D (6) $450. E. (9) $60.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Lee, McCarthy and DeRosa, 102 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $100.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Northwestern Refining Co. Drawer Nine, St. Paul Park, Minn. 55071.

A. James T. Corcoran, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Suite 308, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) $87.50.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y. 14380.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $231.23.

A. Robert M. Coultas, Suite 508, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $784.69. E. (9) $784.69.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgins Road, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wisc. 53044.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Road, Miami Beach, Fla. 33140.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Casualty & Surety Agents, 5225 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Glass Dealers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Optical Manufacturers Association, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Raymond L. Courage, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. Roger C. Courtney, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $115.44. E. (9) $127.53.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. MGIC Investment Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53201.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Eugene S. Cowen, 9024 Willow Valley Drive, Potomac, Md. 20854.
B. American Broadcasting Co., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $21. E. (9) $21.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.
D. (6) $1,260. E. (9) $88.70.

A. Roger M. Craver, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $275.

A. Robert W. Crawford, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of General Merchandise Chains, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 2006.
D. (6) $9,999.99. E. (9) $1,839.67.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Hubert M. Crean, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2252. E. (9) $428.

A. H. C. Crotty.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

A. J. A. Crowder, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $1500.

A. Crowell Collier & Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $125.80.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, One Farragut Square, South, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Canned and Cooked Meat Importers' Association, c/o Deltec International, Ltd., 2801 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla.
D. (6) $1,245. E. (9) $234.20.

A. William E. Cumberland, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $866.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $5,749.98.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,250. E. (9) $2,910.37.

A. Pamela G. Curtis, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $4,474.98. E. (9) $423.84.

A. William Kay Daines, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $260. E. (9) $41.

A. Danzansky, Dickey, Tydings, Quint & Gordon, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $6,039.

A. Richard C. Darling, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $521.74.

A. Jean Daugherty, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Philip J. Daugherty.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,697.75. E. (9) $34.50.

A. John B. Davenport, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $160.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $148.81.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60690.
B. Bankers Life & Casualty Co., 4444 Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60630.
E. (9) $47.58.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
E. (9) $61.20.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.
E. (9) $326.64.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $131. E. (9) $61.20.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
E. (9) $1,248.01.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Trans-Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
E. (9) $65.20.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. United Insurance Co. of America, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
E. (9) $37.57.

A. Fred E. Davis.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $409.45.

A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Walter L. Davis, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $750.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $257.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $94.75.

A. DeHart and Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc., 114 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $74.85.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ray Denison, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,421. E. (9) $444.82.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 1 Lincoln Plaza New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
D. (6) $2,255.
E. (9) $1,689.72.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association for Broadcast Engineering, Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif. 95802.
D. (6) $3,420.95. E. (9) $260.95.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Marysville Dam Committee, Post Office Box 1550, Marysville, Calif.
E. (9) $7.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, Post Office Box 815, West Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,430.75. E. (9) $40.75.

A. Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., 968 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky 41076.
D. (6) $41,875.47. E. (9) $41,875.47.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. William H. Dodds, UAW, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $1,347.15. E. (9) $292.15.

A. Steven P. Doehler, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $97.50.

A. James F. Doherty.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $1,777.80.

A. Patrice M. Doherty, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $93.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $316.25. E (9) $261.54.

A. Leo J. Donahue, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. James C. Donald, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $4,105.81.

A. Gary W. Donnelly, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $57.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, Room 1128 Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $2,911.72. E. (9) $270.

A. Mitchell Dorson, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $450.

A. F. Raymond Downs, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

A. Harry J. Doyle, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $180.30. E. (9) $143.85.

A. Robert H. Doyle, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $3,693.05.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,004. E. (9) $2,920.02.

A. M. L. DuMars, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $60.

A. Pauline B. Dunckel, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 900, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Louise C. Dunlap, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $395.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,075.

A. Robert E. Early, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $94.11.

A. Roy W. Easley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $9. E. (9) $25.67.

A. Daniel J. Edelman, Inc., 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Safety Belt Council, Post Office Box 467, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10802.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $1,319.70.

A. Arthur B. Edgeworth, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Hallett D. Edson, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Macon T. Edwards, Ring Building, Room 610, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $607.50. E. (9) $103.03.

A. Charles Ehrhart, 1800 K Street NW., No. 924, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Food, Agriculture, Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $103.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., 1600 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. E. Neel Edwards, Jr.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $730.35.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.
D. (6) $157. E. (9) $253.31.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Ruth Bowdey Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.
D. (6) $2,990. E. (9) $3,406.15.

A. Roy Elson, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $399.77.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $2,139.

A. Richard W. Emory, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
E. (9) $845.75.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Bob Hoffman, York Barbell Co., York, Pa. 17405.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $285.81.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $130.80.

A. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $6,782.52. E. (9) $9,397.72.

A. Alfred S. Ercolano, 1775 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $185.

A. Russell G. Ernest, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1014, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,575. E. (9) $25.75.

A. Robert R. Fahs, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Cargill, Inc., 1200 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $39.30.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,824. E. (9) $137.72.

A. Joseph A. Fanelli, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $24.20.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $85,055. E. (9) $29,743.01.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $4,500.

A. Federation of American Scientists, 203 C Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $13,668.70. E. (9) $3,369.75.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500 Guinness Tower, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, B.C.
D. (6) $8,499. E. (9) $155.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 4th Floor, 117 Eglinton Avenue, East, Toronto 12, Canada.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $46.

A. Francis S. Filbey, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,508.40.

A. Matthew P. Fink, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $35.

A. Thomas Fink, room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tennessee 38112.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $41.

A. James W. Finley, 1015 18th Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Crown Zellerbach Corp., One Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $6,725.63. E. (9) $133.68.

A. John F. Fochtman, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,062.50. E. (9) $874.13.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
B. Minnesota Railroads Association.
D. (6) $500.

A. James W. Foristel, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,343.75. E. (9) $624.71.

A. John S. Forsythe, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $583.63. E. (9) $6.15.

A. David H. Foster.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $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. (6) $750. E. (9) $284.90.

A. William C. Foster, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $63.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street N.W., Washington D.C. 20036; 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007.
D. (6) $37.50.

A. Charles L. Frazier, 485 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Room 2250, Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa 50841.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1564.12.

A. Robert M. Frederick, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $4,750.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Susan Fridy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $7.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, Fort Totten, N. Dak.
E. (9) $11.20.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Mizrachi Women's Organization of America, 242 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10003.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Ariz.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $80.20.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.
D. (6) $350.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.
E. (9) $2.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Pueblo of Cochiti, Box 70, Cochiti, N. Mex 87041.
D. (6) $150.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.
D. (6) $150.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 120, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. Fried, 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. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Sisseton, S. Dak.
E. (9) $11.30.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $100.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $61,300. E. (9) $15,109.

A. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $9,300. E. (9) $9,300.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frosh, Lane, and Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. Frosh, Lane, and Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frosh, Lane, and Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Frosh, Lane, and Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $450.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $295.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Martin Report, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,729.68. E. (9) $372.97.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Professional Services, 1100 Glendon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $13.01.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vance Sanders & Co., Inc., Boston, Mass.; Federated Investors, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Fidelity Management & Research Co., Boston, Mass.

A. James E. Gaffigan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $205.75. E. (9) $21.05.

A. Robert E. Gallamore, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $1,215.

A. Nicole Gara, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $5,934.37.

A. John W. Gardner, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
E. (9) $610.65.

A. Edward V. Garlich, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va., 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $150.

A. Thomas Garrett, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $870.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Associaton, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washintgon, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $406.50.

A. George W. Gephart, Gas & Electric Building, Baltmore, Md. 21203.
B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. Donald A. Giampaoli, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. William T. Gibb, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $124.69. E. (9) $5.91.

A. Wayne Gibbens, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 620, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $131.44.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 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 S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

A. Lawrence D. Gilson, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $300.

A. Dave Givens, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37201.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson and William B. Beebe, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.33.

A. Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson and William B. Beebe, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $7.74.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 Eye Street NW., Suite 614, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J. 07470.
D. (6) $253. (9) $38.65.

A. Frederick D. Goss, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $120.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 W. Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48226.

A. Government Employes Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $13,771.68. E. (9) $5,428.10.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,809.17. E. (9) $116.50.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. James A. Gray, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
D. (6) $12,132.51. E. (9) $122.60.

A. Robert K. Gray, 1425 K Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $211.58.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $196.06.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho 83702.
B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Milk Industry Foundation, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $500.

A. John F. Griner, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $12,432.70. E. (9) $2,894.71.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $6,802.80.

A. James J. Gudinas, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Kenneth J. Guido, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. R. William Habel, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,880. E. (9) $306.12.

A. Matthew Hale, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $200.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60602.

A. J. G. Hall, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,193.92.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $12.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,049.99. E. (9) $49.88.

A. Donald K. Hanes, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $263.75. E (9) $8.47.

A. Robert B. Harding, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770.
D. (6) $150. E (9) $58.44.

A. Eugene J. Hardy.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $510.75.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $54.50.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
D. (6) $161. E. (9) $161.

A. Thomas E. Harman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $415. E. (9) $32.25.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Harper, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $132. E. (9) $51.60.

A. Barbara W. Harris, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,166.60.

A. Otto R. Harrison, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $25.90.

A. William C. Hart, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 20 Montchanin Road, Wilmington, Del. 19807.
D. (6) $2055.16. E. (9) $3229.52.

A. Clifford J. Harvison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,670.34. E. (9) $710.13.

A. Andrew T. Hatcher, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $637.

A. Robert T. Hayden, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15222.
D. (6) $3,168.59. E. (9) $605.80.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.63. E. (9) $880.76.

A. Hays and Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

A. Ralph E. Heal, 250 West Jersey Street, Elizabeth, N.J. 07207.
B. National Pest Control Association, 250 West Jersey Street, Elizabeth, N.J. 07207.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $208.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (b) $7,490.75. E. (9) $7,490.75.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $182.51.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Heilman, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $2,583.30.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $609.90.

A. Barbara Heller, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $15.

A. Ross E. Heller, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $410.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Leslie P. Hemry, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $268.93.

A. Richard A. Henneges, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,933. E. (9) $73.07.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $456.40.

A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $8,875. E. (9) $671.59.

A. J. Thomas Higginbotham, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Consumer Bankers Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $935.50.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $2,000.

A. James J. Hill, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Harry R. Hinton, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $1,987.50. E. (9) $801.14.

A. James D. Hittle, Sr., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pan American World Airways, Pan Am Building, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $128.63.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $435.

A. Leo D. Hochstetter.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20006.

A. Thomas W. Holland, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10022.
D. (6) $923.12. E. (9) $78.20.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,813. E. (9) $4,333.

A. John W. Holton, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $38.55.

A. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn., 55912.

A. C. T. Hoversten, 209 West 53d Street, Western Springs, Ill. 60558.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill. 60501.
D. (6) $469.20.

A. Thomas Howarth, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $759.43. E. (9) $759.43.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $8,703.75. E. (9) $2,844.53.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ashland Oil, Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Gregory A. Humphrey, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $445.84.

A. David J. Humphreys, Paulson and Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $11,250. E. (9) $221.95.

A. Richard M. Hunt, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
D. (6) $750.

A. James L. Huntley, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL-CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,145.36. E. (9) $766.82.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., East Benning Road, Galesville, Md. 20765.
B. Committee on Federal Procurement of A/E Services; 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

B. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013.
B. Elmer P. Hutter, lobbyist, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013.
D. (6) $50.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, lobbyist, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013.
B. Daniel Smith, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $241.

A. Lester S. Hyman, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Midland Enterprises, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $7,553.70. E. (9) $7,553.70.

A. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $161.56.

A. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $9,091.17. E. (9) $640.

A. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $9,353.44.

A. Internation Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $4,363.56.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $19,612.93.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
D. (6) $7,791.12. E. (9) $9,572.35.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, Chas. E. Jackson & Associates, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1112, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $205.67.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1819 H Street NW., No. 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1750 Old Meadow Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
D. (6) $1249.98.

A. Robert L. James, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 920, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bank of America N.T. and S.A., Bank of America Plaza, San Francisco, Calif. 94137.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
E. (9) $500.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Smith Kline & French Laboratories, 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.
E. (9) $579.20.

A. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J. 07960.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975.

A. Jess Johnson, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1 Shell Plaza, Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $5,169.02. E. (9) $138.28.

A. Charles N. Jolly, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 315, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Miles Laboratories, Inc., 1127 Myrtle Street, Elkhart, Ind. 46514.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1100 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $550. E. (9 $150.

A. H. Daniel Jones III, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Bldg., Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
E. (9) $38.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $13.

A. Oliver H. Jones, 1125 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $719. E. (9) $9,619.

A. Carl D. Jordan, 408 East Maple, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
E. (9) $160.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $11.65.

A. Gerald M. Katz, Esquire, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $170.

A. William J. Keating, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain & Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500.
D. (6) $100.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $15.20.

A. John G. Keller, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $3.30.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Francis A. Kelly, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Asssociation.

A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. They Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.
E. (9) $326.64.

A. R. G. Kendall, Jr., Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala. 36104.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $833.32.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
E. (9) $440.90.

A. Jeremiah J. Kenney, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $41.35.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $150.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $545. E. (9) $29.

A. Mrs. Walter G. Kimmel, 1715 25th Street, Rock Island, Ill. 61201.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $475.84.

A. Charles L. King, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $72.

A. Joseph T. King, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors, 615 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill. 60521.
E. (9) $368.53.

A. Gibson Kingren, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $466.75.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,344.88. E. (9) $651.02.

A. Kirkland, Ellis & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton St., Allentown, Pa. 18101.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $478.36.

A. James D. Kittelton, 1100 Ring Building Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $725.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $200.

A. Douglas E. Kliever, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,749.98. E. (9) $480.

A. Paul R. Knapp, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.
D. (6) $875.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $575.

A. Philip M. Knox, Jr., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $25.

A. Joseph L. Koach, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bradley R. Koch, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $125.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $58.50.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul A. Korody, Jr., 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $300.

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $4,467.75. E. (9) $965.36.

A. Howard R. Koven and Abe Fortas, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. June Kysilko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $144.50.

A. Lawrence E. Kreider, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., 20036.

A. Germaine Krettek, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $750.

A. James S. Krzyminski, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,049.98. E. (9) $53.38.

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 R. Kuhn, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,324. E. (9) $1,215.64.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $4,964. E. (9) $4,526.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $13,035.37.

A. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
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.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $365.27.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. District of Columbia Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va. 22150.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Donald F. Lavanty, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $784.76. E. (9) $574.97.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $125.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Lee, McCarthy & DeRosa, 102 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10005.
E. (9) $850.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $261. E. (9) $599.82.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $40.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $12,374.98.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 2401 Crow-Canyon Road, San Ramon, Calif.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Metropolitan Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
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.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
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. Stanly 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.

A. Herbert Liebenson, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 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) $4,868.53. E. (9) $4,868.53.

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, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $591.23.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

A. John E. Linster, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
B. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Electric Companies.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $139.86.

A. Laurence London, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.

A. Sheldon I. London, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
D. (6) $625.

A. Philip J. Loree, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $119.89.

A. James F. Lovett, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $200.

A. Otto Lowe, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.
E. (9) $1,550.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash. 99201.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ebasco Industries, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J. 07960.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
E. (9) $.91.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 390, National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $600.

A. William George Lunsford, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,512.

A. James H. Lynch, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,551.70. E. (9) $249.24.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Printing Industries of America, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $1,495.

A. James E. Mack, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., 60603.
D. (6) $6,687.50. E. (9) $1,146.72.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andre Maisonpierre, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $620.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va., 22101.
B. National Coal Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,876.01. E. (9) $110.90.

A. Mike Manatos, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Procter & Gamble Manufacture Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
D. (6) $110.33. E. (9) $110.33.

A. Man-made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $700.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. John V. Maraney, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Ralph J. Marlatt, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $1,335.

A. William J. Marschalk, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $105.28.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $4,416.90. E. (9) $244.22.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $17.78.

A. J. Paul Marshall, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $334.32. E. (9) $356.45.

A. Richard E. Martinez, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $313.10. E. (9) $446.35.

A. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. Guy B. Maseritz, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Paul J. Mason, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $156.56. E. (9) $7.44.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,499.91. E. (9) $550.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Ocean Industries Association, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. P. H. Mathews, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $435.34. E. (9) $436.15.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $376.05.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 410, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill. 60657.
D. (6) $5,675. E. (9) $560.

A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
B. L. M. Williams and Clayton Burch Families, in care of Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., Trustee, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz 85621.
D. (6) $500.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Brass & Bronze Ingot Institute, 300 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill 60606.
D. (6) $72. E. (9) $26.50.

A. William J. McAuliffe, Jr., 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Land Title Association, 1828

L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $15.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Government Employes Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,871.69.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 3308 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La. 70119.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., North Perry and Jefferson Streets, Montgomery, Ala. 36103.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobile Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Magnavox Co., 1700 Magnavox Way, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804.
E. (9) $100.98.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf & Western Industries, Inc., 1 Gulf & Western Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga. 30301.

A. E. L. McCulloch, Room 819, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.
D. (6) $284.60. E. (9) $81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $486.65. E. (9) $106.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $57.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.
E. (9) $98.07.

A. J. Raymond McGlaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
D. (6) $7,080.

A. Myles F. McGrail, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich. 48640.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $77.30.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,088. E. (9) $345.25.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,067.63.

A. John A. McKenna, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,362.50.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 1200 North Courthouse Road (G4), Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. NCO Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex. 78298.
D. (6) $1,890. E. (9) $1,071.94.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 1200 North Courthouse Road, No. 626, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. National Headquarters, Marine Corps League, 933 North Kenmore Street, Suite 317, Arlington, Va. 22201.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $350.

A. C. W. McMillan, Suite 1015, National Press Building, 14th and F Street, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 90202.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $435. E. (9) $60.29.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $7,389.74.

A. McNutt, Dudley, Easterwood & Losch, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Dredging Co., 12 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Co., 22720 Michigan Avenue, Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $5,150. E. (9) $2,992.39.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., Suite 1100, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montgomery Ward, Inc., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $225.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, Room 737, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $2,020.86.

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.
E. (9) $7,580.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) 6,006. E. (9) $619.93.

A. William A. Meissner, Jr., 6200 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Rudolph Wolff & Co., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $133.68.

A. R. Otto Meletzke, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $86.45. E. (9) $3.36.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,009.27. E. (9) $298.75.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $392.

A. James G. Michaux, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
D. (6) $500.

A. Bruce L. Mikesell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Independent Automobile Dealers Association, 1719 West End Avenue, Nashville, Tenn., 37203.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $394.54.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Questor Corp., 1801 Spielbusch Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43694.
D. (6) $295.

A. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $100.

A. Anne Miller, Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $135.54.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $93.38.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $30.97.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Texas Gulf, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $257.73.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
B. Nebraska Railroad Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) $6,049.98. E. (9) $529.26.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $875.

A. Luman G. Miller, Suite 912, 620 Southwest Fifth Avenue Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, Suite 912, 620 Southwest Fifth Avenue Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

A. Jack Mills, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Arnold C. Johnson.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, Post Office Box 829, Boise, Idaho 83701.

A. John G. Mohay, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $350.

A. Graham T. T. Molitor, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 403, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55440.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Michael Monroney, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crollius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $2,150.

A. G. Merrill Moody, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $95.54. E. (9) $239.22.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bituminous Coal Operators Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $500.

A. O. William Moody, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,072.18.

A. Donald L. Morgan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo. 80201.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Committee for Civil Airlift.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. James M. Morris, 1660 L Street NW., Room 804, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,290.58.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) Under $100.

A. Jack Moskowitz, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $191.88.

A. John J. Motley.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $355.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

A. Motorists United for Ecology, Inc., 3477 New Ridge Drive, Palos Verdes, Calif. 90274.
D. (6) $677. E. (9) $1,272.02.

A. William G. Mullen, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
E. (9) $183.31.

A. John J. Murphy, 517 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Richard W. Murphy, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J. 07065.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $4.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $438.13. E. (9) $775.13.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $185.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,887.50. E. (9) $44.25.

A. John J. Nangle, 1625 E Street NW., Suite 812, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $586.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) $41.25.

A. National Air Carrier Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $875.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $57.50. E. (9) $57.50.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $36,230.50. E. (9) $5,991.39.

A. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,50.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,115.84. E. (9) $5,536.58.

A. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (6) $232.75. E. (9) $232.75.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
E. (9) $12,733.39.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $781,503.51. E. (9) $72,253.07.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $30.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,981.37. E. (9) $1,981.37.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,486.11. E. (9) $4,486.11.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $17,496.66.

A. NBA Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) $384.69. E. (9) $384.69.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. National Audio-Visual Associates, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $20,131.12. E. (9) $4,433.25.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $665,266.59. E. (9) $4,873.07.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $416,239.23. E. (9) $3,293.06.

A. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif., 90004.
D. (6) $1,423.69. E. (9) $1,423.69.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn., 38112.
D.(6) $13,010.55. E. (9) $13,010.55.

A. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $553.50. E. (9) $282.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $23,824.75. E. (9) $27,129.62.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $568.76. E. (9) $756.88.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco, Inc., 2600 South Kostnez Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,475. E. (8) $138.30.

A. National Counsel 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 Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. ELBA Systems Corp., 5909 East 38th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $32.09.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.
E. (9) $518.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920–922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,920.70. E. (9) $19,920.70.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,898.50 E. (9) $2,935.41.

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. 20006.
D. (6) $142,387.72. E. (9) $11,220.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
E. (6) $694.93.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 632, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,631.76. E. (9) $15,479.41.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,917.95. E. (9) $3,917.95.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $774.79. E. (9) $1,986.82.

A. National Institute of Locker & Freezer Provisioners, 224 East High Street, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022.
D. (6) $87.61. E. (9) $817.81.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $37,187.38. E. (9) $37,187.38.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68107.
D. (6) $4,264.42 E. (9) $4,264.42.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $825.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,025.50. E. (19) $750.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,625.46. (9) $1,391.

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. 20036.
D. (6) $1,964.34. E. (9) $1,964.34.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,000. E (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $13,345.

A. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,531. E. (9) $5,016.09.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
E. (9) $865.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. 84101.
D. (6) $18,408. E. (9) $5,785.57.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $5,380.27.

A. Alexander W. Neale, Jr., 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,290. E. (9) $15.80.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770.
D. (6) 200. E. (9) $150.10.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. George Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $146.88.

A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $303.05.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,656.25. E. (9) $186.32.

A. E. J. Newbould, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Clay Pipe Institute, 350 West Terra Cotta Avenue, Crystal Lake, Ill. 60014.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $15.

A. Charles E. Nichols, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,105. E. (9) $792.10.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,960.62. E. (9) $796.36.

A. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $150.29.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Seward Nyman, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
D. (6) $650.

A. Northeast Utilities Service Co., Selden Street, Berlin, Conn.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Transit Association, 465 L'Enfant Plaza West SW., Suite 2900, Washington D.C. 20024.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $143.67.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Suite 2900, IDS Tower, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Koch Refining Co., Post Office Box 3596, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $29.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Room 110, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $156.99.

A. Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Standard Oil Co., Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
E. (9) $334.96.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill 60603.
D. (6) $400.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Philippine Sugar Institute.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) $4,269.98. E. (9) $1,626.03.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215; Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Room 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $26.60.

A. Edward W. Oliver, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Suite 816, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. L. T. Barringer & Co., 161 South Front Street, Memphis, Tenn.
D.(6) $2,500.

A. Roy E. Olson, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $56.75.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $300.69.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $185.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Edward J. Panarello, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,324.32. E. (9) $894.92.

A. Carol Ames Parker, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $187.43.

A. Kenton H. Pattie, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $1,302.40.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Boating Industry Association, 401 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601. National Asociation of Engine & Boat Manufacturers, 537 Steamboat Road, Greenwich, Conn. 06830.
D. (6) $920.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & Boggs, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Snowmobile Industry Association, 5100 Edina Industrial Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
D. (6) $457.50.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Nestle Co., 100 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, N.Y. 10605.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Jack Pearce, Suite 808–810, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee on Modern, Efficient Transportation.
D. (6) $8,460. E. (9) $1,009.64.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,294.86.

A. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. D. V. Pensabene, Suit 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, Shell Oil Co., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1 Shell Plaza, Houston, Tex. 77002.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,460. E. (9) $309.22.

A. Richard W. Peterson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $375.

A. Roger J. Phauf, 1825 K Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $130.33.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washingtin, D.C. 20005.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,460.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex. 79401.
D. (6) $2,721.36. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $19.70.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. William I. Powell, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $14.30.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $98.59.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $475.

A. William H. Press, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,225.

A. H. F. Pressler, 1122 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $50.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $296.35. E. (9) $3.

A. Louis V. Priebe, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,931.20. E. (9) $1,931.20.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Questor Corp., 1801 Spielbusch Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43694.
E. (9) $295.

A. Joseph E. Quin, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $720.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 8, Box 238, Annapolis, Md. 21401.
B. Associated Retail Bakers of America, 735 West Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,742. E. (9) $487.76.

A. Thomas H. Quinn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,666.50 E. (9) $268.21.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,996.80.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $337.44.

A. Raymond Raedy, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13.43. E. (9) $2.97.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, Room 804, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $8,692. E. (9) $8,692.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $1,565. E. (9) $1,565.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $450.

A. D. Michael Rappoport, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $73.12.

A. Robert J. Rauch, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $685.

A. Thomas D. Ray.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $305.

A. William W. Rayner, 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $113.80.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $11,471.95.

A. Dwight C. Reed, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) $46.86.

A. David J. Reedy, 6S430 Huntington Circle East, Naperville, Ill. 60540.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Argo, Ill. 60510.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 602 Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $600.

A. Robert S. Reese, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Barbara Reid, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $540.

A. John A. Reilly, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y., 10038.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz. 85364.
E. (9) $25 est.

A. W. W. Renfroe, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky., 40507.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky. 40507.
E. (9) $197.05.

A. Reserve Officers Association of United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,057.97. E. (9) $460.25.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, Warner Building, Suite 1128, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $5,817.68. E. (9) $10,214.83.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,919.

A. James J. Reynolds, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $363.

A. Austin T. Rhoads.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $42.80.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $625.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.
B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.

A. Rosalie Riechman, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
D. (6) $1,575.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.
E. (9) $30.

A. Stark Ritchie, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,813.34. E. (9) $329.34.

A. Kenneth Roberson, 2 Dubonnet Road, Valley Stream, N.Y. 11581.
B. Meat Importers Council of America, Inc., 708 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $13. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. William S. Roberts, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $75.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Thomas G. Roderick, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $729.20.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 793, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017.
D. (6) $750.

A. Walter E. Rogers, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Rouss & O'Rourke, 231 East Vermijo Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80903.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas 36, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $2,631.95.

A. Robert J. Routier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., No. 1009, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Press, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $41.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., No. 1009, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Deltona Corp., 3250 South West Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33129.
D. (6) $10,680. E. (9) $49.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio 44316.

A. Albert R. Russell, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $686.15. D. (9) $80.

A. Cristine Russell, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Coalition to Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,710.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $838.49.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., No. 514, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $866.76.

A. E. M. Ryan, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co, Inc, 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $24.25.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 500 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Corp., Atlantic Richfield Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Union Oil Co., Gulf Oil Corp., all of Los Angeles; Humble Oil & Refining Co., Midland, Tex.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum & Tayler, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson, Muncie, Ind.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum & Tayler, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. York Bag Co., Ltd., 3577 Dundas Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

A. Carl K. Sadler, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $6,698.30. E. (9) $6,657.09.

A. Eric P. Schellin, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $750.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. Allan D. Schlosser, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. John W. Scott, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Raymond L. Schafer, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $82.61.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill. 60076.

A. Donald H. Schwab, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.
D. (6) $1,691.25. E. (9) $52.45.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Jefferson Pilot Corp., Post Office Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C. 27402.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.
E. (9) $4.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $231.25. E. (9) $31.12.

A. Kay Sealy, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $450.

A. Earl W. Sears, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $327.50. E. (9) $26.91.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich. 48207.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz. 85364.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
E. (9) $174.38.

A. Alice Shabecoff, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pfizer Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $360.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Albright Title & Trust Co., 100 North Main Street, Newkirk, Okla. 74647.
E. (9) $1,596.75.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia, 2125 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.
D. (6) $2,901.30. E. (9) $1,462.22.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $820. E. (9) $47.

A. Jane M. O. Sharp, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Council for a Livable World.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, Barr Building, 910 17th Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $5,995.75. E. (9) $3,463.96.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. Edward L. Shields, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,050.

A. Max Shine, 1126 16th Street NW., Room 200, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 1126 16th Street NW., Room 200, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Harvey A. Shipman, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Penn Central Transportation Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.

A. Lucien J. Sichel, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill. 60064.
D. (6) $300.

A. David Silver, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Talmage E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $50.

A. Lana H. Sims, South Carolina Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.
D. (6) $26.61. E. (9) $87.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. William L. Slayton, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $8.

A. Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Horse Council, Inc., 1776 K. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $781.17.

A. Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $148.85.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Delaware Corp., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $319.29.

A. Arthur J. Smith, 1700 K Street NW., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. Howard H. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $217.12.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $48.

A. Robert William Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $187. E. (9) $128.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $44.35.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $2,840. E. (9) $1,399.40.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1100 17th Street NW., Suite 306, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $129.60.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,802.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C., 20001.
E. (9) $250.

A. Society for Animal Prevention Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C. 20007.
D. (6) $7,515.04. E. (9) $6,596.08.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, 1 East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $100.

A. Jerome N. Sonosky, Gerald E. Gilbert, and Alvin Ezrin, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Physical Therapy Association, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, O'Hare Office Building, Suite 400, 10400 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $1,125.40.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $1,399. E. (9) $4.64.

A. Frank J. Specht, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William C. Spence, Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Columbia Gulf Transmission Co., Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $150.

A. Squibb Corp., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $155.

A. John M. Stackhouse, Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 400 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., Room 400, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $525.

A. Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $334.96.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $350.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $200.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Robert College of Instanbul, Turkey, 305 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wynne A. Stevens, Jr., 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $870.

A. Travis B. Stewart, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J. 07110.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Edward W. Stimpson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $406.50.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $6,039.35. E. (9) $300.50.

A. William M. Stover, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) Under $100.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $5,910. E. (9) $698.97.

A. John Stringer, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,550.

A. Michael E. Strother, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $57.

A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Walter B. Stults, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $600.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $575.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Travelers Corp., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn. 06115.

A. Irving W. Swanson, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Suite 61, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. National Tuberculosis & Respiratory Disease Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $141.55.

A. David A. Sweeney, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. John R. Sweeney, Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa. 18016.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $279.20.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.
D. (6) $230.76. E. (9) $238.97.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C. 20036.

A. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va. 22901.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard M. Tempero, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $343.74.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Tenneco Inc., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 402 Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American National Insurance Co., Anico Building, Galveston, Tex. 77550.

A. William D. Thompson, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,528.59.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $459.33.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electrical Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $605. E. (9) $162.38.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $24.90.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $792. E. (9) $478.54.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.
E. (9) $103.05.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., 1620 I Street NW., Room 700, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washingotn, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $14,244.58.

A. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,169.10. E. (9) $2,169.10.

A. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $25,068.57.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $300.13.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $619.19. E. (9) $619.19.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $43,202.95.

A. Universal Development Consultants, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $59.30.

A. David E. Ushio, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
D. (6) $500.

A. John A. Vance, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
D. (6) $2,304.75. E. (9) $1,882.13.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $480.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 I Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
E. (9) $8.

A. Lois Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va. 22302.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $80.

A. John W. Vardaman, Jr., 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $468.88.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $1.46.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $179. E. (9) $45.95.

A. L. T. Vice, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $185.

A. Walter D. Vinyard, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250

A. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $317.36.

A. Donn L. Waage, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank, Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $157.25. E. (9) $62.55.

A. E. R Wagner, 888 17th Street NW, Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $259.62. E. (9) $18.95.

A. Paul A. Wagner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $844.70. E. (9) $194.36.

A. Lionel L. Wallenrod, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. E. F. Waldrop, Jr., Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $376.25.

A. Jack A. Waller, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, International Union, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,869.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $1,153.20. E. (9) $322.11.

A. Charles S. Walsh.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $127.50. E. (9) $15.

A. William A. Walton, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, Eighth and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans. 66612.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, Eighth and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans. 66612.

A. Richard W. Warden, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., 48214.
D. (6) $857.82. E. (9) $33.50.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, 401 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $850.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Occupational Therapy Association, 6000 Executive Boulevard, Suite 200, Rockville, Md., 20852.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $340.

A. George B. Watts, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Ray Wax, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22022.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22202.

A. Herman Webb, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, O'Hare Office Building, Suite 400, 10400 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $525.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $9,999.99.

A. F. Paul Weiss, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $169.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul S. Weller, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $181.25.

A. Fred M. Wertheimer, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20037.
D. (6) $6,600. E. (9) $80.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $207.52.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
E. (9) $500.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., 1800 K Street NW., Suite 820, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Sun Oil Co., 240 Radnor-Chester Road, St. Davids, Pa. 19087.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $1,750.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. 53703.
B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $6.83.

A. John C. White, Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. John S. White, Marathon Oil Co., 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
E. (9) $733.65.

A. Robert L. White, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1005, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Zale Corp., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $150.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $5,212.70.

A. Joe O. Wiggs, 425 North Henry Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $482.08.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $93.15.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities, care

of John Howard, Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
E. (9) $0.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. College Placement Council, Inc., 65 East Elizabeth Street, Bethlehem, Pa.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $389.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Pierre Agency, Pierre, S. Dak.
E. (9) $33.31.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Dakota Association of Canada, Post Office Box 1193, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
E. (9) $118.47.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Estate of Albert W. Small, care of Mrs. Albert W. Small, 5803 Green Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) $0.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817 Hoopa, Calif.
E. (9) $78.76.

A. Wilkinson, Cragum & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bonneville International Corp., 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $180.80.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
E. (9) $22.48.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $84.29.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20006.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $46.78.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservations, New Town, N. Dak.
E. (9) $97.64.

A. Williams, Connolly & Califano, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $468.88.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for Health Care Services, 407 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bankers Association of Puerto Rico, care of Wender, Murase & White, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Francis G. Williams.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $100.

A. Harding de C. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Harry D. Williams, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 204-05, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ashland Oil, Inc., Post Office Box 391, Ashland, Ky. 41101.
D. (6) $250.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $707.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $172.85.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $3,960. E. (9) $28.55.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Oil Investment Institute, 2500 Dunstan, Suite 605, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $5,752.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La. 71106.
B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $70.

A. R. 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. Peter L. Wolff, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
D. (6) $3,645.76. E. (9) $6,042.53.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $150.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line., Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Signal Cos., Inc., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Merger Committee, National Basketball Association, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20011; Merger Committee, American Basketball Association, 601 Portland Federal Building, 200 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky. 40202.
D. (6) $2,850.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Copyright Owners Negotiating Committee, care of Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Embassy of the Government of the Republic of Korea, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman, and Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20011.

A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va. 22207.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 No. Quincy Street, Arlington, Va. 22207.
D. (6) $375.

A. George M. Worden, Hill, and Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $252.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel. 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., 1675 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska. 99501.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman, and Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Motion Picture and TV Producers 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90048; Hollywood AFL Film Council, 7715 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif. 90046; Screen Actors Guild, 7750 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif. 90046.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

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. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,331. E. (9) $404.98.

A. Albert H. Zinkand, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Getty Oil Company, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles O. Zuver, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $205.40.

* 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 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: 19_____ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

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 "employee" 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".—(*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]

PAGE 1 ◄

A. Actors' Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. John J. Adams, Suite 550, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Vepco, Seventh and Franklin Streets, Richmond, Va.
D. (6) $150.

A. Alaska Interstate Co., Post Office Box 6554, 5051 Westheimer, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. Frederick K. Alderson, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $740. E. (9) $306.31.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E.(9) $2,000.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.
D. (6) $7,497.83. E. (9) $7,497.83.

A. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $16,587.08. E. (9) $2,794.96.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $6,116.84. E. (9) $6,116.84.

A. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $13,487.15.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $3,520.42. E. (9) $3,520.42.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,487.23.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $28,219.26. E. (9) $28,219.26.

A. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $5,203.72. E. (9) $5,203.72.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,264.58. E. (9) $1,264.58.

A. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1750 Old Meadow Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
E.(9) $1,250.

A. John Anderson, 4111 Franconia Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 2007 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. APCO Oil Corp., 1000 Liberty Bank Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Franklin Life Insurance Co., Franklin Square, Springfield, Ill. 62705.
E. (9) $15.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Maremont Corp., 168 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $1,735. E. (9) $35.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Powell Lumber Co., Lake Charles, La.
D. (6) $1,476.25. E. (9) $20.42.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $1,046.47.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $405.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $301.

A. Bailey, Sipes, Williamson & Runyan, Inc., 1100 V and J Tower, Midland, Tex.

A. Charles W. Bailey, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C., 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert B. Baldwin, Post Office Box 6554, 5051 Westheimer, Houston, Tex. 77005.
B. Alaska Interstate Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. Peter M. Balitsaris, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,234.38. E. (9) $169.96.

A. C. Thomas Bendorf, 1620 I Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Trial Lawyers Association.
D. (6) $1,500. E. $150.

A. Richard W. Bliss, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $475.

A. William Blum, Jr., 700 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, care of William A. Geoghegan, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $833.33. E. (9) $328.23.

A. Norman F. Blundell, 811 Dallas, Americana Building, Houston, Tex. 77002.
B. Gulf Interstate Engineering Co., 811 Dallas, Americana Building, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. Frederick C. Bond III, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill.
D. (6) $79.68. E. (9) $82.65.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO–CLC, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Cyril F. Brickfield, 1225 Conecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $208.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $16.50.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $22,090.78. E. (9) $22,090.78.

A. David Brower, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of CPA's, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of CPA's, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $248.71.

A. Richard L. Bullock, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Hearst Corp., 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
E. (9) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Parcel Post Association, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $700.

A. Burwell, Hansen & McCandless, 700 Federal Bar Building West, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $322.42.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1106, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,396.37. E. (9) $1,158.81.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Alaska Interstate Co, 2200 Post Oak Tower, 5051 Westheimer, Houston, Tex. 77027; Apco Oil Corp., Liberty Bank Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102; Gulf Interstate Co., American Building, Houston, Tex. 77022.

A. Casey Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $2,034.04.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Post Office Box 445, Mbabane, Swaziland.
D. (6) $8,333.36. E. (9) $3,363.32.

A. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Cordage Institute, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $937.50.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Dental Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Lowell I. Christison, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $76.96. E. (9) $41.90.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $52.50. E. (9) $2.91.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,850. E. (9) $7,325.67.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 6, Pittsburg, Kans., 66762.

A. Coalition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $2,021.24.

A. Coalition for Rural America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,970. E. (9) $16,876.07.

A. Carl A. S. Coan, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,562.49. E. (9) $401.46.

A. Robert E. Cole, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Automobile Manufacturers Association, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $500.

A. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) $23,490.97. E. (9) $19,904.70.

A. Committee for Modern, Efficient Transportation, Suite 808–10, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $325.

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.

A. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,250.

A. Roger C. Courtney, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) 230.38. E. (9) $235.40.

A. John A. Couture, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,406.27. E. (9) $207.11.

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.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $3,045.70. E. (9) $1,057.20.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1 Farragut Square, South Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Canned Meat Importers' Association, in care of DELTEC International, Ltd., 2801 Ponce De Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla.
D. (6) $1,245. E. (9) $227.87.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Lumber Importers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $68.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Office Machine Dealers Association, 2510 Dempster Street, Des Plaines, Ill. 60016.
E. (9) $185.85.

A. Richard C. Darling, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $582.36.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. D.C. Transit Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Plaintiffs Trial Attorneys of Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United States Brewers Association, Inc., 1750 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $6,875. E. (9) $1,880.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $116.

A. Joseph E. Dillon, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Toro Co., 8111 Lyndale Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn. 55420.

A. Harry J. Doyle, American Optometric Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $372.62. E. (9) $344.95.

A. Pauline B. Dunckel, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 900, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $105.74. E. (9) $34.01.

A. Hope Eastman, 1424 16th Street, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.
D. (6) $7,497.83. E. (9) $7,497.83.

A. Daniel J. Edelman, Inc., 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Safety Belt Council, Post Office Box 467, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10802.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $152.20.

A. Harmon L. Elder, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $188.21.

A. D. A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $5,514. E. (9) $1,311.04.

A. Roy Elson, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $503.65.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,480. E. (9) $4,782.35.

A. Alfred S. Ercolano, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $175.

A. Federation of American Scientists, 203 C Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $12,978.93. E. (9) $2,238.60.

A. Edward R. Fellows, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $25.25.

A. Francis C. Fini, 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.
D. (6) $3,050. E. (9) $793.53.

A. Charles L. Frazier, 485 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Room 2250, Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa 50841.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,473.36.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1133 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $450.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $480.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $19.37.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $26,200. E. (9) $3,257.78.

A. Leo J. Gehrig, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $264.80. E. (9) $18.56.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Louis Gerber, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,899.96.

A. John A. C. Gibson, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $347.39.

A. Glenmede Trust Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Jack Golodner, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 165 W. 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Jack Golodner, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Vance V. Goodfellow, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $451.57.

A. Frederick D. Goss, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $315.

A. Gulf Interstate Engineering Co., 811 Dallas, Americana Building, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. R. William Habel, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,880. E. (9) $211.78.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $55.98.

A. John F. Hall, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,517.70.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60602.

A. John W. Hammett, 1000 Liberty Bank Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.
B. APCO Oil Corp., 1000 Liberty Bank Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

A. Donald L. Harlow, 310 Riley Street, Falls Church, Va., 22046.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Ralph E. Heal, 250 West Jersey Street, Elizabeth, N.J. 07207.
B. National Pest Control Association, 250 West Jersey Street, Elizabeth, N.J. 07207.
D. (6) $620. E. (9) $241.65.

A. Robert B. Heiney, National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $455.66.

A. Ross E. Heller, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2110 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $905.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50309.
B. Iowa Railway Association, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50309.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Forest Products Association.

A. Thomas P. Holley, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. O. Charles Honig, Post Office Box 6554, 5051 Westheimer, Houston, Tex. 77005.
B. Alaska Interstate Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Power Tool Institute, 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $450.

A. Peter W. Hughes, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Gregory A. Humphrey, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $1,003.67.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., East Benning Road, Galesville, Md., 20765.
B. Committee on Federal Procurement A/E Services; 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

A. Gerald W. Hyland, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $936.92. E. (9) $372.15.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Glen L. Jermstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Coalition for Rural America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $334.42.

A. Francis A. Kelly, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Kennedy & Leighton, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $92.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railways, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $5,294.40. E. (9) $672.

A. Peter M. Kirby, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $599.81.

A. Kominers, Fort, Schlefer & Boyer, Fifth Floor, Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,325. E. (9) $1,723.25.

A. Laurence F. Lane, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Suite 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 270, Washington, D.C. 20041.
B. American Trucking Association, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,525.

A. Donald F. Lavanty, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter; O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $1,062.68. E. (9) $807.80.

A. League for Economic Assistance and Development, Inc., 390 Plandome Road, Manhasset, N.Y. 11030.
D. (6) $385.08. E. (9) $385.08.

A. Charles W. Lee, Room 211, Congressional Hotel, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $30.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $156.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,527.02. E. (9) $17,522.84.

A. Charles B. Lipsen.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,100. E. (9) $531.

A. J. Patrick Logue, 100 935 North Van Dorn, Alexandria, Va.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
D. (6) $3,563.28.

A. Raymond W. Lucia, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motorcycle Industry Council, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

A. John V. Maraney, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. 84101.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. 84101.
D. (6) $4,416.90. E. (9) $971.92.

A. Richard E. Martinez, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, O.D., 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $292.90. E. (9) $474.30.

A. Guy B. Maseritz, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Albert E. May, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $88.50. E. (9) $2.32.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 410, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill. 60657.
D. (6) $5,657. E. (9) $680.

A. C. H. McCall, Post Office Box 6554, 5051 Westheimer, Houston, Tex. 77005.
B. Alaska Interstate Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex. 77005.
A. John L. McConnell, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. New York Stock Exchange, Inc., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $325.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $3,054. E. (9) $782.78.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,025.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $2,593,27.

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.
E. (9) $7,580.

A. Lester F. Miller, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $254. E. (9) $15.

A. Paul J. Minarchenko, Jr., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $649.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. John G. Mohay, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $337.51.

A. Michael Monroney, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
D. (6) $950.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo. 80201.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John Morgan, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $580.65.

A. Lynn E. Mote, Northern Natural Gas Co., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Motorists United for Ecology, Inc., 3477 New Ridge Drive, Palos Verdes, Calif. 90274.
D. (6) $828. E. (9) $280.71.

A. Richard E. Murphy, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Service Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.
B. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park NE., Altanta, Ga. 30329.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $169.22.

A. National Air Carrier Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $875.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $864.11 E. (9) $1,030.40.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $14,016.79. E. (9) $14,353.20.

A. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachsuetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Home, Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $32,679.34. E. (9) $33,035.55.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
E. (9) $12,376.74.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $654,057.57. E. (9) $5,496.58.

A. National Citizens Committee for Revenue Sharing, 707 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
E. (9) $186.82.

A. National Forest Products Assoication, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,707.68. E. (9) $4,186.14.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 632, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,727.61. E. (9) $23,664.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $845. E. (9) $2,327.80.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $24,035.62. E. (9) $2,217.87.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers Asso- Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $825.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $985. E. (9) $750.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,679.30. E. (9) $2,679.30.

A. National Rural Housing Coalition, Du-Pont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $230. E. (9) $3,437.91.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (6) $3,507. E. (9) $4,489.

A. National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $9,404.85. E. (9) $14,789.50.

A. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,000.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,161.66. E. (9) $4,585.31.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20037.
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.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wisc.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $265.85.

A. William E. Neumeyer, Suite 900, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. GTE Service Corp., 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $108.

A. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $13,298.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa. 18332.
B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr., 68102.
D. (6) $2362.50. E. (9) $809.05.

A. Julia Norrell, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $170.76.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

A. Claude E. Olmstead, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $254. E. (9) $18.

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.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $127.94.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa. 19035.
B. Campbell Soup Co., Campbell Place, Camden, N.J. 08101.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.
B. Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control & Conservation Association, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1689 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

A. Jack Pearce, Suite 808–10, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee on Modern, Efficient Transportation.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Glenmede Trust Co., 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $896.95.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
B. National REA Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,573.89.

A. James H. Pittinger, 1000 Liberty Bank Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.
B. APCO Oil Corp., 1000 Liberty Bank Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

A. James B. Potter, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motorcycle Industry Council, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. William I. Powell, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $15.90.

A. Power Tool Institute, 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill. 60204.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $450.

A. H. P. Pressler, 1122 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $110.

A. Pugsley, Hayes, Watkiss, Campbell, and Cowley, 400 El Paso Gas Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atkins, Kroll & Co., Ltd., 417 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Department of Tourism, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $5.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Island Equipment Co., 3300 Northeast Yeon Avenue, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Rial M. Rainwater, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $254. E. (9) $14.

A. Louis J. Rancourt, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airlines & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $70,388.02. E. (9) $13,940.65.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institutes, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $11,344.50.

A. John T. Raggitts, Jr., R. D. No. 2 Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J. 07005.

A. Reserve Officers Association of U.S., 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $956.30. E. (9) $618.

A. William L. Reynolds, Suite 500, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, Suite 500, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $740. E. (9) $76.

A. James W. Richards, 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $1,609.81. E. (9) $30.22.

A. Mark Richardson, 432 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Footwear Industrial Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York. N.Y.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $250.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10013.

A. John Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $665.62. E. (9) $33.95.

A. Thomas G. Roderick, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $88.46.

A. John F. Rolph III, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

A. Ross, Marsh & Foster, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Raymond L. Schafer, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $261.54.

A. Stuart Philip Ross, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Motorcycle Industry Council, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Arlie Schardt, 410 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $7,497.83. E. (9) $7,497.83.

A. Eric P. Schellin, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $750.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill. 60076.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $231.25. E. (9) $61.12.

A. Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $450.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $962.50. E. (9) $88.22.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $1,479. E. (9) $297.64.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia, 2125 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.
D. (6) $7,978. E. (9) $2,673.52.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $5,862.75. E. (9) $3,478.88.

A. Norman R. Sherlock, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $865. E. (9) $520.70.

A. Lana H. Sims, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.
D. (6) $17.74. E. (9) $13.

A. Julian H. Singman, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, 17 Battery Place, Suite 1530, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $6,668. E. (9) 141.35.

A. Hall Sisson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) 2,801.04.

A. William L. Slayton, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va. 22207.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,040.10. E. (9) $2,707.93.

A. Frederick F. Spalding, Box 96, RR3, Annapolis, Md. 21403.
E. (9) $64.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Edward W. Stimpson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Wahington, D.C. 20036.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $43.21.

A. Sutton & O'Rourke, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Union National de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas 36, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $2,718.19.

A. Ivan Swift, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America.
E. (9) $1,515.19.

A. Robert F. Sykes, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) 125.59.

A. Evert S. Thomas, Jr., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,125.94. E. (9) $258.20.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Morgan Drive Away, Inc., 2800 West Lexington Avenue, Suite 103, Elkhart, Ind. 45614.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. REA Express, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. R. Markey & Sons, Inc., 99 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Wall-Away Corp., 505 West Canal Street, Wabash, Ind.

A. Tipperary Land & Exploration Corp., 500 West Illinois, Midland, Tex. 79701.

A. John P. Tracey.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $3,132. E. (9) $1,019.75.

A. W. M. Trevarrow, 1056 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich. 48232.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $165.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $201.75.

A. W. Lloyd Tupling, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Sierra Club, 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $47.

A. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,090.52. E. (9) $2,090.52.
A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 Eye Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hertz Corp., 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10021.
E. (6) $58.77.

A. DeMelt E. Walker, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $682.84. E. (9) $161.

A. Charles S. Walsh.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $127.50. E. (9) $15.

A. Richard D. Warden, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $8,570.94.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Friendship Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. REA Express, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $150.

A. Fred W. Wegner, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif., 95814.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $7,101.48.

A. Augusta E. Wilson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Coalition for Rural America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,291.65.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,968.77. E. (9) $505.57

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $750. E (9) $150.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, Suite 220, 1175 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Charge Account Bankers Association, Suite 220, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John L. Zorack, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $1,415. E. (9) $365.30.

SENATE—*Wednesday, October 18, 1972*

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. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, rule over the deliberations of this body for Thy glory and the good of these people, and to Thee shall be our praise and thanksgiving.

Now may the Lord bless you and keep you: the Lord make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you: the Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace; now and evermore. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING 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 ask 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 ask 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 ask 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 532 rollcall 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 on the 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 $104.3 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

[In billions]

Fiscal year 1970	$8.269
Fiscal year 1971	3.505
Fiscal year 1972	2.743
Fiscal year 1973	5.740
Total	20.2

Administration deficits over the past 4 years

[In billions]

Fiscal year 1970	$13.1
Fiscal year 1971	29.9
Fiscal year 1972	28.9
Fiscal year 1973 (administration estimate)	32.4
Total	104.3