

of America in Congress assembled, That section 302(c) of the Labor Management Relation Act, 1947, is amended by striking out "or (7)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(7)" and by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: " ; or (8) with respect to money or any other thing of value paid by any employer to a trust fund established by such representative for the purpose of defraying the costs of legal services for employees, their families, and dependents: *Provided*, That the requirements of clause (B) of the proviso to clause (5) of this subsection shall apply to such trust funds: *Provided further*, That no such legal services shall be furnished (A) to initiate any proceeding directed (i) against any such employer or its officer or agents except in workmen's compensation cases, or (ii) against such labor organization, or its parent or subordinate bodies, or their officers or agents, or (iii) against any other employer or labor organization, or their officers or agents, in any matter arising under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, or this Act, and (B) in any proceeding where a labor organization would be prohibited from defraying the costs of legal services by the provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959".

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, having been directed to do so by the distinguished majority leader and having cleared the matter with the distinguished assistant Republican leader and with the able Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill, S. 1423, be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided between and controlled by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS); that there be a time limitation on any amendment thereto of 1 hour; that there be a time limitation of one-half hour each on amendments to amendments, debatable motions, and appeals; and that the agreement be in the usual form throughout.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That, during the consideration of S. 1423, a bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, debate on any amendments in the first degree shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of the amendment and the manager of the bill, and that debate on amendments in the second degree, debatable motions or appeals shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill: *Provided*, That in the event the manager of the bill is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, that on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits); *Provided*, That the said Senators, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

15 minutes and in the order stated: Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD.

There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion thereof, the Senate will resume its consideration of the unfinished business, S. 1423, a bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to jointly administered trust funds established by labor organizations to defray costs of legal services.

Yea-and-nay votes will occur thereon. There is a time limitation on the bill and amendments thereto.

Upon the disposition of S. 1423, the Senate will take up S. 1672, a bill to amend the Small Business Act, under a time limitation. Yea-and-nay votes will occur on amendments thereto, and on passage of the bill, presumably.

So, I repeat, yea-and-nay votes will occur during the afternoon tomorrow.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNFINISHED BUSINESS, S. 1423, TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the period for the transaction of routine morning business on tomorrow, the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 1423.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REVISION OF ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revise the orders for the recognition of Senators on tomorrow as follows: After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BELLMON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1672, TO AMEND SMALL BUSINESS ACT, TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of S. 1423, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1672, a bill to amend the Small Business Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows: The Senate will convene at 11 a.m. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:34 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1973, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15, 1973:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Kenneth D. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Victor R. Ortega, of New Mexico, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years (reappointment).

Brian P. Gettings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years (reappointment).

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for terms expiring January 27, 1976:

Hobart Lewis, of New York (reappointment).

J. Leonard Reinsch, of Georgia, vice Frank Stanton, term expired.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John H. Hay, Jr. [REDACTED] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 15, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. George W. Ingerson, Minister,
The Bethel United Methodist Church,

Hymeria, Ind., offered the following prayer:

In everything give thanks: For this

is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you. I Thessalonians 5: 18.

I thank You Lord for the honor and

privilege of offering this prayer as our Congress convenes today. We bow in Thy presence grateful to be alive.

We open our hearts unto Thee, endeavor to make them channels for Thy power in our Nation and world. Help us to keep our thinking clear, clean, our emotions in complete control. Give us the mind to keep our bodies healthy, fit for finer service to Thee and greater service to our great country. Give to these Members of Congress, faith, hope, love that they may lead our people into the right paths of enduring peace, abounding good will.

In the name of Him who summons us to higher fields of endeavor, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

THE REVEREND GEORGE W. INGERSON, THE BETHEL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, HYMERA, IND., LEADS HOUSE IN OPENING PRAYER

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the prayer was offered this morning in the House of Representatives by Rev. George Ingerson of the Bethel United Methodist Church of Hymera, Ind. I am extremely proud of Reverend Ingerson for several reasons, but particularly because he is a self-made man.

By that I mean he was born to a family of 10 children and because of the financial plight of that family was unable to finish high school in the normal course of years. He served in World War II with distinction in the U.S. Army and in 1956 finished high school. He then became a Christian in 1958 and answered the call to the Church of the Nazarene in its ministry in 1960. Since then he has become a United Methodist minister.

Mr. Speaker, I share with the community of Hymera their pride in Reverend Ingerson, and we thank the congregation of the Bethel United Methodist Church of Hymera, for sharing Reverend Ingerson with the House of Representatives today.

FARM SUBSIDY NO. 3

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, fat cat farmers are not the only ones making tracks to the taxpayers' trough.

A wealthy railroad and a small municipal airport also hauled away hefty farm subsidy payments in 1972.

The Southern Pacific Railroad whistled away with \$82,000 in subsidies last year for two "farms" in California.

And the municipal airport of Kearney, Nebr., flew off with a farm subsidy of \$25,000.

Collecting fat farm subsidies may be a better way to travel for railroads and airports, but it is the taxpayer who is being taken for a ride.

CONCERNING INTRODUCTION OF THE "200-MILE LIMIT"

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to call attention to the approaching International Conference on the Law of the Sea. This Conference will consider the international conservation and regulation of the seas and our seabed resources. At issue is whether the oceans will be used rationally and equitably for mankind or whether they will become an arena of unrestrained exploitation. However, the trouble in my State is that Maine's seabed has already been exploited and misused by members of the Conference who now declare their deep concern over diminishing resources. While I am in full agreement with the goals of the Conference, I am skeptical that it will bring the tangible results needed by our fishermen.

In this light, I am introducing my own bill to establish a 200-mile contiguous fishery zone beyond the territorial sea of the United States. Under the provisions of this bill the United States would exercise the same exclusive fishing rights that it now enjoys in its territorial sea. This bill is protective medicine. In the past these conferences have failed to produce the substantial progress so urgently needed. The passage of this measure will insure the conservation and protection of our ocean resources, whether the Conference is successful or not.

MEATPACKING REQUIREMENTS

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in what one might interpret as a "victory" for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Supreme Court, yesterday, refused to hear an appeal by the Michigan Department of Agriculture for reinstatement of the State's strict meatpacking requirements.

It is the contention of the USDA that States cannot enforce meat packaging laws that are tougher than Federal regulations, and this has now been upheld.

While this may be a victory for a universal implementation of Federal meatpacking regulations, it is not a victory for Michigan consumers who will no longer be protected by Michigan's strict law against using such offal as hearts, stomachs, snouts, spleens, bladders, tongues, and the variety of unwholesome byproducts which packers put into hotdogs and similar items.

It is quite clear that the only recourse the consumer now has is in the Congress, and, with the decision now resting

squarely in our laps, I would urge that prompt consideration be given to H.R. 372, which would eliminate such questionable byproducts, which I introduced on the opening day of this 93d Congress.

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has informed us he does not intend to call up H.R. 6912, the Par Value Modification Act, tomorrow, as originally planned. The bill will not be called up this week, and it is being postponed indefinitely.

We still intend to call up H.R. 2990, the U.S. Postal Service authorization, as announced.

MAJORITY LEADER THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., SAYS PHASE III IS AN ECONOMIC JOKE ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, an economist has called President Nixon's phase III a joke—"one of the funniest economic games ever foisted on the American people."

This particular economist happens to be Pierre Rinfret—who was the chief economic spokesman for Mr. Nixon's re-election campaign. Mr. Rinfret gave congressional testimony last week that pointed out the basic fallacies underlying phase III.

The administration is relying on a free enterprise system to control inflation. But it cannot, because the system is no longer free enterprise. Price-fixing, monopolistic practices, and Government intervention have undermined the system to such an extent that it can no longer promote fair competition in the marketplace.

Mr. Rinfret shows how well this economic theory has held up under phase III. In March, the rate of inflation in wholesale prices was 31 percent, he noted. In April, the administration patted itself on the back when that rate declined to "only" 14 percent. Between January and April, consumer inflation exceeded 8 percent on an annual basis.

This testimony by one of President Nixon's former economic advisers simply affirms the bankruptcy of Mr. Nixon's hands-off economic policies. What we need is the comprehensive economic stabilization program that Congress envisioned when it extended the President's wage-price control authority.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL SUB-COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, TO SIT TODAY

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during legislative business this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the bills on the Private Calendar have not been on the calendar in accordance with the agreement between the objectors on the majority and minority sides, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the call of the bills on the Private Calendar today.

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

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 361 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 361

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6768) to provide for participation by the United States in the United Nations environment program. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 142]

Anderson, Ill.	Carney, Ohio	Downing
Badillo	Carter	Eilberg
Barrett	Chisholm	Esch
Bell	Clark	Fascell
Blaggi	Cotter	Fish
Biester	Crane	Frey
Bilatnik	Cronin	Fuqua
Breckinridge	Culver	Gilman
Brown, Calif.	Davis, Ga.	Gonzalez
Burke, Calif.	Denholm	Grasso
Carey, N.Y.	Diggs	Gray

Green, Oreg.	Mayne	Rooney, N.Y.
Green, Pa.	Michel	Rostenkowski
Hanna	Mink	Rupe
Harrington	Mitchell, N.Y.	St Germain
Hays	Moorhead, Pa.	Sandman
Hebert	Morgan	Staggers
Howard	Nix	Steiger, Wis.
Karth	Obey	Stokes
Kemp	Parris	Talcott
King	Passman	Taylor, Mo.
Lehman	Patman	Teague, Tex.
McCloskey	Peyer	Walsh
McDade	Powell, Ohio	Williams
McKinney	Riegle	Winn
McSpadden	Roberts	Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 provides for consideration of the bill H.R. 6768, which, as reported by our Committee on Foreign Affairs, would authorize U.S. participation to contribute funds to the United Nations Environment Fund.

As suggested by the name of the Fund, this program is an international effort to improve the global environment. The U.N. Environment Fund, created largely as the result of U.S. efforts, would be used to coordinate and support work in such international environmental fields as identification and control of pollutants, monitoring, conservation, human settlements, information exchange, education, training and research. The Fund would employ the facilities of existing organizations wherever possible.

At the end of 1972, the following nations had made public their intention to contribute specific amounts to the United Nations Environment Fund: Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Several other governments have also indicated their intention to contribute amounts which, when combined with the total amount of \$40 million authorized to be appropriated under H.R. 6768, would bring the total of the Fund to the \$100 million goal to cover the first 5 years of this international program.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that, under H.R. 6768, not more than \$10 million will be authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after which the bill would be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the rule provides that the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 361 in order that H.R. 6768 may be considered.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree that if the bill should pass in its present form, insofar as the House is concerned it would obligate this country to an expenditure of \$40 million?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The obligation for the next 5-year period would be \$40 million. For fiscal year 1974 it would be one-fourth of that amount, or \$10 million.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, \$10 million for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman, did the Rules Committee obtain any information as to how this was arrived at?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I believe that question could be put during consideration of the bill itself, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) the capable chairman of that subcommittee, I am sure will be able to provide a satisfactory answer to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But the Rules Committee did not ascertain on what basis this 40-percent contribution was arrived at, or how the \$40 million and the \$10 million were arrived at.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I do not recall whether the Rules Committee did or not. I may have been absent during the time the matter was raised. I am not able to recall at this time.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 361 is the rule under which we will consider H.R. 6768, the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973. This open rule provides for 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6768 is to authorize funds for participation in the United Nations Environment Fund.

The Fund is to be used to coordinate and support international environmental programs. The creation of a United Nations Environment Fund was largely the result of U.S. efforts. In February 1972, President Nixon proposed such a Fund with an initial funding goal of \$100,000,000 during the first 5 years. The President has established, subject to congressional approval, the U.S. share of the Fund, at 40 percent or up to \$40,000,000 out of a \$100,000,000 Fund.

Therefore, the total amount authorized by the bill is \$40,000,000, of which not more than \$10,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule, but on final passage of the bill I shall vote "no." The matter should be fully discussed on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6768) to provide for participation by the United States in the United Nations environment program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'NEILL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6768, with Mr. FULTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLARD), will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to us as the result of a request by the President for authorization for the United States to participate in the new United Nations environment program, including contribution to its voluntary fund for the environment. The President originally proposed this Fund over a year ago, and the idea was accepted at the Stockholm Conference last summer and approved by the U.N. General Assembly last fall.

Briefly, what the bill would do is to authorize \$10 million for this year, which is already listed in the President's budget, with the balance of the money authorized to be expended in succeeding years. The undertaking of the United States is to match at a 40-percent level the amount of money which can be generated through contributions from member nations for the U.N. Environmental Fund up to an aggregate total of \$100 million to be spent over a 5-year period.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal has already been endorsed by both the House and the Senate in the last Congress. House approval came through an amendment to the foreign assistance bill which urged U.S. support at the General Assembly for this program and for the

Fund. In the other body, Senate Concurrent Resolution 83 passed in June of last year during the Stockholm Conference, endorsed the U.S. position on the Environment Program and Fund.

I might say that in the hearings we asked for the comments of a number of the organizations which are concerned with the environment, including the National Audubon Society, the Conservation Foundation, and the Sierra Club. In general their position was that this was a very modest beginning for a very important undertaking, and they strongly urged passage of this bill.

Now, what will this Fund do if the House and the other body approve of it?

First, we expect the Fund to support a global monitoring system which is necessary for the protection and the assessment of environmental effects which are of international significance. It is expected that this Fund will support studies on environmental problems in the nuclear field, in which the United States has a major interest. It will make an important contribution to American agriculture and to the world food supply by helping to establish a global "gene pool" of plants and seeds of known characteristics. By generally stimulating environmental programs over the world, the fund should help increase the export of U.S. environmental protection equipment.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this program will be centered in the new headquarters in Nairobi. The money, however, will not go to support the new secretariat, which is headed by Maurice Strong, a Canadian. The cost of the secretariat will be supported by the regular assessed budget of the United Nations.

So this money is all programmed money. The money will be spent primarily through the specialized agencies, so there will be no large bureaucracy; instead they will use organizations like the World Health Organization, the International Meteorological Organization, and so on.

Dr. Robert Frosch, who is a senior adviser in this new U.N. program and who recently served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, will be the person in the new secretariat in charge of the entire program of funds which we are authorizing the United States to participate in by the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill. It has had bipartisan sponsorship in our subcommittee; it was passed out of the full committee without dissent. It is in support of an important objective of the President's foreign policy, and I would urge this committee to give it its support.

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

Mr. FRASER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the gentleman for his very lucid explanation of the purpose of the Fund to be established.

I would simply like to say that this initiative which has been taken by the United States should be supported. This is an important area that does need in-

ternational attention and the contribution by the United States to this effort, in my opinion, is minimal. I will hope it will be passed and will finally be enacted by the Senate.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. I think the purpose of the bill is laudable in its aim and purpose, but I wonder if the gentleman can tell me how the 40-percent figure was arrived at for the U.S. contribution.

Mr. FRASER. This figure was suggested by the President when he made his proposal before the Stockholm Conference convened. I might add that this is probably a rather low percentage for a U.S. contribution to a new venture in which the United States has taken the lead in its establishment. For example, I think in the narcotics program around 50 percent is given where we have a major interest in the international control of narcotics. In population control it is over 80 percent, and in other activities it has ranged as high as 70 percent, for example, in the United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief Works Agency for Palestinian refugees, although our percentages have been going down.

For a program in which the United States has taken the lead and said, "We think it ought to be done," this is certainly a low percentage.

Mr. WYLIE. If the gentleman will yield further, did anybody raise the question of the provision of the law which we passed last year; namely, Public Law 92-544, which simply stated would prohibit an appropriation in excess of 25 percent of the total annual assessment to the U.N. or any affiliated organization? Was that question raised during the committee's deliberations?

Mr. FRASER. Well, we are very much aware of the 25-percent limitation, because it came up repeatedly in our committee last year. However, it is important to make this specific point: Some of the thrust for that 25-percent limitation came from a recommendation of the Lodge Commission appointed by the President. The commission recommended that the United States work its way down to 25 percent on the assessed budget, but that there should be a corresponding increase in U.S. contributions to the U.N. voluntary programs. Their recommendation was limited to the assessed budget of the U.N., and so far the United Nations has accepted that recommendation as presented by the U.S. delegates, but it was specifically not intended to refer to voluntary programs such as the U.N. Development Program or U.N. Children's Fund and now this program.

Mr. WYLIE. Then this is an admitted effort to avoid the law, as I understand from what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. FRASER. No.

Mr. WYLIE. In other words, there was an agreement in advance, that even though the contribution of the United States to the U.N. can only be 25 percent by Public Law 92-544 now, we would make up the difference through special programs and exceptions such as this. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. FRASER. Let me say to the gentle-

man, unfortunately, we have not done very well on the voluntary side. In fact, what has happened in the U.N. Development Program is that we run the risk this year of being well below what we have contributed in the last 2 years. That may put this 25 percent recommendation in jeopardy, when it is up for final approval in the General Assembly this fall, because at last year's General Assembly when Ambassador Bush and Senator GALE McGEE were arguing for the 25-percent limitation they were giving assurances in the U.N. with the authorization of the executive branch that we would hold up our end and even expand our contributions to the voluntary programs and, in fact, right now we are not; we are behind where we should be.

So throughout the debate the distinction between the assessed budget and the voluntary contributions has always been crystal clear. As I say, the Lodge Commission itself separated the two and said that if one of these goes down the other one should go up.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I must say that it is not crystal clear to me. What assurances do we have that the other participating nations will come up with their share, or what steps have been taken generally to see that their money is on deposit at least simultaneously with the deposit of the U.S. contributions?

Mr. FRASER. We have been informed already of ten countries who are pledging an aggregate of \$41 million: Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, The Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Also there are 11 other governments who have indicated their intention to contribute. Assurances are given that their money either is on hand or has been pledged firmly. That is the understanding.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his intelligent response.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation, which authorizes U.S. participation in the United Nations environment program, and a U.S. contribution to the U.N. Environment Fund.

The total authorization is \$40 million, of which not more than \$10 million is to be appropriated during fiscal year 1974. The U.S. share of the Fund would be 40 percent.

The U.N. Environment Fund was proposed by the President in his environmental message to the Congress earlier this year. As the President noted, many environmental problems are worldwide in character and can more effectively be dealt with through international cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, there is much that the Fund can do to help member nations of the U.N., including the United States, deal more effectively with environmental problems. For example, the Fund can foster a greater competence in many countries in the ability to solve environmental problems. The Fund can help countries develop expertise in this area through training activities, research, and by encouraging countries to take environmental factors into account in their decisionmaking processes.

The Fund also is expected to help establish an information referral service which would help facilitate the timely exchange of information between governments on how to solve environmental problems.

The idea of the Fund has been well received by the U.N. membership. As noted in the committee report, 10 countries have announced their intention to contribute specific amounts to the Fund. Eleven other countries have made known their intention to contribute. While the Fund was proposed by the United States, we will not be alone in financing it.

The task of improving our environment will require the cooperation of the other nations that inhabit the earth. Through the U.N. Environment Fund we can take a major step toward achieving that cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the chairman of the subcommittee has thoroughly explained the bill, which is a very simple bill. I would just like to make one point that I think perhaps has not been made here, and that is in our domestic life the United States is proceeding very rapidly not only at the Federal level, but also at the State level, to impose environmental restrictions of all kinds on our industry so that it is quite obvious that if we do this unilaterally this is going to put our goods at a relative disadvantage competitively in the world markets. Goods that are produced in countries that do not require their industries to incur this added expense of production for environmental protection purposes will have a clear advantage.

I think this is one of the reasons the United States took the initiative in trying to propose that the U.N. get into this business so that the other developed countries of the world will pay comparable attention to environmental problems in their countries as we are proposing to do here in the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, a 40-percent contribution by the United States does not seem to me to be overly large because I think we have probably the most to gain out of a worldwide effort to take into consideration environmental problems which obviously know no national boundaries, but also to get the other industrialized countries to make a similar effort.

So, as I say, Mr. Chairman, I think we have the most to gain out of it, and I do not think it is unreasonable that we should be willing to put the most into it.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would just like to add that I had the privilege of attending the Stockholm Conference last year, and I certainly want to commend our participation there. I think we can say without qualification that the problems of air and water pollution, the endangered species, the conservation and prudent use of natural resources, and all of the other problems of the environment are subjects that extend beyond national boundaries. Problems of the environment have worldwide implications and their solutions require both national and in-

ternational action. Accordingly, it is important for us to participate in most of those activities recommended at the U.N. Environmental Conference, and I support the recommendations of the committee in the presentation of this measure (H.R. 6768).

Mr. Chairman, in further reference to the United Nations Conference, I would like to recall that our colleagues Congressmen JOHN D. DINGELL of Michigan, FRANK M. CLARK of Pennsylvania, and GILBERT GODE of Maryland were also in attendance at this significant international gathering devoted to the human environment.

Also, our colleague from the other body, Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., of Tennessee, served as chairman of the advisory committee which participated in the preparatory work of the Conference. He took a prominent part in the deliberations.

In my own behalf, I would add that in serving on a committee dealing with human settlements, I was joined by the distinguished citizen environmentalist, Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller of New York, and Mr. Samuel Jackson, former Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Lending further stature to our delegation, I should recall that Attorney General William J. Scott of Illinois was likewise one of our delegates.

While the United Nations Conference declarations and recommendations represent a first step toward the solution of global environmental problems, it is a most important first step—in which it is to our best interests as well as in the best interests of the world community that we should participate in a manner such as is set forth in the pending bill, H.R. 6768.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to know that the administration is supporting this measure and that it has broad bipartisan support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to respond to the statement just made by the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) with respect to other countries. There is nothing in this legislation; there is nothing in existence that gives us the least assurance that after spending \$100 million, or any other amount, these foreign countries are going to put into effect effective measures with respect to ecology, environment, or anything else. As a cold, hard matter of fact, there is no assurance to be found anywhere in the hearings or in the report that great land masses of Soviet Russia or Red China—and, of course, a much smaller land mass, but the highly populated industrial area of Japan—are going to do anything in this regard. Moreover, I see nothing in the report or in the hearings to indicate that Soviet Russia is going to make any contribution to this cause, or is Red China, or any of the other so-called Communist satellite nations. There is one assurance—that the American public is about to be raped again.

I do hear talk this afternoon about this being a voluntary contribution. It sure as the devil is involuntary on the part of the taxpayers of this country.

and you had better believe it. If the average American taxpayer had an opportunity to vote on this bill here today, committing this country to spend \$40 million at the start, with \$10 million in the coming fiscal year to get this outfit off the ground, it would be sunk without a trace. The taxpayers would never approve the spawning of another new handout program around the world.

In the name of all that is reasonable haven't we paid through the nose long enough and compelled our people for too long to contribute to these so-called voluntary funds for foreigners? I have no illusions about what is going to happen here today. The President wants this bill, and the House is going to roll over and play dead again and give the President what he wants, despite all of the protestations and all of the wailing and gnashing of teeth and bellyaching about delegated power to the President.

Read the bill. Page 2, lines 3, 4 and 5 state:

... which amount is authorized to remain available until expended, and which may be used upon such terms and conditions as the President may specify . . .

Yes, go on wailing about the delegating of powers to the President and accuse him of usurping power. He is not usurping power. If the Members vote for this bill in its present form you will be giving him the power to spend another \$40 million as he sees fit.

Howl to the housetops about Presidential impoundment of funds and then, as in this case, give him some more delegated power.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I compliment the gentleman from Iowa for raising this point, Mr. Chairman. I am disturbed that the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, is not paying close attention to the thrust of these arguments, because it was just last week that he was complaining about how much power we were delegating away to the White House. I wonder today he is not complaining about this unwarranted delegation of authority. I am disappointed that the majority leader is not participating in this discussion.

I compliment the gentleman from Iowa for raising these several items of discrepancy in this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from California.

How did the promoters of this new foreign handout arrive at the figures in this bill?

In the hearings we read the following exchange:

Mr. FOUNTAIN. It seems like we always ask for things in millions, I never see anything in thousands any more.

Mr. HERTER. Congressman Fountain, first this is a proposal by the President that the U.N. establish a voluntary fund of \$100 million for 5 years and the President has also said that he has thought our fair share should be 40 percent . . .

And again Mr. FOUNTAIN of North Carolina had the following exchange with Mr. Herter, Jr., a professional in-

ternational promoter in the State Department:

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I was curious to know how you arrived at \$100 million.

Mr. HERTER. As I say, sir, I suppose you could call this somewhat arbitrary. However, it was the result of reducing estimates from U.S. agencies in all these fields, some 20 agencies, and their estimates came to 250 collectively.

We said let's reduce this to a figure that at least is one that one can handle and that would appear to do the trick at the outset.

I emphasize the words "appear to do the trick at the outset"—in other words, eeny, meeny, miny, mo, they counted their toes and came up with the answer. Yes, these spenders said, let us get all the traffic will bear; all we think we can gouge out of the public to get this new organization off the ground.

Incidentally, for the information of the Members, I understand the headquarters is to be established in Nairobi, Kenya. Is that the case, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes. We would have preferred to have it in Iowa but we decided on Nairobi.

Mr. GROSS. But the arms of Americans were twisted at the United Nations to the point where they had to agree to establish headquarters in Kenya.

Mr. FRASER. To be fair about it, the third world has not had too much participation in these U.N. activities.

Mr. GROSS. Is it true that only recently have they been able to install a few dial telephones in Nairobi?

Mr. FRASER. My understanding is they have very good communications systems out of Nairobi.

Mr. GROSS. So it is intended to establish a headquarters of an outfit that is going to cost the taxpayers of this country at least several hundred million dollars before we get through with it, on the basis of this start, and place that in an area where they have just obtained a few dial telephones.

Mr. Chairman, I will have an amendment to offer to this bill to cut it down to size and in conformity with the financial situation in this country which invites national bankruptcy.

Mr. MAILLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question, hoping someone on the Foreign Affairs Committee can answer it. First, it is stated in the report that—

The purpose of the Fund is to coordinate and support international environmental programs, particularly in the fields of identification and control of pollutants.

What authority would the United Nations have to require a nation to control its pollutants?

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this program is engaged essentially in monitoring, research, and information exchange. There are other international programs which are now wrestling with the problem of controlling pollution. One of the

more significant ones would be the International Maritime Consultative Organization. The forthcoming Conference on the Law of the Sea would also be involved in establishing machinery to deal with some kinds of marine pollution. One of the ways these international organizations would be able to do their work effectively would be if there are some international base lines for standardization and monitoring systems established so they have accurate information on which to base whatever kinds of regulations they will try to develop.

That is really one of the major purposes of this United Nations Environmental Program, to establish international base lines and monitoring systems.

Mr. MILLER. But there would be no way for the United Nations to enforce the control of pollutants in any particular country, am I correct?

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman is referring to internal pollution within a country, that is correct. Neither this organization, which has no regulatory authority, or any other existing international organization has any authority to deal with pollution confined inside national boundaries.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, as I appreciate the bill before us, bearing the title of "United Nations Environmental Program," it seems to be just another of the inflationary administration programs that send millions of our taxpayers dollars abroad pursuing prestigious projects while depriving our people of similar programs. This trend has become a trademark of the administration.

The purpose of the bill, we learn from the hearings, is to establish a global monitoring system to measure environmental factors affecting human health, the atmosphere, the oceans, climate and terrestrial eco-systems.

Control of the purse strings of the fund will be vested in 58 member nations, with the United States contributing 40 percent or \$40 million of the operational costs. Ten other developed countries have apparently agreed to contribute another \$41 million. This leaves 47 member nations manipulating the voting control of the destiny of the organization, without agreeing to contribute a single penny.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings indicate that there was some disfavor expressed originally by the U.N. money lobby from the U.S. State Department concerning the selection of Nairobi as the headquarters. But just as they have done on most crucial General Assembly votes during the past few years, the African bloc vote bulldozed its position past the other nations. And Nairobi, in the emerging boondocks of Kenya, was selected over New York or Geneva because the "emerging nations" flexed their voting control over other countries' money can muscle in unison. This kind of bloc vote be expected to continue if the program goes into operation.

Any time the United States, which

contributes from 25 to 70 percent of the United Nations operations, represents a position unpopular with "emerging nations," whether in the 132-member General Assembly or the 58-member environmental program, we can expect to be out-voted by the bloc.

Based on its past performance, it is not surprising that the administration is in support of this oversized contribution from our people under the "noninflationary" assumption that we are contributing to salvaging the international environment. What about the environment of this country? It seems that any program that has an international name to it is hailed by the administration as a non-inflationary investment in goodwill. But any bill tagged with a "domestic" label for similar purposes, is stamped with the kiss of impoundment and denounced as fiscally irresponsible legislation. The internationalists would lead us to believe that if it benefits the U.S. taxpayer, it is "irresponsible"; if it benefits foreigners, it is "goodwill." This doubletalk by the President just does not make good economic sense.

Already this year we have seen this same administration impound as "inflationary" the funds from the Clean Water Act and impound as "irresponsible" funds from the Land and Water Conservation Act. As recent as several days ago, the President vetoed the water and sewage bill, which would have been a dynamic factor in helping control environmental problems in rural America.

Many of the people of my State of Louisiana, whose land has been ravaged by floods, do not understand how the President can turn his back on programs to help them, while lavishing large sums of their money overseas where few Americans will benefit.

By no stroke of the wildest imagination can the foreign aid giveaways by the U.S. Government during fiscal year 1972 which reached the overwhelming total of \$16,828,200,000 be considered fiscally responsible. This bill, Mr. Chairman, is yet another indication of the "America Last" foreign policy being recklessly pursued by the administration.

We have been informed that this week, for the second time in 15 months, this body is expected to again devalue our currency and debase our dollar. I, for one, cannot explain to the people I represent how this Congress in good faith can vote to spend \$40 million of their money on an unproven, high-sounding scheme controlled by 47 emerging foreign nations, while chipping away at and devaluing their dollars.

I shall cast my people's vote for true fiscal responsibility, and against this bill.

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

Mr. RARICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Baker.

Mr. BAKER. Would the gentleman have any information as to the amount which Kenya is going to contribute to this fund, which is the place where the headquarters will be located?

Mr. RARICK. Kenya is called an emerging nation and therefore may not be expected to contribute since it is not polluted as yet.

I believe I am correct. The hearings

show that Kenya has not agreed to contribute one cent except to provide a site for office space.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I have supported in the past and will continue to support multinational efforts through the United Nations to improve the world's environment. However, I am concerned that the commitment we express today is too shallow to meet the grave challenges that face us today. The pollution of our earth's water and air has grown to frightful proportions.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration recently made surveys of the Atlantic Ocean. The NOAA report was shocking: several of the research ships encountered pollution so thick that their nets were tangled with a spaghetti-like mass of oily globs. One ship, *Albatross IV*, reported being surrounded by globs of oily substance 75 percent of the time.

Oil is not the only problem. Plastic debris in massive proportions contaminates bodies of water throughout the world.

It is clear that our earth faces a grave challenge. This Nation, as the most prosperous in the world, assumes a special responsibility in meeting the challenge—with the direction we take, others will soon follow.

I am afraid that few of us realize completely the magnitude of the problem and the inadequacy of our past response. We have been all too willing—as with many other special problems we confront—merely to throw money around in hopes for an adequate solution. Events in recent years have taught us the inadequacy of this approach.

We must not allow our commitment to the world's environment to stop with a \$40 million check. As world leaders, we must be willing to seek new solutions to the vexing problem of worldwide pollution. Our present energy crisis is in many respects the acid test of our capacity to respond creatively with new direction. The issues of energy and the environment are closely interrelated for very simple reasons: Economic growth requires energy; and the production and use of energy has an unavoidable impact on the environment.

In recent years these issues have become more and more visibly linked. The Alaskan pipeline, the Santa Barbara oil spill, the vital matter of strip mining, all have been embroiled in the energy versus environment struggle. Unfortunately, the controversy has been too often distorted to an economic growth versus no-growth argument. The reconciliation of energy and environment should not be thought of in these terms. The issue, quite simply, is not whether we as a nation and the rest of the world will grow economically; the issue is how we choose to grow in the future.

Despite the mistakes of the past, it still appears true that economic growth—as measured in per capita GNP—does work to improve the general welfare. However, given this fact, there remain many alternative paths to growth.

In the years immediately after World War II, the United States experienced a tremendous technological expansion—new productive technologies led to a number of new products such as plastics,

synthetic fertilizers, and detergents. The production—and consumption—of these materials helped us to live a little easier and more comfortably. However, we are only now seeing that the real cost of these materials—in terms of their degradation of the environment—is greater than we were originally aware. In fact, the environmental movement has grown largely out of an effort to put a price tag on those resources—air, land, and water—which heretofore had been, for virtually all intents and purposes, free.

Technological advancement is not good or bad; it is neutral. Mankind decides what rewards technology will reap and what challenges it will conquer. In short, the decision to pollute or not to pollute is one we must all make. If we value the land we stand on, the air we breath and the water we drink, we must learn the importance of guarding these resources from careless assault. This will mean, in most cases, paying more for those products which we enjoyed in the past. But this additional price is not a cost to us as consumers as much as an investment in a better environment.

The United States is presently at the crossroads. The energy shortages of last winter and this spring have presented us with questions which reach to the core of our economic system. Will we continue attempting to supply our voracious appetite for petroleum products despite the environmental risks of the trans-Alaskan pipeline and drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf? Or will we make a serious effort to reduce significantly our careless waste of resources? Will we begin seriously to consider alternative energy sources which present small environmental risks? Or will we continue headlong into an atomic program whose risks we have neither carefully assessed or thoroughly researched?

Any solution to our energy problems must include three complementary solutions: the first is the development and use of improved pollution control devices; the second is the development of clean energy sources such as solar energy and the gasification of coal; and the third is the improvement of efficiency in energy use and the elimination of wasteful consumption.

We have a unique opportunity before us to strike out a new direction in the production and use of world resources. Energy shortages have focused our interest on fossil fuels, but other raw materials are also in a critical state. Recycling technologies must be developed and implemented.

All of this lies ahead of us. We are capable of leadership in the abatement of worldwide pollution. But that position of leadership requires that we go beyond the steps we have taken here today.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, which would authorize a voluntary contribution of \$40 million by the United States to the United Nations Environment Fund, not more than \$10 million of which could be authorized for fiscal year 1974.

As a member of the subcommittee that heard testimony on this legislation from a variety of witnesses, I want to note that I support the bill as reported from committee for a number of reasons.

First, H.R. 6768 is a fitting fulfillment

of the goals enunciated by many nations at the Stockholm Conference.

Second, it represents our involvement in a multilateral, worldwide effort to clean up our environment, specifically in the fields of identification and control of pollutants, monitoring, conservation, human settlements, information, exchange, education, training, and research.

Finally, I would point out that drastic reductions in the authorizations along the lines that some suggest today would in my view discredit and cast serious doubts not only on our commitment to the environment, but also on our very commitment to the United Nations.

I support the committee bill and urge my colleagues to oppose the crippling amendments being offered.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973".

Sec. 2. It is the policy of the United States to participate in coordinated international efforts to solve environmental problems of global and international concern, and in order to assist the implementation of this policy, to contribute funds to the United Nations Environmental Fund for the support of international measures to protect and improve the environment.

Sec. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated \$40,000,000 for contributions to the United Nations Environment Fund, which amount is authorized to remain available until expended, and which may be used upon such terms and conditions as the President may specify: *Provided*, That not more than \$10,000,000 may be appropriated for use in fiscal year 1974.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 2, strike all of Section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$2,500,000 for contributions to the United Nations Environment Fund for use in fiscal year 1974."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is not a complicated amendment. It simply strikes out the \$40 million that this bill would commit the taxpayers of this country to put up for the future, and it would strike out the language that the money may be expended on such terms and conditions as the President may specify. It would give to this budding organization \$2.5 million, or 25 percent of the \$10 million which the bill would provide for fiscal year 1974.

I hope there are those in the House of Representatives who will want to consider, in voting on the amendment, that it strikes from the bill the specification that the President can spend the money as he sees fit.

And I am sure every Member of the House is well aware today of the financial chaos here and around the world.

I am also sure most Members know that the bill to validate the devaluation of the dollar, the devaluation that was announced on February 12, has been eli-

minated from consideration for this week, and that is apparently because of the sour climate in which to bring that bill to the floor of the House.

With gold on the world money markets to more than \$100 per ounce and the American dollar plunging to new lows it would look more than a little funny to bring up a bill to increase the price of what gold the United States still holds by only \$4.22 an ounce.

It was the devaluation that brought these things about. The climate, I say again, is not favorable for bringing that bill before the House now.

And, in view of what is going on in this country today the mounting debt, deficit and inflation, the climate should not be favorable for bringing up this kind of a bill; to start off a new international organization with a commitment to spend \$40 million. As the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) pointed out, at a time when we are cutting back on programs here at home, this is not the time to launch another brand new foreign organization on a hand-out program with no indication as to what the result may be. It is throwing more money out of the door.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) on his amendment.

I think that more and more Members are beginning to appreciate the strong role the gentleman from Iowa plays in trying to point out the importance of these bills that come to us rather quickly, without a full consideration, and the tremendous impact that these types of bills collectively have on the inflation problem; especially when we spend it so willy-nilly overseas. This limitation is in line with the 25 percent concept developed by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what prompts the President in supporting a bill of this kind, in view of his activities with respect to the impounding of funds for domestic purposes and in view of the cutbacks and cut-offs of other funds. I do not know what prompts him. All I am trying to do in a small way here today is to save him from himself.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, most of us over the years have tried to understand our role on the international scene. We have tried as we have gone along, I think, to contribute not only our share but much more than our share. But in those days we were indeed a rich nation; we are no longer a rich nation. Probably, if measured, we are

the poorest nation on the face of the earth today.

It might interest the Members to know that the stock market has just dropped down to 900. That is the barometer of the condition of the economy of this country of ours.

Mr. Chairman, certainly we want to join hands with all good people all over the world to do something about environmental corrections that are needed in the ecology of this world of ours.

But by their own admission they say this has nothing to do with the international environmental problems of our brother nations in the United Nations, and yet everything that they drop in their rivers naturally comes into our oceans. You cannot stop environmental damage and dangers by picking out one source at one point.

Mr. Chairman, how many men and women in this world have any idea of what it is going to cost this Nation for its own environmental corrections that are needed so badly? The things that we need in this country amount to billions upon billions of dollars. Untold amounts of money are needed to make us safe from the ravages of floods, the dangers of air pollution and water pollution, and the change in the ecology that may mean something serious to all our children and our children's children.

This is for \$40 million today, and just a few days ago the Emergency Employment Act was vetoed. What was that meant to do? It was meant to give these kids coming home from Vietnam a little bit of a stop-gap income, to get tailored back into the American job economy. Money is impounded which was for necessary programs that this Congress measured to be the needs of this country.

Mr. Chairman, on one hand I am getting a great deal of criticism for being a spender, and the President is supposed to be the saviour. Yet no one seems to recognize that spending can take many forms. If you make it sound good, it becomes holy, but in the end the sin is assessed against the people of these United States.

Mr. Chairman, I was home for the election, and just this week it was announced that two little school districts had to raise the price of the school lunch by better than 12½ percent. Every day I turn and you turn around and you get a complaint from somebody that their taxes are going up locally, statewide, and federally and that costs are going up and prices are climbing.

We are no longer a rich nation. Let us declare that right now. We are not a have nation; we are a have not nation. Over \$80 billion of American money is floating around the world and raising the price of gold to an unprecedented figure. A third devaluation is in the making. We have become a nation of raw goods producers like a colony of a manufacturing and a producing nation.

Every war that has ever been started for liberation started against the mother country, because it kept the colonies producing the raw materials and turned back the job-giving production of manufactured and semimanufactured goods.

Yes. You can fight and fight to win your liberty, as we did against the English, but now we cannot fight because

we have become a colony to the whole world. We are producing raw goods and foodstuffs at prices that we pay a premium to produce with billions of dollars of subsidies so that they do not have to devote their time to the growing of foodstuffs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DENT. They can devote their time to processing what we send them. Only 45 percent of the shoes worn by Americans are produced in the United States. Why? Because we sell our raw hides so that others can produce our shoes.

You ask about what unemployment is. I will tell you what unemployment is: the greatest number of nonproducing individuals by percentage and number anywhere in the world at any time since the beginning of the world. There are 26 million under social security, 14 million under welfare, 3 million on private pension systems, and 10 million attached to the Department of Defense, with funds coming out of the Department of the Treasury. Forty cents out of every dollar a worker earns is gone before he gets to spend it. If you measure the damage done to the stocks held by Americans, many of them older citizens and dependent upon some kind of a dividend to keep them from going on relief, you will see what happens. Any situation that keeps every person on a minimum wage today in this country puts them into a welfare role. Yet we cannot raise that because they say it is inflation. If you give \$40 million in wage increases, it is inflation, but you take \$40 million and put it into this kind of a thing, and it is not inflation. Someone straighten me out, will you?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with much of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said about the problems we are having in this country, but I would like to address myself to the amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) would cut this year's contribution by 75 percent. The amount in the bill is the amount that the President put in his budget, \$10 million for the year 1974. We have already told the committee that there is a large number of countries which on the strength of what the President proposed had already made commitments exceeding \$41 million over the next 5 years, including the principal NATO allies of this country.

On a matter which is as simple and understandable as trying to deal with world environmental matters, on a matter which does not threaten to involve us in international military ventures but is designed to advance peace and cooperation among nations; on the matter of trying to deal with the environment of the planet on which we are all stuck, if we decide not to expend a modest amount of money which was urged by the Chief Executive and approved in principle by the House last year and if we are going to turn our backs on that, then indeed the countries around the world are going to wonder what is wrong with the

United States and whether we are really a part of the world community and prepared to behave responsibly.

I think that is essentially the issue. I do not know how much ought to be spent on the problem of worldwide pollution or protecting the environment around the world. Maybe we do not have to spend anything; maybe pollution is not a problem; perhaps we can just let things go and drift, and our world and our country will be all right. But the best-informed people that we have heard from say that there is a need for this program. And I do not believe that organizations like the Audubon Society who strongly supported this bill, or the Sierra Club, who strongly support this bill, or the Conservation Foundation, who strongly supported this bill, and others, would have urged support for this bill if they did not think it was needed. Of course, they all said that it was too small, but they said that we needed it, and this reflected their own considered judgment that we do have an environmental problem and that we do have national and international pollution.

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

Mr. FRASER. I will not yield to the gentleman from Iowa until I am through.

We do need to be a responsible part of the world community. The Stockholm Conference was one of the most worthwhile international conferences that we have participated in, and it came out in support of some very wise and sensible recommendations; this is one of them.

The General Assembly has approved it. And to say now in effect that we do not care what the President said, and we do not care what the conservationists or the environmentalists in the United States think about this, and that we do not care about the testimony we heard, and that we cannot afford \$10 million to carry out our share in this new international undertaking, I think is a very unreasonable position indeed.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) would be rejected.

I do not happen to agree with the President on a lot of things he does, but in this case I do agree with him, and I am prepared to support the position he has taken on this issue, and I hope that the committee will do so as well.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. WYLIE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question:

Can the gentleman from Minnesota categorically state that there is any other parliamentary body or legislature that has taken action to commit themselves to any part of the \$100 million for this purpose?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) will yield, the information I have is that 10 countries, again, Australia, Canada, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand,

Sweden, and the United Kingdom, have announced their intentions to contribute amounts totaling \$41 million.

Mr. GROSS. I have read the report. That does not answer the question. The report says only that the countries you have named have announced only an intention.

Could there not just be one time in the history of this Congress when some other country would initiate a foreign aid program rather than the United States? Could not we just once wait to see what they actually will put up?

The gentleman from Minnesota has not answered the question, and he cannot, I do not believe, categorically state that they have taken action as is proposed here today to commit one branch of this Congress to the expenditure of \$40 million for this new and untried purpose?

Mr. FRASER. I believe I can answer that if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GROSS. No, I cannot yield to the gentleman. The gentleman did not yield to me, but more specifically because the gentleman from Ohio has control of the time.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are two observations that I would like to make. First, in most of these other governments they do not have the tangle between the government and the parliaments that we often get into. If the government announces it is proposing to do something, in general their legislative bodies support them in that purpose. But, the more important point is that we are not going to match more than 40 percent. If there are not enough contributions to make up the other 60 percent, we will be reducing our contributions accordingly. So that there is no problem there.

Further, I do not believe there is any difficulty about these other countries fulfilling their commitments but, if there is, then our portion would be cut back.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to pursue that point for just a moment. I think the gentleman from Iowa makes an excellent point in this regard. We have never required the other countries to put up their money in advance or, indeed, simultaneously with our contributions, as I have suggested earlier, and so many of the countries become in arrears, and we try to pick up the difference all the time. It seems to me this ought to be a voluntary simultaneous-contribution arrangement, and I wonder if any thought has been given to the idea of putting the money in escrow until the other countries put up their money, or put on deposit in such a way so that in effect the contributions of all countries could be spent simultaneously. Was that discussed at all in the committee?

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield further, the practice, as I understand it, is we do not make the money available until it is actually required. We give a form of commitment but not the money until it is actually required for expenditure.

Mr. WYLIE. How do we get in the position, then, of putting up our money

and finding other countries in arrears with respect to U.N. contributions?

Mr. FRASER. The fact is none of the large countries, which make up the bulk of these organizations, have been in arrears except France and the Soviet Union because of the argument over peace-keeping costs. We are late in our contributions. They are due in January, and we do not usually pay them until along about October, so we are usually at the end of the year rather than at the front end of the year.

We are late, and this is one of the problems that the U.N. itself is having in its cash flow.

In any event, the President made it very clear. We are not going to go over 40 percent of what is actually contributed, so if less is contributed than expected, our proportion will go down correspondingly.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I should like to address a question to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). As I understand what the gentleman just said, if other nations do not put their proportionate amount in, we will reduce our amount accordingly?

Mr. FRASER. That is right.

Mr. SHUSTER. Yet the proposed bill does not say that. I will at a later time be offering an amendment to do just that, and I will assume, then, that the gentleman will support my amendment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Where is it provided in the bill that if they do not put up their money, the U.S. contribution will be reduced to that extent? What provision is there in the legislation for that?

Mr. FRASER. Is the gentleman addressing his question to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, or to anyone who can answer it.

Mr. FRASER. The President has made it very clear in his transmittal of the bill and in the undertakings that were made throughout that the United States will match at only a 40-percent level.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows very well that that is not a good answer. What the President intends and what happens can be two very different things. There is no valid assurance.

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota support such an amendment?

Mr. FRASER. Subject to further scrutiny, it would certainly seem to carry out what the President's commitment is.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not want to take a lot of time. I think everybody knows what the issues are, but there is a whole lot of misinformation, it seems to me, floating around.

In the first place, this bill, if it is

passed—and I hope it will be and I hope this amendment will be defeated—merely carries out in authorizing law what the President proposed. The money still has to be appropriated. The money is not going to be suddenly put into the U.N. Fund if other countries do not put in their contributions.

The idea that we are suddenly here tossing \$10 million into a fund that has no other money in it just is not going to happen.

If the gentleman who proposed to offer an amendment to put this into the law and if it is properly drawn I see no objection to it because that is our practice.

The gentleman a few moments ago was talking about arrearages. We cannot have arrearages in a voluntary contribution fund. We have arrearages only in funds that are assessed for the operation of the United Nations. The voluntary funds are voluntary, where we agree to do it. We have a commitment to do it but we cannot be called in arrears on something that we have agreed voluntarily to do. That refers only to assessed U.N. budget amounts.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) yielding.

The gentleman makes the point that this is just an authorization.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I did not use that phrase.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But that is the implication.

Mr. MAILLIARD. It is not an appropriation. That is what I said.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And the problem with this authorization is that when the Appropriations Committee comes to us, they say the constant problems with which they are confronted is the House has continually overauthorized and over-promised and that there just is not enough money to go around for all these over promised programs. The money is going to an international fund. There is some reasonable doubt in the minds of some of us as to how the money will be spent on the basis of other international funds of like type in which we have been asked to participate and therefore we should support this proper limitation.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further.

I will say to the gentleman, he is perfectly entitled to be opposed, but that does not detract from the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) is not particularly inclined to give a blank check. He looks to see whether this money is actually needed before he puts it in an appropriation bill. This bill says that not more than \$10 million could be appropriated, and it could be considerably less.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, the only point I was trying to make is that is why the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) makes sense, because it really is in keeping with the formula we have developed

in our Appropriations Committee in recent years. Since a \$10 million authorization is being called for in this bill for fiscal 1974, the \$2.5 million limitation is in keeping with the concept of a 25-percent contribution for this year.

Mr. MAILLIARD. On the contrary, it is not.

Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, that is not 25 percent. The proposal is for \$100 million over 5 years, so the first year's contribution of \$2.5 million would be 12½ percent.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think the point should be made that we have had the practice, even though it is not spelled out in this bill before us, that our contribution has been directly related to the degree to which other countries have made their contributions. This has been the case in the Cyprus peace-keeping force and other programs. The practice is that if other nations are not contributing we will be holding back a suitable amount. There is no fear we will contribute our \$10 or \$40 million over a period of time and that no other nation will contribute a penny. That just does not happen.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

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

Certainly this legislation has been well thought out. I oppose the amendment as I believe the administration has made a good, clear case for its enactment as reported from committee. This legislation is the culmination of work which was done at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment which I attended as a representative of the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

The Stockholm Conference was the first international effort by all nations to consider and to begin to resolve some of the important, common environmental issues facing all mankind.

Despite this noble goal, some of the human frailties of greed, indifference and ignorance which have produced the world's environmental plight were exhibited, in varying degrees, by all of the nations at Stockholm.

The developed nations, while admitting to their sins of environmental neglect, demonstrated some reluctance to make the investment of resources necessary for the type of cleanup to which their citizens are entitled.

Correspondingly, some of the developing nations seemed to follow the illogic that two wrongs make a right—that they have an equal right to pollute while they go through their period of development and that they need not comply with the rules of cleanup until after they have obtained their rightful share of the world's affluence.

We in Government realize that these

attitudes are to be expected, but it is also clear that they must be changed. For this reason, I feel it is vital that the United States place its full support behind the United Nations Environment Fund.

The purpose of the fund is to coordinate international environmental programs in such areas as the identification and control of pollutants, monitoring, conservation, information exchange, education, training, and research.

The Nixon administration is to be highly commended, Mr. Chairman, for its interest and initiative in backing this program. In his message to Congress on the environment in 1972, Mr. Nixon proposed that an environmental fund be established with an initial funding of \$100 million during the first 5 years. Subsequently, the President established, subject to congressional approval, the U.S. fair share of the fund, up to \$40 million on a 40-60 matching basis.

Following the President's foresighted lead in this area, other nations have pledged matching funds and I understand that the \$100 million goal is quite within reach. I, therefore, urge my colleagues in the House to approve H.R. 6768 and join in this first step toward a coordinated international environmental program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 42, noes 46.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 216, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—164

Abdnor	Davis, S.C.	Jones, N.C.	Runnels	Steelman	Walsh	Rooney, Pa.	Taylor, Mo.	Wilson,
Alexander	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.	Ruth	Steiger, Ariz.	Wampler	Rostenkowski	Teague, Tex.	Charles, Tex.
Andrews, N.C.	de la Garza	Kazan	Satterfield	Stephens	Ware	St Germain	Van Deerlin	Yatron
Andrews,			Scherle	Stratton	White	Stokes	Williams	Young, Ill.
N. Dak.	Delaney	Kemp	Schneebeli	Stuckey	Whitten			
Archer	Dent	Kyros	Sebelius	Sullivan	Wiggins			
Armstrong	Devine	Landgrebe	Shuster	Symms	Wylie			
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Landrum	Sikes	Thornton	Young, Alaska			
Bafalis	Donohue	Latta	Slack	Tiernan	Young, Fla.			
Baker	Dorn	Litton	Snyder	Towell, Nev.	Zion			
Beard	Downing	Long, Md.	Spence	Treen	Zwach			
Bennett	Dulski	Lott	Staggers	Veysey				
Bevill	Duncan	McEwen	Steed	Waggoner				
Blackburn	Eshleman	Macdonald						
Bowen	Evins, Tenn.	Mahon						
Bray	Fisher	Martin, Nebr.						
Breaux	Flynt	Martin, N.C.						
Brinkley	Fountain	Mathis, Ga.						
Brooks	Froehlich	Michel						
Broyhill, N.C.	Fuqua	Milford						
Burgener	Gaydos	Miller						
Burke, Fla.	Gettys	Mills, Ark.						
Burke, Mass.	Ginn	Mills, Md.						
Burleson, Tex.	Goldwater	Mitchell, N.Y.						
Burlison, Mo.	Gonzalez	Mizell						
Butler	Goodling	Mollohan						
Byron	Gross	Montgomery						
Camp	Grover	Moorhead,						
Casey, Tex.	Gunter	Calif.						
Cederberg	Haley	Myers						
Chamberlain	Hammer-	Nichols						
Chappell	schmidt	Pickle						
Clancy	Hanley	Poage						
Clausen,	Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio						
Don H.	Harsha	Price, Tex.						
Clawson, Del	Henderson	Quillen						
Cochran	Hinshaw	Roberts						
Collier	Holt	Robinson, Va.						
Collins	Huber	Rogers						
Conlan	Hudnut	Rogers						
Daniel, Dan	Hunt	Roncallo, Wyo.						
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hutchinson	Roncallo, N.Y.						
Davis, Ga.	Ichord	Rose						
		Johnson, Pa.						
		Rousselot						

NOES—216

Abzug	Hamilton	Pritchard						
Adams	Hansen, Idaho	Quie						
Addabbo	Hansen, Wash.	Rallsback						
Anderson,	Harrington	Randall						
Calif.	Harvey	Rangel						
Annunzio	Hastings	Rees						
Arends	Hechler, W. Va.	Regula						
Ashley	Heckler, Mass.	Reid						
Aspin	Heinz	Reuss						
Bell	Heilstoski	Rhodes						
Bergland	Hillis	Rinaldo						
Bingham	Hogan	Rodino						
Blatnik	Holifield	Roe						
Boggs	Holtzman	Rosenthal						
Boland	Horton	Roush						
Boiling	Hosmer	Roy						
Brademas	Hungate	Royal						
Brasco	Jarman	Sarasin						
Breckinridge	Johnson, Calif.	Sarbanes						
Broomfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saylor						
Brotzman	Jones, Ala.	Schroeder						
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Okla.	Seiberling						
Brown, Ohio	Jordan	Shipley						
Broyhill, Va.	Karth	Shoup						
Buchanan	Kastenmeier	Shriver						
Burke, Calif.	Keating	Sisk						
Burton	Ketchum	Skubitz						
Carey, N.Y.	Kluczynski	Smith, Iowa						
Carney, Ohio	Koch	Smith, N.Y.						
Chisholm	Leggett	Stanton, J. William						
Clay	Lent	Stanton, James V.						
Cleveland	Long, La.	Stark						
Cohen	Lujan	Steele						
Conable	McClory	Steigler, Wis.						
Conte	McCormick	Stubblefield						
Conyers	McFall	Studds						
Corman	Madden	Symington						
Coughlin	Madigan	Talcott						
Culver	Mailiard	Taylor, N.C.						
Daniels	Mallary	Teague, Calif.						
Dominick V.	Mann	Thone						
Danielson	Maraziti	Udall						
Dellenback	Mathias, Calif.	Ullman						
Derwinski	Matsunaga	Vander Jagt						
Diggs	Mazzoli	Vanik						
Dingell	Meeds	Vigorito						
Drinan	Melcher	Whalen						
DuPont	Metcalfe	Whitehurst						
Eckhardt	Mezvinsky	Widnall						
Edwards, Ala.	Minish	Wilson, Bob						
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Wilson, Charles H.						
Erlenborn	Minshall, Ohio	Wise, Calif.						
Evans, Colo.	Mitchell, Md.	Wolff						
Findley	Moakley	Wright						
Fish	Moser	Wyatt						
Flood	Moss	Wydler						
Flowers	Murphy, Ill.	Wyman						
Foley	Murphy, N.Y.	Yates						
Ford, Gerald R.	Natcher	Young, Ga.						
Ford,	Nedzi	Young, S.O.						
William D.	Nelsen	Pike						
Forsythe	O'Brien	Podell						
Fraser	O'Hara	Patten						
Frelinghuysen	O'Neill	Pepper						
Frenzel	Owens	Perkins						
Fulton	Grailmo	Pettis						
Gilmor	Gibbons	Pike						
Gilman	Green, Oreg.	Parris						
Grasso	Green, Pa.	Price, III.						
Griffiths	Hanna	Price, Ill.						
Gubser	Hawkins	Price, Ill.						
Gude	Clark	Price, Ill.						
Guyer	Carter	Price, Ill.						
	Biester	Clark						
	Brown, Calif.	Hays						
	Price, Tex.	Hébert						
	Quillen	Crane						
	Roberts	Cronin						
	Robinson, Va.	Howard						
	Rogers	King						
	Rogers	Lehman						
	Rogers	McCloskey						
	Rogers	Riegel						
	Rogers	Rooney, N.Y.						

NOT VOTING—53

Anderson, Ill.	Fascell	McDade						
Badillo	Frey	McKay						
Barrett	Gray	McKinney						
Biaggi	Green, Oreg.	McSpadden						
Blester	Green, Pa.	Mayne						
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Moorhead, Pa.						
Carroll	Hawkins	Morgan						
Carter	Clark	Nix						
Cotter	Hays	Obey						
Crane	Hicks	Passman						
Cronin	Howard	Patman						
Denholm	King	Peyser						
Eilberg	Lehman	Riegle						
Esch	McCloskey	Rooney, N.Y.						

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYLIE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYLIE: Page 2, strike out lines 1 through 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, for contributions to the United Nations Environment Fund, which may be used upon such terms and conditions as the President may specify.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an effort to conform this bill today to a law which this Congress passed on October 25, 1972, and which is included as a part of Public Law 92-544. In that law it says:

For expenses not otherwise provided for necessary to meet annual obligations—

And so forth—

Provided, however, That after December 31, 1973, no appropriation is authorized and no payment shall be made to the United Nations or any affiliated agency in excess of 25 per centum of the total annual assessment of such organization.

In this bill we are specifying that the United States will put up 40 percent, which is in direct contravention and contrary to the language of the law which we just passed last year. We are in the habit of making exceptions to rules and laws in this House, but we had adequate debate on this provision over a period of several years. It was finally decided that this Congress should speak up and say that no further appropriations will be made in excess of 25 percent, which is an adequate amount, it seems to me, since we do not have anywhere near that kind of influence in the United Nations.

There is no question but this bill has a laudable aim and purpose, and I support the thrust and the intent of the bill.

My amendment would simply say that the United States is now following the law which we passed last year, and would in effect make our contribution 25 percent for fiscal year 1974.

What is wrong with that, Mr. Chairman?

Maybe some of the Members voted against the Gross amendment because they thought the cut was too big but, on the other hand, I do not think we should come right back, after we passed this law just last year and suggest that we should now increase our contribution to that organization to 40 percent, because if we do then we are right back in the same old hassle we had before we passed the law to which I just referred and each time another appropriation comes before this House for the United Nations we are going to make exceptions to that rule.

So I think, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that this is an amendment we can all support. It merely confirms again what we said last year, that we think that the other na-

tions of the world ought to share in this effort.

As I said, I think the environmental protection aspects of this legislation are laudable, and for that I applaud the committee in bringing this bill out. I did not receive any good justification in answer to my questions as to how the committee came up with the figure of 40 percent for the United States, and 60 percent for the other nations involved, so I am saying why do we not use the 25-percent formula we approved last year?

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

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would state to my learned colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) that I note in the gentleman's amendment in the last two lines of the amendment, after "United Nations Environment Fund," it says "which may be used upon such terms and conditions as the President may specify."

Would my colleague be amenable to striking that last portion of his amendment? I think the first portion of the gentleman's amendment is an excellent amendment.

Mr. WYLIE. I understand the thrust of the question propounded by the gentleman from New Jersey, and that is that again the House of Representatives is delegating to the President authority in the matter of how the money can be used. That argument was made by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). However, I would like to have that language remain in this amendment because I think it would be more agreeable and more acceptable to the Members of this body. Someone has to decide how the money is going to be used, and I believe that that the President is in a better position to do this than anyone else. I do not believe it is feasible, in other words, for this U.N. organization to come back to the Congress at every whistpoch and ask authority to spend the money in the area of control of international environmental protection.

Mr. HUNT. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not believe that is the situation we have on this, but I am a little bit puzzled as to how the President can specify how the United Nations can do anything.

Mr. WYLIE. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WYLIE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman from New Jersey is saying, but really all I want to do with my amendment is to make it conform to the statute which we passed last year. In other words, I want to get back to the 25-percent allocation for the United States and the 75 percent for the other nations of the world formula, and not now make this exception which would increase our contribution to 40 percent. Therefore I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the thing that puzzles me about this amendment is that it does not do what the author of the amendment says it is designed to do. What this amendment does—and I have just been up at the desk to check the amendment—is to cut the President's request by 87 percent, but it does not say a word about percentages; it just cuts the \$40 million authorization for the next 5 years down to \$5 million, but it says nothing about percentages at all, but even if you gave it the most liberal interpretation it would still be way under the 25 percent matching, for while the gentleman claims that it deals with the percentage contribution, in fact, the amendment is totally irrelevant to that. It is simply a cutting amendment, it is simply the same type of cutting amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) the matter that we have just voted on.

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

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

Mr. WYLIE. I am using the language from the bill which is before this House today. Additionally, I am reading language from the report which accompanied H.R. 6768. The report says that the United States will make a contribution of \$40 million over a period of 5 years, and that this amount represents a contribution of 40 percent. If we divide \$40 million by 5 which would be for 1 year—and my amendment would apply only to fiscal year 1974—that would amount to \$5 million, as far as the 25 percent figure is concerned. One-quarter of \$100 million is \$25 million, so what I am talking about is not 25 percent of the total amount; I am talking about 25 percent of the amount which would be contributed for fiscal year 1974 or 1/5 of \$25 million. If we multiply \$5 million per year by 5, for 5 years we arrive at the \$25 million figure which is one-fourth of \$100 million. I am using the language which the gentleman has put in his bill. There is no percentage figure in his bill either. It does not say 40 percent, 60 percent, but the report is very specific in calling for a 40-60 ratio of contributions.

Mr. FRASER. If I can make a point with the gentleman, even with his amendment, we can still make up the 40 percent of the amount of money that is provided. He does not deal with a percentage limitation. Moreover, there is absolutely no assurance whether this money is going to be spent at a uniform rate each year. Part of the problem is that the fund has to get under way, and whether that involves either a larger-than-usual or a less-than-usual expenditure is not clear.

The gentleman's amendment does not quote a percentage limitation. It cuts the \$40 million to \$5 million.

Mr. WYLIE. For 1 year. Will the gentleman yield for just one additional observation?

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

Mr. WYLIE. The real reason why I offered my amendment is so that there will be a limitation of 25 percent as the maximum amount to be contributed by the United States. My amendment will

require the other participating nations to put up their money before the end of the fiscal year—something not required in the past. So, if other nations contribute an amount which would equal 75 percent of the total amount necessary for fiscal year 1974, then our 25 percent can be utilized but we would make it clear that our contribution will not go above \$5 million for fiscal year 1974. This would give us an opportunity to establish a track record to see if the other nations are sincere about this and if they do want to contribute to this new worldwide organization.

What I am saying is that the authorization should not be open ended, and that there ought to be a money limit placed on it, and that it should not exceed 25 percent of the total amount, and the other nations involved would be required to put up 75 percent, which is in accordance with the law we passed last year.

Mr. FRASER. I understand what the gentleman says he is trying to do, but he is not doing it this way.

Another thing, the countries may say if the United States is cutting back their amount of money, they are going to cut back, too, so we will still be faced with matching it at a 40 percent level, because the other governments have been told by the President that we are prepared to carry a 40 percent share. So the gentleman is not succeeding in his amendment in doing what he says he wants to do.

What I want to emphasize is he is simply providing a second version of the Gross amendment cutting the whole bill back.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Ohio read a provision of the appropriations law last year which limited contributions by the United States to U.N. and U.N. agencies to 25 percent. If there is no provision in this bill, we are changing that law. Does in fact that limitation still prevail, and are we not thereby limiting contributions to United Nations agencies to 25 percent?

Mr. FRASER. I say to the gentleman my understanding is that the 25-percent limitation applies to the assessed budget for the U.N. As I said earlier on the floor, both Ambassador Bush and Senator GALE McGEE—who was one of our representatives in the U.N. last year—argued for the 25-percent provision with respect to the assessed budget. I want to underscore that it is to the "assessed," not voluntary contributions which the 25-percent limitation applies. They argued for this on the basis that we were going to keep up our support on U.N. voluntary programs which is well above 25 percent. I reemphasize that the limitation here dealt with the assessed budget. I think it is important that that be made clear.

But in any event let me just say that this wipes out 87 percent of the President's request in the face of a number of commitments from our major allies and important countries around the world. I think it is a very serious mistake and does not do what the gentleman says he would like to see it do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 184, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

AYES—200

Abdnor	Gaydos	Parris	Dingell	Lehman	Riegle
Alexander	Gettys	Poage	Drinan	Lent	Rinaldo
Andrews, N.C.	Gialmo	Powell, Ohio	du Pont	Long, La.	Rodino
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goldwater	Price, Tex.	Eckhardt	McCormack	Roe
Archer	Gonzalez	Quie	Edwards, Ala.	McFall	Roush
Ashbrook	Goodling	Randall	Erlenborn	McKay	Roy
Bafalis	Gray	Rarick	Findley	Madden	Ruppe
Baker	Gross	Roberts	Fish	Mailiardi	Ryan
Beard	Grover	Robinson, Va.	Flood	Mallary	Sandman
Bennett	Gubser	Robison, N.Y.	Foley	Mathias, Calif.	Sarbanes
Bevill	Gunter	Rogers	Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga	Schroeder
Blackburn	Guyer	Roncalio, Wyo.	Ford, William D.	Mayne	Seiberling
Bowen	Haley	Roncalio, N.Y.	Forsythe	Meeds	Shoup
Bray	Hammer-	Rose	Frelinghuysen	Metcalfe	Shriver
Breax	schmidt	Rousselot	Frenzel	Mazzoli	Sisk
Brinkley	Hanley	Royal	Gibbons	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Brooks	Hanrahan	Ruannels	Gilman	Minish	Smith, N.Y.
Broomfield	Harsha	Ruth	Griffiths	Moss	Talcott
Brown, Mich.	Harvey	Sarsas	Gude	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Broynhill, N.C.	Hechler, W. Va.	Satterfield	Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, Wls.
Broynhill, Va.	Henderson	Saylor	Hansen, Idaho	Natcher	Thone
Burgener	Hinshaw	Scherle	Harrington	Nedzi	Udall
Burke, Fla.	Holt	Schneebeli	Hastings	Neisen	Van Deerlin
Burke, Mass.	Huber	Sebelius	Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara	Vander Jagt
Burleson, Tex.	Hudnut	Shipley	Heinz	O'Neill	Steiger, Wis.
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Shuster	Helstoski	Owens	Studds
Butler	Hunt	Sikes	Hicks	Patten	Symington
Byron	Hutchinson	Skubitz	Hillis	Pepper	Stark
Camp	Ichord	Slack	Hogan	Perkins	Steele
Casey, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Snyder	Holifield	Pettis	Wilson, Bob
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Spence	Holtzman	Pickle	Wilson, Charles H.
Chamberlain	Jones, N.C.	Staggers	Horton	Pike	Calif.
Chappell	Jones, Okla.	Stanton,	Hosmer	Podell	Winn
Clancy	Jones, Tenn.	J. William	Jarman	Preyer	Wolf
Clausen,	Kazan	Stanton,	Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Wright
Don H.	Kemp	James V.	Jones, Ala.	Pritchard	Wyatt
Clawson, Del	Ketchum	Steed	Jordan	Railsback	Wydler
Cleveland	Kuykendall	Steelman	Karth	Rangel	Wyman
Cochran	Kyros	Steiger, Ariz.	Kastenmeier	Rees	Charles H.
Collier	Landgrebe	Stephens	Keating	Regula	Yates
Collins	Latta	Stratton	Kluczynski	Reid	Young, Ga.
Conlan	Littton	Stubblefield	Koch	Reuss	Young, Ill.
Daniel, Dan	Long, Md.	Stuckey	Leggett	Rhodes	Young, Tex.
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Lott	Sullivan	NOT VOTING—49		Zablocki
Davis, Ga.	Lujan	Symms	Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Nik
Davis, S.C.	McCollister	Taylor, N.C.	Badillo	Green, Pa.	Obey
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Teague, Calif.	Barrett	Hanna	Passman
de la Garza	Macdonald	Thornton	Biaggi	Hawkins	Patman
Delaney	Madigan	Tierman	Blester	Hays	Peyser
Dennis	Mahon	Towell, Nev.	Brown, Calif.	Hebert	Rooney, N.Y.
Dent	Maraziti	Treen	Carter	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Ullman	Clark	King	Rostenkowski
Dickinson	Martin, N.C.	Vessey	Cotter	Landrum	St Germain
Donohue	Mathis, Ga.	Vigorito	Crane	McCliskey	Stokes
Dorn	Milford	Waggoner	Cronin	McDade	Taylor, Mo.
Downing	Miller	Walsh	Denholm	McKinney	Teague, Tex.
Dulski	Mills, Ark.	Wampler	Derwinski	McSpadden	Williams
Duncan	Mills, Md.	Ware	Eilberg	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson
Eshleman	Minshall, Ohio	White	Esch	Moorhead, Pa.	Charles, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whitten	Fascell	Morgan	Yatron
Evins, Tenn.	Mizell	Widnall	Frey	Myers	
Fisher	Mollohan	Wiggins			
Flowers	Montgomery	Wylie			
Flynt	Moorhead,	Young, Alaska			
Fountain	Calif.	Young, Fla.			
Froehlich	Nichols	Young, S.C.			
Fuqua	O'Brien	Zion			
		Zwach			

NOES—184

Abzug	Boggs	Clay	Dominick V.	
Adams	Boland	Cohen	Danielson	
Addabbo	Bolling	Conable	Delenback	
Anderson, Calif.	Brademas	Conte	Dellums	
Annunzio	Breckinridge	Conyers	Diggs	
Arenda	Brotzman	Corman		
Armstrong	Brown, Ohio	Coughlin		
Ashley	Buchanan	Culver		
Aspin	Burke, Calif.	Daniels,		
Bell	Burton	Dominick V.		
Bergland	Carey, N.Y.	Danielson		
Bingham	Carney, Ohio	Delenback		
Blatnik	Chisholm	Dellums		

I remind my colleagues that under the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) as well as provided in section 3 of the bill authority is still vested with the President so that the funds may be used upon such terms and conditions as the President may specify.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment, and I ask for a yeas vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is not a germane amendment. This amendment would deal with the contribution to the United Nations Environmental Fund, and this amendment, which appears to deal with aid to North Vietnam, has no relation to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a limitation upon the use for which the funds are intended. I think it is germane, and I urge the objection be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULTON). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) would provide for a restriction of the use of the funds authorized by this bill, and it is germane as an amendment to the bill.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SYMMS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SYMMS: Page 2, line 7, immediately after the period, insert the following: "Beginning with the fiscal year 1974, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the amount of funds authorized and appropriated to the U.S. Forest Service shall be increased by an amount equal to the funds appropriated for contribution to the United Nations Environment Fund. These additional funds shall be used for the purpose of carrying out reforestation programs in the national forests of the United States."

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if I heard the amendment right, I want to make a point of order against the amendment, although I will be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I think with regard to the total environmental picture of the world, as a good example here, the United States would do as well as anything we can do in the United Nations if we enact this amendment which calls for reforestation of our national forests. This is certainly a problem that we need to address ourselves to in this Congress, so I think it is in order.

I urge the Chair rule in favor of its germaneness.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

Clearly this is not germane. If I understand it, reforestation in the United States has nothing to do with this subject matter. It is a matter over which our committee has no jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FULTON). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment goes to authorizations and appropriations for an agency and a program not within the scope of this bill and not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which reported the pending measure. The Chair holds the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

If there are no further amendments to be proposed, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6768) to provide for participation by the United States in the United Nations environment program, pursuant to House Resolution 361, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Wylie amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the remaining amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 2, strike out lines 1 through 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, for contributions to the United Nations Environment Fund, which may be used upon such terms and conditions as the President may specify."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 198, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—192

Abdnor	Butler	Dent	Martin, N.C.	Shipley	Wilson,	Wolff	Young, Ga.
Alexander	Byron	Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Shuster	Charles H.,	Wright	Young, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.	Camp	Dickinson	Michel	Sikes	Calif.	Wyatt	Young, Tex.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Casey, Tex.	Donohue	Milford	Skubitz	Wilson,	Wydier	Zablocki
Archer	Cederberg	Dorn	Miller	Slack	Charles, Tex.	Wyman	
Ashbrook	Chamberlain	Downing	Mills, Ark.	Snyder	Winn	Yates	
Bafalis	Chappell	Dulski	Mills, Md.	Spence			
Baker	Clancy	Duncan	Minshall, Ohio	Staggers			
Beard	Clausen,	Eshleman	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stanton,			
Bennett	Don H.	Evins, Tenn.	Mizell	James V.			
Bevill	Clawson, Del.	Fisher	Montgomery	Steelman			
Blackburn	Cleveland	Flowers	Moorehead,	Steiger, Ariz.			
Bowen	Cochran	Flynt	Calif.	Stephens			
Bray	Collier	Fountain	Calif.	Stratton			
Breas	Ceilins	Froehlich	Calif.	Stubblefield			
Brinkley	Conlan	Fuqua	Calif.	Stuckey			
Brooks	Daniel, Dan	Gaydos	Calif.	Sullivan			
Broyhill, N.C.	W., Jr.	Ginn	Calif.	Talcott			
Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Ga.	Goldwater	Calif.	Taylor, N.C.			
Burgener	Davis, S.C.	Gonzalez	Calif.	Thornton			
Burke, Fla.	Davis, Wis.	Goodling	Calif.	Towell, Nev.			
Burke, Mass.	de la Garza	Grasso	Calif.	Treen			
Burleson, Tex.	Delaney	Gray	Calif.	Ullman			
Burlison, Mo.	Dennis	Gross	Calif.	Vander Jagt			
			Calif.	Veyssey			
			Calif.	Vigorito			
			Calif.	Waggoner			
			Calif.	Walsh			
			Calif.	Wampler			
			Calif.	Ware			
			Calif.	White			
			Calif.	Witten			
			Calif.	Widnall			
			Calif.	Wiggins			
			Calif.	Wylie			
			Calif.	Young, Alaska			
			Calif.	Young, Fla.			
			Calif.	Young, S.C.			
			Calif.	Zion			
			Calif.	Zwach			

NAYS—198

Abzug	Frenzel	Natcher	
Adams	Fulton	Nedzi	
Addabbo	Giaimo	Nelsen	
Anderson,	Gibbons	O'Brien	
Calif.	Gilman	O'Hara	
Annunzio	Griffiths	O'Neill	
Armstrong	Gude	Owens	
Ashley	Guyer	Patten	
Aspin	Hamilton	Pepper	
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Perkins	
Bergland	Hansen, Wash.	Pettis	
Bingham	Harrington	Pickle	
Blatnik	Hastings	Pike	
Boggs	Heckler, Mass.	Podell	
Boland	Heinz	Preyer	
Bolling	Helstroski	Price, Ill.	
Brademas	Hicks	Pritchard	
Brasco	Hillis	Railsback	
Breckinridge	Hogan	Rangel	
Broomfield	Holfield	Rees	
Brotzman	Holtzman	Regula	
Brown, Mich.	Horton	Reid	
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Reuss	
Buchanan	Jarman	Rhodes	
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle	
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Rinaldo	
Carey, N.Y.	Jones, Ala.	Rodino	
Carney, Ohio	Jordan	Roe	
Chisholm	Karth	Rosenthal	
Clark	Kastenmeier	Roush	
Clay	Keating	Roy	
Cohen	Kluczynski	Royal	
Conable	Koch	Ruppe	
Conte	Kyros	Ryan	
Conyers	Leggett	St Germain	
Corman	Lehman	Sandman	
Coughlin	Lent	Sarbanes	
Culver	Long, La.	Schroeder	
Daniels,	McClory	Seiberling	
Dominick V.	McCormack	Shoup	
Danielson	McFall	Shriver	
Dellenback	McKay	Sisk	
Dellums	McKinney	Smith, Iowa	
Diggs	Madden	Smith, N.Y.	
Dingell	Madigan	Stanton,	
Drinan	Malilliard	J. William	
du Pont	Mallary	Stark	
Eckhardt	Mathias, Calif.	Steele	
Edwards, Ala.	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.	
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Stokes	
Erlenborn	Madden	Studds	
Evans, Colo.	Madigan	Symington	
Fascell	Malilliard	Teague, Calif.	
Findley	Mallary	Thompson, N.J.	
Fish	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson, Wis.	
Flood	Matsunaga	Thomson, Wis.	
Foley	McFall	Thone	
Ford, Gerald R.	McKee	Udall	
Ford,	McKee	Van Deelen	
William D.	Madden	Vanek	
Forsythe	Malilliard	Vanek	
Fraser	Mosher	Whalen	
Frelighuysen	Mosher	Whitehurst	
	Mosher	Wilson, Bob	

Grover	Martin, N.C.	Shipley	Wilson,	Wolff	Young, Ga.
Gubser	Mathis, Ga.	Shuster	Charles H.,	Wright	Young, Ill.
Gunter	Michel	Sikes	Calif.	Wyatt	Young, Tex.
Haley	Milford	Skubitz	Wilson,	Wydier	Zablocki
Hammer-	Miller	Slack	Charles, Tex.	Wyman	
schmidt	Mills, Ark.	Snyder	Winn	Yates	
Hanley	Mills, Md.	Spence			
Hanrahan	Minshall, Ohio	Staggers			
Harsha	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stanton,			
Harvey	Mizell	James V.			
Hechler, W. Va.	Mollohan	Steelman			
Henderson	Montgomery	Steiger, Ariz.			
Hinshaw	Moorehead,	Stephens			
Holt	Calif.	Stratton			
Huber	Calif.	Stubblefield			
Hudnut	Nichols	Stuckey			
Hungate	Parris	Sullivan			
Hutchinson	Poage	Talcott			
Ichord	Powell, Ohio	Taylor, N.C.			
Johnson, Pa.	Price, Tex.	Thornton			
Jones, N.C.	Quie	Towell, Nev.			
Jones, Okla.	Quillen	Treen			
Jones, Tenn.	Randall	Ullman			
Kazen	Rarick	Vander Jagt			
Kemp	Roberts	Veyssey			
Ketchum	Robinson, Va.	Vigorito			
Kuykendall	Robinson, N.Y.	Waggoner			
Landgrebe	Rogers	Walsh			
Latta	Roncalio, Wyo.	Wampler			
Litton	Roncalio, N.Y.	Ware			
Long, Md.	Rose	White			
Lott	Rousselot	Witten			
Lujan	Runnels	Widnall			
McCollister	Ruth	Wiggins			
McEwen	Sarasin	Wylie			
McDonald	Satterfield	Young, Alaska			
Mahon	Saylor	Young, Fla.			
Mann	Scherle	Young, S.C.			
Maraziti	Schneebeli	Zion			
Martin, Nebr.	Sebelius	Zwach			

NOT VOTING—43

Anderson, Ill.	Frey	Nix
Arends	Green, Oreg.	Obey
Badillo	Green, Pa.	Patman
Barrett	Hanna	Peyser
Biaggi	Hawkins	Rooney, N.Y.
Biester	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Hebert	Rostenkowski
Carter	Howard	Steed
Cotter	King	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Cronin	McCloskey	Tiernan
Denholm	McDade	Williams
Derwinski	McSpadden	Yatron
Eilberg	Moorhead, Pa.	
Esch	Morgan	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Frey for, with Mr. Morgan against.
Mr. Crane for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.
Mr. King for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Taylor of Missouri for, with Mr. Cronin against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Nix with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Obey.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cotter.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hebert.

The result of the vote was announced as above record.d.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Unqualifiedly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6768, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 267, nays 123, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—267

Abdnor	Griffiths	Preyer
Abzug	Gubser	Price, Ill.
Adams	Gude	Pritchard
Addabbo	Guyer	Quie
Alexander	Hamilton	Railsback
Anderson,	Hammer-	Randall
Calif.	schmidt	Rangel
Andrews, N.C.	Hanley	Rees
Andrews, N. Dak.	Hansen, Idaho	Regula
Annumzio	Hansen, Wash.	Reid
Arends	Harrington	Reuss
Armstrong	Harsha	Rhodes
Ashley	Harvey	Riegle
Bell	Hastings	Rinaldo
Bergland	Hechler, W. Va.	Robison, N.Y.
Bingham	Heckler, Mass.	Rodino
Blatnik	Heinz	Roncalio, Wyo.
Boggs	Helstoski	Roncalio, N.Y.
Boland	Hicks	Rosenthal
Bolling	Hillis	Roush
Brademas	Hogan	Roy
Brasco	Holifield	Royal
Bray	Holtzman	Ruppe
Breckinridge	Horton	Ryan
Brooks	Hosmer	St Germain
Broomfield	Hungate	Sandman
Brotzman	Jarman	Sarasin
Brown, Mitch.	Johnson, Calif.	Sarbanes
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Colo.	Saylor
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Bryhill, Va.	Jordan	Schroeder
Buchanan	Karth	Seiberling
Burke, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Shipley
Burke, Fla.	Kazen	Shoup
Burke, Mass.	Keating	Shriver
Burton	Kemp	Sisk
Carey, N.Y.	Kluczynski	Smith, Iowa
Carney, Ohio	Koch	Smith, N.Y.
Cederberg	Kyros	Stanton
Chamberlain	Latta	J. William
Chisholm	Leggett	Stanton
Clark	Lehman	James V.
Clausen, Don H.	Lent	Stark
Clay	Long, La.	Steele
Cleveland	Lujan	Steelman
Cohen	McClory	Steiger, Wis.
Collier	McCollister	Stokes
Conable	McCormack	Stratton
Conte	McFall	Studds
Conyers	McKinney	Symington
Corman	Macdonald	Talcott
Coughlin	Madden	Taylor, N.C.
Culver	Madigan	Teague, Calif.
Daniels,	Mailliard	Thompson, N.J.
Dominick V.	Mallary	Thompson, Wis.
Danielson	Maraziti	Thone
Delaney	Martin, Nebr.	Tierman
Dellenback	Martin, N.C.	Ullman
Dellums	Mathias, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Dennis	Matsunaga	Vank
Diggs	Mayne	Veysey
Dingell	Mazzoli	Vigorito
Donohue	Meeds	Waldie
Drinan	Meicher	Walsh
Dulski	Metcalfe	Wampler
du Pont	Mezvinsky	Ware
Eckhardt	Milford	Whalen
Edwards, Ala.	Miller	White
Edwards, Calif.	Minish	Whitehurst
Erlenborn	Mink	Widnall
Eshleman	Minshall, Ohio	Wiggins
Evans, Colo.	Moakley	Wilson, Bob
Fascell	Mosher	Wilson
Findley	Moss	Charles H., Calif.
Fish	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson
Flood	Murphy, N.Y.	Charles, Tex.
Foley	Natcher	Winn
Ford, Gerald R.	Nedzi	Wolff
Ford,	Nelsen	Wright
William D.	O'Brien	Wyatt
Forsythe	O'Hara	Wyder
Fraser	O'Neill	Wymann
Frelinghuysen	Owens	Yates
Frenzel	Parris	Young, Ga.
Fulton	Patten	Young, Ill.
Giaimo	Pepper	Young, Tex.
Gibbons	Perkins	Zablocki
Gilman	Pettis	Zion
Gonzalez	Pickle	Zwach
Grasso	Pike	
Gray	Podell	

NAYS—123

Archer	Beard	Bowen
Ashbrook	Bennett	Breux
Bafalis	Bevill	Brinkley
Baker	Blackburn	Burgener

Burleson, Tex.	Grover	Powell, Ohio
Burlison, Mo.	Gunter	Price, Tex.
Butler	Haley	Quillen
Byron	Hanrahan	Rarick
Camp	Henderson	Roberts
Casey, Tex.	Hinshaw	Robinson, Va.
Chappell	Holt	Rogers
Clancy	Huber	Rose
Clawson, Del.	Hudnut	Rousselot
Cochran	Hunt	Runnels
Collins	Hutchinson	Ruth
Conian	Ichord	Satterfield
Daniel, Dan	Jones, Ala.	Scherle
Daniel, Robert	Jones, N.C.	Sebelius
W., Jr.	Jones, Okla.	Shuster
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Davis, S.C.	Ketchum	Skubitz
Davis, Wis.	Kuykendall	Slack
de la Garza	Landgrebe	Snyder
Dent	Littton	Spence
Devine	Long, Md.	Staggers
Dickinson	Lott	Steed
Dorn	McEwen	Steiger, Ariz.
Downing	Mahon	Stephens
Duncan	Mathis, Ga.	Stubblefield
Evins, Tenn.	Michel	Stuckey
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Sullivan
Flowers	Mills, Md.	Symms
Flynt	Mitchell, N.Y.	Thornton
Fountain	Mizell	Towell, Nev.
Froehlich	Mollohan	Treen
Fuqua	Montgomery	Waggonner
Gaydos	Moorhead	Whitten
Gettys	Calif.	Wylie
Ginn	Myers	Young, Alaska
Goldwater	Nichols	Young, Fla.
Goodling	Passman	Young, S.C.
Gross	Poage	

NOT VOTING—43

Anderson, Ill.	Frey	Morgan
Aspin	Green, Oreg.	Nix
Badillo	Green, Pa.	Obey
Barrett	Hanna	Patman
Biaggi	Hawkins	Peyser
Biester	Hays	Roe
Brown, Calif.	Hebert	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Cotter	King	Rostenkowski
Crane	Landrum	Taylor, Mo.
Cronin	McCloskey	Teague, Tex.
Denholm	McDade	Williams
Derwinski	McSpadden	Yatron
Ellberg	Mitchell, Md.	
Esch	Moorhead, Pa.	

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Peyser for, with Mr. Crane against.
Mr. Cronin for, with Mr. Carter against.
Mr. Biester for, with Mr. Taylor of Missouri against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Hebert with Mr. Howard.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Obey.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Teague of Texas.
Mr. White with Mr. Aspen.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Denholm with Mr. Biaggi.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Mitchell of Maryland.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that on the first quorum call today (rollcall 142) I am shown as not being present. Mr. Speaker, I was present, inserted my voting card in the proper slot, but the electronic machine did not record same. I had no reason to think my presence had not been recorded and request that the RECORD reflect this.

CHANGE IN LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker. I take this time to announce that there has been a change in the legislative program. We are putting over until tomorrow consideration of H.R. 5777, the Hobby Protection Act. We have indefinitely postponed the two bills scheduled for tomorrow, H.R. 2990, the U.S. Postal Service authorization, which was not given a rule today and H.R. 6912 the Par Value Modification Act, which we postponed earlier at the request of the committee chairman.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I am happy to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does that indicate there will be business tomorrow but not on Thursday?

Mr. O'NEILL. There is no business scheduled at the present time for Thursday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

NEW "ATLANTIC CHARTER"

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article entitled "New 'Atlantic Charter'" written by my constituent, Henry Huglin, brigadier general, USAF (retired), of Santa Barbara, Calif.:

NEW "ATLANTIC CHARTER"

(By Henry Huglin)

Despite Watergate and serious problems in Indochina and the Middle East, the President through Dr. Kissinger has launched another wise, appropriate, and timely foreign affairs initiative, a call for "a new Atlantic Charter" setting the goals for the future—a blueprint that: builds on the past without becoming its prisoner, deals with the problems our success has created, creates for the Atlantic nations a new relationship in whose progress Japan can share."

This call was set forth in a major administration address which Dr. Kissinger delivered on 23 April to an Associated Press meeting. It was the type of creative leadership that our country has repeatedly offered since the first Atlantic Charter was signed in Au-

gust, 1941 (during World War II when Britain, Russia, Canada, and much of Europe were fighting Hitler's Germany, but before we got involved) by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill "to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world."

Dr. Kissinger explained the essence of the proposal as follows.

"Today the need is to make the Atlantic relationship as dynamic a force in building a new structure of peace, less geared to crisis and more conscious of opportunities, drawing its inspirations from its goals rather than its fears . . .

"We must ensure that the momentum of détente is maintained by common objectives rather than by drift, escapism, or complacency.

"The agenda I have outlined here is not an American prescription but an appeal for a joint effort of creativity . . .

"The United States is prepared to make its contribution: We will continue to support European unity . . . We will not disengage from our solemn commitments to our allies . . . We shall continue to pursue the relaxation of tensions with our adversaries on the basis of concrete negotiations in the common interest . . . We will never consciously injure the interests of our friends in Europe or in Asia . . . We are prepared to work cooperatively on new problems we face. Energy, for example . . .

"Just as Europe's autonomy is not an end in itself, so the Atlantic community cannot be an exclusive club. Japan must be a principal partner in our common enterprise."

This speech struck the right note. It is dynamic without being dictatorial. It set a constructive tone, without spelling out details that should be worked out in concert. It presented a sound analysis of the situation now faced by the major non-communist nations—which is what "Atlantic" means in this context.

We are the only nation which can provide such leadership. Despite the buffeting we have undergone from the agonies over Vietnam and monetary and trade problems, we have by far more strength and influence in all major fields than any other non-communist nation. As always, with wealth and power properly go responsibilities. By launching this well-conceived initiative our country is exercising fine leadership.

Along with our NATO allies, we still face the persistent challenge of Russia's massive military might. Through coordinated negotiations with the Russians, we and our Atlantic partners are seeking to reduce tensions and to achieve mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe and further strategic arms limitations.

With the nations of the Common Market, Canada, and Japan, we are engaged in coping with major non-security challenges: reforming the monetary system, moderating trade barriers, insuring dependable sources of oil, reversing the pollution of the air and seas, and generally managing technology for our mutual good.

With Japan we also have additional common political interests in our new relations with China and in promoting stability and peaceful progress throughout Asia.

It was proper and prudent to have spelled out that Japan must be included in the partnership arrangements of the Atlantic community nations. Japan is a first-rank nation in trade and monetary matters with great potential influence.

The preliminary negotiations on this proposal are underway. The concept of a new Atlantic charter now provides the framework on which the President can explore common issues with the many allied leaders with whom he is to confer before he goes to Europe this fall, by which time specific agreements on basic goals and initial actions may be achieved.

Coping with the great international issues of war and peace, economic health, political and social progress, monetary stability, energy, pollution, etc. requires, from us, wisdom, statesmanship, maintenance of adequate economic and military strength, and appropriate initiative and leadership—followed up with skillful, painstaking diplomacy. The President and Dr. Kissinger, backed up by Secretary Rogers and the State Department, have shown—in such steps as the opening to China, negotiations with the Russians, and this new proposal—that they have a clear understanding of geopolitics and the vision, flexibility, and creativity needed.

There is a very long way to go to "a generation of peace." Perhaps it is not even attainable, because the choice is by far not ours alone. But the President and his foreign affairs team are making excellent efforts toward that goal. We all ought to support him in this endeavor and hope that the Watergate mess does not diminish his effectiveness in international affairs.

LET US NOT FORGET OUR OVERSEAS EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, let us not forget our overseas employees. We, in the Congress, need to review from time to time the problems which from day to day confront our 57,000 Federal employees stationed overseas.

I recently had the opportunity to visit several of our installations in the Pacific, including Hawaii, Guam, Okinawa, Taiwan, and Japan. It was apparent to me that the problems for our employees at those locations have been calling to our attention have been, in large measure, ignored.

First, there is the problem of mandatory rotation of employees from overseas areas. Authority for this rotation of overseas employees is contained in DOD instruction 1404.8, Rotation of Employees in Foreign Areas and the Canal Zone, dated April 10, 1968. Nowhere in Public Law 86-585, 86th Congress, can I find an authorization for mandatory rotation of overseas employees. There is a grandfather clause contained in the cited DOD instruction.

There is apparently a move now to revoke or evade this clause and this could create serious problems for those who have been overseas for many years. As an example, I found that many long tenure employees had been in overseas assignments in excess of 15 years, and some of them more than 20 years. Now they are being told they will have to rotate back to the States for a period of 2 years without a guarantee of job assignment when they reach the United States. This will create a severe hardship on those who have gone to the outlying areas, established their families and homes, and are in many instances nearing their time of retirement. In most instances when these employees went overseas, they went under different circumstances.

Certainly all of us will understand that Okinawa, 28 years ago, was not the most desirable place to live. Similar circumstances were true on Guam. These people who made the early sacrifices to go overseas, build, and improve the living circumstances there, are entitled to some consideration when they wish to

remain during the latter part of their tenure. It is understandable that those stateside now who look upon the overseas assignment as a very desirable experience will push for the rotation system, because they want now to take advantage of what these others have sacrificed so much to accomplish. Aside from the hardships that would be imposed upon our overseas employees, there is the item of unreasonable expense. The Department of Defense has estimated that it will cost \$15,000 per family to rotate them and replace them, and when you multiply this by the affected 5,000 employees, this amounts to some \$75 million.

Mr. Speaker, the argument made by the Department of Defense in favor of mandatory rotation is that those who have been overseas for periods greater than 5 years tend to "go native" and more and more lose touch with the United States, its goals and principals—that they tend to accept the philosophies and teachings of alien nations. This is one of the most unfounded arguments I have encountered. I found complete repudiation of such an argument in my visits in the Pacific area. I had the opportunity to visit in the homes of these employees, to talk with their children, and to get a good feel of their regard for America. I mention, as examples, such fine Americans as Fred Neylor, president of AFGE Local 1678; Carl Toole, Bill Boone, all of Okinawa; Archie Bengston of Guam, and John Cabral of Honolulu, to name only a few.

I have never encountered a more patriotic group of people, nor have I had the privilege of meeting people who are more keenly aware of the necessity of perpetuating the principles of the United States than are these employees. If, in fact, this is what one calls "going native" then I suggest we find the way to send greater numbers of our Americans to such kinds of assignments for such long periods of time. This injustice can be averted by action on the part of DOD. I hope legislation will not be required. I believe it will not be.

Second, there is a question of permanent resident aliens. Many citizens of the Philippines came to Okinawa to work for the U.S. Government. These foreign nationals, after working for the U.S. Government, many in excess of 20 years, paid their transportation to the United States, obtained their first papers toward U.S. citizenship and returned to Okinawa to their position and continued to work there. They stand in tenure group three, and in the event of reduction in force will be the first to be separated. The immigration laws governing acquisition of U.S. citizenship requires 5 years residence in the United States, of which 1 year may be spent overseas in the employment of the U.S. Government. These permanent resident aliens have indicated their desire to become U.S. citizens by obtaining their first papers. In the event of a RIF—reduction in force—joint travel regulations permit Government transportation to their former country and not the United States. In other words, they had more advantages as a foreign national than as American citizens. This is grossly unfair and unreasonable, and the regulations should be

so drafted and construed that such an injustice will not occur.

Again, I believe this is a matter that can and must be corrected, hopefully, without legislation by a change of attitude on the part of the Department of Defense. This problem has been presented to the Department of the Army and they appear sympathetic, but state that travel regulations must be changed. In the event these employees are compelled to return to their native country, they will be under a stigma since they had indicated their desire to become U.S. citizens, thus renouncing their prior citizenship. Certainly, it behooves each of us to insist that such travel regulations be changed to provide a more equitable treatment of these foreign nationals—now U.S. citizens.

Third, there is a problem of overseas limited appointees. Prior to April 1956, the vast majority of all Government employees going overseas served under an overseas limited appointment. By Executive order, and under certain criteria, the majority of these employees were converted to career status in April 1956. Due to certain, and in many cases peculiar circumstances, many were not converted. When the "taper bill" was passed several years ago, converting over 30,000 temporary employees to career status, overseas employees were not included. H.R. 10131 was introduced during the 2d session, 92d Congress, but no action was taken on the bill. The Air Force and the Navy have put forth great effort to convert these overseas limited appointees to career status, but the Army has not. I hope and trust the Army will make such a conversion negating any necessity for congressional action.

Fourth, the problem of quarters allowance is keenly in focus. The recent devaluation of the dollar has resulted in a reduction of the exchange rate. On Okinawa alone, the exchange rate dropped from 360 to 300 yen per dollar as of January, 1973. The recent devaluation has dropped the exchange rate to approximately 260 yen per \$1. This problem exists not only in Okinawa, but in most areas overseas. In most overseas areas, there are some quarters allowed, but these quarters are not sufficient to take care of the total housing for employees, particularly those in the lower grades. A quick review reveals that there is no uniformity in the criteria for assignment of civilians to government quarters.

For example, the Air Force authorizes the GS-7 or wage board equivalent to government quarters on post. All beneath GS-7 must obtain their quarters off base. The Army in certain areas authorizes quarters on post for GS-11 and above, other employees have to seek their own quarters off base. The Air Force will authorize such quartering for 4 years, while the Army will allow up to 5 years. There are many other disparities between the treatment of personnel by the various services. I believe there should be a uniform approach to this problem on the part of the services, and I believe the Department of Defense should be encouraged to establish uniform regulations regarding these matters.

Additionally, it seems to me that we

must establish some kind of reasonable policy which would take into consideration the devaluation of the dollar on these employees, especially those who are compelled to live off station. Otherwise, they experience severe hardships. It is my hope that this will be done without the necessity of legislation.

There is a fifth cause for grievance on the part of Government employees assigned overseas. The services will give quarters allowance for one assigned temporarily overseas for 6 months or less, but will not make any such allowance for one who is assigned for a greater period than 6 months. The service considers one a resident of an area if he is assigned there more than 6 months. I believe it would be far more reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to make a standard and uniform allowance for all of our employees assigned overseas whether they are temporarily or permanently assigned. That is to say, whether they are local hire or whether they are transfer employees from the mainland of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in short, it is time for those of us in the Congress and those in our agencies and departments effected to recognize that our overseas employees are doing a great and outstanding job, that they are keenly dedicated Americans, that they want to be and are of real service to our country, and that they have grievances which should be seriously understood and corrected by our leadership, both in our departments and in the Congress. I hope and believe the matter should and can be handled short of legislation. I invite each one of my colleagues to assist our employees in these matters. Let us not forget our overseas employees.

CONGRESSMAN VEYSEY PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE DALIP SINGH SAUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1973, while this House was in recess, a former Member of the Congress, the late Honorable Dalip Singh Saund, passed away in Los Angeles, Calif., after a long illness.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order on this particular day because Karnail Singh Saund of Punjab, India, a brother of our late former Member, Congressman Saund, is here in Washington. He is in attendance at this time along with Ganga Singh Dhillon and several representatives of Sikh temples from throughout the United States. Also with them are Mr. and Mrs. Aya Singh Dhillon of Holtville, Calif., Miss Patricia Dhillon of El Centro, Calif., and Mr. Troy Yberra of Costa Mesa, and representatives of the Indian Embassy, and the United Nations Delegation.

I wish to welcome these friends to Washington.

A memorial service for the late Congressman Saund will be held later in room H-107 of this building under arrangements made by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Cali-

fornia, JOHN McFALL, the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly saddened by the death on April 22 of my friend former Congressman Dalip S. Saund, who served admirably in this House, alongside you and many of our colleagues from 1957 until 1963.

"Judge" Saund, as he was affectionately known to friends, associates and constituents, was my Congressman during those years, representing the area which I am now proud to serve.

Although "Judge" Saund and I were elected as members of different political parties, and although our philosophies sometimes differed, I had the highest admiration for him as a man and as a public servant. As an elected local government official in Imperial County, and later as the area's State Assemblyman, I had the privilege of working closely with Congressman Saund during his tenure in the House. I enjoyed a warm, personal friendship with him in that capacity and as a neighbor in the Imperial Valley.

It was "Judge" Saund who led the way during the 1940's in the effort to afford U.S. citizenship to natives of India, where he himself was born and where he grew to manhood. He was the first president of the Indian Association of America.

He came to this country to attend the University of California, Berkeley, in 1920, and began farming in the Imperial Valley in 1930.

In 1952, he became the first native of India to hold public office in the United States, when he was elected Justice of the Peace in the Westmorland Judicial District.

In 1956 he was elected to the Congress of the United States, and during his 6 years of service in this House he demonstrated the patriotism, the determination, and the belief in the American system that made his life a classic American success story.

I especially want to offer my condolences to his widow, Marian, to his son Dalip Saund, Jr., who is at present an anthropologist in Thailand, to his daughters, Mrs. Ellie Ford of Los Angeles, and Mrs. Julie Fisher of San Diego, and to his eight grandchildren. We have lost a great American.

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California who now very capably serves much of the district that was formerly served by Judge Saund.

I had the opportunity to serve with Judge Saund when I was here in my one previous term in 1961 and 1962. I always found him to be a very gentle and thoughtful man. He was known for his very compassionate approach to all problems that faced the Congress. He genuinely devoted himself to all legislative tasks in a meaningful manner. I think the country is the loser because this man, who has now passed from the scene, was an extremely devoted public servant.

As the gentleman in the well has indicated, the two of us probably differed

in philosophy in some ways with this fine man, Judge Saund, but we still found him to be a very able and capable legislator who made a serious and definitive attempt to always represent those from his district in a total way, and with a maximum effort.

I thank the gentleman from California for taking this time. We do indeed pay tribute to this fine man, Judge Saund, and extend our prayers to his family.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, when the light of life extinguished for Judge D. S. Saund on Easter Sunday afternoon, the Nation lost a truly remarkable man.

He was a learned man. Yet he will be remembered far more for his outgoing personality, his commonsense, and successful approaches to complex problems rather than the fact that he had earned high degrees in mathematics.

Born in a foreign land and subjected to severe discrimination during a great deal of his adult life in this country, he proved by his thoughts and deeds that he possessed the determination to succeed which Americans most admire.

Inspired by the writings of Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, he decided early in life that the United States would become his adopted home.

His determination and wisdom enabled him to overcome many obstacles. As a young man he became a leader in the fight to change U.S. immigration laws which prohibited natives of the Orient from becoming citizens.

He earned the respect and affection of his friends in Imperial Valley who elected him a judge of the community of Westmorland, Calif., where he had lived since earning master's and Ph. D. degrees at the University of California at Berkeley.

Then, in 1956, he became a national figure almost overnight when he was elected to Congress—the first native of Asian ancestry to gain this distinction.

I consider myself fortunate to have had Judge Saund as a friend and to have served with him during the 6 years he was a Member of the House.

He was highly successful in representation of the people of his district. He knew the needs of the two counties of Imperial and Riverside and worked with skillful determination for beneficial legislation as well as consideration by the executive branch for helpful programs.

I worked closely with him to obtain a law providing protection from a flood of low quality products from abroad which threatened dates and walnuts grown respectively in our two districts.

Because we were in the same "freshman" class of 1957 and had many mutual interests, I learned early of his abilities to work with people and to get things done.

One of his accomplishments was passage of a law to establish an annual interparliamentary conference between Members of the U.S. and Mexican Congresses to discuss mutual problems—of

extreme importance to a district adjacent to the Mexican border which Judge Saund represented. Another was enactment of an equalization law dividing equitably the assets of the Agua Caliente Indian tribe in the Palm Springs area among the 100 remaining members.

The unfortunate illness which struck the judge down 11 years ago deprived many of us in this Chamber of a companion whom we had come to know and love. But the loss was even larger for the Nation, for he had the mark of greatness.

What made the judge the type of a man he was? The preface to his autobiography, "Congressman From India," written in 1960, provides much insight. Here are his words:

This book is the simple story of the struggles, sorrows and joys, defeats and recoveries, of a twenty-year-old native of India who came to the United States and, nearly two score years later, became a United States Congressman.

My guideposts were two of the most beloved men in history, Abraham Lincoln and Mahatma Gandhi. My constant inspiration was the memory of my wise though unlettered mother, who had loved me dearly and taught me the lessons in good living.

I received my inner joys and support from a devoted wife who knew how to chide and guide. Thirty years ago she had married me not for money, position, or prospect, for these I had none. Kipling said, "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." Clearly, he was wrong, for a Saund from the East met a Kosa from the West. God blessed them with three marvelous children.

In private life I have never known a verbal or physical quarrel with anyone. My religion teaches me that love and service to fellow men are the road to earthly bliss and spiritual salvation.

Lincoln said once, "Be satisfied with skim milk if you can not get cream." I have had to live on skim milk on occasion in life and found it both sweet and nourishing. Gandhi said, "I love my enemies." In my political battles I have found it impossible to malign or belittle my opponents. Yet I have won every contest against heavy odds.

Two of the greatest satisfactions in my professional life came first, when my children, together with my daughter-in-law and son-in-law, volunteered to ring doorbells for me in the campaign in 1956, and second, when in that same election the citizens of my own small home town of Westmorland, my neighbors of thirty years voted over 80 per cent in my favor as an expression of their confidence.

I find comfort in the Declaration of Independence and hope for mankind in the great inalienable truths expressed in the Bill of Rights.

To his widow Marian, his two daughters and a son, his eight grandchildren, and his brothers and sisters in India—one of whom is here today—we extend our condolences. They were fortunate to have shared so intimately in the life of Judge Saund, and I know their loss is very difficult to bear. Their sorrow is shared, however, by many others who can only take comfort in having known this man who helped to make America greater.

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentle-

man from California, for yielding and also for taking the time to sponsor this special order. I join the gentleman in sharing our expression of grief at the fact that Congressman Saund has passed on.

My freshman year here was marked by my getting to know that distinguished fellow American. I got to know him early in my career. I was sworn in on January 10, 1962, and one of the first to come over to shake my hand was Congressman Saund. I got to know him fairly well in the few weeks to follow. Therefore when he went to the hospital I was quite shocked and surprised. I visited him at the hospital. Then when the campaign started in California—and the gentleman in the well will appreciate this because I am a member of the opposite party—I was requested to campaign in behalf of the gentleman from California, Mr. Saund, in his district, and I did indeed go to that beautiful section of California and I did as well as I could, and I met some of his relatives including his lovely wife.

I have thought often of this very distinguished American. For one thing he had had many experiences. As the gentleman has pointed out here briefly, Congressman Saund had been a victim of discrimination. Sometimes it is very difficult to know what it is to experience this type of injustice and it is not until one experiences it that one can really comprehend it. But because of this Judge Saund was able to be sensitive and to be responsive to certain things which at that time, especially between 1956 and 1962, were not as pervasive in the consciousness of the people of our Nation as they are today. So in that respect Congressman Saund was a pioneer.

He also was the author of the bill that set forth the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group Committee. I have had the honor of serving on that committee now for about eight years.

So in many ways we are indebted to this distinguished American. I wish to join the gentleman from California and our other colleagues in expressing my deep condolences to the family and surviving relatives of this distinguished American.

Again I compliment the gentleman from California for allowing us the opportunity to set forth in the RECORD our sentiments.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his heartfelt remarks.

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

Mr. VEYSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN).

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, America's history books often recite the story of Abraham Lincoln walking 40 miles to borrow a book. There is also the story about Lincoln's determination to pay a debt even if it involved a few cents. Americans have long admired the traits of self-sacrifice and honesty and tried to emulate Lincoln.

The United States was indeed lucky that a young student in India during the early 1900's was also impressed with Lincoln's life and ideals. His name was Dalip Singh Saund, the first U.S. Congressman of Asiatic birth and ancestry.

D. S. Saund grew up in a proud and hard-working family in Chhajalwadi, India. During his studies in mathematics at the University of Punjab, he became interested in Mahatma Gandhi's efforts to secure independence for India through nonviolent tactics. Saund joined the struggle for liberation following the footsteps of Gandhi. At the same time he read about Abraham Lincoln and the democracy his own country was struggling to secure.

When Saund came to the United States, he was overwhelmed with the freedoms which most of us take for granted. He decided to stay here, where he could openly argue for or against anything. Mostly he spoke to civic groups about India's effort to throw off British rule.

Saund's first familiarity with American politics tested his belief that Americans were open and loving toward all men and would not judge people by their skin color. In 1949, after 4 years of effort, he helped secure citizenship rights for persons of Asiatic ancestry.

Soon after he entered an election in Imperial Valley, Calif., for the position of judge. It was a hectic campaign in which his ancestry was an issue. But he overcame this obstacle and won.

In 1956 he entered the campaign to become a U.S. Congressman from California. Saund never swayed from the Gandhi principles of loving one's enemies even in the fiercest political battles. Saund told the voters:

I am not running against anybody; all I'm asking for is a job, and it's up to you to decide whether I deserve your support or not.

As a U.S. Congressman from 1956 to 1962, Saund contributed a great deal to the welfare of his constituents. He listened closely to their problems and worked hard to help them. As a legislator he worked equally hard to provide constructive proposals. He always kept the underdog in mind, because of his own struggles to overcome prejudice.

Judge Saund and I worked together between 1960 and 1962 when I was a freshman in Congress. My personal admiration and respect for him was great and matched only by the admiration of his many friends and colleagues in the Congress.

The country and citizens of southern California were indeed fortunate to have as a public official such an ardent follower of Abraham Lincoln and Mahatma Gandhi. Saund's ideals, modeled after these two great men of world history, never faltered. He lived the principles this country was founded upon. D. S. Saund was in this sense a most "American" American.

I was extremely saddened by Saund's recent passing. Yet I know his life was full and rewarding and it is America which was rewarded most by his presence.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. DANIELSON) for his gracious remarks.

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

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON).

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my many colleagues today in paying tribute to the late California Congressman Dalip S. Saund. Although I did not have the privilege of personally serving with Judge Saund in the Congress, but as a Californian active in political matters, I was very much aware of the excellent reputation he enjoyed as Congressman for what was then the 29th District of California.

As a matter of personal interest, I now represent the 29th District of California and Judge Saund's secretary, Miss Toni McKenzie, is now my executive secretary.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there have been times in my office when unique problems have come up and I am not sure what to do, and Miss McKenzie has told me, "Well, when Judge Saund had a similar problem, he handled it this way."

That is a very valuable contribution.

As the first native of India to be elected to public office in the United States and the first ever to be elected to Congress, he was an important example to the peoples of Asia of what could be achieved through dedication and determination under the opportunities offered by our democratic system.

He was noted for his interest and activities in international affairs while serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee. The proximity of his congressional district to Mexico and his understanding of the mutual problems of our countries, prompted him to author legislation establishing annual interparliamentary conferences between the United States and Mexico. These official exchange visits have contributed greatly to the good relations we continue to enjoy with our neighbor to the south.

In addition to his legislative accomplishments, Judge Saund was noted for his dedicated service and the attention he gave to the problems and concerns of his constituents. He never lost sight of the individual as a person and felt that no problem of any of his constituents was too slight or unimportant to be considered. Not only will he be long remembered by his colleagues in the House, who had the privilege of working with him, but the many Californians whom he served so diligently will long hold his memory in esteem.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California (Mr. DANIELSON) for his gracious remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman in January of 1959, one of the first Californians to greet me was a man who became one of my closest friends and advisers.

Judge Saund had been in Congress for 2 years before I came to Washington but in these 2 years he had learned quickly and well the legislative procedures and operations of the House of Representatives. He had also proven to be one of the hardest working, most dedicated Congressmen I have ever known. He was a generous man and those of us who knew him are well aware of how he shared with his colleagues whatever information, knowledge, or skills he possessed.

I learned much from this hard-working Congressman and the lessons which he taught me in the years we served together have proven helpful to me ever since.

We all knew the judge was a native of Chhajalwadi, India, a graduate of the University of Punjab, and came to this country in 1920 as a graduate student attending the University of California. After obtaining his doctorate in mathematics he tried to teach, but was prohibited from doing this because he was an alien and instead in 1925 entered the farming business in the Imperial Valley. The judge began a long campaign to permit persons native to Asian countries to obtain citizenship, and the result of this effort which began in the early 1940's was that our former colleagues, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, who served so long and so faithfully in this House and Congresswoman Clair Both Luce sponsored legislation to achieve this goal. The legislation was enacted and the judge became a citizen December 16, 1949. The wisdom of this legislation was felt deeply by those of us who knew the judge for had it not been for the Celler-Luce bill Judge Saund could never have served in the House of Representatives.

The judge, as might be expected, served on the Foreign Affairs Committee and as a member of this committee contributed greatly to our understanding among the Members of the House of problems being experienced in Southern Asia and Southeast Asia and of course in his own native land where he was hailed as a "vivid example of democracy in action."

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee the judge sponsored and shepherded through the Congress legislation to establish the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conferences. As one who has participated in these conferences for many years I can personally attest to his wisdom in getting the legislators of our two neighboring countries together to discuss mutual problems. I feel that we have, through these conferences, achieved the goal of better understanding among officials and peoples of these two countries that Judge Saund sought in sponsoring the original bill.

There are many personal recollections of the judge and his wonderful wife, Marian. We lived for several years in the same apartment building. These memories will live with my wife and me the rest of our days as wonderful moments experienced with truly great friends.

Judge Saund served in Congress only a relatively few years, but his mark will be felt for generations to come, and especially for those generations from and interested in Asian nations. He was a fine public servant in the true sense of the word and he was a wonderful individual devoted to his family who, in turn, have stood by him during his long illness.

It grieves my wife and me that the judge is gone, but we know that the world is a better place for his having been here.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to serve in this House with Judge Saund. His keen mind, generous, and friendly manner, and ready sense

of humor made him a delight to associate with. His life is a magnificent success story which has been an inspiration to many others in his adopted country.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sentiments on this occasion honoring the late Member of this body from 1957-63, D. S. Saund of California. Judge Saund was a personal friend even though our respective service in Congress did not overlap. He represented Imperial County, where I grew up and still have family, and Riverside County, which Congressman VEYSEY and I jointly represent now.

Probably no freshman Member of Congress received as much attention as did Congressman Saund in 1957 during his first year in office. In short order he was sent on around the world tour representing the United States and was received enthusiastically by thousands of people in the Asian countries he visited. It was well deserved attention. He was a remarkable man who had overcome enormous obstacles on the way to being elected a Member of the most powerful and influential legislative body on earth. When Dalip Saund arrived in the United States in 1920, he was still a native of India. It was not until 1949 that he was able to become a citizen and then only as a result of a nationwide effort which he led to revise the Nation's immigration laws on behalf of all Indians in this country seeking to become U.S. citizens. Even the first public office to which he was elected in 1950 was denied him on a technicality due to the date of his naturalization.

During the depression, farming conditions caused him to lose his ranch property and threw him into \$8,000 debt. Unlike many others in similar circumstances who filed for bankruptcy, the easiest thing to do, Judge Saund was determined to pay off every one of his debts which he succeeded in doing several years later despite the hardship it caused him.

A man is molded to a large extent by the circumstances of his origins. Such was the case with D. S. Saund. His parents, though illiterate, believed intensely in the importance of education and saw to it that he was given the opportunity to receive a good one in India. It was this belief in education that led Judge Saund to come to this country to obtain further specialized graduate training and led him ultimately to receive a Ph. D. in mathematics at the University of California at Berkeley. Later as a community leader and Member of Congress, he pressed for high standards of educational curriculum and school equipment.

In the same manner he developed deep religious convictions that were to stay with him throughout his life. Although he was a regular contributor to Westmorland's Community Church and an active member of the House Breakfast Prayer Group, Judge Saund remained a devout Sikh, a Hindu religious sect that revolted against the unjust Indian caste system 500 years ago.

He had a strong sense of obligation to his community. Even before leaving India, he helped organize two cooperative banks in his town to make loans to vil-

lagers who previously had been victimized by moneylenders. He was a community leader in Westmorland, Calif. long before seeking public office. As a judge, he was instrumental in cleaning up a vice-ridden section of his town, forcing local merchants to observe pure food laws, and obliging the local police to behave in a manner worthy of the positions they held. As a Member of Congress, he was a diligent and devoted servant of his constituents, solving innumerable personal and public problems. He was an active member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author, among other things, of legislation enacted to provide for regular informal meetings of Members of the Congresses of the United States and Mexico.

As a young man, his fervent belief in the democratic system of government was molded by his reading the writings and biographies of Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. His own election to Congress, he believed, was a vindication of these convictions.

Judge Saund was a believer in the individual worth of every man. Once, when asked by a heckler if people would have to wear turbans in his courtroom, he answered:

My friend, you know me for a tolerant man. I don't care what a man has on top of his head. All I'm interested in is what he's got inside of it.

When Dalip Singh Saund arrived on our shores in 1920, the United States was the richer for it. Now that we have lost him, it is the poorer.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to those here assembled familiar with the personal and political exploits of Hon. Dalip S. Saund, who represented the California 29th District in this Chamber from 1957 to 1963, the news of his passing is received in a spirit of deep remorse. Throughout his lifetime he stood as a symbol of political integrity, personal ability, and democratic principle, in the eyes of thousands of Americans. And his independence, innate honesty, and unquestionable courage endeared him to the multitude both here in his adopted country and in India, his native land.

Born in Amritsar in Punjab, India, Dalip Saund graduated from the University of Punjab and migrated to the United States, where he arrived at the age of 20. Here he renewed his education, receiving a doctorate in mathematics at the University of California. Ineligible at that time, as an Indian, for American citizenship, he became the first president of the Indian Association of America which was largely instrumental in promoting an amendment to the U.S. immigration laws permitting the nationalization of Indian nationals. This was accomplished in 1946, by which time Dalip Saund had become a successful rancher and fertilizer dealer in the Imperial Valley of California.

As a community leader he was persuaded to accept a nomination for justice of the peace in the Westmorland District, to which post he was elected in 1953. Upon the occasion of his swearing-in, he became the first native Indian to hold an

elective office in the United States. Coming to the attention of Democratic Party leaders in his district, he received wide support in the Democratic primary contest of 1956 and captured the nomination; and when he easily won the general election in November, the victory was regarded both here and abroad as a great forward stride in American race relations, receiving considerable attention both in Asia and Europe.

In Congress, Dalip Saund was appointed a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He served with distinction, ability, and enthusiasm on both these committees. Under the Eisenhower administration, he was a well-known supporter of the President's position on foreign aid, and was always in his corner on that score, irrespective of political differences. In the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the major issue of the Eisenhower years was the pressing demand for statehood on the part of both Alaska and Hawaii; and Dalip Saund was ever in the forefront of this particular battle. On the House floor, he was only vocal, as a general rule, on matters pertaining to his committee assignments, with the exception of his frequent remarks on the farm question about which he, as a California farmer, knew more than many members of the Agriculture Committee itself.

The deep sympathy of Dalip S. Saund, as well as his vast sense of understanding, great knowledge, and good humor made Washington not only a more productive place during his tenure in the House, but also rendered it a more pleasant place to be.

A self-made man, with a strong sense of community purpose, Dalip S. Saund was one of the true reformers of his time, a great political force, and a distinct benefit to American society. I am grieved to hear of his demise, and would like to extend my fondest sympathies to all the members of his family.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to have served in this body with the late Dalip Saund of California. I cannot recall a man who has served here during my tenure who commanded more respect and personal popularity. He was a gentleman in the best sense of that word. He was knowledgeable, highly intelligent, and always devoted to any legislation, any cause, which would contribute to the betterment of this country and its government.

Judge Saund, as he was called, had many friends here. Always attentive and courteous, his conduct was always affable and beyond reproach.

I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to a good friend and a truly great American—the late and lamented Judge Dalip S. Saund.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues on this special occasion in paying tribute to Judge Dalip S. Saund, the first native of India ever elected to public office in the United States and the first to serve in Congress.

All of us in this Chamber who knew Dalip wholeheartedly concur with his autobiographical statement that his life was indeed "a vivid example of democ-

racy in action." Greatly influenced by the writings of Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, Dalip Saund was determined to translate to modern government the ideals upon which America was founded.

Once denied citizenship in the United States and the right to own land, Dalip enthusiastically assumed the mantle of leadership to change Federal law which discriminated against persons of Asiatic ancestry. In 1942 he helped organize and became the first president of the India Association of America which sought to obtain citizenship for East Indian residents of the United States.

Through unwavering dedication and resourcefulness Dalip Saund was prominently responsible for the successful passage of a bill, cosponsored by Representatives Emanuel Celler and Claire Booth Luce, permitting persons born in Asia to become U.S. citizens. What a proud and joyous day for Dalip Saund when he was naturalized in 1949.

Elected to the House of Representatives in 1956, Judge Saund conscientiously devoted his 6-year tenure in this body to the cause of civil liberty and rights for all Americans. As a member of the Interior and Insular Committee he authorized legislation granting equalization of properties owned by the Aqua Caliente Indian Tribe in the Palm Springs area, and providing equitable sharing of the assets of the tribe for all its members. He was also successful in obtaining approval of protection for dates against unwholesale imports, development aid for Indian-owned lands, and flood protection for his district.

To chronicle all his legislative achievements and personal successes during his lifetime could not begin to pay Dalip Saund the justice and honor he deserves. Those of us who knew and admired him in the House, remember him as a man of boundless energy, personal integrity, and strong convictions—consistently and tirelessly fighting for the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" for all Americans.

Mrs. O'Neill joins me in expressing sincere condolences to the family and friends of Judge Dalip Saund.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) arranging for this special order today and permitting me to join in this well-deserved tribute to our departed colleague, Judge Dalip S. Saund.

As Judge Saund himself said upon his triumphant return to his native India in 1957 as a representative of the U.S. House of Representatives, his life was a vivid example of democracy in action.

He was born in the village of Chhajalwadi, India, September 20, 1899; and graduated from University of Punjab with a A.B. degree, majoring in mathematics, 1919. He then came to the United States in 1920 where he enrolled at the University of California at Berkeley as a graduate student and earned M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in mathematics. After receiving his Ph. D. in 1924, he attempted to obtain teaching positions, but was unsuccessful, because he was not a citizen and could not be under Federal law. In 1925, he went to the Imperial Valley of California to enter farming.

In 1942, he helped to organize and became the first president of the India Association of America for the purpose of obtaining citizenship for East Indian residents of the United States.

He joined in an intensive effort to change Federal law prohibiting citizenship for all persons born in Asia. In 1946 a bill cosponsored by Congressman Emanuel Celler and Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce to permit persons born in Asia to become U.S. citizens was approved by Congress and became law. Mr. Saund became a citizen on December 16, 1949.

After long participation in community events in Westmorland, Calif., Saund was elected judge of the Justice Court in 1952 and served until his election to the House of Representatives in November 1956.

He was the first person of Asiatic ancestry to be elected to the Congress.

During his tenure of office he became much loved and respected by his fellow Congressmen, and I had the pleasure of serving with him on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

He was also noted as a strong advocate of Federal aid to education.

We shall miss this outstanding international figure and Mrs. Sisk and I extend our deepest sympathies to his wife Marian and surviving family.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I noted the recent passing away of a distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Dalip S. Saund of California.

Judge Saund was originally elected to the 85th Congress, and his distinguished service in this House extended through the 87th Congress. He holds the distinction of being the first native of India ever to be elected to Congress.

Prior to coming to the House of Representatives, Judge Saund had served in important positions in government in his beloved adopted State of California. He had been a judge of the justice court in Westmorland Judicial District immediately preceding his election to Congress.

It was my privilege to know and respect Judge Saund during his 6 years of distinguished service in this House. He will be long remembered for his many contributions and dedicated and effective representation of his district, and California, and his love for this country.

We all mourn the passing of Judge Saund, and I am honored to join with his many friends in the House in expressions of tribute and farewell to this highly esteemed former Member from California.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those paying tribute to the memory of our friend and former colleague in the House, the late Dalip S. Saund.

Originally from India, Congressman Saund received his graduate education in the United States earning both a masters and doctoral degree in mathematics from the University of California at Berkeley. Congressman Saund was an ardent community activist and civic leader and, after long participation in community events in Westmorland, Calif., was elected judge of the justice court in 1952. He was the first native

of India to hold public office in the United States and his subsequent election to the House of Representatives gives testament to the very high esteem in which he was held by the residents of his district. During his short but distinguished career in the Congress, which was interrupted by failing health, he proved their regard to be well-founded, and I have no doubt that all with whom he came in contact were affected by this same sense of admiration and respect for him.

A capable legislator and dedicated public servant, Dalip Saund will long be remembered as one of our outstanding Congressmen. It is with a deep sense of personal loss that I take note of the passing of one of my most respected supporters and political advisers, as well as beloved friends.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to add my sentiments to those already expressed today honoring the memory of the late Congressman Dalip S. Saund of California. I would also like to thank my colleague Mr. VEYSEY for arranging for this special order.

Judge Saund, as the first native of India to be elected to the Congress, was uniquely suited to sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee and served there with the distinction that characterized all of his official activities.

All who knew him were impressed with the range of his accomplishments and the depth of his commitment to serving his adopted country and its people.

He was a man of great determination and high goals. As a former colleague of his, I can say that I am proud to have served in the House with Dalip S. Saund and held him in highest regard.

I join with my colleagues in offering my deepest sympathy to his widow, Marian, and the entire Saund family on the death of this fine American.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a high honor to have the opportunity to pay my respects to our departed colleague, the late Judge D. S. Saund.

Although his tenure was relatively short, he was one of the most widely known and respected Members of the House. He was one of those rare persons who, without histrionics, held the attention of all those present when he took the floor to speak.

Respected by the minority as well as those of us in his own party, Judge Saund was a living testimonial to the concept that naturalized Americans from varying backgrounds can and do become great national leaders as elected officials of their adopted country.

Never for a moment did anyone doubt Judge Saund's loyalty to his Nation and his devotion to its cause. His patriotism was of a brand and a degree too often lacking in native-born Americans and was an inspiration to all of us who knew him.

The House of Representatives is the poorer for his loss, but a better body for his service among us.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I join in this tribute to our former colleague and friend, Judge Dalip Saund. Judge Saund was a man of immense warmth

and kindness who genuinely exemplified the spirit of our country.

During my first term in Congress, I had the privilege of serving with Judge Saund. I admired his ability as a legislator and frequently sought his wise counsel.

Born in India, Judge Saund obtained his graduate education in the United States. He became president of an organization with the goal of obtaining citizenship for East Indian residents of the United States. Because of his efforts, Congress passed a law enabling persons born in Asia to become U.S. citizens. He was elected judge of the justice court and served in that capacity until his election to Congress in 1956. Judge Saund received the distinction of being the first person of Asian ancestry elected to Congress.

Judge Dalip Saund will be deeply missed by everyone who knew him. He termed his life "a vivid example of democracy in action." May his memory serve as an inspiration to all.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action of the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) in obtaining time for the Members to pay their tribute to former Congressman Dalip Singh Saund who formerly represented portions of the gentleman's congressional district.

Judge Saund was born in Amritsar, India, on September 20, 1899. He was educated at the University of Punjab where he graduated with honors. He also obtained a Ph. D. in mathematics at the University of California, and he graduated from the California Institute of Technology.

Judge Saund volunteered for service in the Korean war and obtained the rank of lieutenant before he was honorably discharged.

Judge Saund, born a citizen of India, became a citizen of the United States and he was very proud of that fact. Many of his countrymen had immigrated from India and had become farmers in the great Imperial Valley. Judge Saund was interested in getting them to become citizens also. To this end, he organized the India Association of America for the purpose of encouraging his countrymen to become citizens.

Judge Saund was active in the civic activities of his home city of Westmorland, Calif. in the Imperial Valley and he became an elected judge of the Justice Court of the Judicial District of the County of Imperial. The fact that this former East Indian could be elected as a judge of the justice court was a tribute to his standing as a citizen and a businessman, and as an individual who was very proud of his American citizenship.

Judge Saund decided in 1956 that he would campaign for election to the U.S. House of Representatives. Here, again, the fact that the people of the congressional district which he served were willing to lay aside any prejudices or feelings that they might have in electing a foreign-born citizen was an example of the high esteem in which he was held by the people. He was elected to Congress on November 6, 1956, and was reelected to the 86th and 87th Congresses.

During the time he was a Member of the House, he served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Foreign Affairs Committee. Judge Saund was highly popular among the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans. He never failed to speak of his pride of American citizenship. As a matter of fact the speeches which he gave in his district during his first campaign were speeches which enunciated a deep and abiding faith in the American system of constitutional government, and his fervent appreciation of the fact that he had been accepted as a citizen in the country of his choice—the United States.

Congressman Saund was married to Marian Z. Kosa in 1928 and they were blessed with three children. His recent demise after a long period of illness left his wife and their three children as his immediate family survivors.

Congressman Saund's life was an example, to all of the people of his congressional district and his State, of the fact that an emigrant could come to the United States and establish by his own effort and his sterling character a reputation in his district as a judge of the justice court and as a U.S. Representative in the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying final tribute to Dalip Singh Saund, the first person of Asiatic ancestry to be elected to the U.S. Congress. Dr. Saund was a strong and courageous man whose determination and perseverance should stand as an example to all of us.

I was privileged to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Dr. Saund during his three terms in the House. My respect for his insight and dedication developed into admiration during this time, and I am pleased to be able to say that our service together also permitted the development of a strong, personal friendship.

A native of India, Dr. Saund came to the United States in 1920 to continue his studies at the University of California at Berkeley where he earned M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in mathematics. However, his efforts to teach were thwarted because U.S. law at that time prohibited him from becoming a naturalized citizen. He then turned his energies to farming.

In 1942, however, Dr. Saund helped to organize the India Association of America. Because of his initiative and leadership in this association, efforts to amend the Federal law prohibiting citizenship for all persons born in Asia were finally successful in 1946. Legislation sponsored by the former distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, made the necessary change in the law, and in 1949 Dr. Saund became a U.S. citizen.

Dr. Saund was first elected to Congress 7 years later in 1956 after serving as elected judge of the justice court in Westmorland, Calif. Under his leadership, legislation authorizing an annual inter-parliamentary conference between the United States and Mexico was enacted. He also served as the chairman of a special one-man subcommittee on the Foreign Affairs Committee and toured

Southeast Asia to study the working of the mutual security program there. His insights and his contributions to the Foreign Affairs Committee were indeed invaluable.

Dr. Saund's tireless campaign for the rights of all Americans and especially those of Asian origin serve as a model for us today. His life, as he said, was "a vivid example of democracy in action."

"The Judge" was a dear friend whose service in the Congress meant very much to me personally and professionally. I am saddened that his death is the cause for our remembering his strengths and contributions here today, and extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, Dalip Saund left Congress the year before I came here. I knew him well as a man. It was my misfortune not to know him better as a legislator, for I would have profited from his experience, precepts, and example.

When Judge Saund gained his seat in Congress in 1956, he had overcome obstacles such as few Members of this body have had to face. The biggest of these was his foreign birth. Judge Saund came to this country from India in 1920. Already holder of a degree in mathematics from the University of Punjab, he earned M.A. and Ph. D. degrees in mathematics at the University of California. Despite his credentials, however, he was unable to obtain a teaching position because he was not a citizen, and under Federal law at that time could not become one.

Undismayed, he joined in intensive efforts to change the law prohibiting citizenship for all persons born in Asia. That law was changed in 1946, and in 1949—29 years after he landed in America—Dalip Saund became a U.S. citizen. In November 1956, after serving for 4 years as a judge of the justice court in Westmorland, Calif., he entered a congressional race against famed aviatrix Jacqueline Cochran Odum. He won, and became the first person of Asiatic ancestry to be elected to Congress.

Contributing largely to that victory were the dedicated efforts of his daughter, Julie, and her husband, Dr. Fred Fisher, who labored tirelessly on his behalf. Julie's interest in people and her community, inspired by her father, is exemplified by her current campaign to gain a seat on the San Diego Board of Education. Her husband, Dr. Fisher, is a widely known marine scientist who designed the FLIP, a revolutionary 300-foot research vessel which stands on end for deep water studies. Together, Dr. Fisher and Julie formed part of a close-knit registration and canvassing team which led to the success of Judge Saund's first campaign.

Having gained this seat, Judge Saund more than justified the confidence displayed by the electorate. His achievements here were many and, as one might expect from a man who knew adversity, were aimed in great part at helping the poor and deprived, particularly American Indians.

Shortly after his election, Congressman Saund made a tour of Southeast Asia, culminated by a visit to his native

land where he was greeted by huge crowds. What he saw overseas impelled him to take a position regarding Vietnam which was first unpopular, then overwhelmingly popular in this country. He opposed our involvement in Vietnam, and was among the leaders of those who opposed that involvement. He lived to see his views widely accepted.

It has been aptly pointed out that we are born with our relatives, but that we can choose our friends. Dalip Saund, born in India, chose the United States for his own. This country is the better for his choice.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join this special tribute to the late Congressman Dalip S. Saund, a remarkable man and the first native of India ever elected to Congress.

His career is a lifelong illustration of the promise of our American system. As a new arrival from India, he attended the University of California at Berkeley, receiving a Ph. D. in mathematics. Upon graduation, finding his future made uncertain by a Federal law refusing citizenship to natives of Asia, Mr. Saund led a successful fight to remove this law—achieving his goal in 1946.

In 1949, he became a citizen and, after involving himself in local community service, was elected to the Justice Court. In 1956, Judge Saund ran a successful campaign for the U.S. House of Representatives seat from California's Imperial and Riverside Counties. His victory made him the first Asian ever elected to Congress.

During his years here in Washington, Congressman Saund served with distinction on both the Foreign Affairs and Interior Committees and was unofficial goodwill ambassador from Congress to the nations of Southeast Asia.

In his autobiography, "Congressman From India," Judge Saund termed his own life "a vivid example of democracy in action." He was a man who believed in and stoutly defended the American dream; for, even though he was born across the sea, he took America to heart and found the dream a reality.

He will be sorely missed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of former Congressman Dalip Saund in paying tribute to this man who overcame great adversity to become a leader in our State of California and the Nation.

Born in India, he came to the United States in 1920 where he earned a Ph. D. degree in mathematics at the University of California at Berkeley. Denied U.S. citizenship because of his birthplace, he was also denied the opportunity to teach in this country.

Thus, he went to the Imperial Valley to enter farming where he became active in community affairs. To change the law prohibiting citizenship for all persons born in Asia, Mr. Saund helped organize and became the first president of the India Association of America.

His efforts bore fruit in 1946, as a bill sponsored by Representative Emanuel Celler and Representative Clare Booth Luce to permit persons born in Asia to become U.S. citizens was approved by Congress and signed into law.

In 1949, Representative Saund became

a U.S. citizen. Three years later, he was elected judge of the justice court in Westmorland, Calif.

I first came to know him during this period, when I was serving as the chairman of the Democratic Party in California. He was an extremely able, personable man who loved his adopted country and possessed a great desire to serve his fellow man.

Those of us who knew and respected him, urged him to run for Congress where in 1956 he became the first person of Asiatic ancestry to serve in the House of Representatives.

Two years later, in 1958, he was instrumental in my election to the position of Lieutenant Governor.

In Congress, Representative Saund served on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He authored legislation establishing the Interparliamentary Conference with the U.S. and Mexico, and he authored a proposal which provided equitable distribution of properties owned by the Aqua Caliente Indian tribe in the Palm Springs area.

Mr. Speaker, as a student of Gandhi, Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson, Representative Saund had an unwavering determination to translate the principles on which America was founded into our modern government.

My wife, Lee, joins with me in sending our sympathy and condolences to his widow, Marian; their son, Dalip, Jr.; their daughters, Mrs. Julia Fisher and Mrs. Ellie Ford.

He was my friend and he was my adviser, and we shall all miss him, but his contributions to our society, which were great, will live in our memories forever.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing sorrow and in paying tribute to the late Judge Dalip Singh Saund of the former 29th District of California, the first American of Indian ancestry to be elected to the Congress.

It was my privilege to serve in the House and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with Congressman Saund. He represented his district, his State, and the Nation with dedication and devotion. As a man personally interested and sensitive to the conditions in developing and underdeveloped countries, Mr. Saund toured and studied the countries of the subcontinent of India and Asia upon the request of the then chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. His subsequent reports of those countries contributed to a broader understanding of Asia on the part of his fellow colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Although some years have passed since he served in Congress, Congressman Saund is well remembered in these halls. My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his wife, his children and grandchildren. May they derive some small consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by his friends.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on

the subject of this special order, Judge Saund.

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

There was no objection.

ABUSE OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign recently I was talking to a grocer who ran a small supermarket. He was very irate at what had just occurred in his store. A lady at the checkout counter was trying to buy dogfood with food stamps. He advised her that this was illegal, so she said, "All right, son," turning to her boy, "take these cans back to the shelf and bring me 3 pounds of hamburger," which he did.

Another grocer told me of a woman checking out checkout counter, and he remarked on the amount of fresh shrimp that she had. He commented, making a social pleasantry, that she must really like shrimp. She said, "No, as a matter of fact," she did not care for shrimp at all, but her cat liked it, and she could get fresh shrimp with food stamps and could not buy it in a can.

Mr. Speaker, these are just two of many abuses of the food stamp program.

The purpose of our being here today, and taking this special order, is to deal specifically with food stamps for strikers.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a number of my colleagues will join me in discussing why strikers should not be allowed to receive food stamps.

This practice is an abuse of a program which was originally approved for the primary purpose of providing low-income households with the means to obtain a nutritionally adequate diet, and it is estimated that the cost of providing strikers with food stamps is as great today as the cost of the entire food stamp program in 1969.

I am not opposed to organized labor, but I think that giving food stamps to strikers is fundamentally wrong. When we take the taxpayer's dollar and use it to prefer one side over another—to give one side an advantage over another—in a matter directly affecting the public and consumer, we are abandoning our principles of fair play and free enterprise.

According to a study by Armond J. Thieblot, Jr., and Ronald M. Cowin, entitled "Welfare and Strikes: The Use of Public Funds To Support Strikers," strikes are becoming more frequent and they are lasting longer. I believe any of us who read the newspaper can attest to that fact. Figures contained in the Thieblot-Cowin study indicate widespread use of food stamps by strikers and show a relation between the increased length of strikes and the increased use of public assistance by strikers.

During the General Motors strike of 1970, for example, it is estimated that about 50 percent of the 170,000 Michigan strikers received food stamps for at least 1 month. The overall food stamp aid cost

in that State during the 71-day strike was about \$10,673,000. Similarly, almost all—97.7 percent—of the Delaware County, Pa., residents striking against Westinghouse in late 1970 and early 1971 received food stamps during the month of January, 1971. Total food stamp aid costs during the 160-day strike were approximately \$659,000 in this county.

Man-days lost due to strikes increased from an annual average of 17 million during the early 1960's to 66 million in 1970, almost a 400 percent increase; moreover, man-days lost due to strikes of 60 days or more increased from 6,576,000 to 30,921,000, a striking rise of almost 500 percent. During just one of these lengthy strikes, cited in the Thieblot and Cowin study, one of 160 days at Westinghouse steam division plant in Lester, Pa., a local union leader admitted the great extent to which his union had relied on welfare benefits during the strike:

Yes, I think our membership now relies on welfare . . . I like to think that we could have stayed out for twenty-two weeks without welfare . . .

Certainly, this is a case of Government intervening to destroy the balance necessary for a successful collective bargaining system. The system depends on pressure on both sides to negotiate a settlement, and if strikers are receiving enough public assistance—a great part of which is food stamps—to keep them from needing to go back to work, there is obviously not the same amount of pressure on the strikers as there is on management.

If the Government through its intervention eliminates the pressure on one side, then it eliminates the incentive to negotiate in good faith and prolongs strikes. Prolonged strikes mean higher wages at settlement and eventually higher taxes. Therefore, we destroy the economic function of collective bargaining throwing the whole system out of whack.

Who suffers from the destruction of the collective bargaining system? We all do. Most especially, however, taxpayers suffer. They are forced to foot the bill for the strike in a backhanded manner, and they suffer most from increased prices and taxes. Would we have the courage to ask the taxpayers for a direct grant to strikers?

The American housewife has taken to the streets with signs of protest against the high cost of meat, and we say we sympathize with her cause. Yet, we ask her family to continue to pay high taxes to subsidize strikers so they can eat better than she and her family do.

What does the public think of this food stamp subsidy to strikers? An Opinion Research Corp. poll conducted in late May 1972 found 46 percent opposed to it and only 32 percent in favor. It found that even 39 percent of union members opposed the practice. The straw poll conducted following a National Educational Television "Advocates" program on the subject found an overwhelming majority of respondents opposed, and Congressmen polling their districts last year found similar results.

In my own district, I asked my constituents whether persons on strike should be eligible for food stamps or oth-

er public assistance. An overwhelming majority—83.2 percent—said "no." I was also involved in an open line radio show in Montgomery, Ala., on which several union people called in and said they did not think giving food stamps to strikers was a proper use of the food stamp program. A member of the Railroad Brotherhood said that after 7 days on strike, he and his fellow union members were receiving half pay from the union, and he and the majority of the brotherhood did not think it right that food stamps are available to strikers since most do receive money from the union strike fund. This money, furthermore, is not counted as income in determining eligibility for food stamps.

You have probably received letters during the past several weeks asking you to support the President's efforts to keep Federal spending down. I have been receiving mail on this subject through the years, and I can assure you the taxpayers in my district do not feel the least obligation to subsidize the striker so he can eat better than they do while he waits out the strike which is costing my constituents even more money in the form of higher prices and taxes.

What if the shoe were on the other foot? What if Government were directly subsidizing management when they could not ship or sell or manufacture because of strikes? Do you think either unions or the taxpaying public would favor this? Why should it be different for organized labor?

Food stamps are available without a waiting period and may be used even in short strikes. Program administrators customarily grant stamps readily and determine questionable eligibility at a later date—if at all.

According to the best information I could get, the practice is that anyone who is unemployed and claims to have no more than \$1,500 cash or liquid assets can qualify for food stamps. It makes no difference what your actual net worth is, if you claim to have less than \$1,500 in cash or liquid assets—and no one checks as a usual rule—you can say your take home pay is between 0 and \$20 a month, and with no purchase requirement—not even the 50 cents which used to be charged—you get food stamps each month for a family of four with a value of \$112 at the supermarket, or for a family of six with a value of \$152. This means that one who is voluntarily unemployed but—as an extreme example—owns a \$50,000 house free of debt, owns two new Cadillacs and a cabin cruiser, can get food stamps because neither he nor his wife work. He might be earning \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year normally and be on strike for a week or a month—and he qualifies.

Use of food stamps also leads strikers into other benefit programs designed to help the needy, not those voluntarily on strike. For many years unions could not draw upon public funds to subsidize strikes. Today, when unions are better financed and more powerful than ever before, there is no need to increase union power by substituting public moneys for union strike funds.

What are the union arguments supporting use of food stamps for strikers?

A principal argument is that food stamps are provided to the needy, regardless of the cause of their need, and that failure to furnish stamps to needy strikers will cause their children to go hungry. The purpose of the food stamp program is to provide improved levels of nutrition among low-income households. Strikers voluntarily withhold their labor. Any decline in their level of nutrition during the strike is voluntary and is ordinarily of limited duration. Moreover, food stamps have been available to strikers only very recently. Even though billions of man-days have been lost through strikes over the years, children did not starve during those strikes.

Unions frequently argue that strikers and their families are in need involuntarily, that they are not responsible for withholding their labor. Strikes were not protected at common law. Unions fought hard to obtain the broad strike protections now provided by statute. These statutory protections, which include procedures for calling strikes, carry with them a responsibility on the part of unions to care for members and their families who suffer injury through union activities supported by a majority of the bargaining unit. This burden should not be borne by the general public.

It is contended that many union members do not want to strike and thus deserve food stamps. Unions place great emphasis on their right to exclusive representation and forced union membership. When given these rights by statute, they incurred a corresponding responsibility to protect union members and their families who are placed in need by union conduct. If unwilling to fulfill this responsibility, they should forego compulsory union membership or the power to coerce unwilling strikers through fines and other disciplinary action.

A lot of people like to talk about the rights of strikers. What about the rights of the taxpayer?

When there was an automobile union strike and no cars were being made, the strikers got food stamps. What about the salesmen at the auto dealers who live on commissions? They did not have income sufficient to live on, but they could not get free food stamps. However, their tax dollars help subsidize the people who put them out of work and who were drawing food stamps.

The use of food stamps by strikers is a perversion of the objectives of the Food Stamp Act. Food stamps for strikers is an unintended consequence of a program designed to aid low-income families through better use of surplus foods. Its availability to subsidize strikers is maintained through exertion of vigorous union political efforts. If continued, food stamps for those intended to benefit from the program must be reduced or the cost of the program will continue to accelerate rapidly.

According to letters I receive, there are many of our working poor who really need help but cannot qualify because they have some income—and at the same time, because of the way the law is written, strikers many times less deserving are getting food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, the present policy of al-

lowing food stamps to strikers is contrary to good business and commonsense and should be abolished. I am pleased a number of my colleagues share this belief and have the courage to stand up and be counted.

Cosponsors of the bill follow:

COSPONSORS OF WM. L. DICKINSON'S BILL TO PROHIBIT THE ISSUANCE OF FOOD STAMPS TO STRIKERS

John B. Anderson (R.-Ill.).
Leslie C. Arends (R.-Ill.).
L. A. (Skip) Bafalis (R.-Fla.).
Robin L. Beard (R.-Tenn.).
John Buchanan (R.-Ala.).
John N. Happy Camp (R.-Okla.).
James M. Collins (R.-Tex.).
Philip N. Crane (R.-Ill.).
Samuel L. Devine (R.-Ohio).
Edwin D. Eshleman (R.-Pa.).
Don Fuqua (D.-Fla.).
George A. Goodling (R.-Pa.).
James A. Haley (D.-Fla.).
James E. Hastings (R.-N.Y.).
William M. Ketchum (R.-Cal.).
James R. Mann (D.-S.C.).
Robert H. Michel (R.-Ill.).
G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D.-Miss.).
Walter E. Powell (R.-Ohio).
John J. Rhodes (R.-Ariz.).
John R. Rousset (R.-Cal.).
William J. Scherle (R.-Iowa).
Gene Snyder (R.-Ky.).
Sam Steiger (R.-Ariz.).
David C. Treen (R.-La.).
Victor V. Veysey (R.-Cal.).
Lawrence Williams (R.-Pa.).
C. W. (Bill) Young (R.-Fla.).
Bill Archer (R.-Tex.).
John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio).
LaMar Baker (R.-Tenn.).
Ben B. Blackburn (R.-Ga.).
M. Caldwell Butler (R.-Va.).
Bill Chappell, Jr. (D.-Fla.).
John B. Conlan (R.-Ariz.).
Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.).
Marvin L. Esch (R.-Mich.).
O. C. Fisher (D.-Tex.).
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (R.-Cal.).
H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa).
John Paul Hammerschmidt (R.-Ark.).
David N. Henderson (D.-N.C.).
Dan Kuykendall (R.-Tenn.).
Robert B. (Bob) Mathias (R.-Cal.).
Wilmer (Vinegar Bend) Mizell (R.-N.C.).
Stanford E. Parris (R.-Va.).
Robert Price (R.-Tex.).
J. Kenneth Robinson (R.-Va.).
David E. Satterfield, III (D.-Va.).
Keith G. Sebelius (R.-Kans.).
Floyd Spence (R.-S.C.).
Steven D. Symms (R.-Idaho).
Guy Vander Jagt (R.-Mich.).
John Ware (R.-Pa.).
Bob Wilson (R.-Cal.).
Edward Young (R.-S.C.).

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, making food stamps available to strikers means that the hard-earned funds of the vast majority of working people are taken from them by the government and distributed to the relatively few persons who become involved in strikes and whose labor unions are perfectly capable of supporting their own efforts without public assistance.

A recent study published by the Industrial Research Unit of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania described the provision of various forms of assistance to strikers as "as unwarranted imposition on the public treasury and the private good. The benefits ac-

crue to a relatively small group which did not really need them in the past and does not need them now."¹ The study found that public assistance to strikers has a tendency to increase the cost of strikes to the general public.

The public depends upon the existence of a relative balance of power between labor and management to keep the costs of goods and services under control. When assistance is provided to union negotiators in the form of a virtually unlimited strike fund, the incentive to avoid lengthy strikes is greatly reduced. The result is bound to be felt by the public in many ways, including greater inconvenience and hardship because of the inability to obtain needed goods and services, higher prices due to the higher settlements which public assistance enables labor to win and which must usually be passed on to the consumer, and higher taxes, as a result of the increased burden which support of strikers places upon the Public Treasury.

In short, the provision of food stamps for strikers takes undue advantage of the generosity of the American taxpayer by requiring him to pay to support persons who are not truly in need and then to pay again in the form of more strikes, longer strikes, and higher prices.

Furthermore, the time has come to take another look at the congressional policy embodied in the Food Stamp Act. The "congressional declaration of policy" accompanying the act refers to utilization of "the Nation's abundance of food."² It is time that we recognize that that "abundance," upon which so many misguided programs have been based, may very well be a thing of the past.

In addition, we are all concerned about inflation and particularly alarmed at the unprecedented rise in food prices which has taken place in recent months. Food stamps have contributed to this inflation, first by increasing the purchasing power of consumers, which tends to drive prices up, and then by insuring that the full inflationary impact, which is expected to amount to \$2.3 billion³ in fiscal 1973, will be channeled into the market for food.

What is needed at this point in time is a thorough reevaluation of the food stamp program to bring the program into line with the realities of the seventies. Chief among those realities is that the vast majority of citizens are growing impatient with high taxes and the high cost of living. There is no reason whatsoever why tax money should be used to support strikes, which in turn drive prices higher. The result is higher taxes and higher prices for the consumer, and we in the Congress have a duty to eliminate a practice which is harmful and unfair to those who are required to support it.

On March 22, 1973, the Pasadena Star-

¹ Armand Thieblot and Ronald Cowan, *Welfare and Strikes* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Industrial Research Unit of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, 1972), p. 220.

² Food Stamp Act of 1964, 7 U.S.C. Sec. 2011 (1970).

³ Testimony of Harold C. Lumb, Consultant to the National Association of Manufacturers, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Considering S. 517, 93d Congress, 1st Session, p. 564.

News published an excellent editorial which most eloquently state the consumer's case against providing welfare, including food stamps, to strikers. The editorial said:

... It is a perversion of the principle of help to the needy, for the government to grant and the worker to accept such aid.

I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

NO WELFARE TO STRIKERS

The nation's consumers are threatened this year with what is expected to be one of the most damaging periods of labor discord on record. Some 4.5 million workers are covered by union contracts expiring this year, of which it is estimated about three million will go on strike.

These strikes will probably be longer and more costly than ever before because the average taxpayer is helping to subsidize them. Public welfare aid is coming to be a more important source of strike support than the union strike fund.

Such ridiculous practice is made possible through food stamps, Aid to Families with Dependent Children and, of all things, unemployment compensation.

It used to be that meager strike funds and the possibility of prolonged hardship without income mitigated against a strike. But those factors have become less pervasive in recent years as public welfare benefits have been successfully manipulated for the benefit of strikers.

It is possible that a person on strike can collect as much as \$350 per month in benefits, depending upon the state—the equivalent of about \$2 per hour on a working day.

Not only does such practice cause increasing inconvenience to consumers, higher prices and higher taxes, it threatens to undermine the entire system of collective bargaining. Unions and strikers are able to put relentless pressure on employers to acquiesce to their demands since resistance becomes futile when strikers are not greatly hurt by their walkout.

At the same time, the availability of welfare aid to strikers must inevitably lead to like benefits for employers in the form of tax advantages, low interest loans, insurance pools and others, all of which costs the taxpayer still more.

The whole disastrous effect of public welfare to strikers puts the system of collective bargaining out of balance, giving strikers a shield against the hardship of a strike and putting the government on the side of the unions in labor disputes. The federal government, making welfare available to strikers, thus is a partner to the demise of the system of labor negotiation.

The system began to get out of kilter in the mid 1960s with the loosening of the rules of some programs and a change in attitude toward welfare. The number of man days lost during strikes of over 60 days duration more than doubled from 1966 to 1970, from about 15 million to 31 million, once labor realized it could tap welfare's pot of gold for the benefit of strikers.

In some cases, union leaders have consulted with welfare directors far in advance of an intended strike to determine precisely what benefits would be available to workers if they went on strike, then let their members know how to qualify.

What a disastrous change in the attitude of the working man away from self sufficiency and willingness to take the consequences of his own decisions. The public owes a striker nothing.

It is an ominous sign of degeneracy in the strength and self reliance of the American working force, and a perversion of the principle of help to the needy, for the government to grant and the worker to accept such aid.

The need for change in federal and state welfare regulations to preclude the granting

of welfare aid to strikers is obvious. Congress must change the food stamp program to make strikers ineligible for such aid as well as Aid to Families with Dependent Children. States which allow workers to collect unemployment benefits when on strike must also change their laws to prevent such practice.

Granting of welfare aid to those who have chosen to walk off their jobs on strike is an intolerable abuse of public assistance and must be terminated.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made this afternoon and say to him I am glad to have had this opportunity to cosponsor the legislation which he is so ably espousing.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for his kind words and also for his participation here today. He is a cosponsor of the bill which I might say at this time has 56 cosponsors. I anticipate the number will rise even higher.

I am very pleased now to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As a cosponsor of the bill to prohibit food stamps for strikers, along with the gentleman in the well, I would like to make a brief comment.

I do not know that I will exactly have a question to ask, but I do understand—and perhaps the gentleman can assure me that this is the right figure—there are some \$2.5 billion being spent now by the U.S. Government on food stamps. Is that correct?

Mr. DICKINSON. I think the figure is substantially correct, and if it is not, we will correct it in the RECORD.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I will ask the gentleman, also, if he does not think with this sort of artificial pressure that perhaps food stamps have a marked effect on the prices in the marketplace that the housewife pays for food. Do you think that might be a correct statement?

Mr. DICKINSON. It is an absolute statement of fact which has been proven. This is one of three main thrusts that motivated me to sponsor this legislation and to oppose the concept of allowing strikers to be eligible for food stamps.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I will then close my comments with this brief statement.

I would, of course, like to associate myself with the entire comments of the gentleman in the well and would also like to say that perhaps the theory of permitting needy people in the country to have the flexibility and the privilege of the selection of foods that are important through the use of the food stamp program is no doubt commendable.

But, on the other hand, I most sincerely believe that we must tighten up the guidelines not only on food stamps for strikers, but when we have a program that permits a woman to buy very expensive fresh or frozen shrimp to feed her cats, then I do not think that is a fair way to expend the taxpayers' money. It would not be so bad if we had the money to spend, but this is the time when it is

all being part of our deficit financing in this country, and I believe that that is a very dangerous course we are on.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and the contribution the gentleman has made.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, Congress changed the status of the food stamp program from a pilot project authorized by the executive branch to a full-scale national program authorized by law. Since I was not a Member of Congress at that time—and since I am now a member of the Committee on Agriculture and participating in hearings on the food stamp program—I went back and reviewed some of the initial discussions and debates for my own education.

And, even a cursory review of the 1964 debate on the bill indicates that Congress intended the program to aid the involuntarily poor, not those who voluntarily, for one reason or another have temporarily reduced their short-run earning power to increase it over the long run.

Thus, I am grateful to Mr. DICKINSON for requesting this special order, and appreciate the opportunity to express my own concern about strikers being eligible for food stamps.

Time and time again over the past decade, it has been pointed out that this program was intended to help the needy—the unemployed, the unemployable, families on welfare, mothers with dependent children, the aged, the blind and disabled—in short, those people who through no fault or choice of their own are involuntarily the victims of incomes inadequate to provide them with the quality, quantity and kind of food necessary to assure a proper diet.

At this time when we are faced with a critical budgetary situation and must make every dollar stretch as far as it can possibly go, there is an even more imperative necessity to clarify who has the greatest need for assistance through the mechanism of the food stamp program. Who should have priority when Federal funds are limited?

Those involved in labor disputes have far more alternatives for financial assistance than do mothers with dependent children, families on welfare, the unemployable, and other involuntarily poor and needy people. Strikers have access to special funds provided by their unions, and ordinarily they have a salable skill and assurance of work in the future. Every food stamp dollar provided to strikers means there is one less for someone more genuinely in need.

It has been said that legislation such as I have cosponsored to exclude strikers from coverage under the Food Stamp Act is "cruel." Well, is it not cruel to reduce the help which can be offered to the aged, the blind, the disabled, widowed mothers with large families, et cetera?

This is the tragic study of so many of our welfare programs. We change criteria and qualifications, or let down restrictions, and the result is always that the pie has to be cut into smaller pieces. Available funds get spread thinner so that the truly needy are squeezed even

further, and are denied adequate assistance for basic needs. What has been barely adequate becomes less than adequate.

Let us speculate for a moment on the total costs of just one program abuse—\$115,751 in Federal food stamp money given to strikers during 1 month in Detroit, or \$85,428 in Montana during one strike. And here I am talking about only the amount of Federal tax money spent to supplement the strike fund allotments—this does not include administrative costs of additional offices and personnel required to handle a temporary flood of food stamp requests or the amount contributed by the stamp recipients.

Let us estimate that the Federal Government spends \$100,000 on strikers in each of the 48 States participating in the program. This is not unreasonable, based on available case histories. It is, in fact, a conservative estimate. An average of \$100,000 per State quickly mounts up to \$4.8 million per month taken away from the truly poor and needy. Others estimate a cost of some \$240 million a year for a "normal" year in which about 3,000,000 workers would be idled by strikes at one point or another. I do not consider this insignificant at all. It is about the same as the total appropriation for the entire food stamp program benefits in 1969.

The irony in this situation becomes even more apparent when you stop to consider the double blow this is giving the hard-core disadvantaged. Not only are they being deprived of this amount, initially, but they are also victimized by the inflation such subsidies aid and abet.

Food stamps ought not to be a tax-financed strike fund supplement. They should not be used to aid special interest groups at the expense of the poverty stricken.

I urge my colleagues to put an end to this abuse of our food stamp program.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 6708, a bill to prohibit food stamps to strikers, I would like to outline the reasons why I believe it is legislation which must be passed.

By authorizing food stamps for men on strike, we are supporting a growing national trend toward using welfare money to back up union walkouts. Welfare money is tax money, and this trend means that the taxes paid by all citizens are being used to benefit a few citizens.

Who benefits from strikes? The Government certainly does not, and, in fact, it spends much money, time and effort in helping to mediate walkouts. So there is no reason for the Government to give welfare support to strikers out of self-interest.

The public does not benefit from strikes. Every walkout causes the public some kind of inconvenience, and when the settlements result in big, new contracts, the public ends up paying for them in higher prices. So there is no reason to give welfare to strikers in the public interest.

The people who benefit from strikes are the workers and their families who win a new contract to their liking because of the walkout. But it is these same people who we use to justify the practice

of giving welfare to strikers. We say that these families must not be made to suffer just because there is a union-management dispute. But these families are in that position because the workers, through their unions, have chosen to go on strike. That means the practice adds up to welfare for people who have made a decision not to work. And that is unfair to other American families who work to pay welfare benefits to strikers who have elected not to stay on the job.

The result of this trend toward unions reaching into the public welfare pocket is that strikes are getting longer, contract settlements are getting bigger and the taxpayer is picking up the tab.

The striker on welfare is able to hold out longer and thereby win bigger and better contracts. The longer the strike, the more public inconvenience; and the bigger the contract, the more public expense; but the taxpayer pays; for it anyway.

The unions have everything to gain and nothing to lose when welfare becomes their personal plaything. They no longer have to develop a strike fund. Instead their decision to strike can be based on the knowledge that government will pay the cost of supporting workers' families. And that welfare support is no hardship because there is evidence that it can be as much as 80 percent of average take-home pay.

What kind of climate for labor negotiations develop when the management side is the only one suffering? The workers do not have to get back to their jobs because there is the welfare check. The unions do not have to worry about a dwindling strike fund.

Only one side has a real interest in a short-term walkout, and their way of keeping it short must be to give labor what it wants.

It is time for the Federal Government to get itself out of the business of welfare support to strikers. It is time to get back to our original commitment in the field of labor-management relations—to promote the public interest by helping achieve the fairest possible settlement in the shortest possible time. As a starter we should say bluntly that strikers shall not receive food stamps. That is what H.R. 6708 gives us an opportunity to say.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to making food stamps available to striking workers. The food stamp program was enacted by Congress for the purpose of making nutritious food available to low-income families at prices they can afford. Food stamps were not originally intended to be used to subsidize workers who voluntarily choose to strike for higher wages and more fringe benefits. A large number of workers, however, have voluntarily left their jobs to take part in strikes and have taken advantage of the food stamp program. This misuse of Federal funds is not only costing millions of tax dollars, but has created a situation where the Federal Government, in effect, has become a partner with the labor unions by issuing food stamps to strikers. This interference in the collective bargaining process has served to prolong strikes and increase their economic impact on the Nation.

In order to correct these injustices, I

am cosponsoring legislation which will prohibit food stamps from being issued to striking workers.

I believe there are several fundamental reasons why the Food Stamp Act should be amended.

First, the Government should not, under any circumstances, provide direct subsidies to either side of a labor dispute which culminates in a strike. Since strikes are voluntary actions taken with the full knowledge that a loss of income will result, the Government should not be expected to provide financial aid to either side. The responsibility belongs solely with the unions and management.

Second, the Government should not do anything which would strengthen the bargaining position of either labor or management during labor negotiations. Food stamps have served to increase the unions' ability to endure longer strikes. This tends to make the final settlements cost more resulting in higher costs to consumers for products and services.

Government interference in the collective bargaining process is not in the spirit of our basic labor laws and policies. In addition, it is contrary to our principles of free enterprise and fair play.

Third, the Government should stick to the purpose of the Food Stamp Act which is to "provide improved levels of nutrition among low-income households" through a program of food assistance.

I believe the Food Stamp Act must be amended to correct these injustices and insure that help is provided to those who really need it most.

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this discussion and commend my colleague from Alabama for taking the time for us to clear up some of the misimpressions that exist in Congress and among the general public regarding the issue of food stamps for strikers.

It is a real puzzle to me how striking employees and those engaged in labor disputes can still be receiving food stamps when this issue has been debated as often and as thoroughly in Congress as it has. I have reviewed the history of this dispute rather carefully and I simply do not see any rational basis on which fairminded men can justify issuance of food stamps to strikers.

It is one of the most clearcut cases of the abuse of a Federal program that I can think of, and it simply defies all logic that it can have persisted, unabated, over such a long period of time in the face of so many efforts to reform it.

I do not intend to engage in a lengthy review of the issue today. Anyone who is seriously interested in understanding the arguments and equities of this dispute can find them documented in two frequently cited sources: *ITT v. Minter*, 435 F. 2d 939 (1st Cir. 1970), which, in terms of its level of rationality, logic, and intellect, I consider unworthy of a Federal court, but which is the landmark case bearing on this issue; and the very excellent study by Armond Thiebolt and Ronald Corwin of the Wharton School of Finance, entitled, "Welfare and Strikes: The Use of Public Funds To Support Strikers." The latter develops such a reasoned and comprehensive case against

the present policy that I believe this irrational debate may at long last be drawing to a close thanks to the work of these two gentlemen.

The primary arguments against the present policy are briefly stated in the summary of conclusions, in chapter IX of the study which I quote:

In summary, the conclusions of this study are that paying welfare benefits to strikers is an unwarranted imposition on the public treasury and the private good. Organized labor's relative bargaining power before public support was certainly great enough to be influential. The additional power which \$329 million per year in direct benefits can buy may well upset the relative bargaining positions of unions and managements so greatly that the fundamental structure of collective bargaining will be seriously threatened. The general public must pay the costs, not only directly through higher taxes and higher prices, but also indirectly through greater disruption to the economic system and through inflation. The benefits accrue to a relatively small group which did not really need them in the past, and does not need them now.

These points must, I think, be generally conceded on both sides, in light of the facts developed by the study.

However, there is one argument, irrational but telling, which is always made in defense of the present policy. It is with this argument I want to deal today, because it is a myth that has been so widely circulated it will require much time and diligent effort for the truth to catch up with it.

The argument is, of course, that the families—specifically the children—of strikers will suffer hunger and privation unless food stamps are made available to them. It is the kind of humanitarian argument which, if true or accepted as true, rolls over all the other arguments like a tidal wave over sand castles, demolishing them completely.

The problem is that there is very little truth in it. That is why I have referred to this entire debate as irrational. On a factual, economic, equitable basis, the idea of subsidizing strikers with food stamps could not have survived a single year. But almost solely on the emotional strength of a mythical need to feed helpless little children, it has survived every attack. Therefore, I want to lend my efforts today to helping truth catch up with fiction.

Those who have argued that to prohibit food stamps to strikers is unfair to little children have given little recognition to the fact that most strikes occur at the end of a contract period which is specific in terms of time and known to the employee from the beginning of the contract. Most such contracts run for a 3-year period. Thus, the worker has a specified time frame in which to plan for the eventuality of a strike.

As Mr. Otto F. Wenzler, labor relations manager for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce so effectively pointed out in recent testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee, "aid to needy people" is not the only issue involved in this dispute, as some labor officials have tried to insist. Workers do not apply for food stamps "only when they are in desperate need of assistance."

The fact is that under current USDA regulations, a striking worker may have

as much as \$1,500 in the bank; may own in certain circumstances, as many as three automobiles; may have a working wife earning more than twice the minimum wage; may have the income of any children under age 18 who are students living at home; and may have a net income himself of as much as \$360 a month—he may have all this and he and his family remain eligible for food stamps. In addition, the \$360 monthly income is a net figure after deductions for such things as income taxes, social security, union dues, shelter costs in excess of 30 percent of income, medical expenses in excess of \$10 per month, educational expenses for tuition and mandatory expenses even when covered by scholarships, grants, loans, et cetera, and such nonrecurring income as that derived from inheritances, sale of property, gifts, and income tax refunds.

Clearly, the problem is not hungry families. It is simply a question of who is going to pay the bill for time lost from the job because of a strike.

Another point at which the sincerity of the union argument about hunger and humanitarian motives breaks down is in connection with the policies of the unions themselves. A comprehensive survey of national union strike benefits, for instance, concludes that payments to striking workers usually do not start until the second or third week of a strike. Their policies in this regard, as Mr. Wenzler points out, are sound. When workers know in advance that they may face a strike, it would be absurd for unions not to expect them, in their own interests, to have made provision to carry themselves for a week or so. Since many strikes are over in 2 weeks, there is under this union policy often no need to tap the union treasury at all during a strike. Yet, the Federal Treasury can be tapped immediately by those who, owing to their loss of weekly income, are eligible for food stamps and other welfare benefits.

Further, union benefits for striking workers are usually payable only when the parent union has approved the walkout, without regard for alleged hungry families. A union member who is behind in his dues or assessments is often prevented from drawing strike benefits regardless of his family's need. By these actions, unions imply what they will not say—that it is only the Federal Government that should concern itself with hungry people—not unions.

But perhaps the most important point to be made is that "the hungry family argument" ignores a basic union responsibility. A union is responsible for authorization of a strike and has the corollary obligation to authorize a return to work when its members indicate a desire or need to do so. Government intervention in a labor dispute between private parties, by subsidizing union members with food stamps, perverts the process and permits the union to abrogate its responsibilities.

This is not a "union busting" argument, as some may claim. Free collective bargaining with the right to strike at its core is the cornerstone of Federal labor policy. The Supreme Court has made clear on two occasions that—

The right to bargain collectively does not entail any "right" to insist on one's position free from economic disadvantage.

American Shipbuilding Co. v. NLRB, 397 U.S. 300, 309 (1965); and that the "results of the contest" must be left "to the bargaining strength of the parties." *H. K. Porter Co. v. NLRB* 397 US 99, 108 (1970). Any strike burden which workers cannot or will not shoulder for themselves clearly falls on the union as an element of its bargaining strength, despite the economic disadvantage it may impose.

In summary, then, we should note that—

First. When workers have 3 years to plan for the economic dislocation of a strike and know the exact time frame in which it may come, it need not and should not result in hunger and privation for their children.

Second. If workers do not assume the appropriate responsibility to plan ahead and provide for their families in the event of strike, that responsibility falls on the unions as part of the balance of power in collective bargaining—not upon the taxpayer in general. The union has the same avenues of increasing dues and strike benefits as the Government does of increasing taxes and food stamp benefits. Thus, the question is not hunger or need, but who foots the bills.

Third. Even if food stamps were to be made available to strikers in cases of real need, present regulations clearly permit workers to receive food stamps while retaining both liquid and non-liquid assets which might reasonably be expected to be applied to meeting that need.

Fourth. Any able-bodied man has the option of failing to provide for his family, either by refusing to work or by spending his earnings for things other than the family needs. In such a case, the Federal Treasury does not move in and subsidize his family despite their need, though in extreme cases of neglect or abuse, the State may take his children from him. A striker, who has ample notice to prepare for the economic exigencies of a strike, has no more reason to expect a public subsidy than one who for any other reason refuses to plan for the care of his family when he is able to do so.

In conclusion, I urge that this abuse of the food stamp program be ended. Children of strikers would not be penalized for their parents' actions any more than Congress intended to penalize children of parents who regularly refuse to accept available employment. We have only had the food stamp program since 1964. Strikes were successful for many years prior to that time and their history is not replete with starving and deprived children.

It will not be replete with such cases if this abuse of food stamps is ended. That is the essential weakness of ITT against Minter—it looked only at the social impact of denying benefits to strikers. It gave no attention to the impact of continuing such benefits, which had not been a tradition in American labor relations. Had the court looked at that side of the coin, it would have answered some of its own questions. It

would have noticed, as it did not, that denial of benefits to strikers will cause no hardships to the families of strikers which they have not traditionally borne themselves and mitigated to the best of their ability in the past.

Of course, food stamps will ease their burden. And this is precisely the point. It eases their burden at the expense of people to whom the burden does not belong and to the detriment of healthy collective bargaining endeavors.

It is not a question of hunger and need. It is a question of responsibility and who pays the bills.

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this body. I am delighted to be able to engage in this discussion on food stamp eligibility. It is long overdue. To those who have organized this special order and who have long sought to correct the deficiencies of the Food Stamp Act, and the misinterpretation of congressional intent on exactly who should be eligible for food stamps, I would offer my special thanks.

Since the 1964 Food Stamp Act was enacted, the question of whether its benefits should go to those who voluntarily choose not to work, has been unfortunately and increasingly assumed to be the right of the striker. Nothing could be further from the truth or from the original intent of the Congress in passing this legislation.

In the Sixth District of Tennessee national union leadership does not generally speak for the rank and file, and the vast majority of my constituents consider issuance of food stamps to strikers a blatant abuse of our welfare system.

The people of my district are fed up with having to finance a program which does not serve the truly needy, but serves as a backup fund for unionists unable to reach accords with management.

The people of my district do not appreciate a logic which says his tax dollars must be made available to subsidize crippling work stoppages.

The people of my district have given me a mandate to do everything in my power to end this subsidy and the favoritism it displays.

Mr. Speaker, 1973 is going to be a critical year, not only by virtue of the expiration on June 30 of the food stamp program, but also in collective bargaining contracts.

In 1973, about 864 collective bargaining contracts covering 1,000 or more workers effecting a total of 4.7 million workers are scheduled to be renewed. Contract negotiations are scheduled in our Nation's major industries including transportation, construction, automotive, farm implements, electrical machinery and rubber.

If we suffer from long strikes and at least half of those on strike would qualify for food stamps for strikers under the \$1,500 assets rule, the cost of providing food stamps to these individuals could conceivably run as high as \$338 million this year alone. In 1971, there were 739 strikes which lasted 60 days or more involving 3,271,000 workers.

According to a report from the U.S. Department of Labor, in the month of February 1973, there were 590 strikes in

effect involving 200,000 workers costing 1,281,000 man days of idleness. This included 11,000 striking teachers in Philadelphia. Converted into food stamp costs for February alone, the food stamp to strikers could amount to \$1,233,500.

Food stamps and other welfare programs for strikers have changed the collective bargaining process over the years. Congress has created the current state of affairs which encourages and prolongs strikes and enables union officials to hold out for unreasonable demands without pressure from the rank and file. The result is more strikes and longer strikes, and inflationary settlements. The Government's food stamps and other welfare programs resulted in contracts with shorter durations which replaced the prevalent 3-year cycle of bargaining. This trend has been accentuated by a large jump in the number of 1-year contracts.

It is obvious that the unions have misused food stamps and other welfare programs for strikers. Food stamps have become a part of the union's assorted maneuvers for controlling the labor contract negotiation mechanism.

While a few contend that food stamps should be available to anyone in need for whatever the reason, many others feel that stamps are for those who are involuntarily, not voluntarily in need. They believe the use of the food stamp program is an unfair Federal intervention into collective bargaining on behalf of the unions. They believe that there is simply no justification for the continuation of the food stamp program as it is presently constituted. I agree with them. It diverts money from the program originally enacted to help the truly needy who cannot help themselves. It discriminates against 80 percent of the work force which is not unionized and does not strike, but which pays taxes to subsidize those who do. It prolongs strikes and enables unions to hold out for inflationary wage settlements.

To correct this situation, I believe that the proposal offered by my colleague, Mr. Dickinson, H.R. 5029, which I am pleased to cosponsor, effectively addresses these points. I hope it will be soon adopted by this body.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the professional unionists, in a vain attempt to defend food stamp subsidies, seek to inflame public opinion, charging that those who oppose a taxpayer subsidy to one who refuses to work, are taking the food from the mouths of hungry children.

Let us take a look at this. In 1970, the UAW negotiated the following contract for their 355,000 members working for General Motors. It was a 3-year national agreement providing wage increases from 49 to 61 cents effective November 23, 1970. The contract included a 26 cent cost-of-living adjustment employees would have received during the previous agreement if a limit of 16 cents had not been provided. Other terms included a cost-of-living increase from 16 to 21 cents to cover the current cost-of-living allowance incorporated into the base rate. In addition, effective October 1, 1971, the contract provided optional early retirement after 30 years service at \$500 per month and a normal pension rate in-

crease of \$1.75 to \$7.25, \$7.50, or \$7.75 a month for each year of credited service depending on the hourly rate. This is not all. The contract also included improvements in the life and health insurance program of the worker and his family.

Does this sound like a breadwinner whose child will starve if the Federal Government will not provide food stamps when he voluntarily chooses not to work? Or, does this indicate to you that the Government should not be a third party in the collective bargaining process by providing food stamps and other welfare benefits to strikers?

The issue is not a question of starving children. We are not talking about the poverty-stricken people for which the food stamp program was originally intended. We are talking about highly paid unionists, earning in some cases up to \$20,000 or more a year who want the public to give them discounted food at the expense of Americans who remain at work. This issue is that food stamps and other welfare programs were not designed by the Government as a tool for organized labor, but increasingly they have been bent that way. The issue is that food stamps and welfare payments to strikers amount to a Government subsidy of strikes and make strikers less inclined to reach a settlement.

Mr. BAFAKIS. Mr. Speaker, recent studies have determined that welfare benefits received by strikers, primarily in the form of food stamps, now total more than \$300 million annually. I don't know how this astonishing fact affects my colleagues, but I personally find myself outraged that the American taxpayer is footing the welfare bills of these people who are voluntarily unemployed. I feel the case of strikers receiving huge welfare subsidies while striking for higher wages and more benefits is the classic example of those in our society who abuse these programs.

The end cost of this abuse to the taxpayers is more than just the \$300 million for food stamps. By virtue of the fact that the families of strikers can receive food stamps and other welfare benefits, the hand of the unions is being strengthened in its ability to prolong strikes and to make more and more demands. Obviously, the end result of this is higher prices to the consumer to cover the union's benefits. To my mind, this represents direct Government interference in the collective bargaining process. In matters such as this which directly affect the public and consumer, we are abandoning our principles of fair play and free enterprise.

A recent study conducted by the Wharton School of Finance shows there is a direct relation between the increased length of strikes and the increased use of public assistance by strikers. A good example of this relationship is the 1970 General Motors strike. During this massive strike, the total cash benefits to General Motors' strikers' families in Michigan was more than \$4 million with the number of families covered by these programs in that State increasing from 4,000 to over 22,000 during the period of the strike.

Even union representatives have not denied the impact of public assistance in their bargaining process. In the 1969

General Electric strike, representatives stated that public assistance was one of the key contributions to the union's success in securing all its demands. Similarly, I. W. Abel, now president of the Steelworkers Union, acknowledged that during the 1959-60 steel strike, public aid made the strike durable and exceeded by far the amount that the union poured into the districts and local.

Obviously, the end effect of all this is the erosion of the process of collective bargaining which has long served as the backbone of our economy, at the direct expense of the Nation's taxpayers—both in higher taxes and higher prices. In an attempt to prohibit this abuse, I have joined in sponsoring H.R. 6708 which would make strikers ineligible to receive these welfare benefits. Certainly this Congress must unite in action to end this blatant abuse of public funds once and for all.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join with my distinguished colleagues in discussing the matter of eligibility for food stamps.

I have cosponsored Congressman DICKINSON's bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to exclude from its provisions every household in which there is a person who is on strike—although this ineligibility would not apply to any household that was eligible for and participating in the food stamp program before the start of such a strike.

It has always been my feeling that welfare assistance should be limited to those persons who are unable to find employment. It makes no sense to take our tax dollars to subsidize voluntary unemployment. Recent studies have also indicated that the availability of welfare assistance to strikers has increased the length of strikes and therefore given one side a weighted advantage in the collective bargaining process.

In addition, the rapidly increasing cost of welfare services must be seen in the light of the continually expanding need. Therefore, it is only sensible to channel all the money available toward our truly needy citizens, who have no other recourse but the State for their daily bread. We are a wealthy country but we cannot care for our poor adequately if we try to stretch our tax dollars too far.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) for this special order today. It is most appropriate that the abuse of the food stamp privilege in this country be revealed and the need for remedial legislation emphasized. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) has also been a leading exponent of this need for strong and meaningful legislation in this area. Many other Members have joined in this movement.

According to Dr. Armand J. Thieboldt, a professor of management of the University of Maryland, an estimated \$300 million in welfare benefits were paid to strikers in 1972.

This is indeed a preposterous misuse of public funds and tax dollars paid by men and women who worked to support those who choose not to work.

Abuse of the food stamp privilege has been a popular and convenient source of assistance that is being provided to those who by their own choice do not

work—those on strike. This is a monstrous policy that allows welfare to be misused in this manner, and is manifestly unfair to taxpayers.

Moreover, it is axiomatic, and often contended by labor unions, that when a strike is in progress the Government should be neutral and should not favor either side. It is amazing to me, therefore, that the labor unions would condone this preferential practice by the Federal Government. I have an idea that if the Government stepped into a stricken plant to provide special help to management, the affected union would scream to the high heavens—and with good reason.

Therefore, in the interest of taxpayers and of neutrality, the Dickinson bill to exclude members of households who are on strike from food stamp privileges should be approved. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Dickinson measure.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem facing our country and its long established system of collective bargaining is that, in recent days, we have witnessed a situation in which workers on strike have become the recipients of Federal and State financial assistance.

In West Virginia, for example, a coal strike caused 15,000 new families to be added to the food stamp program, a fact which swelled the State's total food stamp role by 20 percent. In 1 week, the West Virginia State Welfare Department distributed \$1.7 million in food stamps to the miners' families and declared that the Federal Government had paid for the program.

Another example is provided by a strike against the Dow Chemical Co. in Bay City, Mich. In its paper of September 6, 1972, the Christian Science Monitor reported that—

About 135 of 165 workers now in the seventh month of strike against the Dow Chemical Company . . . are receiving unemployment compensation averaging \$79 a week, payments that Dow contends lessen the strikers' incentive to negotiate a settlement.

In a recent address, Dr. Herbert Northrup, chairman of the Labor Relations Council and director of the Industrial Research Unit of the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, pointed out that during a strike at General Motors.

We figured that almost 30% of the General Motors employees in Michigan were on food stamps and 20% on welfare . . . We've made studies of local situations such as the long Westinghouse strike at the Lester plant outside of Philadelphia. We found out that the Welfare Department took on 10 people to take care of the situation.

In cases such as these, the agencies of government have provided workers with their sole strike benefits. The labor unions themselves, in such situations, paid no strike benefits at all.

Such a state of affairs tends to encourage and prolong strikes. Dr. Northrup notes that—

It enables the union to hold out without pressure from the rank and file. If there is one thing that was clear in both the General Electric and General Motors strike, it is that there was no pressure on the rank and file to settle the strike.

When no pressure exists to settle a strike, the strike tends to continue, costing all concerned, workers, management, and the taxpayers, huge amounts of money. In addition, it makes a significant difference in the character of the result, usually leading to increased inflationary pressure.

Collective bargaining is based, at least in part, upon the assumption of government neutrality. Dr. Northrup declared that—

The collective bargaining system in the United States cannot work satisfactorily if the public purse becomes an extension of the union treasury for paying strike benefits.

This, however, is clearly what is happening. Government is becoming a silent partner in labor-management disputes, assisting labor unions to prolong strikes and eliminating pressures upon the union leadership from the rank and file to accept settlements.

A study recently published by the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School has sharply criticized the trend of the past 5 years to use public funds to aid strikers. The study is entitled, "Welfare and Strikes: The Use of Public Funds To Support Strikers."

The study pointed out that strikers sometimes collect as much money from public relief agencies as they were taking home from their jobs and that almost \$15 million worth of Federal food stamps alone were distributed to strikers in a major walkout in 1970. Union leaders in another major dispute collected over \$5 million a week in public relief.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that Government subsidies to strikers in 1973, a heavy bargaining year, could go as high as \$304 million. The Chamber believes that much of this will come from a food stamp program originally designed to improve the nutrition levels of low income families, and that other money would seriously drain the reserves of other welfare programs needed to help those at the poverty level, including aid for dependent children.

George B. Morris, Jr., a key labor negotiator, contends that—

Permitting the trend toward public assistance to strikers to continue is one of the surest ways I know to destroy collective bargaining.

Mr. Morris says that it "cushions the impact of strikes on the union and the striking workers and thus tends to encourage and prolong strikes."

In the 71-day strike of the United Automobile Workers against General Motors in 1970, an estimated \$30 million was spent in public welfare benefits to the strikers. Of this sum, nearly \$16 million was spent in Michigan alone by 54 of the State's 83 counties.

In New York State, workers meeting certain conditions become eligible for unemployment compensation after being off the job for 7 weeks. General Motors estimates that about \$5,250,000 in unemployment compensation was paid by New York to General Motors strikers.

In effect, since the unemployment insurance fund in New York is funded through a tax on employers, General Motors was forced to subsidize its own striking workers.

Under the food stamp program and other forms of public aid, combined with union strike benefits, General Motors strikers were able to endure the 71-day strike with a minimum of economic hardship. Some of them lived as well as, or even better than, when working full time.

The University of Pennsylvania study shows that under the food stamp largesse, one striker, with six children, paid \$26 for \$180 worth of stamps. He confessed that shopping was a dilemma "because you don't know what to buy."

The availability of food stamps in this and other strike situations prompted other eye opening reports, among them:

One striker had more food stamps than his family could use, so he sold the stamps so he could buy liquor.

A local grocery store owner reported some of his customers who were receiving food stamps were eating expensive steaks and chops every day during the strike.

Strikers were receiving so many food stamps that their freezers were being filled with steaks and roasts that would feed their families for months after the strike.

The authors of the University of Pennsylvania study conclude that—

Paying welfare benefits to strikers is an unwarranted imposition on the public treasury and the private good.

They make it clear that the overwhelming weight of opinion unearthed by their study is that tax supported benefits to strikers reduce economic pressures on the strikers for a settlement, thereby prolonging the strike and leading to costly and inflationary settlements.

One simple answer to the problem is for the Congress to simply declare that strikers are ineligible for tax supported benefits. The time to take such action is now—before this unfortunate practice becomes institutionalized and before the inflationary pressures it will produce go beyond our ability to restrain and control them.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for securing this time in order that we might fully discuss the legislation several of us have introduced today to prohibit strikers from receiving food stamps. This is a very important measure and involves an issue which I feel must and should receive the fullest attention.

Let me say at the beginning that my sponsorship of this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with being pro-labor or pro-business. I have always tried to approach each piece of legislation dealing with labor and management as a separate entity and decide each one on its individual merits. It is with this same philosophy that I decided to cosponsor the bill to prohibit food stamps for strikers.

My basic thinking is that to allow strikers to receive food stamps has resulted in a gross inequity in our collective bargaining system. By allowing strikers to be eligible for food stamps, the Federal Government in essence is subsidizing strikes. Just as I would be totally opposed to the Government paying business for their losses during a strike, I am opposed to the Government providing assistance to strikers.

Under our present laws, contract negotiations are supposed to be free of any Government intervention except in two main instances—if either or both parties request a Federal arbitrator or if the President calls for a cooling off period by invoking the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the present eligibility of strikers to receive food stamps has resulted in Federal intervention in the collective bargaining process that I feel is unwarranted and must be stopped. It is my very firm opinion that both sides in labor negotiations should be on equal footing and certainly the Federal Government should not show partiality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort to return stability to the collective bargaining process.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when the legislative schedule permits me to spend some time in my congressional district, talking informally with citizens in all walks of life, I am continually impressed by the strong public concern about abuses of the welfare system.

In particular, I am questioned as to why something cannot be done to confine the availability of food stamps to individuals and families who are in urgent need through no fault of their own.

Citizens who are at work and paying taxes resent the fact that a portion of their taxes is being used to subsidize the feeding of families whose able-bodied wage earner is absent from available work by choice, as in the case of a labor dispute.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to divorce this matter from emotionalism.

Certainly, we do not want children to go hungry.

Certainly, we do not want to use the welfare system as a strike-breaking tool.

Labor-management disputes should be settled within the framework of the legitimate collective bargaining process.

This is the very point of the legislation before us.

The food stamp program should not be a lever in the hands of either management or labor. We should make plain that it is intended only to help those who cannot help themselves—those who, because of age, physical disability or unavailability of gainful employment, require public assistance in sustaining themselves and their families.

Historically, members of labor unions have made their judgments, in potential strike situations, on the basis of their view of the merit of their cause and their individual and collective resources available to maintain a strike.

The availability of food stamps, however, has added a tax-financed resource, and this, Mr. Speaker, is clearly wrong.

It is not my expectation, Mr. Speaker, that strikes will be forestalled by enactment of the pending legislation. They will continue to occur when the collective bargaining process breaks down.

The Federal Government, however, should be removed from the area of incentive to the instigation or prolongation of strikes.

The individual striker, in consultation with the members of his family and the officers of his union, should make his own

determination as to whether or not the strike can and should be instituted and maintained without the subsidy of food stamps.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the practice of making food stamps available to striking workers has been of concern to me for some time, and I know I do not need to review with my colleagues the legislative history of this issue or the efforts that have been made to prohibit this use of food stamps.

Neither do I need to recite the evidence which has been presented on numerous occasions indicating the extensive use of food stamps for this purpose. It is estimated that program benefits to strikers run into the hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

I do, however, want to outline some of the basic reasons supporting the view held by many of us that issuance of food stamps to striking workers simply cannot be justified, that the practice is, in fact, damaging, both from a social and from an economic standpoint, and that a specific prohibition against this use of food stamps should be incorporated into the law.

The original thrust of the food stamp program was to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households whose members do not have the resources to help themselves—the involuntarily poor. Nowhere in the history of the legislation establishing this program do we find an expression of congressional intent to extend program benefits to those who have adequate resources to sustain themselves and their families but have chosen not to use them—the voluntarily poor.

And yet, because the language of the law itself has not clearly made this distinction, we find ourselves in a situation today where as much as 10 percent of total annual program benefits may now be going to one particular category of voluntarily poor—striking workers.

Providing food stamps to those who voluntarily stop work in order to improve their pay or employment benefits is not only contrary to the original purpose of the program, but it also constitutes an unwarranted intrusion by Government into the labor-management bargaining process. It helps tip the scales to labor's advantage in a situation where the Federal Government should remain as neutral as possible.

Additionally, it has the effect of reducing the total amount of program funds which could otherwise be made available to those who really need help and have nowhere else to turn.

Beyond the question of whether or not providing food stamps to strikers is wrong in principle looms the even more critical question of whether such a practice makes any sense from an economic standpoint at a time when we are desperately trying to control the upward drive of consumer prices and hold down the skyrocketing balance-of-trade deficits.

The strike is a significant and necessary economic tool for U.S. labor, and has been used responsibly and well to improve the economic conditions of countless millions of workers in this country. But, this is not at issue here,

nor is the fact that the strike has also been used irresponsibly from time to time, contributing to our problems of inflation and balance of trade.

The issue is whether or not it is appropriate for the Federal Government to provide an indirect subsidy which has the effect of prolonging such work stoppages and weighting the balance of the collective bargaining system on the side of labor.

Taxpayers are, in effect, forced to subsidize strikes in a way that encourages inflated wage settlements which they, as consumers, wind up paying for in the form of higher prices for goods and services. While we certainly cannot begrudge any segment of the economy the opportunity to obtain a fair return for its labor or product, we must be judicious in the kind of leverage we allow any one group to use to gain advantage over another. The use of the food stamp program as a strike-support mechanism is clearly beyond the pale of reasonable economic leverage.

Few will argue that excessive use of the strike or artificial prolongation of work stoppages is not damaging to our economy. In 1970, 6 years after the passage of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, the number of work stoppages hit a new all-time high of 5,716. The number of strikes from 1956-60 was 18,233. From 1961-65 there were 17,961 strikes. But, from 1966-70 there were 25,460. The number of strikes lasting 90 days or more jumped from 200 in 1960 to 334 in 1970.

The number of strikes almost doubled between 1960 and 1970, the percentage of the labor force involved in strikes more than double, and the loss of man-days more than trebled. We do not need to draw a picture to understand what this means in terms of economic instability and inflation.

We have heard numerous arguments in the past against amending the law to specifically prohibit issuance of food stamps to striking workers, but none of them are compelling. On the contrary, the preponderance of evidence supports the case for prohibition.

We have been presented with emotional appeals based on the specter of starving wives and children, but this argument becomes increasingly hard to accept as the general level of affluence in the labor force increases.

The timing of most strikes is well known in advance, allowing any thoughtful person to take the necessary provident steps. Most unions have their own strike funds, and many States provide welfare assistance to those on strike. In addition, most of the proposals offered to amend the food stamp law, to date, have contained provision for the continued eligibility of any household that was eligible for and participating in the food stamp program prior to the start of a strike.

In summary, then, the adverse effects of the policy of providing food stamps to striking workers has been amply documented. This practice simply cannot be justified, and now is the time for Congress to face up to the problem once and for all.

There is no conflict between support of the basic right to strike and simul-

taneous support of prohibiting food stamp benefits to the strikers. I urge my colleagues in the House to support our efforts to correct this abuse of the food stamp program.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks immediately following my remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT AND ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S NEW BUDGETARY DIRECTIONS

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1973, President Nixon spoke to the Nation on radio. In his address "The New Budget: Charting a New Era of Progress," he stated:

At noon tomorrow (January 29), I will send to the Congress one of the most powerful documents I will sign as President—my budget proposals for the coming fiscal year.

The President indicated that his budget "calls for spending \$250 billion in the current fiscal year 1973, \$269 billion next year—fiscal year 1974, commencing July 1, 1973—and \$288 billion in fiscal year 1975—beginning July 1974."

To achieve this objective, the administration has embarked upon two courses: First, the impoundment of certain moneys already appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1973; second, the termination and/or pruning of funds in the fiscal year 1974 budget for specific categorical programs. On page 50 of his January 29, 1973, budget message, President Nixon notes that—

The actions taken and proposed to reduce spending in this fiscal year, when combined with the FY 1974 budget proposals, will reduce federal outlays by \$17 billion in 1974 and by about \$22 billion in 1975.

What is the purpose of this effort? This question was answered succinctly by the President in his January 28 radio talk:

It is time to get big government off your back and out of your pocket. I ask your support to hold government spending down, so that we can keep your taxes and your prices from going up.

Other crucial queries, of course, are: What fiscal year 1973 funds have been impounded? What specific programmatic cuts does the fiscal year 1974 budget detail? These shall be examined in the following two subsections.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 1973 APPROPRIATED FUNDS

House Joint Resolution 1, enacted January 19, 1973, required the administration to submit to Congress, no later than February 10, 1973, a list of funds impounded during the period from July 1, 1972, to January 29, 1973. On February 5

the Office of Management and Budget reported a figure of \$8.7 billion. (See exhibit A.)

Many observers contend that this sum is too conservative. A study headed by Representative JOE L. EVINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations, revealed that more than \$12 billion was being "withheld, frozen, and impounded by the Office of Management and Budget." (See exhibit B.) The Communication Workers of America Fact-sheet estimates that, of the money already appropriated by Congress, "the President has determined that he will not allow \$14.7 billion to be spent," including \$3 billion in HEW funds.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROGRAMMATIC CHANGES

The \$17 billion net "savings" projected in the fiscal year 1974 budget is illusory. According to Hobart Rowen, financial editor of the Washington Post, of this amount "about \$15 billion are in gimmicks, or part of a numbers game, and the rest is real." A recent study issued by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress verifies Mr. Rowen's conclusions. The JEC report reveals that reductions of \$8.4 billion were "not real savings at all." Many of the estimated reductions represent cuts from commitments that have never been made. For example, the fiscal year 1974 budget proposes a savings of \$2.7 billion by limiting "outlays through the operation of the administration-supported statutory ceiling on social services grants—already enacted by Congress." How can \$2.7 billion be saved when Congress already has limited social services expenditures to \$2.5 billion?

However, a number of programs are faced with "real" cuts. Mr. Rowen estimates that \$10 billion has been "sliced out of money basically ticketed for the poor and underprivileged." These reductions include: welfare, \$1.5 billion; medicare and housing, \$1.5 billion; manpower programs, \$1 billion; health, education, and poverty programs, \$1 billion; pensions and retirement, \$1 billion; environment, \$1 billion; agriculture, \$1.5 billion; water and natural resources, \$0.5 billion; all others, \$1 billion.

The fiscal year 1974 budget also reflects an anticipated shift in the method of disbursing funds. In the introduction to this document President Nixon reaffirms his support for the special revenue sharing concept. He states:

I remain convinced that the principle of special revenue sharing is essential to continued revitalization of the federal system. I am, therefore, proposing the creation of special revenue sharing programs in the 1974 budget. These four programs consist of broad-purpose grants, which will provide state and local governments with \$6.9 billion to use with considerable discretion in the areas of education, law enforcement and criminal justice, manpower training, and urban community development. They will replace 70 outmoded, narrower categorical grant programs and will, in most cases, eliminate matching requirements.

MY OWN STUDY

As President Nixon has suggested, current impoundment efforts, coupled with his fiscal year 1974 budget recommendations, represent "a new era." Indeed, the directional changes outlined by the administration are so profound that their

potential impact is difficult to measure. Thus, for the past 3 months I have undertaken a detailed investigation of this new fiscal approach to determine whether the "new era" represents a "better era."

To ascertain its effect nationally, I have read extensively and have conferred with several eminent economists.

Understandably, the effect of administration fiscal procedures upon Ohio's Third Congressional District also concerns me. Consequently, on Friday, March 23, and Saturday, March 24, I conducted ad hoc budget hearings in the Dayton-Montgomery County Public Library. Invited to testify were representatives of various political subdivisions and government and private agencies whose operations are supported by Federal funds.

Hearing procedures conformed to those regularly followed by congressional committees and subcommittees. Each witness, due to time constraints, was limited to a 20-minute appearance—a 10-minute prepared statement followed by a 10-minute question and answer period. In all, 55 citizens, serving 28 organizations, participated in the ad hoc budget proceedings. (See exhibit C.)

THE ISSUE TWO BASIC CONCERN

Impoundment, the level of fiscal year 1974 appropriation requests, and the implementation of special revenue sharing in lieu of categorical grants pose two fundamental questions.

First, does this new fiscal direction meet our Nation's needs in such areas as education, health, housing, the environment, manpower training, and poverty?

Second, are inflation and tax increases the only alternatives to termination of impoundment and the retention of human resource categorical programs in the fiscal year 1974 budget?

In researching these two issues, I have utilized both macro-economic and micro-economic analysis. Ohio's Third Congressional District, obviously, has been the focus of my "microscope." That being the case, a description of my district and a brief recitation of its needs is in order.

OHIO'S THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—ITS PROFILE AND ITS PROBLEMS

The 463,140 residents of Ohio's Third Congressional District are compressed in a 230-square-mile urban-suburban area in the southwest part of the State. Approximately 68 percent of the population dwells in two adjoining communities—the city of Dayton, 243,601, and the city of Kettering, 69,599; 74,649 blacks are segregated in the western portion of the city of Dayton. An estimated 72,000 white Appalachian migrants are quartered in East Dayton.

Dayton is afflicted with all of the inner-city ills confronting other urban communities throughout the United States—whose population, incidentally, is 68.6 percent of the Nation's total.

First, both black adults and black youth experience an above average rate of unemployment. Overall joblessness in the model cities area is 26 percent. Unemployment among those youths, ages 16 to 21, is an astronomical 70 percent.

Second, the level of education is sub-standard. Of those persons in the district

who are 25 years of age and over, 57,792, 23.1 percent, have not progressed beyond the eighth grade.

Third, there is a substantial incidence of poverty. As of 1969, 7,925 families—6.7 percent of the district—received less than \$3,000 annually. The total yearly income of another 7,282 families—6.2 percent of the district—was in the \$3,000 to \$4,999 range.

Fourth, housing is inadequate. 51,980 of the district's occupied dwelling units, 34.8 percent, were constructed more than 34 years ago.

Fifth, the crime rate is high. In 1970 and 1971 the total crimes reported in the city of Dayton were 31,312—128 per thousand population—and 27,960—115 per thousand population—respectively. During those same 2 years crimes reported in the model cities section of West Dayton were 252.1 per thousand, 1970, and 220.1 per thousand, 1971.

Sixth, the poor, largely due to malnutrition, are more vulnerable to disease. The Health and Welfare Planning Council of Montgomery County found that those whose income is below the poverty level were disabled 12.2 days per year. Members of families whose incomes exceeded \$7,000 yearly lost only 6 days through disability.

How will efforts to solve those problems be affected by impoundment of fiscal year 1973 appropriated funds, fiscal year 1974 budget recommendations, and the institution of special revenue sharing? The following sections detail the results of my research:

THE FINDINGS

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

On February 4, 1971, President Nixon forwarded to Congress his message on general revenue sharing. His arguments for adopting this plan paralleled those which I advanced in 1966 when I first espoused this theory.

First, personal income and corporate profits, as a source of public revenues, largely have been preempted by the Federal Government.

Second, as a consequence, State and local tax receipts have not kept pace with the demands for services at those levels of government.

Third, there are certain problems which are unique to a particular State or community.

Fourth, State and local, rather than Federal, officials are best able to identify these peculiar needs.

After citing his rationale for general revenue sharing, President Nixon explained how it would work. He stated:

The specific appropriation level I am recommending is 1.3 percent of taxable personal income; this would mean a General Revenue Sharing program of approximately \$5 billion during the first full year of operation, a sum which would rise automatically to \$10 billion by 1980. All of this would be "new" money—taken from the increase in our revenues which would result from a growing economy. It would not require new taxes nor would it be transferred from existing programs". (Emphasis mine.)

On June 22, 1972, the House of Representatives, by a 275-122 vote, approved the administration's general revenue sharing plan. In keeping with my own

views, combined with the President's assurance that its implementation would not affect existing categorical projects, I supported H.R. 14370. With the President's signature, the general revenue sharing bill became law on October 20, 1972. Initial allocation to political subdivision in my district included \$2,100,342 to the city of Dayton, \$1,319,031 to Montgomery County, and \$168,387 to the city of Kettering.

My recent budget hearings make it clear that the administration has "changed the rules in the middle of the game." Several witnesses testified that they were advised by Federal authorities to seek general revenue sharing funds to continue programs ticketed for termination. In his article of April 7, 1973, Dayton Journal Herald reporter John Felton notes:

Dayton, for example, found that it will have to use nearly \$800,000 in general revenue sharing money this year to continue federal programs cut in the budget.

The biggest chunk—\$500,000—will go later this year to continue paying the 130 employees under the Emergency Employment Act program when it expires.

Another \$150,000 will be used for summer youth jobs, and \$100,000 has been set aside to continue a soon-to-expire program of abolishing nuisance structures.

City Commission has earmarked \$50,000 for several smaller programs about to end.

Thus, it is evident that general revenue sharing offers less "new money" than advertised, and it is being financed, in part, through cessation of existing categorical commitments. Had I been aware last year that Congress was being "led down the primrose path," I would have voted against H.R. 14370.

PROBLEM OF TRANSITION—APRIL 1, 1973, TO JULY 1, 1974

Impoundment and the proposed fiscal year 1974 budget have created a fiscal dilemma for many communities throughout the Nation, including those in my district. Three facts contribute to this situation.

First, it is anticipated that the current withholding effort will continue at least until July 1, 1973—and in some instances for a longer period—at which time the administration hopes its four special revenue sharing programs will become operative.

Second, funds requested in the fiscal year 1974 budget reflect the administration's desire to reduce or eliminate certain categorical projects—as previously noted—in favor of special revenue sharing.

Third, the appropriations bills now before the Congress allocate no new moneys to one of the four special revenue-sharing categories—urban community development. With new commitments dropping to zero in fiscal year 1974, metropolitan centers, between July 1, 1973, and June 30, 1974, suffer a 100-percent reduction in funds available for extension of those projects now being financed through categorical grants.

From my March 23-24 budget hearings, plus subsequent investigation, I have been able to construct the following irreplaceable loss in Federal assistance—that is, grants not replaced by special revenue sharing—in the Third Congres-

sional District between now and June 30, 1974:

Impoundment—fiscal year 1973 funds	
HUD water and sewer grants	\$1,400,000
Open Space (4 parks in Dayton; 1 in Kettering)	322,625
Code enforcement—Five Oaks area	666,500
652 FHA units (McLin Village; Young Estates; Kettering Senior Citizens; Vandalia), mortgage value	10,779,828
National Science Foundation projects:	
Wright State University	50,000
University of Dayton	416,500
Higher Education Act—veterans cost of instruction (Sinclair, U.D., Wright-State), minimum estimate	897,000
Total impoundment	\$14,532,453

Fiscal year 1974 allocations—Reductions from fiscal year 1973 (either due to impoundment or nonreplacement by special revenue funds)

Open space	\$910,625
Water and sewer	1,400,000
Neighborhood facilities	450,000
Urban renewal—neighborhood development	5,000,000
Urban Renewal—code enforcement	1,960,500
Model cities—Inner West	947,000
Montgomery County Community Action Agency (legal aid; ombudsman, etc.)	1,900,000
Public employment program	2,039,227
University of Dayton:	
College library resources	7,000
Student loan programs	800,000
Research	662,000
Other programs	80,500
Sinclair Community College:	
College library resources	6,000
Student loan programs	561,603
Wright State University:	
College library resources	60,000
Student loan programs	796,000
Research	368,000
Third District School Districts:	
ESEA title II programs (library materials)	161,808
NDEA III	97,736
School Assistance—federally affected areas	1,736,052
Health programs:	
Drew Neighborhood Health Center	262,220
Dayton Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse	268,000
Higher Education Act—veterans cost of instruction (Sinclair, U.D. Wright-State), minimum estimate	986,700
Total	21,460,971

In human terms, the effect of these program terminations is incalculable. Monetarily, they represent a \$35,993,424 income loss to the Third Congressional District. When a 2.5 "multiplier"—(an economics principle which recognizes that each dollar received is respent several times by subsequent recipients) also is calculated, the true loss to the Greater Dayton area during the next 18 months is \$89,983,560.

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING—JULY 1, 1974

As discussed previously, the administration has requested Congress to approve four special revenue sharing programs. If the authorization measures are approved this year, funding, with the exception of urban community develop-

ment, will commence July 1, 1973. How will special revenue sharing affect the Third Congressional District? Its effects, according to Mr. Howard E. Bales, associate director of research and development, Wright State University, as yet "cannot be measured." This opinion was echoed by other witnesses who participated in my ad hoc budget hearings. Indeed, there is no certainty that Congress will adopt the President's special revenue sharing recommendations. Even assuming legislative implementation, at this juncture total funding levels still are in the "recommendation" stage, channels of disbursement are not prescribed, and distribution criteria have not been defined. Consequently, for those local agencies and political subdivisions presently operating federally funded programs, these uncertainties make fiscal year 1974 planning difficult, if not impossible.

While long-range planning is important, special revenue sharing must be examined in the light of a more basic consideration. As proposed, does it improve, or degrade, our ability to cope with sub-standard education, unemployment, inadequate housing, growing crime rates in the inner cities, and the high incidence of disease among the poor? Specifically: First, is the dollar commitment adequate to meet these needs? Second, conceptually, does special revenue sharing represent a more efficacious method of coping with these problems?

My own inquiries, buttressed by the sentiments registered by those attending my budget session, lead inescapably to a "no" answer to both queries.

First, special revenue sharing will allocate less funds to urban needs than do present categorical undertakings.

Many of the categorical authorizations, through which the core cities now receive their funds, will be terminated.

As noted previously, no new urban community development projects will be authorized in fiscal year 1974. Only \$600 million in new commitments will be accepted by HUD in fiscal year 1975.

Special revenue sharing commitments for education—excluding school lunches—are pegged at \$2.5 billion for next year, \$600 million less than the categorical level in fiscal year 1972—\$3.1 billion.

Special revenue manpower commitments for fiscal year 1974—\$1.340 billion—are \$360 million below the previous categorical high.

No special revenue sharing is contemplated to replace many of the expiring categorical health programs.

Governmental units, not now receiving categorical aid, will share in special revenue disbursements. Thus, even as the size of the "pie" shrinks, it will be divided among more consumers.

Dayton and its counterparts throughout the United States, therefore, most certainly will suffer a substantial per capita contraction of Federal support with the advent of special revenue sharing. This means that the following Third District projects, now supported by categorical programs scheduled for phase-out, may face partial or complete loss of funds during the coming fiscal year:

Present Third District categorical programs which may be refunded through special revenue sharing:

Manpower revenue sharing:	
Neighborhood Youth Corps (board of education)-----	\$557,040
Manpower training programs-----	925,400
Better Schools Program (educa-	
tion revenue sharing):	
Title VI-B, ESEA (validating the placement of the inner- city child)-----	29,000
Vocational and adult educa-	
tion -----	1,325,000
Total -----	2,836,440

Second, special revenue sharing is a less viable means of dealing with urban problems. This conclusion is predicated upon five factors.

In relinquishing its policymaking role to State and local officials, Congress has abandoned its responsibility for establishing national goals. Special revenue sharing concerns itself more with the means of distributing Federal funds than with the objectives which these monies are addressed.

Social prejudices will inhibit many State and local officeholders from voting to channel funds into minority-assistance projects.

Suburban communities are unlikely to direct their new-found revenues toward the solution of central-city problems. The distinguished Pulitzer Prize winner, David S. Broder, recently noted that this new fiscal approach represents "a callous sacrifice of the minority who are poor" in favor of "the many who are complacent and comfortable".

(d) Intergovernmental coordination, now being advanced through the A-95, planned variations, and chief executive review processes, becomes more difficult with the proliferation of independent decisionmaking authorities.

Local governments will be burdened with the costly, and perhaps impossible, task of replacing the technical expertise now provided by those administering Federal categorical programs.

From the foregoing it is clear that, for the central city, such as Dayton, special revenue sharing represents an inadequate substitute for the present categorical aid system.

A counterbudget?

Mrs. Sybil B. Silverman, speaking for the National Association of Social Workers, Inc., at my budget session, strongly urged congressional adoption of "a rational counterbudget that will reflect lifegiving social support for the national citizenry." I replied that, regrettably, current congressional fiscal procedures preclude any immediate entertainment of this suggestion.

Presently the House and Senate Appropriations Committee submit 14 individual budgets, plus a number of supplements thereto, for consideration of the Congress. Each of these proposals is acted upon separately and bears no relationship to the total budget. Furthermore, the congressional appropriations process often is not completed until well into the new fiscal year.

In a radio address delivered on October 7, 1972, President Nixon described the failures of this system:

Congress not only does not consider the total financial picture when it votes on a particular spending bill, it does not even contain a mechanism to do so if it wishes...

The Congress, thus, has no sure way of knowing whether or when its many separate decisions are contributing to inflation and higher prices, or possibly to higher taxes.

Last fall, in a statement submitted to Republican Task Force on House Rules, I proposed a revision of congressional budgetary procedures. I recommended that Congress institute its own fiscal package which could be known as the Speaker's budget. After consultation with appropriate committee members, the Speaker would present his budget to the House of Representatives on the first Monday of March. I suggested that this document contain three sections: First, a total spending limit for the forthcoming fiscal year; second, a breakdown of this figure by departments—14 sub-totals, in other words; and third, a recommendation to increase, decrease, or maintain present tax rates.

Following 2 weeks of general debate, the proposal would be open to amendment. However, any change in departmental allocations would require: First, a corresponding revision in spending and/or tax totals; or second, an equivalent change in another agency's allocation. Once the budget receives House approval, it would be transmitted to the Senate where the same procedure would be followed. It also was my advice that, following the budget's enactment, any subsequent changes in the total spending limitation would require a two-thirds affirmative vote by each Chamber.

In my opinion, four significant benefits would accrue to our economy if Congress adopted this, or a similar plan.

First, integrating the Government's spending and taxing programs affords Congress a cohesive approach to our Nation's economic needs.

Second, by permitting the legislative branch to consider each department's needs within the context of the whole budget, my proposal permits a more precise delineation of spending priorities.

Third, this process also would diminish the impact of pressure groups which would have to vie with other interests for "their share of the action."

Fourth, departmental effectiveness would be increased since each executive agency would know its total expenditure capabilities at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Is such an idea feasible? Referring to Congress' fiscal inadequacy, TRB, writing in the April 21, 1973, issue of the New Republic avers that it is. He observes:

Well, something can be done about it, and we guess it is the big story from Washington though it is terribly dull to watch and tell. (Anything constructive generally is dull, we notice.) A real effort is underway by a strong special Senate and House study committee to give Congress, after 200 years, a budget control mechanism. It would set an annual spending limit, with powerful committees in the House and Senate to police it, and more important, a review process at the end of the year. If Congress overspent itself it would cut back on appropriations or, alternatively, institute new taxes to foot the bill...

Sounds simple, eh? It is also revolutionary. And yet there are prominent, well-known, middle-of-the-road Congressmen talking seriously about the biggest legislative reform that we know of. If it comes who will have produced it? Why, Mr. Nixon, to be

sure. Congress is reluctantly saving its own life because he drove them to it.

SUMMARY

A recent joint statement issued by the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington, the Council of Churches of Greater Washington, and the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington declares that—

The search for efficiency should not take the form of large-scale elimination of funds needed by children, by the poor, by the elderly, by the sick.

Yet this is precisely the design which is emerging from the architects of the "new era." The administration's budgetary redirection certainly represents a retrenchment in the battle to combat urban problems.

The promise that general revenue sharing will produce all "new" moneys already has been breached. Special revenue sharing funds will be less, both totally and per capita, than the categorical grant programs which they are scheduled to replace. Further, the categorical approach is more effective than is special revenue sharing in treating specific metropolitan area ills.

Congress, unfortunately, is poorly equipped, at present, to match the administration in "the battle of the budget." Progress, however, is being made in this area. Hopefully, by next spring the Congress will have adopted procedures which will permit a more cohesive fiscal process.

THE ALTERNATIVES—INFLATION AND/OR HIGHER TAXES?

Surprisingly, the premise that inflation and/or a tax increase is the inevitable result of the restoration of funds for human resources has not been challenged.

Suppose that all of the \$10 billion in the "real" cuts, described by Hobart Rowen, were reinstated by Congress with no compensating budgetary changes? In the face of a \$1.26 trillion estimated gross national product for 1973, coupled with substantial unused productive resources—5.1 percent unemployment; 80.5 percent plant capacity utilization for the first quarter of 1973—the inflationary impact of this increase—0.7 percent of GNP—would be minimal.

There is evidence that factors other than inflation underlie recent administration fiscal actions. The abrupt ending on January 11 of phase 2 of the economic stabilization program lends credence to this thesis. Further, the President apparently saw nothing inflationary in his recommendation that the fiscal year 1974 Department of Defense obligational authority be increased \$5.7 billion over this year's figure—from an estimated \$77.8 billion in fiscal year 1973 to an estimated \$83.5 billion for the coming year. Nor does the prospect of spending \$1.6 billion for military assistance and \$600 million for economic aid in South Vietnam seem to raise inflationary fears.

Indeed, the principal objective of the administration's new budgetary strategy is to force Congress to accept the proposed special revenue-sharing plans. This is made clear in executive department letters to State and local governments.

In these communications State and local officials are advised that funds are being held until such time as Congress adopts special revenue sharing.

Even though maintaining urban area categorical programs at current funding levels, with no further budgetary adjustments, will not contribute significantly to inflationary pressures, this is not the only alternative available to Congress.

At a very minimum, two other possibilities exist.

First, Department of Defense obligational authority for fiscal year 1974 can be trimmed by \$5 billion without impairing the efficiency of our Armed Forces. If this cut were effectuated, Department of Defense obligational authority still would be \$700 million greater than in fiscal year 1973. Of the proposed \$5 billion reduction, approximately \$1.01 billion can be achieved by reducing troop strength from a projected 2,230,000, as of June 30, 1974, to 2,100,000—computed at an average cost of \$7,813.98 for an enlisted man per year. I will detail how other military savings can be realized in a subsequent position paper.

Second, enactment of an equitable tax reform measure would expand Federal revenues by at least \$7 billion without a concomitant increase in personal and corporate rates. Approximately \$2.5 billion of this can be generated by repealing the accelerated depreciation subsidy extended to the business community through a 1971 Executive order—the 7-percent tax investment credit would not be affected if this recommendation were implemented by Congress. A comprehensive analysis of my views concerning tax reform will appear in a future position statement.

Thus, by reducing defense spending and eliminating certain inequitable tax provisions, Congress can retain those vitally needed urban programs destined for the guillotine and, concurrently, reduce the total proposed appropriations level.

MY BUDGETARY VOTES—93D CONGRESS

In view of the preceding views, what fiscal actions do I plan to pursue during the present legislative session?

First, I shall continue in my efforts to secure more rational congressional budgetary procedures along the lines which I suggested last fall (see section III, D).

Second, I shall support measures designed to end impoundment of fiscal year 1973 appropriations for the Environmental Protection Agency—water and sewer grants—the Department of Housing and Urban Development—open space; code enforcement; public housing; FHA 235 and 236 housing—the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—federally affected areas; veterans education.

Third, I shall oppose bills seeking to establish special revenue sharing programs.

Fourth, until I am given the opportunity to consider an overall congressional fiscal package, I, of course, will be required to vote on authorization and appropriation proposals on a bill-by-bill basis.

I will be guided in each instance by the following criteria: Does the measure

meet a specific need? If so, what is the position of this need on the scale of national priorities? Is the funding adequate to insure resolution of the problem?

In conformity with these standards, I shall be obliged to oppose certain legislation. This I did in the case of the rural environmental assistance program—REAP—which the Washington Post, in an editorial, termed "an obscure and questionable farm subsidy." I also acted to sustain President Nixon's veto of the rural water and sewer bill. As I stated on April 9:

The issue at hand is that of priorities . . . within the context of needed budgetary restraints, I have assigned greater priority to programs designed to curb the urban ills of our country.

However, I do intend to support retention, full-funding, and suggested improvements of the following categorical programs:

- 1. Housing and Urban Development:
 - a. Public Housing.
 - b. Subsidized Housing (235; 236; Rent Supplement).
 - c. Water and Sewer.
 - d. Open Space.
 - e. Model Cities.
 - f. Urban Renewal.
 - g. Neighborhood Facilities.
 - h. Public Facility Loans.
- 2. Department of Labor:
 - a. Public Employment Programs (PEP).
 - b. Economic Opportunity Act (EOA).
 - c. Manpower Development and Training Act.
 - d. Summer Neighborhood Youth Program.
- 3. Office of Economic Opportunity:
 - a. Head Start.
 - b. Legal Aid.
 - c. Community Action Program.
- 4. Department of Health, Education and Welfare:
 - a. Title I—Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
 - b. Library Support.
 - c. Child Care (Social Security Act).
 - d. Federally Affected Areas (Impacted Areas).
 - e. Veterans Education.
 - f. Community Mental Health Centers.
 - g. Higher Education Assistance Programs.
 - 5. Environmental Protection Agency—Air and Water Pollution Programs.

I shall endorse efforts to consolidate redundant categorical projects, particularly in the manpower training realm.

Fifth, I shall actively seek a \$5 billion reduction in the Department of Defense's fiscal year 1974 obligational authority.

Sixth, I will work for a more equitable tax structure. A corollary benefit of this undertaking should be an additional tax yield of \$7 billion.

CONCLUSION

As columnist Marquis Childs wrote on February 20, 1973:

Who is the enemy? Is it the Russians, the Chinese? Is that why the defense budget of \$80 billion plus is sacrosanct? Or is it the killers that day after day strike down men, women and children—cancer, stroke, heart disease? These are life-and-death questions pressed by the specialists who believe that money wisely spent can bring victory over the enemy here at home.

To this domestic enemy list also should be added inadequate education, poverty, poor housing, excessive incidence of urban area crime, and malnutrition.

"The New Era of Progress" ignores

these foes. The administration's fiscal outlook, in fact, represents a regression both in the funding and in the manner of dealing with our country's major domestic ailments. For the welfare of our Nation this attitude of benign neglect must not prevail. Insuring that it does not will be the focus of my legislative efforts during the coming months. I include the following appendixes:

EXHIBIT A

Summary of budgetary reserves
(Dollars in millions*)

	Amount
Executive Office of the President	\$3
Funds Appropriated to the President	127
Department of Agriculture	1,497
Department of Commerce	181
Department of Defense—Military	1,899
Department of Defense—Civil	118
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	35
Department of Housing and Urban Development	529
Department of the Interior	482
Department of Justice	36
Department of State	6
Department of Transportation	2,937
Department of Treasury	24
Atomic Energy Commission	316
Environmental Protection Agency	2
General Services Administration	261
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33
Veterans' Administration	71
Other Independent Agencies:	
National Science Foundation	62
Small Business Administration	51
All others	52
Total	8,723

*Above figures submitted by the Office of Management and Budget to Congress as of January 29, 1973.

EXHIBIT B

Partial Listing of Impoundment by Office of Management and Budget of Funds Appropriated by Congress. Released by Representative Joe L. Evans (D-Tenn.), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriations, January 15, 1973.

Funds withheld and impounded by OMB include the following:

Department of Agriculture	\$1,267,076,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development	523,200,000
Department of Transportation (For Federal-aid to Highways including Interstate)	2,000,000,000
Department of Defense (Corps of Engineers)	20,462,000
Department of Commerce (Including \$109,555,000 for water, sewage, and industrial expansion grants by the Economic Development Administration)	243,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency	6,000,000,000
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	56,997,490
Department of the Treasury	24,034,197
Atomic Energy Commission	15,400,000
Department of Defense (military)	1,940,448,924
Veterans Administration (Including \$46,786,000 for reduction in apportionment)	111,786,000
Appalachian Regional Commission	65,000,000

EXHIBIT C

Ad Hoc Budget Hearings Held by Congressman Charles W. Whalen, Jr., March 23-24, 1973:

ORGANIZATIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES

City of Dayton: Mayor James H. McGee.
City of Kettering: Mayor Charles F. Horn.
Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce: Mr. Gene Lawrence.

Dayton Board of Education: Mr. William E. Goodwin, President.
Dayton Development Council: Mr. Dudley P. Kircher, Director.

Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority: Mr. Carl Copp, Chairman; Mr. Hughbert Poore; Mr. Arch Warner.

Dayton-Montgomery County Library: Mrs. John E. Coleman, President-Board of Trustees; Mr. William Chait.

Health Planning Council of Greater Miami Valley: Dr. Robert Craig, President; Mr. Stephen Davie.

Health and Welfare Planning Council: Mrs. Fred Young, President—Board of Directors; Mr. Bernard Hyman.

Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Dayton: Mr. Robert W. Booher, President—Board of Directors; Mr. Jacques Sheley.

League of Women Voters: Mrs. Gail Levin, President.

Metropolitan Churches United: Rev. Richard Hardy, President; Rev. Thomas Dorenbusch; Rev. Robert Kolze.

Model Cities:

 Planning Council, Mr. George Washington, President.

 South East Priority Board, Mr. Robert Hand, President.

 South West Priority Board, Mr. Roscoe Simmons, President.

 FROC Priority Board, Mr. Michael Means, President.

 North East Priority Board, Mr. Martin Harmuth, President.

 North West Priority Board, Mr. Solomon Crane, President.

Miami Valley Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers: Mrs. Sybil Silverman; Mrs. Virginia Creamow; Mr. Robert M. Eschbach; Mr. James Lucas.

Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission: Mr. Edwin S. Brubaker, Chairman; Mr. Dale Bertsch.

Montgomery County Board of Education: Mr. Roland St. John, President; Dr. Kenneth Crim; Dr. Raymond Hopper.

Montgomery County Childrens Services Board: Mr. William Bacon.

Montgomery County Community Action Agency: Mr. Herman Lander, President; Mr. Terry Bradford; Mr. Melvin Jackson.

Montgomery County Farm Bureau Federation: Mr. Ralph Dull, President.

Sinclair Community College: Mr. B. R. Blackidge, Comptroller; Dr. F. P. Parsons.

Supervisory Council on Crime and Delinquency: Honorable Walter Rice, Chairman.

University of Dayton: Rev. Raymond A. Roesch, S. M., President.

Wright State University: Mr. Howard E. Bales, Assistant Director, Research Development.

EDUCATION TAX CREDITS

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation that would allow individuals a tax credit for all educational expenses that they incur. This tax credit would not be limited to only elementary and secondary school expenses, but would also include the cost of higher education, including trade and vocational schools.

Credit would be allowed, within specific limitations, for tuition, fees, books, supplies and other equipment required for courses at an educational institution. Items such as meals, lodging and similar

personal and family expenses would not be allowed under my proposal.

At this point I would like to include the complete text of my bill:

H.R. 7708

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for educational expenses

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 42 as section 43, and by inserting after section 41 the following new section: "SEC. 42. EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount, determined under subsection (b), of the educational expenses paid by him during the taxable year to one or more educational institutions in providing an education for himself or for any other individual.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) AMOUNT PER INDIVIDUAL.—The credit under subsection (a) for educational expenses of any individual paid during the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) 100 percent of so much of such expenses as does not exceed \$200,

"(B) 75 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds \$200 but does not exceed \$500, and

"(C) 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds \$500 but does not exceed \$1,500.

"(2) PRORATION OF CREDIT WHERE MORE THAN ONE TAXPAYER PAYS EXPENSES.—If educational expenses of an individual are paid by more than one taxpayer during a taxable year, the credit allowable to each such taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be the same portion of the credit determined under paragraph (1) as the amount of educational expenses of such individual paid by that taxpayer during the taxable year is of the amount of the educational expenses of such individual paid by all taxpayers during the taxable year.

"(3) REDUCTION OF CREDIT.—The credit allowed a taxpayer under subsection (a) for educational expenses of any individual paid during the taxable year, as determined under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, shall be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year exceed \$25,000.

"(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES.—The term 'educational expenses' means—

"(A) tuition and fees required for the enrollment or attendance of a student at an educational institution, and

"(B) fees, books, supplies, and equipment required for courses of instruction at an educational institution. Such term does not include any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for meals, lodging, or similar personal, living, or family expenses. In the event an amount paid for tuition or fees included an amount for meals, lodging, or similar expenses which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount which is attributable to meals, lodging, or similar expenses shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'educational institution' means—

"(A) an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4)) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c); or

"(B) a business or trade school, or technical institution, or other technical or voca-

tional school in any State, which (1) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within that State, a program of vocational or technical education designed to fit individuals for useful employment in recognized occupations; and (ii) is accredited by a nationally recognized agency or association listed by the United States Commissioner of Education; and (iii) has been in existence for two years or has been specially accredited by the Commissioner as an institution meeting the other requirements of this subparagraph.

(3) STATE.—The term 'State' includes the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIP AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The amount otherwise taken into account under subsection (a) as educational expenses of any individual during any period shall be reduced (before the application of subsection (b)) by any amounts received by such individual during such period as—

"(A) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includable in gross income, or

"(B) an educational assistance allowance under chapter 34 or 35 of title 38, United States Code.

"(2) NONCREDIT AND RECREATIONAL, ETC., COURSES.—Amounts paid for educational expenses of any individual shall be taken into account under subsection (a)—

"(A) in the case of an individual who is a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction for which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree, and

"(B) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate for a baccalaureate or higher degree, only to the extent such expenses are attributable to courses of instruction which are required courses under the rules and practices of the educational institution or are necessary for such individual to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(e) DISALLOWANCE OF EXPENSES AS DEDUCTIONS.—No deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) for any educational expenses which (after the application of subsection (b)) is taken into account in determining the amount of any credit allowed under subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not apply to the expenses of any taxpayer who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, elects not to apply the provisions of this section with respect to such expenses for the taxable year.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 42. Educational expenses.

"Sec. 43. Overpayment of tax."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973.

With education playing an ever-increasing role in our society and in view of the crisis facing our nonpublic schools, the desirability of such legislation is clearly evident.

The nonpublic school system represents a vital national asset. We must not allow our nonpublic schools to die. They have been making an important con-

tribution to American education and society as a whole since the founding of our Nation and play a special role in education, especially in our urban areas.

Nonpublic schools are having serious financial problems. Low to middle income parents are having a difficult time meeting the increasing tuition costs of nonpublic schools as high taxes and inflation continue to make inroads in their earnings.

Approximately 10 percent of the Nation's children attend nonpublic schools thereby relieving the public school systems and the taxpayer of substantial cost. It has been estimated that the closing of nonpublic schools would result in an increase of \$4 billion in annual operating expenses and \$5 billion in capital costs to public school systems.

In my opinion, Federal tax relief for the individual family is the best way to help assure the continuance of our private system of education. It would ease the pressure on the public school system by enabling more parents to send their children to nonpublic schools for the first time or to assure their continuing attendance at such schools. The use of the tax system to give relief to parents is preferable to grants and subsidies to the nonpublic schools themselves. Aside from the constitutional problems such direct aid would involve, there would be no reason for Federal involvement in the educational programs of the nonpublic schools, since the parents, not the schools would be the recipients of such benefits under my bill. Federal control of the curriculum and activities of the private school, especially the religiously oriented schools, is a situation which must be avoided.

Within the framework of tax relief, I believe the tax credit approach for all educational expenditures, including trade schools and higher education, as proposed by the legislation I have introduced today, is the best option. It is superior to a tax deduction for two reasons: First, it may be taken even when the taxpayer does not itemize his deductions; and second, it provides a greater benefit to low- and middle-income taxpayers than an itemized deduction.

My bill would provide a tax credit for educational expenses equal to the sum of 100 percent of so much expenses as does not exceed \$200; or, 75 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds \$200 but does not exceed \$500; or 25 percent of so much of such expenses as exceeds \$500 but does not exceed \$1,500.

Under our present tax laws we have numerous examples of allowable deductions for private investment to serve the public good. Deductions for charitable contributions to religious and educational institutions are particularly apt. Present tax laws also permit persons who pay taxes to a State or local government for various purposes to deduct these taxes on their Federal returns. Businessmen benefit from deductions for numerous expenses incidental to their activities. Certainly, payments made by parents for reduction ought to receive similar treatment.

We need only look at declining private school enrollment, which is reported at a rate of 6 percent a year, to recognize

the need for prompt action by Congress. In addition to nonreligious private schools, there are, of course, many Jewish and Christian schools who are facing serious financial problems. For example, Roman Catholic schools, which comprise the bulk of nonpublic schools, have been forced to close hundreds of schools in the face of increased costs. A major problem facing these schools is their inability to compete with public schools in meeting salary demands of lay teachers. Compounding the problem is the fact that the number of lay teachers has steadily increased as the number of religious orders engaged in teaching has steadily decreased. People of low- and middle-income who want their children to have the benefits of religious instruction as well as academic instruction are finding it next to impossible to meet both the increased tuition costs of the parochial schools and the ever-increasing property taxes needed to support public schools. Increasingly, these parents are being forced to shift their children to the public school system. This trend, if it continues, will seriously aggravate the existing critical situation faced by public institutions.

Far too often, we slip into debate regarding education strictly in terms of dollars and cents, forgetting the contributions made by both the public and nonpublic school systems to the growth of healthy social, ethnic, and cultural expression in America.

Far too often we forget that for virtually every student in a private school there is one less student supported by tax funds, local, State, or Federal. In both the State of Maryland and my county of Prince Georges it costs \$1,000 annually for each student in elementary and secondary public school. The parent that makes this saving possible is entitled to some tax saving himself.

In addition to this saving to the local, State, and Federal governments, I would like to cite the problem of those parents in my district who have been subjected to the largest court-ordered schoolbusing in the Nation's history. A Federal court has ordered 32,000 of the county's 160,000 students to be bused so that no school will have less than 10 percent and no more than 50 percent black students. As a result there is massive racially balanced busing in and out of essentially all of the county's 235 schools. The selection of those to be bused is arbitrary in order to meet quotas. The distances students are bused may be extreme because of the size of Prince Georges County. Even with one of the largest school bus fleets in the world, schools must open and close on staggered schedules. Some open as early as 7:30 a.m., some close as late as 4:30 p.m. Bused students must leave home as early as 6:30 a.m., return as late as 5:30 p.m.

This court-ordered busing has increased attendance and interest in private schools. Parents are reluctant to have young children transported to distant schools for the sole purpose of achieving an arbitrary statistical balance. Parents with several children are reluctant to have them at different schools because they are of different ages.

Parents with transportation problems are not able to permit their youngsters to take part in extracurricular activities.

Thus, private schools in my district serve many purposes. Those with high incomes should not be the only ones who have access to these private schools.

Americans want to retain pluralism in our society that has been a hallmark of its democratic institutions. Our society wants and deserves alternatives to public education. This legislation is a major step in assuring that we retain them in the future.

DESIGNATION AND PROTECTION OF NATURAL AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would grant the Secretary of the Interior the power to develop a program for the designation and protection of natural areas throughout the United States.

Presently, the only program available to the Secretary for the preservation and protection of natural areas is the wilderness system. Unfortunately, land must already be in Federal hands for this act to apply. Though the land and water conservation program does provide a 50-50 matching grant for the development of land and water resources for recreation purposes, it does not apply to saving natural areas. Thus, the Interior Department does not have authority to grant aid to States and local governments to acquire natural areas of geological or ecological significance. The legislation which I am introducing would grant the Secretary of the Interior the power to make 50-50 matching grants for this purpose.

I have found, through my studies, that there is a need for an expanded program to protect natural areas in order to achieve an increased appreciation of the natural history of the United States. Their appropriate use, including environmental education, scientific research, and public appreciation of these areas will be encouraged if they are so protected. Most of us remember our youth in which there were large expanses of natural areas. Unfortunately, with the continuing urban sprawl, these areas are being destroyed and we face the danger that future generations will not have the chance to use nature's wonders as we did.

I realize that in any program of this nature there should be an orderly system and criteria established for designating which areas deserve protection and assistance. Therefore, under title II of my legislation, I establish an Advisory Council on the Preservation of Natural Areas. The members of the advisory council shall be the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture; Housing and Urban Development; Transportation; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; the Smithsonian Institution; the President of the Natural Resources Council; and 10 appointments made by the President of the United States from the public.

This Council will advise the President and the Congress on matters relating to the implementation and the coordination of this act with other Federal and State activities. Furthermore, the Council shall establish a national registry of areas which are endangered and will be first to receive funding under this act.

In my own State of Georgia, the following areas have been declared eligible for registration as National Historic, Natural, and Environmental Education Landmarks: Etowah Mounds in Bartow County, Harris (Joel Chandler) House in Fulton County, Kolomoki Mounds in Early County, Low (Juliette Gordon) Birthplace in Chatham County, St. Catherine's Island in Liberty County, Savannah Historic District in Chatham County, Stalldings Island in Columbia County, Traveler's Rest in Stephens County, Marshall Forest in Floyd County, Wassaw Island in Chatham County, and the Elizabeth Elementary School Environmental Study Area in Cobb County.

I am sure many of you have areas in your State that some day might be endangered. If my bill was enacted, these areas would not be lost through oversight and if for some reason their destruction was imminent there would be a mechanism available to be employed in order to preserve and protect these areas for prosperity.

Preservation and protection of our natural areas at this time in our country's history is of prime importance. If we wait too long, there will be little left to protect. I urge prompt consideration of my bill.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME FOR CUT-BACKS IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today our country is as concerned as I have ever seen it with the problems of continually rising food prices.

As an outgrowth of this concern, the American farmer is under scrutiny by the people of this Nation as never before. Today, I rise to plead his case and to say that now, more than ever, we should be aware of the efficiency of the American farmer, what it means to all of us, and to make sure that we, as a government, do everything humanly possible to work to make the American farm increasingly efficient.

The way to accomplish this is through research and development, through education and conservation, by continuing and expanding the programs that have helped make the American farm the most efficient in the world.

Yet, I regret to say that now when all of us should be concerned with—and are concerned with—rising food prices, we are told of cutbacks in agricultural research, in State experimental stations, in the extension services, and in conservation programs.

In my judgment, this is a false economy.

I know from my own personal knowledge that money spent on agricultural research and development is one of the most important investments this country can make.

During the Easter recess I traveled over my district and talked with many people. I was impressed with the recurring theme that was often mentioned. Some of the people from the agricultural experiment stations came to me to discuss projects that were being cut completely. Others mentioned early retirement and the fact that personnel were being transferred from one station to another and not replaced.

I listened to these folks as they spoke about the work they felt so strongly about. My first thought was that I was prejudiced concerning these people. As a boy in high school I had watched crops on these stations grow. Year after year the yields of the crops increased amazingly. Increases of 20 to 30 percent were realized through research, improvement in seed, and cultivation and fertilization. These scientists at the research stations had the time, facilities, and appropriations to carry on these experiments, and all the people on the farms reaped the benefits of their work, research, and dedication.

For years it was my pleasure to serve as a supervisor on a soil conservation board. As a member of that board it was a joy to see land reclaimed through ditching, terraces built to keep the soil from eroding, and efforts made to conserve our resources. It is sad to realize that a great part of our pollution today comes from the land. It has always impressed me that the streams of England run clear, yet all too often I see the silt in our Nation being washed away, irreplaceable, while the conservation programs initiated to remedy this problem are being cut. Many of our friends from the city feel that this program is no longer necessary, yet this is the life blood of not only our generation, but of generations to come.

Another problem that was mentioned to us during the Easter holidays was the cutback in agricultural education. Then my mind went back to the time that my farm friends and I spent learning together from agriculture teachers and the exchange of ideas that flowed from the students in the class. As a unit in an agricultural learning institution we searched for a better way to do a job on the farm, for ways to raise production, for ways to improve the quality of crops. Now programs for agricultural training are being cut.

Specifically, today, the Department of Agriculture is withholding funds from agricultural research that were voted by this Congress. It also intends to recommend additional cuts in the budget for the coming year.

The same practice—of withholding funds appropriated by the Congress—is true in the Cooperative State Research Service—this is the program that helps finance the State experimental stations. Also, further cuts are being proposed for the coming year.

In the Extension Service, while no meaningful budget cuts are proposed, the amount available to be spent on programs is cut in effect by the change in the post-

al regulations, meaning that some \$5.7 million must be diverted from other activities to pay for postage.

In ASCS, personnel are being reduced and spending eliminated on the cancellation of the REAP program, which we hope this Congress will reinstate. And, the Soil Conservation Service is being sliced heavily, \$9 million coming out of the resources conservation development and \$6 million from the watersheds program.

All of these reflect a lessening in priorities on programs that eventually can cut back on farm efficiencies. Farm efficiency means more food for the dollar and is in direct conflict with our determination to hold down further increases in food prices.

Right now food pours forth from our farms. But what if the efficiency of the American farmer stumbles? What if the shelves in the grocery store suddenly become empty and we have to stand in line for our food?

It is our responsibility to keep our farmers in business. We are in the process now of reexamining the Agriculture Act of 1970. Here again we have conflicts. Here again we debate priorities.

In this process we search for the truths and look for the best solutions for the Nation. In so doing, we must examine very closely our agriculture policy.

We must be sure that our priorities maintain a dynamic and productive agriculture.

Food is basic. Food is necessary. All of us need to reexamine the problems relating to the farms that provide our food.

DANGER MAY SPAWN IN A PERIOD OF PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Ernest McNeill Eller, former Director of the Naval History Division, retired from the Navy in 1970, ending a distinguished 48-year career. Currently, he is serving his second year as national historian of the Navy League. Author of the book "The Soviet Sea Challenge," Admiral Eller has been an anxious observer of the momentous changes of the past decade which have eroded U.S. oceanic strength and tipped the precarious balance of sea power in favor of the Soviet Union.

These are his views as published in the magazine *Sea Power* for May 1973, on the perils which a nation can allow to develop during a period of peace by failure to prepare for trouble which inevitably will follow:

THE POSTWAR FOLLIES
(By Ernest M. Eller)

After all major conflicts in which the United States has been involved there has been, and rightly so, a cutback of U.S. military forces.

Sometimes—more often than not, unfortunately—such cuts have gone beyond the point of reason and safety as the nation's craving for peace and weariness with war, particularly with expenditures for war, have caused the pendulum to swing too far—re-

gardless of postwar world conditions, U.S. international treaty responsibilities, and domestic economic needs.

The country again faces such a situation today as, in the wake of the longest war—and one of the most divisive—in U.S. history, she begins a substantial dismantling of the country's defense establishment and turns to consideration of what many stridently proclaim as "higher priority" domestic matters.

But it is no exaggeration to say that, if America follows too closely the postwar excesses of the past, if she once again permits the pendulum to swing too far, she will be inviting calamity.

This is particularly true as regards the situation at sea, where the United States is losing the fight to a relentless opponent—and, in fact, in the opinion of many naval leaders, has probably already lost it.

It is also no exaggeration to state, alarmist though it may sound, that never before in history has the United States been in as great peril as she is today.

This is so because, for the first time in history, the nation is faced with a ruthless antagonist which, always strong on land, is now, and has been for several years, furiously building a strength at sea which is today second to none.

THE BRITISH SHIELD

In the past, particularly throughout the last century, the benevolent shield of British sea power protected the United States and many other nations from would-be predators. When in this century aggressor nations, ambitious for world conquest, became more so because of the naval and military weakness of the democracies and finally did challenge the Royal Navy, as well as the ascendant, newly powerful U.S. Navy, at sea, there followed the catastrophe of two world wars.

Those who lived through the darkest days of World War II, particularly, know how perilously thin was the margin of naval/military strength by which the Allies finally won out, and should remember that Great Britain nearly succumbed to a submarine force insignificant to that which the Kremlin now directs. Those in the U.S. Navy who survived will never forget the dark and desperate year after Pearl Harbor when the Japanese had a stronger Navy in the Pacific, nor the immense efforts required of the combined navies of the United States, Great Britain, and other Allied countries to check the smaller German and Japanese navies.

With such examples from the recent past, with a strong friendly sea power no longer standing between America and potential adversaries, with an avowed enemy already armed to the teeth daily growing ever stronger—particularly on, under, and now over the seas—and with the acknowledged responsibilities thrust upon and accepted by her as the most powerful of the world's democracies, it seems incredible that America has allowed herself to become abysmally inferior in most of the essentials of sea power.

But this is exactly what has happened. It is hard to understand why this is so. Perhaps today's willingness, not to say eagerness, to demolish the tools of war simply reflects historical American tendencies to let hope ride over common sense. The country has always suffered heavily in times of war for its lack of foresight during the preceding periods of peace.

If history repeats itself once again, if the past is lantern for the future, which it is, Americans can expect cruel days ahead—but this need not be so if, in fact, U.S. leaders in Congress and in the Executive Branch can read history, and can learn from it.

EARLY ECONOMY ERRORS

Examining the past may help to put the present situation in better perspective. After

the American Revolution Yankee maritime enterprise ranged far and wide. Merchant ships multiplied, and commerce prospered. However, bankrupted by the long war, and struggling to unite on national purpose, the nation's forefathers disbanded the small U.S. Navy of the day and depended upon the good will of others for protection.

They soon learned—the hard way, unfortunately—that freedom cannot survive without the courage and sacrifice and strength that won it in the first place. In a world where power must back the best intentions, one cannot fight sturdily for the right and then on victory day abandon his arms and leave the future as unprotected as the past. Strength in peace is almost more important than in war, for it can prevent war. Weakness, on the other hand, invites war.

In 1785, as the United States auctioned off her last warship, Barbary corsairs captured American merchantmen and enslaved the crews. Neglected by their government, many luckless sailors, the "POWs" of their day, died in captivity, and a decade would pass before the last survivors were freed—any similarity with Korean War and Vietnam War POW experiences is more than coincidental.

Worse followed. The French Revolution that began in 1789 soon ignited the fifth World War of that century. In efforts to cut each other's lifelines, both England and France (America's ally, under another government, during the Revolutionary War) preyed on the American merchant marine. The U.S. government protested but it was too weak to do more.

Then, in 1792, Algerian corsairs captured several ships and enslaved over 100 more American mariners. Congress finally authorized the building of six frigates—but soon cut that number to three when U.S. diplomats negotiated a humiliating peace at a tribute cost of one-sixth of the national revenue (then \$6 million).

At that time the nation's income came almost exclusively from taxes on foreign trade. During the 1795-97 period, income averaged under \$6.5 million annually, of which the Navy was allocated 5.5 per cent. Congress obviously wasn't rushing to rebuild a fleet, even though world war still raged.

As hostilities mounted, outrages against American commerce increased. French corsairs even captured ships in U.S. territorial waters. Congress consequently sped up commissioning a small fleet, and the country entered upon the naval quasi-war with France.

In 1801, following successful conclusion of that war, the U.S. government commenced operations against the Barbary pirates but, as usual, tried to conduct them on a shoestring: naval appropriations dropped from \$2.111 million in 1801 to \$916,000 in 1802. The war thus dragged on for years until finally settled when the government agreed to pay ransom for the U.S. POWs.

Thereafter, as war continued and American commerce suffered heavily, naval budgets grew. From 1806 to 1811 they averaged around \$1.9 million annually, or 20 per cent of the national budget. Such wiser allocation of resources to provide protection at sea in perilous times, however, was hamstrung by what can only be called the "gunboat aberration." (Not only do Americans usually deceive themselves that the end of war means peace forever, but they ever follow the other chimera that security can be bought on the cheap. This time the bargain basement offered Mr. Jefferson's gunboats. Most of the Navy's increased funds went into this folly; hence real preparedness afloat benefited little.)

FOLLY AND FORESIGHT

When the War of 1812 came the United States had, therefore, only a few high-seas warships. The little Navy could not stop the ravages—including the burning of Washington—of the British fleet, but it won not-

able single-ship duels and lake victories of lasting importance to the American future. When the war ended in 1815, the government consequently continued to strengthen the Navy by commissioning ships of the line, backbone of sea power. During the period 1817-21, appropriations for the Navy averaged \$3.56 million, or 18 per cent of total government spending. Three sea wars in less than two decades, and pirate depredations in the West Indies, had apparently driven the lesson home.

It is not necessary to detail the wisdom or folly in naval appropriations for the ensuing century to World War I, except to note two significant examples:

(1) Power afloat played a giant role on the ocean, bays, and rivers during the Civil War. Yet when peace came naval funds plummeted and stayed in the deep six. For 25 years they averaged under 7 per cent of the overall budget, and did not rise to above 10 per cent until the late 1890s. The nation survived such a perilously low level of security only because of Britain's benign rule of the seas—a safeguard no longer present.

(2) One of the few instances of wise and strong U.S. maritime policy over an extended peacetime period followed the short Spanish-American War. During that war, naval expenditures rose only moderately over the years immediately preceding, holding at about 10-11 per cent of total national spending (then \$605 million). But in 1900 a new trend began.

It was a time of cataclysmic changes. Giant forces were sweeping the world. The rising tide of the Industrial Revolution and accelerating technology had completely changed navies. A modern ship of the line, the "battleship," had evolved. Submarines were bringing their deadly stealth to boost the offensive strength of navies and increase defensive problems. Aircraft would soon follow.

These revolutionary developments at sea converged with the rise of ambitious rivals east and west yearning to wrest the sea from Britain. At the same time, although not understanding it, the United States was rising to world primacy. Without conscious preparation the nation was becoming world leader.

TR'S PRESCIENCE

A number of Americans, with Teddy Roosevelt—a leader who demonstrates the overriding importance of a single great man in shaping history—in the van, did understand the changes taking place, however, and saw clearly that the key to the defense of freedom lay at sea. With Teddy Roosevelt on the bridge, funding for the Navy rose steadily to about 18 per cent of the rising national budget. Had the U.S. government held to the preceding low 6-10 per cent ratio, in the opinion of many military historians, World War I might well have gone the other way.

Roosevelt's foresight did, of course, provide the naval muscle needed by the Allies to win World War I, and should have been an example to future generations of the necessity for strength at sea. Yet, since the World War I armistice of November 11, 1918, the record of U.S. national peacetime leadership in providing a navy adequate to the nation's needs and to cope with changing and increasingly hostile world conditions has been as bleak as the worst of the past, with only a few bright spots.

Each generation seems to find its own false standard to displace strength, within history has repeatedly demonstrated is the one sure hope for peace in a world where aggression never sleeps. The post-World War I generation found solace in the term "disarmament." Full of good will, the United States scrapped real ships, afloat and building; other nations scrapped mostly blueprints and obsolete hulls.

The Depression and vocal anti-arms ad-

vocates led U.S. leaders to cut back even more. Hence, the Navy was not permitted to build up even to treaty levels. By 1930 funds allotted to the Navy had shrunk to under 11 per cent of the national budget, and matters soon grew worse. From 1932 to 1939 Navy funding averaged well under half a billion dollars annually—about 7 per cent of the national budget, approximating the doldrum ratio of the 1870s and 1880s. The Army received little more.

This head-in-the-sand folly, it should be noted, took place in an environment radically different from the post-Civil War era, when the British Navy kept world peace. During the 1930s explosive dangers raged on three continents as the world was rocked by the conquests of the Nazis in Germany and the Fascists in Italy at the same time Japanese imperialists were threatening Asia and the Communists were completing their brutal consolidation of the USSR.

WHAT PRICE WEAKNESS?

The inevitable followed. Determined aggressors, encouraged by weakness, unleashed the horror of another world war. If Britain and America had been prepared, this and future generations may well ask, would Hitler have risked the gamble into Poland? If the United States had doubled appropriations for sea power in the 1930s, would Japanese militarists have dared the Pearl Harbor Day of Infamy?

America's scrimping—Navy funding, for example, fell from \$2 billion in 1919 to a \$44 million average during the years 1931-38—during the fateful decade of the 1930s turned against her with a vengeance. Expenditures on the Army (and Army Air) exceeded \$50 billion in the single year of 1945, and on the Navy (and Marines and Navy Air), \$30 billion. During the long and bloody battles of World War II the small dollar savings achieved by crippling U.S. military strength in the 1930s were turned—at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars—into an awesome and awful loss of life, untold human misery, and a world torn asunder and open, moreover, to yet another ruthless type of aggression: communism, with its evil philosophy that the end justifies the means.

Yet did America heed? No, she seemed bent on suicide, as in wild abandon, after VJ Day, she dissipated her expensive and hard-won military strength. Theorists hoisted a new signal of cheap security—the atomic bomb, which would now keep peace without the expense of conventional arms. Sea power, which had just made possible victory in the most gigantic struggle in the history of mankind, was obsolete, and this was where the biggest savings could be achieved.

Communist intrigue and aggression soon caused new crises: in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, Greece, Iran, and China. But the United States continued to cut its military strength, nevertheless. The party line now ran that if the nation spent more on defense it would go bankrupt. By 1950 the Navy's share of the now much-reduced defense budget had dwindled to 30 per cent from nearly 50 per cent through most of the 1930s—although dollar expenditures of course much exceeded those of the 1930s, as inflation and sophisticated weapons skyrocketed costs.

Looked at through another prism, the Navy's share of the overall national budget had shrunk to 10 per cent, a hazardous level at any time, but downright foolhardy in 1950, when the mantle of leadership of the Free World had fallen on the United States.

Thus, even with the tragic lesson of the 1930s made abundantly clear by hindsight, only a decade later U.S. leaders were making the same disastrous mistakes. Actually, such repetition of previous mistakes was far worse than the originals, since there was full evidence of the Kremlin's intent to dominate the world stage.

THE LONELY GUARDIAN

The folly of the late 1940s surpassed preceding ones in yet another way. During the 1930s the Navy shared U.S. defense funds close to 50-50 with the Army, averaging over 45 per cent of the small pittance that Congress was allocating for security. But at that time Great Britain still had a powerful fleet, comparable in size to the U.S. fleet. By 1950, however, the U.S. Navy stood almost alone as guardian of the seas, but the share of the new tri-service defense budget earmarked for sea power had dwindled to 30 per cent.

Just as Pearl Harbor followed America's lack of foresight in the 1930s, so in 1950 came the onslaught of the communist juggernaut that rolled down Korea, sweeping to the last corner of land on that embattled peninsula before finally being checked by the Inchon landing and subsequent U.S./U.N. counter-attacks. The shadow of the mighty World War II Navy and Marine forces that had swept across the Pacific sufficed once again, though barely, and only because the sea was uncontested.

Had the U.S. Navy been stronger and had U.S. forces ashore been larger, however, there might have been no Korean War and no need for an Inchon landing. The dollars saved by cutting the defense budgets from 1947 to 1950 went up like smoke. The loss of lives and the world disruption that followed those budget cuts—inevitably, it would seem—could be directly charged, once again, to abandonment of the wise maritime strategy that had just led to victory in World War II.

THE SOVIETS MOVE AHEAD

Today, for the third time in one wracked generation, the United States is repeating the same mistakes of the recent past. With the Soviet Union driving to dominate the sea, the nation is spending less than 10 per cent of the national budget for security afloat—this was the level of disaster in the past, and was at that low a level only because no navy in any way comparable to the USSR's present-day fleet existed to challenge the Free World. Today, because of the USSR's furious naval/maritime build-up, coupled with America's own neglect—not to say deliberate cutback—of its Navy, the Soviet Union has shot ahead in nearly every aspect of sea power. In the Navy the Soviets lag only in carriers, amphibious ships, and at-sea replenishment ships. But the Russian fleet now far exceeds the U.S. Navy in submarines, guided-missile surface ships, minecraft, and—most important of all for the future—in new construction. One early consequence of U.S. lethargy occurred when the United States—which only five years earlier had been far ahead—accepted, in the 1972 SALT Agreement, a 3:2 Soviet superiority in sea-based ballistic missiles.

In shipyards, oceanography, R&D, merchant marine shipping, fishing fleets, and training of seamen, the Soviets also have drawn far ahead. The significance of the purposeful Soviet drive to win the world at sea, and of the incredible inaction of this country, becomes even more apparent when it is remembered that only 25 years ago the United States led overwhelmingly in all aspects of sea power, and the USSR, far behind, wasn't even in the running.

It is now evident, and becoming more so each day, that the United States will in the future have to import more and more raw materials for the U.S. economy—and, therefore, the American way of life itself—to survive. This being the case, intelligent men may ask, why have those who control this nation's destiny not seemed to learn, as apparently Kremlin leaders have learned, that the nation that controls the seas controls the course of civilization?

There are those who say that the present drive to cut expenditures for national security is a natural revulsion on the part of democratic peoples to spending heavily for

armaments immediately after a war. There may be some truth in this theory, but it is evident from a study of history that the nation acted more wisely after the War of 1812, the Spanish-American War, and the Korean War. At least part of the difference, it would seem, was the foresight of the nation's leaders of those times, as well as their willingness to go to the people and explain to them the need for a continuing strong national defense.

The seas, and free access to them, have ever wielded a mighty influence on the American destiny, and will prove even more vital to the American future. Those who love and understand the sea, and who also know and love this country, may well pray today—having seen the Free World and the U.S. role in it twice barely escape annihilation—that in this third and last chance of this century U.S. leadership, in Congress as well as in the Executive Branch, will rise to the need and not throw away, once again, the strength that has always been a mandatory prerequisite to freedom.

AN END TO FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that during 1973, this Nation's taxpayers are going to pay out well over \$200 million in food stamp assistance to strikers. If he has no union-supplied strike benefits or other income, and has not saved any money as a precaution against a strike, a striker with an average-size family could be getting up to \$112 per month in food stamps. If he taps other welfare programs—intended for those who cannot work, as food stamps are—he might be able to garner 80 percent or more of his prestrike salary while he is on strike. These and other even more shocking examples of abuse make it imperative that Congress act to deny food stamps to strikers and remove the Federal Government from the collective bargaining process.

Since the late 1960's, there has been an explosion in the abuse of food stamps and other welfare benefits by strikers. Many unions have made a concerted effort to utilize every welfare benefit available to bolster their ability to prolong a strike. A 17-week strike against the California & Hawaiian Sugar Co. was so greatly subsidized by public welfare and food stamps, the union never needed to distribute any of its own strike funds. Food stamps have been the major source of direct, tax-supported assistance to strikers—estimated to make up about two-thirds of the public aid claimed by strikers.

Despite a Federal policy of noninterference in strikes—as expressed in the National Labor Relations Act and other laws—a major loophole has been found and is being exploited more and more every year. Food stamps are becoming a standard strike benefit.

Dr. Herbert Northrup, chairman of the Labor Relations Council and director of the Industrial Research Unit of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce which last year completed a study on strikers' use of public assistance has stated:

The collective bargaining system in the United States . . . cannot work satisfactorily if the public purse becomes an extension of the union treasury for paying strike benefits. Yet this is what is happening—and it is happening to such a degree that strikes in many cases no longer hurt.

When there is little or no economic pressure on the rank and file union member to settle a strike, he does not push for a settlement and the union is enabled to hold out longer—for bigger and bigger pay increases. As a result of the abuse of food stamps and other benefits, the most effective pressure on unions to settle a strike is removed.

Mr. Speaker, the public is being asked to pay for strikes not only in higher prices, thus fueling inflation, but in tax dollars going to the dinner table of striking workers. A continued Federal policy of supplying food stamps to strikers cannot help but prolong strikes and push up prices. And perhaps most important, it undermines our commitment to the work ethic, one of the fundamental strengths of this country. One need only look at the example of food stamp abuse in Los Angeles to understand how giving food stamps to strikers fan the flames of inflation and destroys the incentive of an individual to work for a living. The UAW paid the average striker \$40 nontaxable dollars a week in strike benefits for a 4-week total of \$160. He was able to supplement this with \$64 of food stamps and \$282 from the California Welfare Department. This gave the striker a real income of \$506, compared to a net income of \$365 during a 4-week period while he was working—a 38-percent increase for being on strike.

In taking the floor of the House today, it is the purpose of my colleagues and myself to ask that Congress stand up and say that it will not allow food stamps to be used against the public interest. The question of revising and extending the food stamp program will soon be before Congress for a decision and now is the time to reaffirm our commitment to holding down inflation, maintaining the independence of collective bargaining, and upholding a belief in the work ethic as basic to our way of life.

The use of food stamps by strikers is not a case of isolated instances of individual strikers getting food stamps as a last resort. Rather, it is a matter of large numbers of strikers claiming food stamps as a sort of automatic strike benefit, almost from the first day of a strike. It is not a question of starving children, but of organized, assembly line processing of strikers for food stamps, often on the first day of a strike. It is not a case of involuntary poor who, through no fault of their own, must ask for public aid, but a matter of the voluntary poor, for whom welfare was never intended, claiming food stamps as a benefit for choosing not to work.

The precedent was set for large-scale use of food stamps and other welfare benefits by strikers in the 1967-68 copper strike. In that case, public aid was not tapped until strikers' reserves had been exhausted, but it opened up a whole new set of resources to unions. By 1969, the strategy of using public funds to

supplement union strike funds had become refined enough for General Electric strikers to collect about \$25 million in various forms of public assistance. The culmination of the development of the organized use of food stamps and welfare to finance strikes came just a few years ago with the Westinghouse, General Motors, and Teamsters strikes. In these cases, there were blatant abuses of the intent of the food stamp and welfare programs.

In the Westinghouse strike, the Lester—Pennsylvania—local was able to tap public funds to the tune of about \$2.5 million and put up almost nothing in terms of its own funds. This meant that virtually all the economic leverage that the union was bringing to bear against the company was supplied by taxpayers in the form of food stamps and welfare.

In the General Motors strike, Michigan strikers alone were able to lay claim to an estimated \$11 million worth of food stamps and, at one point, it is estimated that about one-half of the strikers were on food stamps.

In the Teamsters strike, the Chicago locals were able to hold out long past the time other locals across the country had settled, primarily because of the organized use of food stamps and other forms of public assistance. This meant that, after the Chicago Teamsters had finally settled, the entire settlement, across the country, had to be renegotiated based on the more liberal settlement obtained in Chicago. And that is not all. There were such excesses in the distribution of food stamps in this strike that the Governor of Illinois stated that \$150,000 worth of food stamps had been procured by members of the Teamsters by "fraud or otherwise." Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture has charged the Cook County Department of Public Aid of "gross negligence in the administration of the food stamp program."

Mr. Speaker, cases such as these are continuing. As unions realize the benefits and the power that public funds can give them, they are using personnel specially trained in the various loopholes in the food stamp program and other welfare programs to go out and prepare unions for strikes. They are, to a greater and greater extent, taking advantage of programs for the involuntary poor to subsidize strikes and strikers.

It is only right that the Federal Government's role in subsidizing strikes, primarily through allowing the use of food stamps by strikers, be ended. It makes sense in terms of this society's commitments to the work ethic and independent collective bargaining and common sense in terms of the money it costs all of us to continue the practice of Federal aid to strikers.

By its nature, the food stamp program, with the most liberal eligibility standards, a requirement for quick certification, and less of a "welfare stigma," is the welfare benefit most widely used by strikers. The program features that make it so easily usable by those voluntarily not working were put there to aid the unfortunate needy. They were not meant to destroy the delicate balance

that is needed if collective bargaining is to work.

Proponents of continuing food stamp aid to strikers point out that the work registration, income, and asset standards of the food stamp program keep non-need people out of the program and make sure that they accept work if offered. I would submit that, in the case of strikes, it is highly unlikely that these controls are workable. The work registration requirement only works if jobs are available at nonstrike sites. This is an unrealistic expectation in a town that is undergoing a strike and is probably having to lay off many workers in related industries. In addition, what employer would accept a worker he knows will be returning to his former job when the strike is ended. The income and assets tests are also unworkable controls on strikers. During a strike, welfare offices are flooded with applicants for food stamps and other assistance. This makes it almost impossible to check out every applicant fully until a month or so has passed. However, by that time a strike is usually over and the striker has received his tax-supported benefits.

The means of controlling the use of food stamps by strikers does not lie inherent in program controls. It lies in making them ineligible for participation. The bill that I have cosponsored, amending the Food Stamp Act to exclude households who would claim food stamps because a member of the household is on strike, offers a positive first step in removing Federal interference in collective bargaining and tax dollars as strike subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, over the past years the House has moved closer and closer to recognizing that the Federal Government must get itself out of the role of actively supporting strikers with food stamps. Between 1971 and 1972, the margin by which the amendment to remove strikes from food stamp eligibility lacked in passing was more than cut in half, to only 19 votes last year. I would assert that the time has come for this serious decision to be made. We cannot afford to permit a continuation of this "end run" around the intent of the food stamp program and the Federal commitment to maintain a "hands off" stance with regard to strikes.

ROBERT W. SARNOFF SPEECH BEFORE NBC TELEVISION NETWORK AFFILIATES CONVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, last week the National Broadcasting Co. met with the ownership representatives of the 218 television stations which make up the NBC television network to review plans for next year's television season and discuss items of mutual interest. During the course of the 3-day meeting, Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA and himself a former president and chairman of NBC, made a major address which, because of its timeliness, I would like to share with my colleagues.

Mr. Sarnoff, who has spent more than 30 years of his life in the communications and information industries, drew on his long experience in examining the current relationship between the Government and the communications media.

I insert the address of Mr. Sarnoff at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF ROBERT W. SARNOFF

I'm delighted to be back among so many old friends. This is a sentimental journey for me. It is not only a reunion; it also helps mark a milestone that reaches back far beyond the time, eight years ago, when we last faced each other across this podium. I've just completed my 25th year at RCA. Those years began, and most of them were spent, at NBC.

Television and I came to NBC at about the same time. I was present at the creation and was part of television's growth—from "Ding Dong School" to "Victory at Sea;" to the creation of specials, the expansion of news and the launching of color; to the emergence of television as a vital force in American life. The ties I formed in two decades of working in television have never been broken. I believe I have some credentials to speak about the medium—with the added perspective of a little detachment in recent years.

It is more than a personal milestone that brings me here today. I believe that broadcasting stands at a critical turn in the road. In a sense, we are at a point that recalls earlier moments of major challenge in broadcasting's history.

The first resulted in the bold decision to create radio networking and forge a national service and a new industry. Next, broadcasters had to decide whether to venture from the success of radio to risk the promise of television. And once again, after television was well established, we were confronted with another monumental commitment—turning the medium to color.

Each of these advances into new territory was beset by hazards; each demanded courage and faith; each brought rich rewards to the public no less than to the broadcasters.

What faces us today is not a great leap into new territory, but it is just as much a test of our nerve and our commitment. The challenge is not from the unknown but from a direction we know all too well. It is the escalation of government intrusion into broadcasting that began long ago, and is now reaching the danger point.

What is at stake is the future of a medium that the American people have relied on increasingly as their chief source of entertainment and information. If we can meet this challenge with unity and resolution, we can enter another era of expanding service and its accompanying rewards. For, this remarkable medium, mature as it is in serving virtually the entire population, still holds the seeds of fresh growth. Before I try to analyze the threats that confront us, let me sketch just how bright our hopes can be.

For the rest of the 70's, households—the basic unit of television circulation—will be growing faster than a growing population. By 1980, TV households will exceed 75 million, an increase of 25 per cent in a decade. Color television, now past the half-way mark in circulation, will spread to more than 90 per cent of these TV households. And color is a built-in growth element all by itself. When it enters the home, viewing goes up and so does advertising effectiveness. We expect television advertising revenues to grow by 40 per cent in the first half of this decade, and by another 50 per cent in the second half.

What about the impact of new technology, such as cablevision, home video cassettes and

the video disc? My role at RCA keeps me on top of these developments, and I foresee important markets for them. But they are highly specialized media, which will serve large numbers of relatively small audience segments with a great variety of specialized material. As they mature, these media will nibble away at television's audience, but that will be relatively marginal. As far ahead as we can see, television will retain its unique position, because of its singular capability of delivering huge volumes of entertainment and information, supported by advertising, more economically and effectively, to more people, than any other medium. Even with the new technology and competition, television should be able to continue a growth curve that other industries would envy.

That growth will not come as manna from heaven. It will have to be earned in the future, as it has in the past, by constant effort in identifying and meeting the changing interests of changing audiences. They can turn us off if we don't turn them on, or they can continue tuning us in if we keep attuned to them. I have every confidence in television's creative capacity to hold and increase its audience if it is permitted to do so.

My projection of a bright future for television is rooted, I believe, in a realistic appraisal of the natural forces of economics, competition and technology. What it does not take into account is the artificial forces that would be imposed by government restrictions.

As a regulated industry, broadcasting has learned over the years how to live with government. The first three letters of our alphabet are FCC. We also deal with the FTC, the Department of Justice and other government agencies. And from the very beginning, the industry has maintained a dialogue, mostly a constructive one, with committees in both houses of Congress. I think it is second nature for us to be alert to the special nature of our public stewardship—and I don't think we're particularly thin-skinned about our regulated status.

But the growing intensity of government assaults on broadcasting must give us new and genuine concern. Most visibly, we have had the unprecedented spectacle of high federal officials attacking the national news media in general and television network news in particular. It is plainly an effort to impair the credibility of the news and to influence how it is reported. It seems aimed at a state of public information fed by government handout and starved by official secrecy on matters that are the public's business.

The effort to discredit television news has coincided with another development—the emergence of a new official voice that speaks for the White House on broadcast policy. The Office of Telecommunications Policy has some antecedents as a technical unit in the Executive Branch, but now it has become an activist agency—something new not only for broadcasters but for the FCC and the Congress to contend with.

Here are some of the policies the OTP has been pushing. The agency seeks to force-feed cablevision beyond its natural growth in order to offset broadcasting. It wants to limit repeat programming with no comprehensive justification in the public interest. It has assaulted network news with colorful generalities that defy definition. It has sought to turn the stations into censors of network news by linking such a role with proposed licensing arrangements we all seek.

This latter device was so transparent that an explanation seemed necessary, and so we have the new rallying cry of "localism." Free-ly translated in this context, "localism" means "divide and conquer." Only the national media have the resources for intensive reporting of major national and international events and issues—in other words, the arena in which the federal government operates. Demeaning and diminishing the national media—whether they be the television net-

works or the nation's leading newspapers, magazines and wire services—is an effort to stifle the most relevant channels of public information. In the name of localism, the federal government would prefer to put the primary burden of reporting and analyzing national and world issues on a fragmented multitude of local media, which lack the resources for such a task.

Localism is pretext. What the government wants is a tamed press. Thus, in non-commercial television, we have been witnessing an interesting variation. There, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, controlled directly by government appointees, has been dismantling national news and public affairs programming. Individual stations have been seeking a role in the decision-making process at the national level. But the Director of the OTP, who proclaims localism for commercial television, opposes giving local non-commercial stations a voice in programming through their own representatives in the national organization.

The government's efforts to make the news media docile and accommodating rely heavily on the technique of intimidation. This technique works only against those who are willing to be timid. But there is another threat that is not sufficiently recognized. That is to strike at national broadcast journalism through actions and proposals attacking the economic capability of networks. I am not suggesting that the government has adopted such a design, but I am concerned that an atmosphere has developed where networks are perceived as fair game.

Whatever may be the motives of this growing pressure on broadcasting, it is important for us—and even more important for the public—to recognize an essential fact: weakening the economic structure of networking could impede the flow of independent information from the country's major national news medium to the people. And in our society, which depends on an informed electorate and an open market of ideas, that would be a calamity.

Some of the economic threats, such as the proposal for countercommercials, are aimed at the whole broadcasting industry. But significantly, the networks are the major target.

For example, the Department of Justice recently dusted off an anti-trust suit against the television networks. It revisits areas already under FCC examination. It proposes actions paralleling steps already taken by the FCC. And it seeks changes that could only disrupt the complex process of program development, selection and scheduling.

Another example is the rerun issue I have cited as one of those pushed by the OTP. During last year's political campaign, the Administration suddenly came to the support of another campaign—one conducted by Hollywood production unions—to cut back network program reruns in prime time. This is a proposal designed for private—not public—interest. Incidentally, no such restrictions have been proposed for stations, where local entertainment programming consists largely of reruns.

Again, it is the networks that have been singled out to their disadvantage in the matter of CATV ownership. Here, it seems to me, they are being doubly penalized. On the one hand, only the network companies have been barred from owning cable television systems anywhere in the country. On the other, we have seen the calculated effort to build up CATV as a competitor to the networks.

With the stations openly courted by the government, there could be a short-sighted temptation for you to say: "It's happening to the networks; it isn't happening to us." This would be like saying that the front end of the boat is sinking but we're sitting in the stern.

In television, we are all very much in the same boat—stations, program suppliers and networks. Damage any part and you damage

the whole. What is also damaged is a broad program service of news and entertainment, free to the public, and a selling force that helps power our whole national distribution system.

The network business is marked by high risk and modest profit margins but it supports the economics of stations which enjoy much higher earnings ratios as a result. Government actions that would increase a network's costs, disrupt its operations and reduce its economic opportunities would, at the same time, strike at the stations and their service to their communities.

Network news and sports are services of particular value to the public—services that the stations could not otherwise supply. They involve enormous costs with little or no financial return. If the networks' economic resources are drained by repressive government measures, news and sports would certainly be vulnerable to cutbacks. And, indeed, so would the entertainment service, which requires continuing and costly program development, culminating each year at the point where the three network put close to a half billion dollars on the line in high-risk commitments. It is those commitments that support the prime-time program schedule that attracts your major audiences and a good deal of your revenue.

So these are the threats we face in this prosperous year of a promising decade: threats to journalistic freedom joined with threats to television's economic base. They overlap and intertwine. Without freedom to fulfill our responsibilities as a news medium, we might hang on to our profits at the cost of our souls. Without a viable economic base, we could hang on to neither. We must meet both threats at the same time and in much the same way—by taking a stand and making common cause with all those who have a stake in freedom of the press and a vigorous system of broadcasting.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough that this is not a matter of partisan politics. What we must resist is not peculiar to any single Administration. It represents a continuing and accelerating trend, begun many years ago. It consists of actions proposed by the well-meaning who do not recognize the side-effects of their prescriptions; it also consists of actions calculated to injure, advanced by men of ill will who seek to cut down the role of broadcasting. Whatever the intention, these attacks on broadcasting are equally dangerous. And do not think that harmful measures, if they are adopted, would not carry into future administrations—and indeed provide the basis for still further turns of the screw.

We are far from perfect and, despite our best efforts, we will go on making our share of mistakes. We do not reject criticism, but we have to consider its source and its purpose. NBC expects to go on hearing from you, and it wants to. As to the work of NBC News, we hope you will not try to act as a censor on behalf of this or any Administration. You can be confident that NBC intends to keep covering, reporting and analyzing the news in a manner best summarized by a famous newspaper slogan: without fear or favor. And that also is in your interest, for that is the kind of news service your audiences want and welcome.

We should all be grateful to the OTP's pot shots at network news for a couple of things. For one, the effort to tie desirable licensing arrangements to demands that stations become watchdogs over network news was so obvious that it backfired and was thoroughly discredited in legislative hearings. Secondly, the OTP's attacks prompted a remarkable outpouring of support for broadcasting from many of the nation's newspapers and magazines. They helped focus the country's attention on the fact that an attack on one news medium is an attack on all. By the same token, many broadcasters have helped

make the public more aware of governmental pressures on the print media.

I believe we could and should do even more. Let me offer two examples of issues on which broadcasters should make themselves heard. One is an economic issue on its face, but it is bound up with freedom and diversity of expression. The nation's magazines have borne heavy postal increases and they are now threatened with a rate hike of 142 per cent over the next five years. Some magazines will die as a result; they will be just as dead as if they had been censored.

Another issue on which broadcasters should rally with newspapers and magazines is one that affects the essential function of all the news media.

It is the effort of government to put self-serving restraints on the free flow of information to the people. This can take different forms. One is outright prior restraint on publication of news. Another is the increasingly common device of subjecting investigative reporters to subpoenas and the threat of jail sentences—an abusive practice that results in drying up news sources. Still another is the use of official secrecy as a cloak for official mistakes and derelictions. This is an abuse that has been demonstrated again and again. It is the reason for widespread concern over the government's current efforts to rewrite the sections of the Federal Criminal Code dealing with disclosure of classified information. Whichever of these different means of suppression is employed, the effect is to deprive the public of what it needs to know in a free society.

In a free society, the government is the servant of the public, not its master, and information about government policy belongs to the people as well as the government. The rights guaranteed by the First Amendment were intended to give the public its due. That is common ground on which broadcasting and the print media must stand together and fight side by side.

As to the economic threats that confront television, we must be even more alert to what the government does than to what it says. In this area, I would hope that we could also enlist the understanding and support of the other media. But the first order of business, for all of us in broadcasting, is to recognize our own stake in the economic battle. We are in this together, not just the networks, but all those who benefit from the unique service a network provides: the stations, the program suppliers, the sports world, the advertisers, the advertising agencies and—above all—the public. If we identify the threats, we can overcome them, for their force tends to evaporate with the ventilation of full public exposure.

To provide this ventilation, we must carry on a continuing campaign that lets the public know what it stands to lose if this medium is progressively weakened by government action. And since the Congress is the most direct representative of the public, we must also help our Congressmen and Senators understand what is at stake.

Within the industry itself, there is a special relationship between a network and its affiliates, and I hope we will all rise to it as we have in the past. You and NBC have come a long way together in what is really not a very long time. Within the careers of scores of men in this room, we have built a great American institution out of vision, courage and enterprise. The best is yet to come. It is worth fighting for. And I am confident we will prevail.

A TRIBUTE TO WARD QUAAL, PRESIDENT OF WGN CONTINENTAL BROADCASTING CO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the honor being conferred on May 16 by Brandeis University to Ward Quaal, president of WGN Continental Broadcasting Co.

Clarence Q. Berger, executive vice president of Brandeis in Waltham, Mass., will present Mr. Quaal with an award for outstanding achievement in the field of communications. The award banquet honoring Mr. Quaal will be held at the Ambassador West Hotel in Chicago.

Ward Quaal, who is also vice president of the Chicago Tribune Co., has distinguished himself in the field of broadcasting for many years and he has spearheaded many innovations in his industry. He has given of his boundless energy and enthusiasm to countless civic projects, and his many contributions to our city of Chicago will be long remembered.

Brandeis University is one of a few small, private universities in the United States, and since its inception in 1948, is recognized as one of the 20 most selective universities in the Nation.

It is the first Jewish-sponsored non-sectarian institution of higher learning in the Western Hemisphere, and is named for the illustrious Supreme Court Justice, Louis Dembitz Brandeis. More than 6,000 alumni have emerged from the undergraduate college, and many are now living in the Greater Chicago area.

This honor for Mr. Quaal follows on the heels of two other recent honors. He received the National Association of Broadcasters Distinguished Service Award—the industry's highest honor, in Washington, D.C., on March 26—and also was named 1973 Illinois Broadcaster of the Year at that statewide association's spring convention in Springfield on April 16.

As the Congressman for the 11th District of Illinois, where the offices of WGN are located, I would also like to mention that Mr. Quaal is to be honored on June 1 with an official portrait award presented by Edward Wilson, president of the Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association. The city of Chicago was proudly represented this year by WGN's "It's a Big Country" float in the Rosebowl parade, and it was WGN's float which placed third in that national event.

It is a genuine pleasure for me to extend my congratulations to Ward Quaal and I take singular pride at paying tribute to him and the entire WGN family for the outstanding public service job they are doing for Chicago and the Nation.

THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER IS THE LOSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, in April, the then Secretary of Defense, Elliot L. Richardson reported to Congress that the F-15 fighter plane, which he called the "Air Superiority Fighter," was moving ahead on schedule. Richardson said that the first three squadrons of the

F-15, which "should be superior to any fighter the Soviet Union is likely to field in the late 1970's and early 1980's," would be operational by the middle of this decade.

This was encouraging news, indeed, because not only is the F-15 a very advanced fighter plane, but it is a very expensive one too. The Air Force wants to buy 77 of the aircraft in fiscal 1974 at a total cost of \$918 million. There is another \$230 million tucked away in this year's budget to pay for research and development on the F-15.

This was doubly encouraging news because, in addition, the development of the F-15 has not always gone quite as smoothly as, let us say, a Pentagon briefing. The F-15 engine, being manufactured by Pratt & Whitney, has had a particular history of defects and delays. Secretary Richardson alluded to the troubled history in his annual report when he said that the engine had failed the military qualification endurance test. However, he felt that Congress to date had been "generally very satisfied."

The test to which Secretary Richardson referred was actually quite important. Under the terms of the contract, Pratt & Whitney could not begin production until the test had been successfully completed. In addition, until the engine passed the test, Pratt & Whitney was to be held financially responsible for all contract deficiencies in the engine. The tests were scheduled for mid-April of this year.

Now, as a result of hearings held last week by the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we learn that we had been misled by the Pentagon. As a result of a secret agreement with the contractor, Pratt & Whitney, the Air Force has certified the F-15 engine for production without insuring that the F-15 engine was up to contract standards. They did this by conducting totally trumped-up tests, planned and executed in agreement with Pratt & Whitney for the benefit of Pratt & Whitney. As a result of the tests, tens of millions of dollars in developmental costs have been passed on from Pratt & Whitney to the taxpayer.

This is an awfully shady deal, even by Pentagon standards and I am requesting the General Accounting Office to conduct an investigation. If this is not fraud—and fraud on a grand scale, then the word does not have a meaning any more.

These are the facts: on March 30, shortly before the F-15 engine was to undergo the crucial 150-hour endurance test, program director, Maj. Gen. Benjamin N. Bellis, agreed with agents of Pratt & Whitney to exclude the standards for both height and speed performance from the test. Original F-15 specifications called for speed of mach 2.2 or 2.3 at 40,000 feet.

However, General Bellis and others involved knew that the F-15 could not pass the test. They had already determined that an engine fan component called the stator blade needed modifications. And they knew that with the stator blades not functioning the F-15 engine would burn up. That is why—just for the test—they lowered the standards.

But now that the engine has passed

this phony test, Pratt & Whitney is no longer responsible for making good on the engine and now the Government has to pick up the bill for the engine modifications. The contract has been successfully circumvented, and on a technicality, if we may be so kind, Pratt & Whitney has been released from its contractual responsibilities.

The primary blame belongs to F-15 program director, General Bellis. However, once high Air Force officials, including Gen. John D. Ryan, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Robert C. Seamans, Secretary of the Air Force learned of the test, they attempted a coverup. Statements by Secretary Seamans before a House Defense Appropriations subcommittee made at a time when Seamans was aware of the test irregularities, were an obvious attempt to hide the unpleasant facts. At that time, Seamans testified that:

While the engine endurance run has been completed, we do not feel the run covered the high speed, high altitude, adequately.

It was only in response to committee questions that Seamans acknowledged the true facts of the test.

As Seamans told the subcommittee, the F-15 engine must now undergo additional tests on the modified stator blade assembly in September, but because of the test results, Pratt & Whitney is no longer "contractually responsible" for the costs of the additional work. These costs will run, to take the Air Force's own estimate, into the "tens of millions of dollars." The loser, as usual, is the American taxpayer.

SUPPORT FOR HOUSE RESOLUTION 382

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much response to a "dear colleague" letter I mailed to House Members this week that I am including the full text of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today so that the matter can be available to others who are interested. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1973.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: By way of trying to stress to you the importance attached by me to the subject matter discussed herein, may I remind you that "dear colleague" letters are an extreme rarity with me.

Views expressed herein include knowledge and experience I have gained in more than 17 years experience with U.S. Customs appropriations as a member, and now chairman, of the Appropriations subcommittee in charge of the U.S. Treasury Department Appropriations bill.

I urge and seek your support of H. Res. 382 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 for the following reasons:

1. It would radically change fundamental American criminal justice procedures and concepts of due process by eliminating the historic separation between investigators and prosecutors. To consolidate these vast powers would alter our historic checks and balances inherent in such separation. Moreover, it will reduce the professionalism of the agents—making them mere aides to the prosecuting attorney who develops proprietary interests

in given cases instead of maintaining objective review responsibility. Separating enforcement and prosecution insures maximum objectivity in the performance of both functions.

2. It is a major step toward a national police force by adding yet another investigative enforcement arm to the Department of Justice.

3. It was ill conceived and not based on any serious management study. It was rushed up to the Congress to get it in under the deadline before reorganization authority lapsed. This plan is actually being staffed out after its presentation and a host of problems are involved. In fact, policy questions apart, so little time remains to organize the proposed agency prior to the July 1 effective date of the plan that the entire U.S. drug enforcement program will be in disarray for an extended period if this plan becomes law.

4. This reorganization plan runs contrary to Federalism and our revenue sharing concept. Federal officers should not be involved in local drug enforcement matters. They should concentrate strictly on the major organized criminal groups and on strengthening the drug enforcement efforts of the over 400,000 state and local police officials, the first line of defense at the state and local levels.

5. This reorganization plan is admittedly not based on reducing spending—the irony is that this plan will cost more and produce less. It is counterproductive. The proposed reorganization plan will strip U.S. Customs of manpower and resources needed for its other contraband and trade enforcement activities. Congress does not have precise details which it needs before acting on the plan.

6. Even the single-agency concept for agents is subject to serious question. There are two broad and distinct areas in the drug field—smuggling and internal distribution, each involving their own tactics and procedures to investigate. Customs has had great success these past four years. The present Commissioner of Customs, a career professional and recent recipient of the Rockefeller Public Service Award, has developed a close working relationship with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

The single-agency approach to drug enforcement largely removes from the battle against illicit drugs the expertise and organization of Customs in preventing the smuggling of all contraband, which has produced substantial successes in drug seizures and arrests. Also important, it removes the checks and balances against collusion which exists when one investigative activity, interfacing with another, may discover and expose corruption.

7. The performance of the elements of the Justice Department now engaged in drug enforcement does not warrant entrusting to it the enormous increase in power and the responsibility for virtually the entire drug enforcement program. The recent DALE raids in Illinois on innocent persons are but one dramatic example of mismanagement.

8. There are alternative plans which would not imperil individual rights and our criminal justice system, and which would cost less and produce more.

A fundamental change in our concepts of law enforcement, as embodied in Reorganization Plan No. 2, certainly should not be entered into lightly, without full public hearings before the Judiciary Committee and without having the views of the American, Federal and other Bar Associations, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and other interested groups.

Since this reorganization plan will weaken the enforcement capability of the Bureau of Customs, the main operating bureau on trade matters, this plan should also be thoroughly considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

This matter is of such serious consequence

that it should not be rushed through in an incomplete or unstudied way. Instead, the Congress either should hold extensive hearings to determine the full ramifications of this plan and compare alternative proposals, or return the plan to the Executive Branch for a complete study and analysis, including alternatives, before resubmitting for Congressional consideration.

For all of these reasons, this plan should be rejected and I urge your support for H. Res. 382 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Chairman, Treasury-Post Office-General
Government Subcommittee on Appropria-
tions.

DOMESTIC ANIMAL WELFARE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two major pieces of legislation in the interest of domestic animal welfare in the United States. Both of these measures seek, in their own way, to reduce needless suffering of domestic animals and to make our laws protecting these animals consistent with the affectionate esteem that exists for domestic animals throughout the United States.

The first of these measures would provide Federal assistance for the establishment and construction of municipal, low-cost, non-profit clinics for the spaying and neutering of dogs and cats. This bill recognizes that there is an enormous homeless population of dogs and cats in our country, and that this over-abundance creates a serious problem for communities and too often leads to the needless suffering of homeless animals. Although several State legislatures, including New York, and city councils have expressed a concerned interest in the establishment of municipal spaying clinics as a humane approach to controlling our exploding animal population, there currently exists no co-ordinated effort on either a State or national level to make these publicly owned, self-supporting clinics a reality and to replace the cruel destruction of unwanted, homeless animals with a viable approach to controlling our over-abundant and increasing dog and cat population.

It is my feeling that the only truly humane answer to the population explosion that each year adds scores of diseased, starved, homeless animals to our communities lies in a concerted effort, with Federal support, to set up clinics across the country where animals can be spayed and neutered by qualified veterinarians. We simply cannot continue to allow our animal population to grow at the rate it has been, and we cannot continue to let the surplus of animals be dealt with through destructive means or by merely letting starved, neglected animals roam the streets and cities. Not only is this a question of protecting our domestic animals, but also a matter of reducing what is often a grave health and safety hazard for our communities. Mr. Speaker, a bill very similar to mine has also been introduced in the Senate by Mr. BAYH. By enacting our legislation,

an enlightened Congress will be furthering the progress of a long overdue humane project.

Mr. Speaker, the second measure I am introducing would prohibit the importation into the United States of commercially produced domestic dog and cat animal products, and to prohibit these products from moving in interstate commerce. In the past year, we have all heard the frightening story about the group in South Africa that is breeding and raising Dalmatian dogs so that their skins can be sold and imported into the United States. In other parts of the world as well, factory-farming and other commercial raising of dogs and cats is increasing; our country does not, and should not want to be a party to this inhumane activity by allowing imports of these products. In fact, if a prohibition against the importation of these dog and cat products is not decreed, we are virtually encouraging the continuation of this reprehensible treatment of domestic animals. We, as a people, have always held in the deepest regard the welfare and well-being of domestic animals, and I believe we should convey this feeling beyond our shores and wholly discourage inhumane treatment of these animals by enacting a strict prohibition against the importation of products made from commercially raised dogs and cats.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to give serious consideration to these two measures as a means to reduce the needless suffering of domestic animals and promote their well-being both in our own country and abroad. The Bible says, "The decent man considers the life of his beast"; in the interest of common decency, I hope Congress will act favorably on my proposals.

RANGEL REPORTS TO THE CITIZENS OF THE 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in this time of great turbulence on the national scene, both politically and socially, I feel it is one of our first responsibilities as Members of Congress to relay to our constituents information on our efforts with regard to the pressing issues of our time.

One of the few bright spots that has shown throughout the entire sordid Watergate investigation has been the open public access to information about the case, sometimes even despite official desires concerning this information.

In line with my goal of keeping these channels of information as open as possible, I place one of my spring informational communications with the residents of the 19th Congressional District before this body and the Nation.

It is my hope that every public official, including the highest officers of the land, will join me in attempting to tell as many Americans as can be reached that we are doing our best to make our Government truly a Government of the people.

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON TO YOU—SPRING 1973

RANGEL ACTS ON OEO

As soon as President Nixon and OEO Director Howard Phillips began destroying the anti poverty program, I authored and introduced H.J. Res. 385, the "Economic Opportunity Compliance Act of 1973", in the House of Representatives with 25 Congressional co-sponsors.

This bill orders all officials of the Executive Branch to stop sabotaging the War On Poverty. Judge Jones' recent Federal court decision on OEO ordered exactly the same thing. I am now watching to see if Phillips complies. If he does not, I will recommend that further, more stringent legal action be taken.

I am also working in Congress to insure that the War On Poverty is redesigned and refunded to be even more effective than before.

At the same time, I am working to implement model social services-welfare regulations to combat the oppressive Administration proposals in this area.

OPEN LETTER TO THE CITIZENS OF THE 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

DEAR FRIEND: Rarely in American history has any Presidential Administration attempted to carry out so vicious an attack on crucially needed human services programs as has President Richard Nixon and Company.

The Watergate investigation has also made it clear that we are dealing with people whose lust for power transcends the bounds of moral and ethical conduct. We have common criminals in the White House.

In light of this situation, it is time we stopped expecting Nixon and accomplices to temper their actions with conscience. Any Administration that would attempt to throw hundreds of thousands of poor children out of day care programs, as well as cut rehabilitation funds for veterans seriously injured in that Administration's illegal war, obviously has no conscience whatsoever.

It is left up to Congress and the Courts, using the full power of the Constitution, to stop these attacks on human needs. I pledge all of my efforts to the most effective and immediate use of this power.

As the Treasurer of the New York State Democratic Congressional Delegation, my efforts have included working to unite these 22 members around issues of critical concern to the citizens of both our community and the rest of the State.

My position as Secretary of the Congressional Black Caucus has given me the opportunity to play a very active role in planning national mobilizations of citizen opposition to such Nixon moves as the attempted destruction of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs. This destruction was also being aimed at manpower programs such as the Opportunities Industrialization Centers.

When organizations from our 19th CD wanted to make their voices heard in person against the antipoverty cutbacks in February, I worked to assist them in having the maximum opportunity to reach members of Congress.

In speaking to them, I pointed out that Nixon's actions against the War On Poverty were not only immoral, but in obvious violation of the Constitution. The Federal Courts have since confirmed my belief and ordered the dismantlement halted.

I urged the several thousand persons who came to Washington to continue their struggle and assured them of my total support. Programs like the Community Action Corporations and OIC cannot be allowed to end. Their contribution to our community is invaluable.

If we are to stop this dangerous trend at every level of domestic policy, we will have to maintain the highest level of mutual sup-

port and cooperation between citizens and elected officials, as well as among the diverse neighborhoods of our community. Together, I believe we can do it.

Following are summaries of more of my efforts.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. RANGEL,
Member of Congress.

RANGEL TAKES ACTION ON THE ISSUES

Southeast Asia

When the Vietnam cease-fire and truce agreements were signed recently, I joined with the rest of America in rejoicing for what appeared to be the end of an American military involvement that never should have begun.

But with the step-up of U.S. bombing over Cambodia and other sections of Southeast Asia, and other facts which have surfaced, I believe it is time for our reassurance to give way to a rebirth of the outrage and protest that characterized the peace movement of the sixties.

"POW's and MIA's"

One area of concern to me is that the Administration has failed to account for large numbers of ground soldiers who were declared captured or missing in action. Blacks were among this group of grunt GIs far in excess of their numbers in the general population.

Even though these enlisted men bore the brunt of Vietnam fighting for almost eight years, they have comprised only 12 percent of the POWs who have thus far returned. I am demanding that the Nixon Administration give all available information about these missing men to their families and the rest of America.

I am also working for the passage of legislation that would forbid any U.S. military activities in Southeast Asia.

Housing freeze

The Nixon Administration's 18-month freeze on all Federal housing programs represented yet another vicious attack on the needs of the citizens of the 19th Congressional District and the nation.

Immediately after the freeze was announced, I telephoned the President to express my outrage at his action. I hoped to force him to realize the devastating damage that would result in our community because of his actions.

I have also been working to further the efforts of a broad-based coalition of groups and individuals adversely affected by the freeze to bring additional pressure on the Administration to reverse its stand.

These and other efforts have resulted in at least a partial lifting of the freeze to allow funding of projects already in the pipeline early this year. I will not slacken my efforts, however, until this cruel freeze is totally lifted.

The fight to save U.S. jobs

At a time when prices are spiraling upward and unemployment still a major problem, our community and this nation can no longer afford the loss of thousands of American jobs to cheaper foreign labor markets.

I have therefore joined Rep. Burke of Massachusetts and Sen. Hartke of Indiana in offering legislation to stop U.S. firms from sending increasing numbers of jobs and dollars overseas.

This proposal would allow the Federal Government to impose exactly the same kind of quota and tariff restrictions on foreign-made products that nearly every other nation in the world already imposes on U.S. products. There are provisions in the bill insuring that these Federally-imposed restrictions will be fluid enough to prevent the gouging of the consumer by greedy corporations.

Voter rights

Following the chaos and frustration experienced by many of you while trying to register and vote in last year's election, I

introduced H.R. 4846, the "National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973" in the House with nearly 40 Congressional cosponsors.

This proposal would enable any potentially eligible voter to register by postcard through the mail without the obstacles of long residency requirements or clerical errors on a local level.

War on Drugs

Recently, I spoke before the Fifth National Conference on Methadone Treatment in Washington, D.C. Following are some of my remarks on the methadone problem.

"Many people in my community are concerned because they believe that drugs have been used in the past for the social control of Blacks, and may be used in this manner again.

"In my community, we are also worried about the rapid growth in the street sale of methadone diverted from its normal channels of distribution and from legitimate treatment programs. The number of methadone overdose deaths in New York City and throughout the country has risen sharply during the last two years and we have the increasing phenomena of methadone junkies on Harlem's streets."

In response to the crisis surrounding methadone, I have introduced H.R. 6868, the "Controlled Substances Security Act of 1973", in the House of Representatives. This would place much tighter controls on the storage and shipment of dangerous drugs like methadone.

Also, I am working for the passage of legislation that would close methadone treatment programs that serve only as "methadone drugstores" with either no, or inadequate supportive services and controls over distribution of the drug.

Early in May, the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, chaired by Rep. Don Edwards of California, held the hearings that I requested on the racist hiring and promotion policies of Federal drug law enforcement agencies.

It struck me as incredible that the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the major Federal anti-drug force has only 68 Black agents, and 1456 whites. The hearings were aimed at ending policies that led to that kind of situation.

I have offered just a few of my efforts in combating drug abuse. Be assured I have not slackened my work to stop the international drug traffic and to force police and other public officials at every level to stop piddling with this life and death problem.

Senior citizens

No segment of American society has been harder hit by the Nixon Administration's vicious attacks on human services than the elderly.

I am happy to report that, despite Presidential veto attempts the Older Americans Act of 1973 has been approved almost unanimously by Congress and will most likely be signed into law. This bill contains a wide range of services for seniors never even imagined under the Social Security Act.

I have also joined with Congresspersons Bella Abzug and Don Fraser of Minnesota to offer legislation that would guarantee a \$3,750 minimum income for seniors and exempt the recent Social Security benefits increases from income consideration in determining eligibility for such services as public housing, veterans benefits, medicare, and food stamps.

These and other measures to benefit our elderly will have to face the same gauntlet of Nixon Administration attacks as other people-oriented programs. All of us will have to work to overcome these obstacles.

Food prices

In response to the skyrocketing price of food for the average citizen in our community and the nation, I introduced legislation to roll all food prices back to their October, 1972 level.

Many other members of Congress, however, do not seem to be concerned about the climbing prices and have voted against firm price controls. Despite this, I will continue to work to increase their awareness of the hardships these prices cause the average citizen, and particularly the poor. I hope I can count on your support in this struggle.

WATERGATE: CORRUPTION "NOW MORE THAN EVER"

Recent weeks have brought a flood of revealed facts and truths bursting through the White House dam of suppression and cover-up tied to the ever-spreading Watergate affair.

Now that former Attorney-General John Mitchell and other White House aides have admitted having prior knowledge of the attempted bugging of Democratic Headquarters and other attempts at political espionage, the entire story might finally surface. The firing of these aides is just the beginning.

Millions of Americans subjected to this sordid affair are losing confidence in our political system. Their hope and faith in American government will only be restored if a swift and thorough investigation is culminated with the prosecution and conviction of all those involved in the Watergate mess. Article I, Section 2 of the United States Constitution gives the House of Representatives the "sole power" of impeachment.

I have called upon the House Judiciary Committee to create a special subcommittee to investigate the facts in this situation.

COMMUNITY NOTES

Few weekends or other days when there is no business on the floor of the Congress go by without my meeting in the 19th Congressional District with constituents, individually or in groups; community political leaders; area government officials; or national figures regarding issues that concern us all.

While many of the constituent meetings deal with the difficult situations that arise, many also deal with the successes of our community's individuals and organizations.

Starting with this month's **COMMUNITY NOTES** column, I will list a few of the grants received and other successes of the past few months with the hope that we can all become better acquainted with the various efforts underway in our diverse community.

The Museum of Modern Art, Children's Art Carnival in Harlem, \$25,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Teachers Inc.—in Harlem—Head Start and Day Care staff training—\$75,000 from HEW.

East Harlem Multi-Service Center (health, counseling, etc.)—an additional \$171,622 from HUD.

East Harlem Interfaith Assoc.—for assisting tenant and community housing management cooperatives—\$40,000 from City of New York.

Have you visited my offices yet? We are there to serve you.

My Congressional Offices have been designed to provide services to our constituents who are having difficulties with housing, welfare, social security and other problems. We will be happy to assist you at the offices listed below:

Harlem—East Harlem Office: 144 West 125th Street, 866-8600.

Washington, D.C. Office: Room 230 Cannon House Office Bldg., 202-225-4365.

West Side Office: 720 Columbus Avenue, 662-2200.

RANGEL CALLS FOR COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

While I sincerely appreciate the warm showing of support I have received from all of you during these challenging days in our national political history, I was saddened to note that, on a national level, public confidence in elected and appointed Government officials has dropped to a record low.

I therefore decided that our 19th Congressional District could, and should, become

even more of a model for citizen involvement and effective concern.

My feeling in this area was happily reinforced when some of you informed me you were looking for ways to become more actively involved in the process of Government in Washington, D.C. as it relates to our community's pressing problems.

I am therefore initiating 19th CD Citizens Advisory Panels on the areas of greatest concern to all of us. These panels would serve as grassroots resource persons in my work for you in Washington.

If you are interested in participating please indicate the area or areas of your greatest concern by filling out the form below and mailing it to my Washington office.

Name.

Address.

Telephone.

Check area of interest:

Housing.

Health.

Senior citizens.

Consumer.

Employment.

Economic Development.

Other.

Education.

Crime.

Prison Reform.

Ecology.

Social Services.

Narcotics Abuse.

International Affairs.

Civil Rights & Civil Liberties.

RANGEL LEGISLATIVE BOXSCORE

Although many members of Congress have cast their votes against people programs just to please the Nixon Administration, I have, and will, remain firm in my resolve to use every bit of power at my disposal to *fight for these crucially necessary social programs*. My votes in just a few of these major areas that have come before the 93rd Congress in its first four months follow.

Social Services: Motion in the Democratic Caucus to make consideration of model HEW Social Services-Welfare regulations a high priority for the full House—passed (Yes).

Older Americans: Expand the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide more and better services for Senior Citizens—passed and awaiting Presidential action at this writing (Yes).

Students: More funds for student loans—passed into law (Yes).

Children: Amend the Child Nutrition Act, ordering the Secretary of Agriculture to stop blocking food for needy children and make cash payments to school districts that were being shortchanged—passed into law (Yes).

Prices: Strengthen Wage and Price Control Act by rolling back prices—Administration pressure on other members killed this approach in favor of a weaker one. (Yes for full rollback).

Loans: Continue the Public Works and Economic Development Act with loan benefits for our area—passed House at this writing. (Yes).

Mass Transit: Open the Highway Trust Fund for mixed mass transit—passed House closed for mass transit, passed Senate open (Yes for opening).

Air Pollution: Expand and strengthen the Clean Air Act for fighting air pollution—passed into law (Yes).

Solid Waste: Extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act for developing better ways of dealing with our waste problems—passed into law (Yes).

I am also pleased to report there has been progress on some of the legislative proposals I have either individually or jointly sponsored. Examples of these include:

BILL AND PROGRESS

Comprehensive Day Care Improvement Act: Work in progress in Education and Labor Committee.

Economic Opportunity Compliance Act—orders Nixon and OEO Director Phillips to

stop destroying OEO and its programs: Action pending in Judiciary Committee.

Model HEW Social Services—Welfare Regulations to counter Nixon proposals: HEW modified its proposals somewhat in our direction, but I will continue pushing for the needed direct Congressional action.

Senior Citizens Income Bill—guaranteed minimum income for older Americans: Action pending in Ways and Means Committee.

Senior Citizens Property Tax Bill—provides income tax deduction for property taxes paid in mortgage or rent by seniors: Action pending in Ways and Means Committee.

Servicemen's Drug Treatment Act: Work in progress in Armed Services Committee.

Controlled Substances Act—proposes needed tightening of shipping and storage of dangerous drugs: Action pending in Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

National Voter Registration Rights Act—greatly improves registration procedures: Action pending in Judiciary Committee and promised for this session of Congress.

Stop the Housing Freeze Resolution: Action pending in Banking and Currency Committee.

Stay Out of Southeast Asia Resolution: Action underway in Foreign Affairs Committee.

Public Corruption Bill—making all bribery of public officials a Federal crime: Action pending in Judiciary Committee.

Dietary Supplement Bill—counters FDA proposals for vitamins, etc.: Action pending in Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE REVISED SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the opportunity to present my views on the revised social services regulations which have been proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Senate Finance Committee. The regulations would cover social service programs such as child care, homemaker services, transportation, and educational programs, and HEW received over 200,000 letters and telegrams protesting their original, ill-conceived, punitive draft.

This new version of the regulations meets some of the objections raised with respect to the first version; there are still a number of serious shortcomings in the proposal, particularly with regard to the assets test for eligibility determinations, the income disregard for people on public assistance, and a framework which may pit programs against one another in the struggle for funds. The current proposal still retains the apparent original goal of an immediate cutting of money costs without regard to the cost in human deprivation or the long-term cost to society of salvaging individuals and families robbed of the hope of becoming self-sufficient, and I urge that it be further revised before being placed in effect. If HEW fails to make the necessary adjustments, then Congress has the responsibility to act, and I am a sponsor of legislation that would enable us to do just that.

The text of my statement to the Finance Committee follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I would like to thank you for giving

me the opportunity to testify on the new social service regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

This has been an issue of deep concern to me, one that I have actively pursued since I received an advance copy of the first version of these regulations before they were issued in February.

Even a cursory analysis of that first version showed them to be most punitive in effect and at variance with the philosophy of Congress. The major goal appeared to be an immediate cutting of money costs, no matter what the cost in human deprivation or the real longterm cost to society of salvaging individuals or families robbed of the hope of becoming self-sufficient.

I protested vigorously at that time and continued to raise objections to the regulations in meetings with HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger and other members of Congress, in letters and in co-sponsorship of legislation. Together with child care organizations and women's groups, I sponsored Working Mothers' Day protests on April 10 to point up the fact that the new regulations would drive out of child care programs working mothers with even modest incomes, forcing many of them to go on welfare to qualify for care for their children.

More than 200,000 letters and telegrams protesting the regulations were sent to HEW from all parts of the country. The so-called final version of the new regulations, issued by Mr. Weinberger May 1, meets some of the objections raised in the first go-round. More careful analysis makes it clear, however, that there are still some very real and serious objections to the regulations, and I strongly urge that they be further revised.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that in a colloquy with you last week Secretary Weinberger raised some possibility of changes in the new regulations. I believe it is essential that the door not be closed on further necessary changes before these regulations are put into effect. There are various "catch-22's," loopholes, and disregards for quality standards in the regulations that require correction, and I am very grateful to this committee for conducting hearings that make it possible to spotlight these deficiencies.

I will address myself to some of the specific problems in a moment, but first I would like to comment on the overall implications and results of these administrative regulations.

When social services were first added to social security legislation, it was done because Congress realized that just giving money to an individual or family in need was not enough. Without back-up services, the problems that forced people onto welfare would not go away nor would more people receive the preventative help that would keep them from entering the public welfare system. With these remedial goals in mind, Congress passed the public welfare amendments that established the 75 percent federal match.

The definition and nature of social services was left to be determined by the states and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It was under this program, and the 1967 amendments thereto, that some of the most innovative and creative programs were developed—programs that had the object of helping people get off public assistance and keeping off others, who were not yet receiving cash grants, by enabling them to be self-supporting.

And yet now, from an Administration that pays lip service to the "new federalism" and professes reverence for the "work ethic," we have a set of regulations that places undue authority at the federal level, penalizes the working poor and lower middle class, and in some cases provides incentives to stay on welfare and not become self-supporting.

Now for the specific problems in the regulations: Both the February and May versions include a new requirement that eligibility for services be linked to the various states' resource test for assets. I know that this

question was raised with Secretary Weinberger and I think it is important that you know the situation in my state.

In New York State (under the resource test for welfare assistance) an individual can have absolutely no bank accounts, either checking or savings, no insurance with a face value of more than \$500, and no personal effects not essential to running the home or related to work.

This means that an individual cannot open a savings account, cannot join the payroll savings plan for U.S. bonds, and cannot even join a Christmas Club.

Let's think of what this means to a working woman who needs a job to support her family and can only work if her child is cared for in a subsidized center. She may work for a company that provides a life insurance policy of \$1,000 or more as a standard benefit. What is she supposed to do? Quit her job and look for one that doesn't provide any benefits? If she is thrifty enough to save a few dollars or requires the convenience of a checking account to pay her rent and utility bills, should she be penalized by being deprived of child care facilities so that she can no longer work at all?

If this isn't a "catch 22" in the new regulations, I would like to know what is.

It certainly undercuts the easing of income eligibility requirements for child care services in the May 1 regulations, which were welcomed by us as recognition by Mr. Weinberger that the draft regulations were discriminatory against working women.

While there have been some improvements in the sections dealing with child care in these regulations, there are still enough loopholes and oversights to warrant HEW's changing them, with time for public comment, before they become effective.

In addition to the resource test or liquid assets test, the regulations no longer require that in-home child care must meet standards recommended by the Child Welfare League and the National Council for Homemaker Services. No longer is there a requirement that the care must be suited to the individual child and the parent or guardian involved in the selection of the care. No longer is there any mention of the necessity of progress in developing varied child care sources so that there can be a choice for the parents. And significantly, although the new regulations say that facilities must meet standards as outlined by HEW, there is no direct mention of the federal interagency day care standards. These standards are clearly set forth in the report accompanying the OEO amendments in 1972 as Congressional intent.

Another issue raised last week and one that I would like to reiterate is the problem of income disregard. A public assistance recipient is allowed to deduct certain work-related expenses, such as social security and union dues, whereas the worker who is struggling to be economically independent, who is holding a job and not receiving cash grants, is not allowed to deduct these expenses. Thus, we have another example of a regulation that makes it more advantageous for an individual to receive a cash grant than to work and try to be self-supporting.

One of the most serious deficiencies in these new regulations is the question of program eligibility. The states are told that they must make available at least one of the services mentioned under the Adult Services Program. The regulations thus place the states in a dilemma. In one situation the states, in an effort either to meet their spending ceiling or in an effort to reduce programs, may make only one of the listed services available to appropriate applicants. For example, a state may then specify that it will only offer protective services, but not health related services, or homemaker services, or transportation services, regardless of the specific need of the individual applicant. On the other hand, the state may allow all

of the services that were previously mandated but because of the funding ceiling the agencies may be forced to compete with each other for dwindling funds. I am afraid that these regulations will lead many administrators to say, as King Solomon did, "Cut the living child in half, giving half to one and half to the other." The solution here is to provide sufficient funds to continue the services.

The program definitions also create problems that I would like to illustrate. In New York State we have a program called the Welfare Education Plan. This program has been funded since 1962 with Title IV-A money and in New York City is administered by the Board of Education. Under the new regulations this program would be shut down because it costs money. Yet it has an 11-year record of success. The program works with public assistance recipients over 18 who have less than an 8th grade equivalency education or have English language deficiencies. They are taught English, helped to get high school equivalency diplomas and placed in jobs, job training programs or schools for more advanced work skills or education.

Some of those who have benefited from this program came by my office last week and explained how as of July 1st, 7,000 people will be shut out of a program that has success stories like these:

These are the words of Monserrate Velez, who came to New York from Puerto Rico in 1961. "A few years later," she told me, "I was in a wheelchair, a total invalid with two small children. I had no hope at all for my future."

"I came to the Welfare Education Plan in January, 1969," she continued. "School became the only bright spot in my life. My teachers' friendship and encouragement helped my self-confidence. I passed the eighth grade test and then the high school test. Now I am at the Interboro Business Institute preparing to be a bilingual secretary. I can hardly wait to get a job so I can get off welfare. I am even learning to walk again."

I know that last week Senator Mondale described a similar program in Minnesota. These are the programs that are filling the gaps between agencies and services, that provide people with the hope of dignity and self-help. We must not let them fall by the boards. I am also certain that as you continue these hearings and take the testimony of the governors and their representatives you will hear more stories like that of Monserrate Velez.

There is another point I would like to make in response to Secretary Weinberger's testimony of May 8. It has to do with the question of the \$2.5 billion ceiling on federal spending for social services. Secretary Weinberger was quite clear in saying that if each state spent the full amount of the money it was eligible to spend, HEW would certainly authorize full reimbursement. Yet, at the same time, he indicated that under the new regulations the estimates for total spending are only \$1.8 billion, \$700 million below the ceiling authorized by Congress.

If there are states that will not be able to spend their full allotment, then we should have a reallocation formula to allow the additional money to go to states with programs in need of these funds. Another recommendation I would urge is enactment of my measure, H.R. 245, which would exempt child care from the \$2.5 billion ceiling. This would enable us to continue obviously useful child care programs, but not at the expense of the other needed services.

There are many other areas of concern to me in these regulations that I will touch on briefly.

We need a clearly defined fair hearing process. Under the regulations there are no advisory committees for any group of services other than child care, and child care advisory committees are recognized only at the

state level and include no parent participants.

There is also the problem within the regulations that the states may have to wait even longer for guidelines to be issued implementing these regulations. These guidelines, which may or may not come out before July 1, will have as much effect as the regulations themselves but are not subject to the review process of public comment that was so useful in changing the first draft of these regulations. I believe it is important that the guidelines be made public as soon as possible and that, like the regulations, they be subject to further change.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the original intent of Congress was to provide services that would strengthen family life, foster child development, help people to support themselves, and aid, with dignity, those who cannot. This should remain our goal, and no administrative regulations should be allowed to subvert our purpose.

ADULT EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for myself and 39 of my colleagues, the Adult Education Amendments of 1973. A similar bill is being introduced today in the Senate by a bipartisan group of Senators led by Senator JAVITS of New York.

The bill we are introducing will amend the Adult Education Act in these ways:

Extend the authorizations of existing programs for 5 years through fiscal year 1978.

Provide that up to 25 percent of funds may be used for high school equivalency programs for adults so as to ensure a concentration of effort on those 64 million Americans with less than a high school education.

Clarify the use of funds for community-sponsored programs utilizing public school buildings.

Specifies the inclusion of institutionalized adults in the target population.

Provide for State advisory councils which may be established in each State to counsel with both State and Federal authorities on adult education programs.

Extends the authorization for adult Indian education programs through fiscal year 1978.

SECOND CHANCE

Census figures tell us that nearly one-third of the adults in the United States, 64 million, have less than a high school education. Of these, 22 million have less than an elementary school education. In my State of Washington, where we have long prided ourselves on providing the best in social services, 750,000 adults have less than a high school education.

Although specific legislation on adult education is relatively new, the first act dating from the 89th Congress, we have come a long way from accepting a child-oriented education system with its terminal approach to education as our only responsibility. The question of providing a second chance for under-equipped adults has changed from whether it should be done to how best to do it.

From a purely practical view, we cannot afford to ignore the educational needs of the adult population. The latest income statistics available indicate that a high school graduate earns nearly double the amount earned by someone with less than an eighth grade education. What this means to our national economy is one thing; what it means to the worker is even more important.

In March of this year I received several letters from students in an adult basic education class in my district. If I needed convincing these would have done it. In one student's words:

This is the only chance I had to at least get somewhere. I hadn't finished high school and I was accepting any kind of job that I could get. These jobs would never allow me to advance in them.

These students, mostly Chicanos, speak of "teachers that care," "that work hard to help us." While these teachers may be more dedicated than the average public schoolteacher, I suspect the biggest difference is that the adult student cares and is willing to work.

Motivation and opportunity combine in adult education programs to make it possible for a student to get what he now knows he needs—a second chance to make a better life for himself.

We need to continue and expand our commitment to provide that "second chance" for the illiterate, the poorly educated, the adult with yesterday's training for today's jobs. I believe the bill we are introducing today moves in that direction.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part A of my financial disclosure statement.

Although this statement is kept on file with the House Committee on Standards and Conduct, it is not published. I feel that any resident of my district should be able to see this report without coming to Washington to examine it. I feel, therefore, that the report should appropriately be published in the RECORD.

At a time when there is growing public distrust of some government officials I am willing to place my investments under public scrutiny. I hope that making my statement an open matter will help restore some of the faith in our Government.

I would like to add two notes of explanation to the statement.

First, in December of last year I placed all my stockholdings in a "blind trust," thus relinquishing all control over their management. My trustee can buy and sell these stocks without my knowledge.

Second, the two debts listed on the report are both in connection with the operation of my farm.

I believe the rest of the report is self-explanatory. I include it below:

PART A—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, STATEMENT OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ASSOCIATIONS AS OF DATE OF FILING AND CERTAIN OTHER FINANCIAL DATA COVERING CALENDAR YEAR 1972

Filing required by April 30, 1973 by Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Fourth District of Virginia.

The interest of a spouse or any other party, if constructively controlled by the person reporting, shall be considered to be the same as the interest of the person reporting.

1. List the name, instrument of ownership, and any position of management held in any business entity doing a substantial business with the Federal Government or subject to Federal regulatory agencies in which the ownership is in excess of \$5,000 fair market value as of the date of filing, or from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year. Do not list any time or demand deposit in a financial institution or any debt instrument having a fixed yield unless it is convertible to an equity instrument.

BUSINESS ENTITY, INSTRUMENT OF OWNERSHIP, AND POSITION OF MANAGEMENT

Brandon Plantation, Proprietorship, Proprietor.

Continental Corporation, Common & Convertible pfd., None.

Va. Real Estate Investment Trust, Common, None.

General Motors Corp., Common, None.

Union Carbide, Common, None.

Continental Can Co., Common, None.

General Electric Co., Common, None.

Square D Company, Common, None.

National Distillers & Chemical Company, Common, None.

Rockwell Manufacturing Company, Common, None.

Kennecott Copper Corp., Common, None.

Exxon Corp., Common, None.

Mobil Oil Corp., Common, None.

Shell Canada, Ltd., Class A Common, None.

Shell Oil Co., Common, None.

Standard Oil Calif., Common, None.

Texaco, Inc., Common, None.

R. J. Reynolds Industries, Common, None.

Va. Electric & Power Co., Common, None.

Consolidated Natural Gas Co., Common, None.

American Tel. & Tel. Co., Common, None.

C & O Railway, Common, None.

R.F. & P. R.R., Common, None.

Southern Railway, Common, None.

On December 22, 1972, all of the securities listed in Part A, Item 1, were placed in trust with the First and Merchants National Bank, Richmond, Virginia, as trustee and manager.

2. List the name, address and type of practice of any professional organization in which the person reporting, or his spouse, is an officer, director, or partner, or serves in any advisory capacity, from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year. None.

3. List the source of each of the following items received during the preceding calendar year:

(a) Any income from a single source for services rendered (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$5,000 and not reported in section 2 above. None.

(b) Any capital gain from a single source exceeding \$5,000, other than from the sale of a residence occupied by the person reporting. (As reportable to IRS.) Brandon Plantation: sale of breeding stock.

(c) Reimbursement for expenditures (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$1,000 in each instance. None.

(d) Sources of honoraria aggregating \$300 or more from a single source. (Name the original source, not a speakers' bureau.) None.

4. List each creditor to whom the person reporting was indebted for a period of 90 consecutive days or more in the preceding

calendar year in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 *excluding* any indebtedness specifically secured by the pledge of assets of the person reporting of appropriate value. First & Merchants National Bank, Richmond, Virginia, Southside Virginia Production Credit Association.

ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

February 8, 1973.

Sworn into Congress January 3, 1973.

NEW YORK TIMES COMMENTS ON FARM BILL

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times editorial of Monday, May 14, 1973, makes a series of both accurate and devastating points about the farm bill approved last week by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the other body.

This bill apparently is the "opening bid" in an extended and expensive exercise to extend the present farm program without substantial revision or without meaningful reform.

I certainly hope that the House will not continue to embrace the present costly and cumbersome farm program, much less embark upon an effort to increase Government expenditures, restrict imports of agricultural commodities, provide unlimited subsidies for not growing crops, and increasing consumer food and fiber costs.

With that thought in mind, I insert the Times editorial in the RECORD at this point.

JACKING UP FARM PRICES

If the farm bill approved last week by the Senate Agriculture Committee wins the support of Congress, American housewives can say good-bye to any hopes they may have of ever seeing food prices return to levels that—as recently as a year ago—they thought of as high but bearable.

For, at a time when food prices have soared to record heights, the Senate Agriculture Committee has moved to create a subsidy mechanism that would lock up the prices of foodstuffs close to their record peaks.

Under a new concept of "target prices," the bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the amount of acreage for producing wheat, feed grains and cotton that would if necessary be "set aside"—held out of production—in order to hit "target prices" set far above the average prices of recent years. Wheat would be set at \$2.28 a bushel, cotton at 43 cents a pound and corn at \$1.53 a bushel. If the "target" prices specified by the Senate committee bill had been in effect last year, they would have cost taxpayers an estimated \$2.6 billion. But the Agriculture Committee chairman, Senator Talmadge of Georgia, blithely says, "Hopefully, if prices stay high, it will cost nothing."

Actually, the bill constitutes an outrageous, guaranteed lien on the housewife's pocketbook. An even worse aspect is that, if farm supply should again catch up with booming domestic and world demand, the Government would either have to pay out enormous subsidies or else remove vast amounts of land from production in order to cut supplies of farm goods and thereby hold prices to "target" levels. Since this would mean higher United States farm prices than world market prices, "target-pricing" would necessitate major increases in export subsidies—unless the United States were to find itself priced altogether out of the world market.

The benefits of target-pricing would—like existing farm programs—go primarily to the biggest farm producers, who own the land and produce the crops that get the subsidies, not to the low-income farmers who really need help. The concept of agricultural price targets should be replaced by one of farm income targets that would benefit the poor, not the rich.

Indeed, the Senate Agriculture Committee has turned a deaf ear to Administration proposals that it reduce the present \$55,000 limit on payments per farm for each crop—a figure that can be multiplied several times over by big farm operators who can plant different crops and split farms into several units.

The Senate committee also ignored earlier proposals of Agriculture Secretary Butz that specific crops be removed from acreage allotments, thus freeing farmers to make plantings on controlled acreage of whatever crops would give them the best returns in response to market demand. The present system amounts to a set of legalized monopolies, with the Government as its director.

Few city people realize, for instance, that not anybody can grow peanuts; a farmer has to have a "license" from the Government—an acreage allotment—to grow and sell peanuts. For years that acreage for peanuts has been frozen at about 1.5 million tons—but production has roughly doubled. Peanut subsidies in 1972 cost the taxpayer about \$105.5 million a year. The program has also jacked up the prices American consumers had to pay for peanuts by about 40 per cent above the world market price. If the present program continues, losses to the Government (the taxpayer) will total \$637 million from 1973 through 1977.

Not absolutely but relatively, this is peanuts. Total budgeted costs of farm price and income subsidies—including milk, sugar, rice, tobacco, cotton, wool, wheat, feed grains and so on—exceeded \$5 billion last year. To this sum must be added costs totaling at least another \$5 billion, in terms of higher prices paid by consumers.

In the midst of inflation, steeply rising farm prices and income, and strongly growing domestic and world food demands, the entire United States farm program desperately needs a complete overhaul, ending costly price supports and subsidies, and modifying existing acreage allotments and "set-asides." The over-all farm problem is no longer one of surplus and deflation but scarcity and inflation. Residual poverty among small farmers will not be ended by present subsidies and acreage restrictions, but requires a different approach aimed directly at increasing the small farmer's income.

THREE PLEAS TO SAVE THE BALD EAGLE

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as a conservationist who is deeply concerned over the dwindling population of many species of animals, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues three letters which I received from sixth grade students in my district concerning the preservation of our National symbol—the bald eagle.

As we all know, the number of these majestic creatures which represent the valor, dignity, and strength of our country, is in critical danger. Positive action is needed if our noble emblem is to remain alive for future generations to observe and enjoy.

Each year, the sixth grade students of Parkview School, Anita, Pa., conduct a

letter writing contest. This year the subject was "The Preservation of Our National Emblem, the Bald Eagle." Under the direction of Mrs. Emma Zimmerman, three winning letters composed by Susan Maruco, Gary Lamey, and Douglas Mesaraco have been selected.

I would like to salute the winners by inserting their views as part of my remarks:

FIRST PRIZE

ANITA, PA., November 29, 1972.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: It seems some people aren't interested in our sixth grade subject this year. It is the preservation of our National Emblem. I guess they just don't see the power, loyalty, and strength that our ancestors saw in the bald eagle. "The noblest creature that flies," they announced. But the question is, do we still believe it today. The title of National Emblem doesn't stop some individuals from using the bald eagle as an illegal target. A few destroy this eagle as it soars proudly over its natural habitat, and that isn't a very nice thing to do. This is our National Emblem, and I think he expects something from mankind. Even if it is just letting him live in peace.

We chose our subject this year from one of our weekly magazines. It is one of the ways that this organization is getting the problem across to other minds. The sixth graders are sending labels that will get us some land in the National Eagle Nesting Place, a place where the national bird is protected.

The subject is smaller than some problems in the United States, but it's one that needs to be solved. The States have quite a few difficult problems. If we try we can at least work out our eagle friend's troubles. The bald eagle is something that should be salvaged for posterity.

Problems don't interest many people, but there are so many books, clubs, coupons, and projects on our subject that they could do a little something, and not much is more important than saving our National Emblem, the bald eagle.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN MARUCO.

SECOND PRIZE

DELANCEY, PA., November 28, 1972.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: This year the sixth grade is writing on the preservation of our National Emblem, the bald eagle. The bald eagle was chosen as our National Emblem in 1782. He was chosen because he's a brave, majestic bird. He is also known for his loyalty because he mates for life. He was also chosen because he's the noblest creature who flies. Man is destroying his natural habitat by cutting down the trees in his forests and by destroying his mountains by mining for minerals. Hunters are shooting him. Now he's facing extinction.

You can help stop our National Emblem from going extinct. For every Big Johns or Snack Pack label you send to the Chippewa National Forest in Minnesota, where two pairs of nesting bald eagles have been discovered, they'll buy approximately 15 square feet of private land in your name. They'll turn it over to the U.S. Forest Service for the protection of our National Emblem, the bald eagle.

The sixth grade is helping to preserve our National Emblem by sending Big Johns and Snack Pack labels to the Chippewa National Forest.

Sincerely yours,

GARY LAMEY.

THIRD PRIZE

DE LANCEY, PA., November 29, 1972.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: This year the sixth grade is writing about the preservation of the National Emblem, the bald eagle. We have taken away his habitat. But our goal is to keep the bald eagle from disappearing

by giving him what he needs most to survive, peace and privacy.

The eagle is a sign of strength and bravery. It is carefree and fearless. In 1782 he was chosen to be the National Bird. In 1940 congress passed a law to protect the American Eagle. Outside of Alaska there are fewer than 800 nesting pairs existing in the United States.

The sixth grade have been collecting labels of Big John's Beans 'n fixins and cardboard jackets of Snack Pack puddings and fruits. We are going to send these to the Chippewa National Forest in Minnesota. Next to the Chippewa National Forest they will have a place for the eagles so they will have peace and privacy. This will be called the National Eagle Nesting Area. By doing this we hope to preserve the eagle.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MESORACO.

ROBERT F. FROEHLIKE

(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, upon the occasion of the departure from Government service of the Honorable Robert F. Froehlke, the Secretary of the Army, it is appropriate to record and commend the outstanding achievements of this distinguished American.

Responding to a request from the President, Bob Froehlke began his public service as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration on January 29, 1969, under Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. In recognition of his managerial and leadership abilities, his already wide-ranging area of responsibility was subsequently expanded to include all Department of Defense intelligence resources and chairmanship of the Blue Ribbon Action Committee and Defense Investigative Review Council. Under Bob Froehlke's leadership, there was marked improvement not only in overall management of administrative services in the Office of the Secretary of Defense but also in the control and realinement of the sensitive and critical intelligence activities.

On July 1, 1971, Bob Froehlke became the Secretary of the Army at a rough time in the Army's history. With steadfast leadership and dedication, he successfully led the Army in the very difficult transition from a large force concerned primarily with supporting U.S. operations in Southeast Asia to a smaller, all-volunteer organization geared to worldwide support of the Nixon doctrine. The results of Mr. Froehlke's special brand of personal, compassionate and enlightened leadership are clearly evident as he returns to private life on May 15, 1973. He leaves the Army better prepared to accomplish its mission, more concerned for the men and women who fill its ranks and with increased esprit and confidence.

I have personally appreciated the friendship and cooperation of Bob Froehlke. I wish him the best in private life and thank him for his fine public service.

AMNESTY LEGISLATION NEEDED

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, some people seem to feel that an appropriate response to the return of the POW's is to declare unwavering hostility to any form of amnesty. It is as if the guilt some civilians feel at imposing such suffering on these men for the most doubtful of political aims can only be canceled out by imposing suffering on another group of men and women, as a present to the POW's.

I feel that the only appropriate response to suffering is to resolve to minimize it in other people. I believe this would be the case even if we could impose a blanket punishment on war resisters in the name of justice. But I do not believe it is just to make others pay for our mistakes. I consider our adventurism in Indochina to be insane, immoral, and illegal. The State asked a certain number of young men, selected unfairly and arbitrarily, to carry the main burden of this adventurism and to violate either their conscience or the law. Whatever their choice, we may be sure that they did not enjoy it.

The war resisters also served our country. They served it by telling us we had gone too far, that the results of our orders here in Washington were immoral and illegal. If it were not for their inconvenient presence, we would never have known what we were doing.

To tell soldiers that their only enemy is the war resisters is the same demagogic trick as telling the working class that their only enemy is the welfare poor. We should realize that the majority of draft dodgers do not require amnesty, for they avoided military service in an entirely legal fashion. The only ones who found themselves outside the law are those who were either too poor, too principled, or too unlucky to take advantage of the hundreds of loopholes in the selective service system.

For these and many other reasons, I have introduced legislation that would end all legal liabilities resulting from refusal to serve in the Vietnam war. I believe any other form of action would be unfair and vindictive.

I am inserting two articles that should dispel some of the myths that those against amnesty use to justify their position: One, that the courts can be relied upon to deal equitably with amnesty; two, that so-called deserters can be given a blanket condemnation:

[From the New Republic, Apr. 21, 1973]

AMNESTY ROULETTE

(By H. Edward Sharp)

"Those who deserted must pay their price," the President says, "and the price is not a junket in the Peace Corps or something like that." That is probably the consensus of his constituency and of the Congress. But what is the price to be exacted? That is to be left to the courts to decide. "The courts," says Senator Adlai Stevenson III, "are quite competent, the enforcement authorities are quite competent to consider the motivations of the individual. . . ."

Unfortunately for the returning draft evaders, what the courts decide will reflect each judge's personal belief. Some who have little compassion for those who deny service to country, will give the maximum sentence of five years in prison. More sympathetic judges will order alternate service in lieu

of prison, or possibly, though unlikely, total amnesty. Some who never acquit may be the most lenient in sentencing. One district judge in Chicago gives lighter sentences to a defendant with a wife and family than to single men.

Besides the disparity of punishments in a given district there is also considerable difference between districts. Southern and southwestern district courts are generally harsher, while Northern districts tend to be more lenient. For example twice as many defendants in Kentucky have received maximum sentences as defendants who have been put on probation. Of the 16 men in the US who in one year received maximum sentences, one-fourth were from Kentucky. On the other hand only two men were given maximum sentences in California, and 408 got probation during the same period. In Senator Stevenson's own state, draft evaders in the Southern Illinois court have only a slight chance for leniency, while those in Northern Illinois have better than a 50-50 chance for probation and alternate service.

The senator's contention that the courts are "quite competent to take into account the reasons, the moral reasons, of an individual for refusing to obey the law" is not quite true. More articulate, educated young men, with a proper air of contrition, may persuade a court to leniency, while an awkward or poorly educated violator who is unable to express himself in appropriate moral terms may get a harsher sentence. Yet each has committed the same transgression. The defendant pleading for leniency on moral grounds must hope his beliefs are consonant with the judge's. I have in mind one defendant who refused induction into the army because he placed a high value on life. The judge noted that he had subsequently attempted suicide, and concluded that if the defendant didn't value his own life he didn't value anyone else's either. Because another defendant had once worked in a factory that produced some war material, one federal judge concluded he had acquiesced in the war.

Not enough Canadian exiles have yet returned to discern a trend in the federal courts; thus the draft evasion cases of those who did not flee are our only guide. During the year ending in June of 1972, 1642 young men were convicted of refusing to submit for induction. All but 53 were put on probation. Of the 53 jailed 16 were given the maximum five-year sentence.

The point I raise is not whether expatriates should receive amnesty, alternate service or imprisonment, but rather whether all should not get the same consideration. There ought to be some legislative equity.

(Note.—Mr. Sharp worked as a legal researcher on Selective Service cases in Chicago during the late 1960s.)

[From the Nation, April 16, 1973]

THE TRUTH ABOUT DESERTERS

(By Robert K. Musil)

(Note.—Mr. Musil, a former Army captain active in the GI movement at Fort Benjamin Harrison, was discharged as a conscientious objector. He is associate secretary of the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, an agency for military and draft counseling and co-editor of CCCO News Notes.)

Myths abound about deserters. A colorful Howard Johnson's place mat warns diners on the New Jersey Turnpike that picking up hitchhikers can be dangerous—many of them are AWOLs. Even liberal Sen. Philip A. Hart characterized AWOLs at the Kennedy hearings on the draft and amnesty last spring as "guys who take off with the company cash."

In the growing debate over amnesty in the new ceasefire period, everyone is getting into the anti-AWOL act. In a carefully orchestrated media campaign, Administration spokesmen, including columnist William S. White, White House special counsel

Charles W. Colson, and speechwriter Patrick S. Buchanan, have tried to minimize the number of deserters and to label them "malingers, opportunists, criminals and cowards." Even the usually moderate editorial page of The New York Times, in discussing amnesty (February 23), draws "a sharp distinction between them [draft resisters] and those who deserted the Armed Forces."

On the surface, those who degrade deserters seem to have a solid case. They point out that unlike draft evaders, AWOLs have already taken an oath to serve their country; many of them have criminal records, or are fleeing prosecution. They add that legal avenues of redress of grievances were open to them. Finally, and most significantly, they claim that the motivations of deserters were neither conscientious nor pure. In support of this final point, one of great rhetorical strength in the amnesty debate, they often allude to or quote Pentagon studies from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (OASD (M&RA)) that purport to show that only 5 per cent of all deserters were motivated by anti-war feelings.

These myths are held for various reasons. Most of the public is simply ignorant about AWOLs. They rely on World War II clichés and stereotypes of the bad guy slinking away from his buddies under fire. Or, lacking the data or background to challenge them, they simply accept official explanations. Some politicians inadvertently add fuel to the myths when, hoping to appear reasonable and pragmatic, they speak about amnesty for draft resisters, but neglect deserters in order to gain support.

The current Administration campaign to disparage deserters and perpetuate misconceptions is another matter. [See "What Nixon Forgets: Congress Bestows Amnesty" by Harrop A. Freeman, *The Nation*, March 26.] By portraying the number of deserters at large as insignificant, and impugning their motives as confused at best, but more likely as dishonorable and criminal, the Administration hopes in one blow to discredit its amnesty opposition, justify its war policies, and cover up long-standing abuses in the armed forces.

In this climate, we need a fresh, hard look at deserters. The facts are difficult to come by, but they clearly explode all of the old myths. First, it must be emphasized that the term "deserter" is simply a convenience. It is used by the military to refer to those persons who have been absent without leave for a period of thirty days or more, been dropped from the rolls of their unit, and then *administratively* classified as deserters for purposes of record keeping, notification of the FBI, etc. No person absent without leave is legally a deserter until convicted of that offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Desertion, as an offense, requires an intent to remain away from the military permanently, and is rather difficult to prove. Thus Pentagon statistics about deserters refer only to those persons who have been dropped from their unit rolls, and do not include a far larger number of persons who at any given time are AWOL for less than one month.

The number of deserters during the Vietnam era is staggering and is probably under-reported. From fiscal 1965 through early fiscal 1973 (August 1, 1964-December 31, 1972) the Pentagon reports 495,689 cases of desertion, not counting the Coast Guard. Of these cases, the Pentagon claims that more than 90 per cent have returned to military control (either by apprehension or voluntarily) and that only 32,718 are still at large. Even accepting Pentagon figures for the moment, we can quickly understand the current Administration attempts to vilify deserters. In addition to the well-known GI movement, another significant segment of the armed forces (about 5 per cent of the

Army and Marines) protested the war the best way they knew how—by leaving.

If one considers that in 1971 in the Army alone, 79,000 soldiers, or nearly six full divisions (7.3 per cent of all Army personnel), deserted, the problem becomes clear. This desertion rate was more than triple the highest rate during the Korean War. It was also much higher than any rate recorded for World War II, when a greater percentage of U.S. troops were in combat zones and there were no one-year rotations. If it is kept in mind that low-ranking soldiers and those in combat-arms units are most likely to desert (only about one in ten GIs engage in combat), it is evident that in some Army units desertion reached epidemic proportions during the war in Vietnam.

If one adds the short-term AWOL rate in the Army (17.7 per cent in 1971) to the desertion rate (there is some overlap for those who had multiple AWOLs or went AWOL before deserting), nearly one-quarter of all GIs walked away from their units for periods ranging from a couple of weeks to years. What were they escaping from? Given the unpopularity of the war at home, the reports of maltreatment and mismanagement of personnel throughout the Vietnam era, a massive GI movement, and desertion rates far higher than for any previous war, one would assume that desertion was related to anti-war feeling. In fact, the rates match escalation and de-escalation in Indochina in an almost perfect bell curve. For instance, in 1972, when the air war was escalated and received more national attention, Air Force desertion rates doubled from the year before.

Not so, says the Pentagon. The official Department of Defense Information Guidance Series claims:

"It is human nature that the grass somewhere else sometimes appears greener. Since the beginning of military forces, the urge to 'go over the hill' has been more than some could resist. The reasons are also as old as man: financial or family troubles, romantic involvement, earlier misconduct that led to disciplinary action, inability to adjust to military life or family pressures before going overseas. . . . Only a small percentage . . . of the deserters who have fled to a foreign country in recent years have been motivated by political reason or anti-Vietnam feeling."

Col. Victor A. DiFlori, the Pentagon AWOL expert and spokesman, points to the now widely quoted studies from his office at OASD (M&RA) that show that "only 5 per cent" of those who desert are motivated by anti-war feelings. The Pentagon studies deserve close analysis, since they are the only official studies of desertion available. The methodology, assumptions and interpretation of findings used by the Department of Defense would cause any self-respecting sociologist to go AWOL from the profession.

Although many, if not a majority, of those who desert remain within the United States by going "underground" in large cities or even in their home towns, the samples used in the studies are based on servicemen who are known to have deserted or have attempted to desert to foreign countries. Maj. Gen. Leo S. Benade, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, added confusion about the source of the studies when he testified at the Kennedy hearings that the surveys were based on 660 of those returned to military control from overseas. This kind of questioning in the face of penalties would have been enough to discredit the study. In appendices to the hearings, however, Benade disclosed that he had been in error, and that the motivation studies were based only on reports from commanders in the field who estimate a man's motivation for leaving through an investigation of statements, interviews with friends, etc. These reports are then filed with OASD (M&RA) on Form DD-N(A) 1039. These reports have been required only since December 24, 1970, and

are entitled "U.S. Military Absentees Who Have Placed or Have Attempted to Place Themselves Under Control of a Foreign Nation to Protest Against the U.S. or Commit Disloyal Acts." Thus, given the method of collecting data—the compilation of estimates of motivation by field commanders—and realizing that such information became desirable only as political exiles received attention, the Pentagon studies can be seen as a collection of unsupported impressions. They are not even as solid as the answers would have been from those returning to military control—the method presumed by many persons to have been used after General Benade's testimony.

Given all these inadequacies, the Pentagon studies still reveal some astonishing conclusions. Only one-third of the sample had had previous "disciplinary or administrative action" taken against them. And, it must be remembered, upward of 80 per cent of all military courts-martial are for the "crime" of going AWOL. Other military crimes include such vague acts as "disrespect to a superior officer," or the famous catchall of military justice, "all other acts prejudicial to good order and discipline." This provision, Article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, caught many an anti-war GI in its disciplinary dragnet, and only recently was struck down as unconstitutionally vague by the Washington Court of Appeals.

The reasons for desertion offered in the survey break down as follows: 47.5 per cent, no reason stated; 20 per cent, aliens, or to live with an alien spouse; 10 per cent, under charges or investigation, or escaped from confinement; 5 per cent, Vietnamese War; 4 per cent, family, financial, or personal; 2.5 per cent, claimed C.O. or pacifistic beliefs; 3.5 per cent, inability to adjust to military life; 5 per cent, fear of being killed; 7 per cent, miscellaneous.

If we neglect the 20 per cent aliens as an untypical distortion due to sampling, the Pentagon either does not know the motivations of nearly half the deserters, or they supplied reasons that, to the average mind, are clearly anti-war or anti-military. ("Inability to adjust" might be better translated as, "My drill sergeant was driving me crazy," or "I just had to get out of the Army.") Only 4 per cent are listed under the widely trumpeted and "time-honored" personal reasons. In short, even if the methodology of the Pentagon's study were sound, its conclusions are virtually useless as an indicator of deserter motivation. If anything, they show that GIs did not desert simply because "the grass is greener." Privately, Colonel DeFlori admits that motivations are extremely difficult to determine, especially on the basis of such field reports. He adds that the attempt to distinguish between the motivations of draft evaders and deserters is bound to be a futile exercise.

Department of Defense statistics on the numbers of deserters are presented with an equal aura of infallibility, but are equally suspect. On January 1, 1972, OASD (M&RA) released untold figures showing the number of deserters from fiscal 1959 through the first few months of fiscal 1972. These were broken down into armed forces members dropped from units and returned to military control by service and year. The figures for those dropped from fiscal 1965-early fiscal 1972 added up to 421,104, while those returned, when added up, came to only 286,625. These figures would indicate that as of January 1972, there were 134,479 deserters at large.

When questioned about this discrepancy, Lt. Col. James Heinbaugh of OASD (M&RA) stated, "That chart is now marked, 'not to be used, inaccurate.' We no longer give the breakdown figures by year for numbers returned to military control. You have the last chart of that type." The chart, however, exactly matches current figures from DOD on numbers *dropped* from unit rolls, which

are still given by year. Only the numbers *returned* and the numbers *still at large* are no longer offered by year. They are available only in summary. The conclusions to be drawn are obvious and ominous. Either Pentagon recordkeeping from 1958-1972 was inaccurate to the tune of 100,000 deserters, or the current figures of those returned to military control have been manipulated to hide a massive problem and serve political ends.

Even if one believes the notion of previous bookkeeping errors and accepts the current figure of 32,718 deserters at large, that figure, too, is open to serious question. The Pentagon likes to pretend that it has a perfect record of the more than 8 million Vietnam-era GIs. This is simply not the case: the recent return of a POW who had been officially buried is but one graphic example of the fallibility of Pentagon records.

Jon Landau, staff attorney for the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors (CCCO) in Philadelphia, has handled countless returning AWOL cases and has been in touch with other attorneys and counselors. He states, "I'm personally aware of at least twenty cases where returning AWOLs gave themselves up only to find no personnel records of them at all. Other times, the base where a serviceman returns has to communicate with a man's previous unit for information, even though it's supposed to be in Washington." Other military counselors report similar experiences, including numbers of men who were never reported AWOL at all. Rev. L. William Yolton of the Presbyterian Church Emergency Ministry on Conscience and War, says, "Just recently, I counseled with a young woman who was receiving a dependent's allowance the whole time her husband was in Canada." Given incidents like these, and the general unreliability of Pentagon paperwork in the war years, from civilians at My Lai listed as "128 VC killed" through GIs sent home to await orders which they never received, the Pentagon figure of 32,718 deserters at large must be seen as a rather shaky *minimum*. And, if the suddenly withdrawn records are correct, there may be 134,000 or more deserters still at large. Similarly, the number of deserters reported by the Pentagon to be in foreign countries is far larger than the 2,705 or so currently claimed. This number counts only those persons whose whereabouts are officially known to the Department of Defense through investigation and intelligence services. Obviously, large numbers of deserters have been remiss in reporting changes of address.

Whatever the true number of deserters still at large—and they are great enough to cause high-ranking heads to roll in any other army—why do so many service personnel go AWOL? Those in a position to know best are the deserters themselves, other GIs, and the military counselors who have maintained a flourishing practice during recent years. Attorney Robert S. Rivkin, author of *GI Rights and Army Justice* and *The Rights of Servicemen*, served in legal services as an enlisted man and currently defends GIs in Germany for the Lawyers Military Defense Committee of the ACLU. He writes, "Experience has taught us that many GIs are away without leave because of something the military did or failed to do."

Thus, in addition to anti-war feelings that are prevalent in most returning AWOLs seen by military counselors, many GIs were finally motivated to leave because of lack of proper discharges, physical, psychological or racial abuse, improper medical treatment, unfair disciplinary actions, and other failings of the massive and impersonal military bureaucracy. Their individual stories vary, but most originally enlisted in the armed forces, come from working-class families, and do not articulate their feelings well. The main difference between them and the middle-class draft resisters is that often they object only *after* their direct experience of war or life in the

armed forces. By then, their legal options and access to outside support and expertise are severely limited. With only a drill sergeant, or unfriendly commander, or career chaplain to turn to, they leave. Like so many refugees, they have voted with their feet.

Take Archie, a Memphis youth recruited into the Marines despite periods of blacking out and a hearing impairment. At boot camp, Archie was continually beaten and abused because drill sergeants thought he was faking when he passed out. So he went AWOL. Finally picked up by the FBI, he was sent to the Philadelphia Naval Base, where he was thrown into the brig despite a physician's recommendation. There he blacked out again, was beaten and thrown under a scalding shower by a guard for his "faking." He was then hospitalized and received death threats if he talked. Finally, Archie was discharged as "undesirable."

Or Tom, a black Marine from Philadelphia who had to quit high school to help his mother, on welfare, raise nine other children. He joined the Marines to earn money. When his wife began having complications with her pregnancy, Tom went to his drill sergeant for help, but got none. It was then that he left Camp Lejeune to support his mother and expectant wife. Someone in his neighborhood thought it would be "best" if he were reported. It wasn't long before the FBI picked him up and returned him to face general court-martial charges.

Stuart is another to whom legal redress was unavailable or improperly denied. He slowly developed conscientious objection to war and requested discharge when his ship at New London, Conn., was armed with nuclear-tipped missiles. The Welsh decision broadening C.O. status to persons whose objections were not religious had yet to be handed down, so Stuart could not qualify for discharge. Like many others he faced an almost impossible choice of up to five years of hard labor in a military prison or violating his conscience. He left.

Although Louie had applied for C.O. status from his local draft board (he was turned down) and had been part of an apprentice program in a machine shop (worth a 2-A deferment), he was drafted and sent to Fort Dix. Objecting to war in the first place and feeling that he shouldn't be there at all, Louie soon left Fort Dix and returned to his home town near Harrisburg, Pa. He tried to begin life again, but eventually the FBI began to close in. Louie was lucky; he came to a military counselor who discovered that, like many young men, he had been illegally drafted. A federal judge freed Louie on a writ of *habeas corpus* within a matter of hours. But he and his young wife could never regain the time lost at Fort Dix, or the months of hell as the FBI closed in.

Scott is typical of the many Vietnam veterans who deserted after they got back to the States. (The problem was so severe that in 1971 the Army quickly dropped its one experiment with allowing Vietnam GIs a mid-tour leave to the continental United States. He had enlisted in the Marines from Peoria. Soon he was fighting along the DMZ where his position was overrun the first week. Scott has a formidable collection of medals to show for his bravery, but as he fought he became sickened by killing, especially the senseless destruction and killing of civilians by U.S. troops. He turned to his chaplain for help, explaining that he could no longer kill, and wanted out. But he was simple told to stick it out; no mention of C.O. discharges. Like many soldiers in Vietnam, he turned to drugs for escape and became dependent. Upon his return to the States, he again turned to a chaplain for help with his drug problem and his feelings against war, but was merely advised to pray. In desperation, he went AWOL and sought drug counseling. He shook his habit, and then turned to military counselors for help. Despite counseling and an excellent war record, he, too, received an undesirable dis-

charge. Even if a GI is "lucky" enough upon his return to receive an undesirable discharge in lieu of court-martial and stockade time, he is branded for life.

Dan was thrown into the Camp Pendleton brig on a minor charge. Like a number of prisoners there in the late 1960s, he was beaten and hanged by his wrists on a fence for long periods of time. He developed severe psychological problems and went AWOL to Canada. Like many deserters in Canada, he was unable to make it in a strange country and returned to military control despite his hatred and fear of stockades. He too was discharged as undesirable. Since then, he has bounced from one menial job to another and continually threatens suicide. He is barred from VA benefits and very few employers will hire him. Even fewer people seem to care about his days hanging from the fence at Camp Pendleton.

All of these men should have been easily and honorably discharged when their problems first arose, but like most AWOLs they were the unfortunate victims of a policy of retaining personnel at any cost. Although the number of administrative discharges rose rapidly in 1971 as the armed forces tried to reach the reduced force levels ordered by Congress, and have shown a rapid increase in the Navy recently as racial problems remain unresolved, proper discharges were given in misery fashion. [See "Administrative Discharges: The 'Less Than Honorable' Solution" by John Grady, *The Nation*, February 19.]

One instructor at the Army's Adjutant General's Corps School at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., where personnel officers are trained, bragged that while stationed at Fort Sill, Okla., "he had never let a single discharge get through his office." His attitude—that most GIs seeking discharge are merely shirkers—is not a typical, despite regulations that provide for discharge in a number of clear-cut cases. But even these provisions are not publicized by the armed forces, and are often unknown to GIs.

In order to fill this gap, CCCO had to print and distribute free to GIs thousands of booklets on each of the five types of discharge. Even then, despite a Supreme Court ruling, *Flower v. U.S.*, permitting leafletting on open bases, the Army went to court to bar distribution of pamphlets that merely explain the legal rights to discharge. Only recently was the Army overruled in *CCCO v. Fellows*, and distribution of information on discharges permitted.

The results of these policies have been disastrous. For example, the discharge available for persons who become C.O.s *after* entry to active duty is not even mentioned in the curriculum at the Adjutant General's School, and most GIs still believe, incorrectly, that it is impossible to get out if you did not declare C.O. status to your draft board. Despite this, more than 8,000 GIs applied for C.O. discharge, while thousands more were intimidated after an initial inquiry by being told no such provisions existed. Or they found that their paperwork mysteriously was lost or arbitrarily denied at the local level. Until federal court intervention in the process in 1969, almost all applications that reached the Pentagon were turned down. Thousands of other GIs, of course, never qualified at all because the courts still do not recognize objection to a particular war. Many of these GIs, faced with harsh sentences in military stockades, or violating their consciences, simply went AWOL.

The record is similar with other discharges for erroneous induction/enlistment, hardship, medical or psychological problems. Dr. Curtis Tarr testified before Senator Kennedy's hearings on the draft in 1972 that large numbers of men had been illegally drafted. The Gates Commission, among others, reported that before recent pay raises, many GIs were destitute and living on welfare. Dr. Peter Bourne has written that

the psychological stresses of basic training are even more severe than those experienced in combat. And, of course, reports of racial abuse, stockade beatings, spinal meningitis, and lack of medical care were rampant. Peter Barnes observes in *Pawns: The Plight of the Citizen Soldier* that "every week at Fort Dix, New Jersey, the Army's major Northeastern training base, there are an average of four suicide attempts. . . . Nine actual suicides occurred at Fort Dix in 1968."

It is no wonder that the Nixon Administration is trying to discredit deserters. To acknowledge their true numbers and their real motivations would require an admission that massive numbers of ordinary, enlisted GIs rejected the war, and that countless thousands were denied humane treatment and legal discharges by a military that felt it could keep its troops in the field only by fear and force. If the truth were known about deserters, the Administration might be forced to consider sweeping changes in military justice and personnel policies—including, not insignificantly, the right to dissent from war, and the right to quit one's job.

THE BETTER VOTING ACT: SENSIBLE MAJOR CHANGES IN THE VOTING-REGISTRATION SYSTEM

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing new legislation that will remedy many current problems associated with voting.

The voting process in our modern, mobile and highly technical society are vastly different than those associated with voting when the Constitution was drafted. Philosophical approaches to voting are also extremely different. When our country was founded, and when registration laws were first enacted, philosophy behind the laws was to restrict voting to a select few. Today, we are concerned with moving toward universal suffrage—without regard to race, sex, national origin, failure to pay a poll tax, or other such obvious methods of discrimination.

What we must legislate away today are more subtle, but glaring discriminatory practices present in our system of registration and voting; practices which affect individuals, not across the board against a specific group, but against people from all groups, from all walks of life.

In last year's election, slightly less than half the eligible voters did not vote. Reasons for not voting have been offered; most center around general apathy, and some feeling that the Presidential election was hardly going to be affected by one vote. There was also disaffection with the candidates—neither aroused the confidence of the electorate sufficiently to cause heavy voting. However, in our major urban areas, in which minority group population has steadily grown, voting participation has fallen off more drastically than most other areas of the country.

I cannot help but feel that the reason for this extremely low turnout among minorities is a feeling that government is not responsive to real needs.

This, in the broadest sense, is the problem we confront today.

The present voting system is designed to keep the mildly interested citizens away from the polls. We must encourage the participation of every citizen to the maximum extent possible. We must prove to the American electorate that we want to represent all of them. And in order to serve in this capacity, we must allow the greatest number of voters to voice their opinions.

The current voter registration process is time-consuming, cumbersome, demanding, and obsolete, a system which is a burden on the individual. It presents a myriad of obstacles that ultimately serve to disfranchise millions and millions of voters. Difficulty in traveling long distances to reach registration places; difficulty in finding parking; uncooperative election officials; complex, outdated and lengthy registration forms; and many other more insidious problems all aid to disfranchise many average voters.

In 1968, a post-election Gallup poll indicated that 5 million voters were prevented from voting by residence requirements. Residence requirements that are over 30 days when applied to presidential elections have apparently been struck down by the Supreme Court in Oregon against Mitchell. However, de facto residency requirements still exist in several States. If registration books close 6 months before the election, then a citizen must be a resident for at least those 6 months before being allowed to vote. This is a horrendous situation, and should not be allowed to continue under any circumstances. Any citizen of the United States should be allowed to vote wherever he happens to be living—whether it is for 1 day or 10 years. His life will still be affected by the elected officials after election day.

For many voters, voting on election day is often costly, time-consuming, and generally inconvenient. According to the Gallup poll, three million potential voters could not leave their jobs to vote—and if they did, they might have lost several hours pay, or even a full day's pay. In essence, being docked pay for voting is a poll tax. Many citizens are justified feeling that they should not have to pay to vote.

Long lines at polling places also discourage voters. Returning from a day's work and going to the polls to find an hours' wait would discourage even the most patriotic and citizenship-conscious voter.

A contributing factor to the west coast's low turnout is the fact that election results are known before polls close. In the last election, in my district, the outcome for President had been determined at 5:30 p.m. with several hours left before polls closed. Citizens feel that their vote is even more meaningless at that point, and understandably will not vote. But there are other offices besides the President's to consider—as well as policy referendums and local officials. Immediate dissemination of "news" serves to disfranchise voters.

Numerous studies have analyzed obstacles to voting; each one in its summary recommended one form or another of national voter registration as a remedy. The report of the Commission on Registration and Voting Participation,

which was established by President Kennedy, stated in 1963 that—

The only effective method of guaranteeing the vote for all Americans is the enactment by Congress of some form of uniform voter qualification standards. The Commission further believes that the right to vote must in many instances, be safeguarded and assumed by the Federal Government. Adequate legislation must include both standards and implementation.

Ten years ago, the question of bringing the responsibility of guaranteeing the right to vote should have rested with the Federal Government. A decade ago, insuring the right to vote belonged with the Congress. Yet, we are just beginning to grapple with the ugly monster of citizenship.

Mr. Richard Carlson, director of the elections systems project for the National Municipal League, has said that:

The non-voting population is large and growing but that it is made up "disproportionately of the young, the urban poor, Blacks, American Indians and Chicanos. The groups with the greatest stake in social change are the least likely to participate in one of the basic mechanisms for generating political power."

I cannot impress upon my colleagues enough the true importance of Mr. Carlson's next statement:

The United States is the only country that holds free elections in which the responsibility for maintaining lists of eligible voters rest almost entirely with individual initiative rather than with an agency of the state.

In Britain, the lists are compiled by electoral registration officers by either a door-to-door canvass or by mail. But it is conducted by an agency of the state, not by the individual.

The League of Women Voters, in a definitive work published last year, noted:

It is the contention of this report that millions of American citizens fail to vote not because they are disinterested, but because they are disfranchised by the present election system. Ironically moreover, many of them lose their right to vote not because they are poor, black, uneducated or uninterested, but because they are part of the mainstream of American society. Moving to a better neighborhood, accepting a company transfer, going to college, getting married, serving their country, and exercising other rights, freedoms and obligations to their country to often has had the effect of denying citizens their right to vote.

The report concluded that the system will continue to disfranchise voters unless changes are made at both the administrative and legislative levels. The Better Voting Act does both these things.

The 1968 Gallup poll projected that 10 million voters could have registered but did not. We must recognize this obvious deficiency in the system. The Senate is receptive to this type of legislation. It is time that the House of Representatives be the same. The simplest, most efficient method of voter registration suggested to date is the post card system, which is an integral component of The Better Voting Act.

The Better Voting Act deals with both aspects of exercising the right to vote. As it exists today there is a two-step approach to voting.

First, the individual must take the ini-

tiative and attempt to overcome initial obstacles to registering. Once that hurdle has been cleared, in order to be heard, there are other major problems: obstacles to actually exercising the franchise; long lines; the early closing times; the inaccurate lists; and the machine breakdowns.

This bill combines into one complete package, a series of remedies designed to radically simplify and expedite the voting process. The New York Times on November 10, 1972 stated that—

The withdrawal of the American electorate away from the voting booth does not halt the election of the president, but it shuts the boycotter out of a voice in the selection of Members of Congress and all the other shapers of public policy. What remains a priority matter for future elections is the breaking down of the enormous barriers that still stand in the way of voting for those who do not want to vote.

The Better Voting Act will do just that.

It administratively simplifies all aspects of voting.

It in no way attempts to force people to vote; it merely simplifies. It remains the obligation of individual candidates to arouse the interest of the electorate; similarly it is the obligation of Members of Congress to insure simplicity in exercising the franchise.

Here, in outline, are the major provisions of the bill: First, the bill would have Federal elections fall on the first Saturday, Sunday, and Monday in November. This would make possible for citizens from all walks of life to vote at their convenience—not at the convenience of the State. Polls would be open for 18 hours each day so that there would be ample time for all citizens to vote. Polls would stay open until 11 p.m. local time thus insuring the equal protection of every citizen's right to vote.

No results could be tabulated or compiled until all polls are closed. In this manner, potential voters will not be influenced by results in one sector of the country. In addition, a truer representation of the electorate will occur. Each voting citizen will vote his own mind and not be influenced by decisions of others.

Equally important, the bill would institute a national system of voter registration by post card. There would be established in the Bureau of the Census an Office of National Voter Registration; the Office will oversee all procedures involved in enrolling the maximum number of voters. The Office will distribute registration forms to every household address, all U.S. military personnel both here and overseas, and all citizens living abroad. Forms would be available to interested citizens' groups, who could possibly canvass in areas difficult to reach by mail and be available in quantity at all post offices. The Office would also analyze patterns and causes of non-voting, and results of each election so that a greater understanding of the American electorate can be realized. This analysis is in addition to reports periodically issued to Congress describing progress made toward universal enrollment, and problems encountered in attempting to attain that goal.

The time for enacting legislation deal-

ing with the voting process was years ago.

But Congress has not acted, and now we must grapple with a problem of monumental importance to the continuing functioning of the machinery of government. Voting—and more specifically—making one's voice heard, is presently comprised of a tangled web of laws that contradict each other, and make little practical sense. It has made voting become a difficult right to exercise; one that takes two separate and distinct acts. "The Better Voting Act" deals with both, and makes them easier to accomplish.

To alleviate problems associated with registration is a commendable goal—but not enough. There exists too many problems concerned with the actual voting act to simply be ignored. The problem is twofold, therefore this legislation is twofold. The responsibility of simplifying voting procedures rests solely with Congress. We must meet that challenge, and deal with it effectively.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McSPADDEN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of family illness.

Mr. O'BRIEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 16 and 17, 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter):

Mr. WHALEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOSMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIELSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Mr. O'NEILL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEED, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HÉBERT, for 60 minutes, May 22.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. (at the request of Mr. ROUSSELOT), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. VEYSEY and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$552.50.

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$467.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. RAILSBACK in four instances.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN in three instances.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. LOTT.

Mr. BROTMAN in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mr. KEATING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIELSON) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. GUNTER.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. DRINAN in 10 instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. BRADEMAS in six instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. CASEY of Texas.

Mr. HÉBERT in three instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER in five instances.

Ms. ABZUG in five instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. BERGLAND.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS in three instances.

Mr. MANN in five instances.

Mr. OWENS in five instances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN in four instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. REID.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to revise and extend their remarks):

Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive

communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

910. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of alternates for the Governors of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

911. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

912. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a construction contract with the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District, pursuant to 70 Stat. 274; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

913. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for a research project entitled "Hoist Radio System for Deep Shafts", pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

914. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of transcribers of official court reporters' transcripts in the United States District Courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

915. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of legal assistants in the Courts of Appeals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

916. Letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 21, 1972, submitted report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Ediz Hook, Port Angeles, Wash., requested by resolutions of the committees on public works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted September 13, and October 8, 1968. (H. Doc. No. 98-101); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

917. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing extension of the leasehold interest for Federal Center No. 1 at Hyattsville, Md., pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

918. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an earlier effective date for payment of pension to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 77. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employee contributions to jointly administered trust funds established by labor organizations to defray costs of legal services; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws

relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 394. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7200. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise certain eligibility conditions for annuities; to change the railroad retirement tax rate; and to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to improve the procedures pertaining to certain rate adjustments for carriers subject to part I of the act, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-207). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 7783. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize safety design standards for schoolbuses, to require certain safety standards be established for schoolbuses, to require the investigation of certain schoolbus accidents and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 7784. A bill to declare Leach Lake, Cass Lake, and Winnibigoshish Lake in the State of Minnesota to be nonnavigable waters for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 7785. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to further develop a program for the designation and protection of additional natural areas throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7786. A bill to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKFIELD:

H.R. 7787. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to prohibit the sale for human consumption of meat from horses, mules, and other equines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 7788. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 7789. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (two hundred-mile limit) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7790. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to authorize the establishment of a class of commuter air carriers, to provide for issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity to members of that class who may apply therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7791. A bill to increase the duty on rubber filament; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 7792. A bill to establish minimum prison and parole standards in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina:

H.R. 7793. A bill to amend the Communi-

cations Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to require the establishment nationally of an emergency telephone call referral system using the telephone number 911 for such calls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 7794. A bill to prohibit reimbursement and the payment of rewards for the apprehension of members of the Armed Forces who are classified as absentees, deserters, or being absent without leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7795. A bill to require educational institutions engaged in interscholastic athletic competition to employ certified athletic trainers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7796. A bill to establish an Office of National Voter Registration within the Bureau of the Census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. HALEY, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GROSS, Mr. ARENDTS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BEARD, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 7797. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage by the act every household which has a member who is on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. TREEN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. SEEBELIUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ASH BROOK, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mr. PRICE of Texas):

H.R. 7798. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage by the act every household which has a member who is on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. COLLIER):

H.R. 7799. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage by the act every household which has a member who is on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. STEED):

H.R. 7800. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by adding a new section to prohibit sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 7801. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. SYMMS):

H.R. 7802. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for a Columbia-Snake Palouse program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 7803. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 7804. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 7805. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require congressional authorization for the involvement of American Forces in further hostilities in Indochina, and for extending assistance to North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HEDNUT):

H.R. 7806. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 certain expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 7807. A bill to provide financial assistance for the development and implementation of work and training and year round recreational opportunities, together with related services and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 7808. A bill to allow non-Federal public bodies to repay in yearly installments cash payments due the Federal Government in connection with any resource water project undertaken by the Secretary of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 7809. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide a more equitable method of allotting funds for vocational rehabilitation services among the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7810. A bill to encourage the movement in interstate and foreign commerce of recycled and recyclable materials and to reduce the quantities of solid waste materials in commerce which cannot be recycled or do not contain available recycled materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7811. A bill to modify the project for Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 7812. A bill to add an additional judgeship in the Western District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7813. A bill to amend certain provisions of Federal law relating to explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7814. A bill to authorize a program for the improvement and restoration of the Buffalo Metropolitan Area, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 7815. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to assure that the school food service program is maintained as a nutrition service to children in public and private schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself, Mr.

HASTINGS, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 7816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts won in State lotteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 7817. A bill to amend the act to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. ESCH,

Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BADILO, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia):

H.R. 7818. A bill to amend and improve the Adult Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mrs.

GRASSO, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ERLINBORN, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. FRASER and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 7819. A bill to amend and improve the Adult Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself and Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming):

H.R. 7820. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigation of certain potential water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 7821. A bill to provide a penalty for the robbery or attempted robbery of any narcotic drug from any pharmacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7822. A bill to provide for the continued operation of various Public Health Service Hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7823. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. ERLINBORN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 7824. A bill to establish a Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 7825. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted therefrom without a public hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7826. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to increase the amount of the annual contributions which may be paid thereunder with respect to low-rent housing projects by establishing a more realistic subsidy formula; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7827. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing dollar limit on the amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for to assist low-rent public housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7828. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to remove the ex-

isting percentage limits on the amount of grant assistance which may be provided thereunder for projects in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7829. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize certifications of a small business concern's competency in lieu of bonding in connection with certain Federal construction contracts, and to establish a National Construction Task Force to assist in broadening small business participation in the construction industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7830. A bill to authorize increases in Federal Housing Administration mortgage ceilings under subsidized multifamily housing programs to meet construction costs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7831. A bill to amend section 236 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7832. A bill to amend section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to provide increased rent supplement payments in the case of tenants with larger families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7833. A bill to establish a new program of loans to be made from a revolving fund by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to assist in the provision and rehabilitation of housing for middle-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7834. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the existing 15 percent limit on the amount of assistance which may be provided thereunder for low-rent public housing in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7835. A bill to provide new and improved transportation programs for older persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7836. A bill to prohibit States and political subdivisions from discriminating against low and moderate income housing, and to give a priority in determining eligibility for assistance under various Federal programs to political subdivisions which submit plans for the inclusion of low and moderate income housing in their development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7837. A bill to amend section 236 (i) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7838. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns from the area of urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7839. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the project area after its redevelopment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7840. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7841. A bill to prohibit States and political subdivisions from discriminating against low and moderate income housing, and to give a priority in determining eligibility for assistance under various Federal programs to political subdivisions which submit plans for the inclusion of low and moderate income housing in their development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7842. A bill to provide the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the authority to make grants to States and local communities to pay for the cost of eye examination programs to detect glaucoma

for the elderly; to the Committee on International and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7843. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation program or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the full deduction of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals of 65 years of age and over, without regard to the 3-percent and 1-percent floors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7345. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income taxes or payments from the United States Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7846. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that no reduction shall be made in old-age insurance benefit amounts to which a woman is entitled if she has 120 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. Long of Louisiana, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 7847. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, to prohibit the importation of agricultural commodities when pesticides are used in connection with such commodities in a manner which is prohibited in the United States by any Federal law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 7848. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 7849. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RONCALIO of New York:

H.R. 7850. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds to carry out or assist research on living human fetuses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself and Mr. ASPIN):

H.R. 7851. A bill to provide for a study of the availability of a route for a trans-Canada oil pipeline to transmit petroleum from the North Slope of Alaska to the continental United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 7852. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to require public disclosure of certain information relating to sales of commodities for export, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 7853. A bill to insure a fair and reasonable participation of U.S. flag commercial vessels in movement of petroleum and petroleum products imported into the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 7854. A bill to discourage experimentation on animals by elementary and secondary school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 7855. A bill to provide for the appointment of a special prosecutor to prosecute any offenses against the United States arising out of the "Watergate affair"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOSMER, and Mr. HUBER):

H.R. 7856. A bill to amend section 9 of the Military Selective Service Act relating to reemployment rights of members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROY, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WARE, Mr. WENGER, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 7857. A bill to amend section 9 of the Military Selective Service Act relating to reemployment rights of members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H.R. 7858. A bill to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 7859. A bill to provide for loans for the establishment or construction, or both, of municipal, low-cost, nonprofit clinics for the spaying and neutering of dogs and cats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7860. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of commercially produced domestic dog and cat animal products; and to prohibit dog and cat animal products moving in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH EXPRESSES APPRECIATION TO THE VALUE OF RADIO—PRESIDENT PROCLAIMS MAY AS MONTH TO FOCUS ATTENTION ON THIS MEDIA—WEST VIRGINIA STATIONS ARE LISTED

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 15, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, May

has been recognized by the Congress and designated as National Radio Month and I join in expressing tribute to the leaders of this dynamic industry on their outstanding service in the public interest.

The development of radio broadcasting has been called the "miracle of the ages," because it more than any other communication media links all corners of the world. Its advent also paved the way for television and the dazzling satellite communication network that are considered so commonplace today.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 7861. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving to Congress the power to make or alter regulations relating to the times, places, and manner of appointing electors to choose the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nominating of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution to express the support of Congress on participation in the Symposium on Management and Utilization of Remote Sensing Data to be held in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., October 29 to November 2, 1973; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 395. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

203. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to funds for advance or preconstruction planning on the O'Neill unit and North Loup Division of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

204. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to retirement compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 7862. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Litman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 7863. A bill for the relief of Donald R. Manning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7864. A bill for the relief of Louise C. Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The dream of broadcasting worldwide is credited to a young inventor, Lee De Forest, who wrote—

My present task is to distribute sweet melody over the city and the sea so that even the mariner far out at sea across the silent waves may hear the music of his homeland.

But this dream might never have become a reality if other men of vision such as Sarnoff, Marconi and Bell had not shared it and realized the possibilities.

"I have in mind a plan . . ." These