

period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate S. 1413, a bill to increase the authorization for fiscal year 1974 for the committee for purchase of products and services of the blind and other severely handicapped.

Upon the disposition of that measure, it is the present intention of the leadership to get consent to take up H.R. 7357, an act to extend kidney disease medicare coverage to railroad employees, their spouses, and their dependent children, and for other purposes. It is not anticipated that that bill will take much time. It is not considered to be controversial.

Upon the disposition of that measure and any other calendar measures which may have been cleared for action or for unanimous consent by that time, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the then unfinished business, it now being the pending business, S. 268, the National Land-Use Policy bill.

Opening statements will be made upon that measure tomorrow. Amendments, of course, may be called up, and yea-and-nay votes could possibly occur on tomorrow.

Looking down the road a bit, Mr. President, in accordance with the distinguished majority leader's statement earlier today, it may be well to recapitulate what may be ahead of the Senate with respect to its schedule for next week. This is a bare-bones prognostication, but it will at least give some indication of what is in the offing.

On Monday, in accordance again with the statement by the distinguished majority leader, the Senate will begin to operate from time to time on a double track system. For example, the land-use bill may be temporarily laid aside on Monday, thus opening up the first track to S. 907, the Arctic Winter Games bill, on which there is a time limitation. It is the present intention of the leadership to try to proceed in precisely that manner up to that point.

Also on Monday the Senate may, on a first-track basis proceed to take up S. 925, the Federal Financing Bank bill. Or it may instead take up S. 470, to amend

the Investment Company Act and Investment Advisors Act. Yea-and-nay votes will occur on Monday.

Another possible first-track item for Tuesday or Wednesday is S. 1125, which deals with alcoholic abuse and alcoholism.

As to Tuesday, June 19, action will continue on the land-use bill. Senators will keep in mind the possible double-track procedure mentioned above for Tuesday.

It is quite likely, as I view the schedule at this point, that most of Tuesday will be taken up with amendments to the land-use bill. Hopefully, that bill will be completed on Tuesday. Yea-and-nay votes will occur on Tuesday.

As to Wednesday, the leadership will call up the NASA authorization bill. Yea-and-nay votes will occur thereon. Hopefully, the land-use bill will have been completed on Tuesday, but if it is still hanging around, it will remain as the unfinished business.

As to Thursday and Friday of next week, any uncompleted measures among those which I have already enumerated will be continued to their completion.

Additionally, S. 1443, a bill to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations, can come up. Other measures will also be cleared for action by then. Hence, yea-and-nay votes can be expected on Thursday and Friday.

Of course, the foregoing sequence of measures may have to be altered from time to time, depending upon the floor situation, but this listing is for the convenience of Senators that they may anticipate a busy week ahead with yea-and-nay votes expected daily.

Mr. President, perhaps this is as good a time as any to state also that the Senate may have to operate on Saturdays if the situation becomes necessary prior to the July 4th holiday. I am not saying that the Senate definitely will be in session on Saturdays, but I am constrained to indicate that there is a possibility of Saturday sessions, if necessary to complete the Senate's work and have the calendar in excellent shape by the time the Independence holiday arrives.

During the month of July we are going

to have a glut of appropriations bills. The House, I anticipate, will act on at least a half dozen of the regular appropriations bills during the remainder of the month of June. This would mean that during July there would be several appropriations bills cleared for Senate floor action. So, Saturday sessions are a very distinct possibility during the month of July.

The same can be said for September, keeping in mind that there is an August recess in the offing.

Mr. President, that about wraps up the program for the week ahead, as far as now can be seen.

ADJOURNMENT TO 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 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:42 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 15, 1973, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 14, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Sidney L. Jones, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Harold C. Passer, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Julius Shiskin, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, for a term of 4 years, vice Geoffrey H. Moore, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 14, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Graham A. Martin, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 14, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend S. W. Easty, Jr., St. Andrew's By-the-Sea Protestant Episcopal Church, Nags Head, N.C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, as we commemorate today the symbol of our unity expressed in our beloved Stars and Stripes, may we ever recall to heart and mind the struggles, sufferings, and strengths, that forged the union of our States into one great nation under God. Grant that we may rediscover and renew the integrity, honesty, and truth, that provided inspiration for past leaders of our land and produced the precious gift of freedom which is so fragile in our world. Help us, O Lord, in this moment of prayer, to revive an awareness of Thy presence in

our every action and thought, that we may be reminded of the source of our strength as we serve God and country, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4682. An act to provide for the immediate disposal of certain abaca and sisal cordage fiber now held in the national stockpile.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1747. An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 with respect to authorizations of appropriations.

THE REVEREND S. W. EASTY, JR.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to present to the House the

Reverend S. W. Easty, Jr., rector of St. Andrew's-By-the-Sea Episcopal Church in Nags Head, N.C.

Father Easty, who offered the prayer in the House today, has been a friend of mine for a number of years, dating back to the period when he was pastor of the Church of the Epiphany in Norfolk, Va. He is a man of many interests and talents. Besides being a splendid professional photographer, he is a knowledgeable racing car buff, and one can often find him on Memorial Day in Indianapolis, talking to drivers and mechanics in the pit areas at the Indy 500.

So it is a great pleasure for me to welcome him to the House of Representatives on this special day, and it is with particular pride that I present him to this body.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. NATCHER. 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. 220]

Anderson, Calif.	Esch	Reid
Ashbrook	Fisher	Rodino
Ashley	Fraser	Roncalio, Wyo.
Badillo	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Harsha	Rosenthal
Burke, Calif.	Hébert	Rousselot
Burliison, Mo.	Heckler, Mass.	Roybal
Chisholm	Hollifield	Runnells
Clark	Jarman	Ruppe
Clay	Johnson, Pa.	Sandman
Crane	Jones, N.C.	Sisk
Daniels,	Leggett	Steelman
Dominick V.	Litton	Stokes
Davis, Ga.	Mathis, Ga.	Stuckey
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead, Pa.	Walde
Erlenborn	Nedzi	Wiggins
	Rees	Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests all Members and all employees who are in the Chamber to be seated and to refrain from conversation during the ceremonies which are about to begin.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of March 8, 1973, the Chair declares the House in recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

FLAG DAY

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the

United States Flag, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding.

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 14, 1973

The United States Navy Band and the United States Navy Sea Chanters entered the door to the left of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The honored guests, Mr. Bob Hope, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and S. Sgt. Gary J. Guggenberger entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them. Mr. Bob Hope and S. Sgt. Gary J. Guggenberger were seated at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The United States Navy Band (conducted by Lt. (j.g.) Paul D. Clemens, United States Navy) presented *Grand Old Flag*.

The Doorkeeper (Honorable William M. Miller) announced the Flag of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The United States Navy Band and United States Navy Sea Chanters presented *God Bless America*.

The Flag was carried into the Chamber by Colorbearer, and a Guard from each of the branches of the Armed Forces: Sgt. George H. Anderson, 3rd Infantry, Ft. Myer, Virginia; L/Cpl. Bobby D. McPherson, Guard Company, Marine Barracks; Sn. Timothy Dearden, Ceremonial Guard, USN; S. Sgt. Thomas A. Slavotinek, USAF Honor Guard, Bolling Air Force Base; BM3 Ricky B. Sorrells, USCG Honor Guard, Washington Radio Station, Alexandria, Virginia.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The Flag was posted and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS).

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to present to you the Honorable PETER KYROS, Congressman from the State of Maine, and a member of the Flag Day Committee.

Mr. KYROS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce to you S. Sgt. Gary J. Guggenberger of Cold Springs, Minn., who has come from Fitzsimmons General Hospital in Denver to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Drafted into the Army in February 1968, Sergeant Guggenberger was assigned to the 352d Transportation Battalion in the Republic of Vietnam. Only 11 months later, while driving in a resupply convoy, his battalion was ambushed and overrun by a superior enemy force. During the battle that ensued Sergeant Guggenberger's vehicle was struck by enemy fire. He was last seen lying at the side of the road, firing his weapon at the enemy.

That was on January 14, 1969. For the next 49 months, he remained in a North Vietnamese prison camp, until his release last February.

This afternoon—Flag Day, 1973—we are aware of how privileged we are to have Sergeant Guggenberger as our guest. We are proud to have him with us. We are lucky to have him with us.

And so, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, I present to you, with affection and profound respect, Staff Sergeant Gary J. Guggenberger.

[Applause, the Members and guests rising.]

Staff Sergeant GUGGENBURGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the Congressmen for asking me to come here today. It is a great honor. I say thank you.

[Applause, the Members and guests rising.]

The Members and guests, led by POW S. Sgt. Gary J. Guggenberger (Minnesota) recited the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag*.

Mr. NICHOLS. At this time I should like to recognize the Honorable WILLIAM H. HUDDNUT III, a Member of Congress from the great State of Indiana, and a member of the Flag Day Committee, who will give our invocation.

Mr. HUDDNUT. O God our Father, we are gathered in this Flag Day ceremony to express our gratitude to Thee for all that our Star-Spangled Banner symbolizes, and to recommit ourselves to making these symbols more real and meaningful parts of our national life.

For the drum beats of history held mute in her folds, we thank Thee, Lord.

For the roll call of heroes—from the mountains to the prairies, from the bayous to the suburbs, from the red clay of Georgia to the snowy caps of Alaska, from the rock-ribbed coast of New England to the sun bleached shores of Hawaii—who have marched with loyalty and courage under her colors down the hallowed corridors of American history, from Valley Forge to Omaha Beach, from Bull Run to Iwo Jima, from the forests of Germany to the rice paddies of Korea, and the prison camps of Vietnam, we thank Thee, Lord.

For the ideals and hopes enshrined in her star-studded field, and for the dreams and aspirations she betokens of a better future and a better way of life, where there will be more justice, more brotherhood, more peace, more liberty, and more equality built into the sinews of the human community, we thank Thee, Lord.

O God, we want to live out our days under Thee and make our's truly a nation "under God". Save us from the idolatry of making a god of our particular country or creed or party or race or way of life or point of view. Remind us of your transcendent sovereignty before which the nations rise and fall, and your benevolent providence under which they keep their rendezvous with destiny.

Where we are wrong, correct us; where we are weak, strengthen us; where we are corrupt, purify us; where we are divided, reconcile us; and where we are right, confirm us.

And grant, O most merciful Father, that in our day and generation, we may achieve something worthy to be remembered, so that when we pass the Flag on to our own children, they will receive it with pride, and we will be able to rest from our labors secure in the knowledge that we have built constructively if not completely, and served faithfully if not

perfectly. And to you be the glory and the praise, now and forever, world without end. Amen.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of presenting another distinguished guest for this occasion, the Honorable JACK F. KEMP, Congressman from the State of New York, and a member of the Flag Day Committee.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor today, Flag Day 1973, to have with us a great American, Mr. Bob Hope and his lovely wife Dolores.

We in the House of Representatives are not just paying tribute to Bob Hope the great comedian, television, and film personality, but to Bob Hope the humanitarian—the man who has for 31 years, and millions of miles, entertained our servicemen around the world and stood up for America here at home.

But as significant as this day is, it is made even more significant by the fact that we meet here today in freedom and at peace.

To the global utopian who longs for a perfect world it is not enough. But to those who understand that we live in a less than perfect world, we see beneath the troubled surface waters of the Earth, the deeper tides of peace.

A young American President not so many years ago, said that we should be willing to pay any price for the survival of freedom. Though the price is sometimes high, it is never so costly as the loss of it. So, Bob, we honor you today for your devotion to that goal and for your lifelong dedication to this flag and the peace and freedom for which it stands.

Bob Hope, thanks for the memories.

[Applause, the Members and guests rising.]

Mr. BOB HOPE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JACK KEMP, distinguished Members of Congress, Joint Chiefs of the Military, and ladies and gentlemen:

I don't have to tell you that this is a great moment for me. I am very thrilled to be here in these beautiful Halls of Congress. It is about the highest a comedian can go.

This has to rank with any honor that I have ever had in my lifetime. It is just the greatest feeling in the world to share Flag Day with the Representatives of Americans who have been chosen to guide them and move this Nation forward.

At first I thought I was getting this honor for paying my taxes. Then I thought I was getting it for leaving the country so often.

Maybe you don't know what a lucky man I consider myself to be. God gave me a certain ability to make people laugh, but America gave me the chance to do it.

[Applause.]

In no other country in the world does free speech pay so well.

[Laughter.]

I've had a great life. I've lived off the fat of the land, and I have the evidence right here in front of me.

[Laughter.]

This freedom of speech is precious, and the least we can do is treat it with respect. An awful lot of men have made the sacrifice so that you and I can enjoy the luxury of freedom in every way.

When we can't laugh a lot at ourselves and love a lot, and leave a lot in the way of a national humorous heritage to our youngsters, then we're not leaving very much of anything for the next generation to bounce around and run with.

Every Flag Day I do something a lot of people save for November and Thanksgiving Day; I say a quiet prayer of thanks that this Nation is enduring and that there are so many wonderful people, young and old, rich and poor, children of all ages, who haven't yet, won't now, and never intend to give up on America or Americans.

This Flag has the power to take more than 200 million of us, with all our differences, and make us one people.

The Flag is the glory of our Founding Fathers and of every generation of Americans for almost 200 years. On the battlefields, on the sea, in the air, it has inspired millions to give their all to insure freedom for everyone.

And the Flag still inspires us today. I understand each of you has sent a Flag from the Capitol to fly over a city hall, a school, a church, or synagogue to enable every American to say, "That's my Flag and I love it," and every American can look up to the Flag and reach for the stars.

Some social critics are saying there's a loss of confidence by the people in the Federal Government, and they are predicting terrible things on the horizon for this nation and its citizens. They are forgetting something that unfortunately we remember only once a year or so—the American Flag. Color it red, white and blue—and symbolic.

You sometimes might want to color it red, white, black and blue, it takes such a pounding from its enemies and unfriendly friends, but it takes that pounding and keeps coming back stronger than ever. I often wonder why our Founding Fathers chose the colors, red, white and blue. Maybe red for Rhode Island sunsets, white for a field of South Carolina cotton, and blue for the magic of the sky over Oklahoma.

That Flag waved long, hard, and bravely when World War I marched into our midst. It was never stronger or more right than in defense of humanity's right to live when it waved throughout the universe during the Second World War.

The Korean conflict found Americans and their Flag rallying around a little Asian nation—and again, it was not a pretty war; no war is.

Vietnam caused a lot of serious wounds in the United States fabric of togetherness. But again, due to a lot of coordination of fine Americans, it came out of a dark and mystic tunnel, and we found the Flag still there.

Yearn with me for the time when proof of our Flag's presence no longer will be the rocket's red glare or the bombs bursting in air, but just a family like yours and mine on a picnic somewhere sitting on the grass on a day like this, silently aware of the best thing that ever happened to cloth—the American Flag.

We saw a wonderful demonstration of what love for country is when the prisoners of war came home. It was truly inspirational seeing so many returning

veterans stand and salute the Flag. What astounds me is the fact that these prisoners had more faith in our country while they were in prison than a lot of us Americans who are walking around here free. [Applause.]

And they brought a Flag home with them, one they had made while they were in the Hanoi Hilton, a small Flag but a powerful force of hope for those great Americans.

You really cannot describe what the Flag means.

We try with words, music and song and salutes, and these are fine. Yet how do you put into words the feelings of goosepimples when the Flag is being raised or goes marching by? You can only stand in reverence and offer a silent prayer of thanks that the Flag still waves for you and me and for all Americans. And long may it wave. Thank you.

[Applause, the Members and guests rising.]

The United States Navy Band and United States Navy Sea Chanters (Narrator—PO1c. Ed Glenn) presented *I Am the Nation*.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would certainly be remiss if I failed to recognize Bob's lovely wife in the Executive Gallery, Mrs. Dolores Hope.

Will you stand, please, Dolores.

[Applause, the Members and guests rising.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, during the long night of September 14, 1814, Francis Scott Key wrote these immortal words:

Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

In times of crisis this has been a recurring question in the hearts and minds of Americans throughout the history of this Nation. Thankfully in every national crisis the answer has been "yes"—this grand Flag has continued to wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave. It was "yes" during the bleak days at Valley Forge—it was "yes" as Key watched the bombardment at Fort McHenry, it was "yes" at the Argonne Forest, it was "yes" at Pearl Harbor and it was "yes" at the Hanoi Hilton.

Brave hands have raised it above the regions of ice in the Arctic Seas and have set it up on the mountains of the West and set it proudly on the Moon.

How many heroes its folds have covered in death—how many have lived for it—how many others have died for it. It has been the pledge of freedom, of justice and of order. Tyrants only have hated it, and the enemies of mankind alone have trampled it to the Earth. All who want truth and righteousness, love and salute it.

During the grim moments in our Nation's history, our Flag has always been a source of inspiration. Why is this? After all, the Flag is only cloth—red, white and blue threads woven together into thirteen stripes, alternating red and white and fifty white stars on a blue field.

But, to the great majority of Americans, the flag is much more than this. It should remind us of everything that is good about this great Nation—our freedom, our individuality, and our unity. It represents in essence our whole way of life—our rich history is embroidered into every star and stripe on that grand banner, from the 13 original colonies represented in the stripes to the fifty States symbolized by the stars, which are united together into one Nation.

Despite elements of anti-American sentiment in some parts of the world, the American flag is still an emblem of strength, honor, benevolence, and freedom to millions of people throughout the world. It was American military might and economic assistance that insured a rapid recovery in Western Europe following World War II. Most Americans are aware that the Nation symbolized by this flag has been the most important force for international peace and stability since the end of World War II.

Our flag has had its share of detractors in recent years. We have all seen film clips of some of our so-called citizens burning the American flag—the symbol of our great Nation. While these flag burners were demonstrating their disloyalty to this country, American prisoners of war were being beaten and tortured by their North Vietnamese captors. One Navy officer whom I talked with several weeks ago, Lt. Comdr. Mike Christian, was seriously injured by the Communists after he sewed an American Flag on the shirt of another POW.

Another prisoner of war, Lt. Comdr. John McCain, has stated:

I had a lot of time to think over there and came to the conclusion that one of the most important things in life—along with a man's family—is to make some contribution to his country.

We have room in this country for but one flag—the Stars and Stripes. We have room for but one loyalty—loyalty to the United States of America.

As long as we have loyal young Americans like Lt. Cmdrs. Mike Christian and John McClain who are willing to stand up for our flag, this great symbol of freedom will continue to wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The Members and guests rose and sang the *Star-Spangled Banner* (first verse) accompanied by the United States Navy Band and the United States Navy Sea Chanters.

The colors were retired from the Chamber, the United States Navy Band playing the National Anthem.

The United States Navy Band and United States Navy Sea Chanters retired from the Chamber.

The honored guests retired from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m., the proceedings in honor of the United States flag were concluded.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this being Flag Day, it is fitting that all citizens pause and reflect on what our flag means to us.

Too often sincere emotion is overcome by sentimentality and our words may take on a hollow sound.

Recently, I was mailed a flag essay written by one of my constituents, the Reverend Monsignor George A. Rosso, pastor, St. Thomas of Canterbury Church, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N.Y., whose statement on the flag is as genuine and sincere an expression of patriotism as I have ever seen.

I respectfully request that this meaningful tribute to the flag and the people for whom it stands be made part of the RECORD for the edification of all who see it.

ON THE RED, WHITE, AND BLUE

(By Rev. Msgr. George A. Rosso)

I guess I am an incorrigible patriot. Every time I see the flag going up the staff and hear the National Anthem I choke up a bit. I suppose it might be called an emotional weakness but, if this is so, I rather like it. It gives me a warm feeling and a sense of gratitude to Almighty God that among all the many gifts He has given me, not the least, is being able to call America my native land.

When I see that flag I am reminded of many things. I remember going into battle once in the South Pacific against the Japanese and seeing and hearing that lovely symbol snapping. There is no other word, in the strong wind of the ocean. I have seen it laid on many and many a casket and had the privilege of folding it and handing it to the next of kin and saying that this was but a small reminder of the debt America owed to one of her dead sons. I have seen pictures of it being hauled down in defeat before the caves of Corregidor in the Philippines.

I saw it waving from the Missouri in Tokyo Bay. I have seen it lazily floating on homes and public buildings on the Fourth of July. I have seen literally thousands of tiny flags on tiny staffs sprouting from the graves in National Cemeteries on Decoration Day. I have seen those who would destroy it, carry the flag in parades and shout defiance to law and order under its protection.

I have seen it caricatured in Communistic paintings, spat upon and trampled and burned by mad mobs in South America, and our own country. I have marched with it in parades, gave it tribute as it went by in the safe hands of our beloved Marines. Watched it folded ceremoniously by Blue-jackets as the last ray of the sun faded into twilight.

I have watched it climb slowly up the flagpole at the Rose Bowl Game as massed bands played the *Star Spangled Banner* which is why I am sitting down at this moment writing this. It is my Flag and my Country, and

in all my travels over the world I have never found a more beautiful flag or a better country. And if this is chauvinism, then call me a chauvinist.

I remember a long, long time ago when I was serving with the United States Marines as a young "make-ye-learn" Chaplain, there was an old Battle Scarred Marine with whom I came in contact and he seemed to take a liking to me. His name was Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Swinnerton; "Smoky Joe" as he was known in the Corps. He had a face like five miles of bad road, and a voice an octave lower than a basso profundo. Yet he was the epitome of kindness and understanding despite his looks and his voice.

On more than one occasion I went to him for advice and it was always good, something I would use all the years of my life in the service. One day I went to pay my respects to the Colonel and his lady as Navy protocol required. I was received most graciously and the three of us sat in his living room in San Diego and engaged in lively conversation. The radio was playing in the background softly and I was enjoying the visit immensely when all of a sudden Smokey Joe stood up at attention right in the middle of the conversation.

I gasped in astonishment and wonder. It was then, in the sudden silence, that I became aware that a band was playing the *Star Spangled Banner* over the radio. Joe stood there like a ramrod until the last note died away and then sat down quietly. He looked at me. There was a, well, shy look, I suppose you would call it, in his face as he explained that it was an old habit with him, and he never sat during the National Anthem, no matter where he was. I have never forgotten that visit and oftentimes do the same thing in the privacy of my home.

That was, as I say a long time ago, and he was not a young man then. I suppose by this time Smokey Joe has gone to his reward. If he has, then I say, God rest your soul Joe and thanks for the lesson that Sunday afternoon in San Diego.

GEORGE A. ROSSO,
Pastor, St. Thomas of Canterbury
Church, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N.Y.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was born in the chaos of crisis—it is not, however, a Nation which thrives on crises but it survives them. The many crises which our Nation has survived include intense domestic unrest, culminating in a civil war and numerous civil disturbances, severe economic upheaval, including numerous periods of inflation and recession as well as one extended depression, and, finally, we have survived many external or international conflicts. These crises are not what make our country great—it is our ability to overcome them, which often is understated. On the one hand, we are great because we avoid most potential crises. On the other hand, we remain a strong viable nation because we are able to cope with those few crises which necessarily causes us to confront.

I am reminded on this Flag Day of when Francis Scott Key composed our National Anthem. As our then young Republic was confronted by one of its first and most trying crises, Mr. Key, out of love for and faith in our great Nation, put his innermost feelings to verse. As the day broke Mr. Key was caught in the rapture of the first sights of a tattered Old Glory flying majestically on the horizon. Mr. Key did not express his

exasperation at the tatters in the flag, rather, he expressed his pride that our Flag had survived. He knew, as we all too often need to be reminded in these contemporary times of crisis, that tatters can be mended.

I, like Francis Scott Key, am glad to be American, not only because of what America is and was but, moreover, because of what we can make her. There are tatters in our flag—we cannot shrink from the task of mending those tatters.

In my opinion, patriotic holidays have, in altogether too many instances, been misinterpreted. There are those who say that they are a time to reflect on the injustice in America. There are those who say that they are a time to reflect on the justice in America. Allow me to interject that they are a time to confront the injustices in America with the justice which America represents. Poverty, inadequate health services, assistance for the aged, the infringement on freedoms, and so forth cannot be ignored on this day or any other. Likewise, our efforts to cope with these difficult problems should not be whisked aside simply because they are accompanied by human error.

Let us, today on Flag Day, join with the likes of Francis Scott Key. The land and laws, which our flag symbolizes, are not flawless, there are tatters, but these are not reasons to give up; they are, rather, a signal to all of America to stand up and face the challenge of making a better America, for ourselves as well as posterity.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, June 14, Flag Day, marks a red-letter date for all Americans, but unfortunately its significance is all too often lost on many persons for whom it is simply another day in a very busy week. I would like to pause briefly to reflect and comment on the importance of Flag Day to our Republic.

We read much today about a "crisis in the national psyche." As our mass society hurtles toward the 21st century, fragmentation and isolation are becoming more and more noticeable factors of divisiveness in America. The violent catharsis of the past few years is ample proof that America is accelerating rapidly and changing quickly—but still leading. There is no question as to whether or not to continue forward. Rather, the challenge is to take control of our own development and to steer our course with surer judgment and clearer foresight than before—thus continuing our leadership and guaranteeing a pre-eminent place in the world to our grandchildren. During periods of quickened social and cultural evolution, the importance of symbols of national life in providing coherence and stability cannot be overemphasized. A few bits of red, white, and blue cloth in themselves are not too meaningful, but when sewn into the Stars and Stripes, all Americans should recognize a source of pride and a unifying force behind which our Nation can aline.

Flag Day is a designated official time for us to become very aware, very conscious of the tenets of equality and justice on which the Republic was originally founded. It is a time to recall our

accomplishments and to dwell on our possibilities. Today is the day for all Americans to drop differences, join hands, and rejoice in our basic oneness. No American should despair, as some seem to do, in that we are not perfect. America is not perfect, but she is the best and most free place for the most people the world has ever known—and she is becoming better all the time. On this occasion of Flag Day, may we as a Congress, and we as a nation, reaffirm the precepts of our forefathers, embellish them for our youth, and rededicate ourselves in a new spirit of togetherness to the solving of our problems and the leading of the world.

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, June 14 is U.S. Flag Day, a day reserved for Americans to honor their national flag and all it represents: liberty, justice, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. It is a day that gives Americans the opportunity to pause and consider the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution that have endured, along with the flag, for nearly two hundred years. It is a day to renew the beliefs and tenets of basic human rights and the individual freedoms expounded by our Founding Fathers in these documents. It is a day to strengthen our national commitment to democracy and representative government, and to bolster our confidence in our national capacity to perpetuate these principles. The American flag symbolizes our American heritage and traditions, at home and overseas, and its day should be observed with respect and reflection upon not only what the flag represents in our past, but what it will mean to future generations.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, June 14 is Flag Day, an honored day in our Nation's annals and one which should be appropriately observed by every American. It also marks the beginning of the Honor America program, a 21-day period which is intended to encourage the citizens of our country to demonstrate their love and respect for America. It is, indeed, an appropriate time to promote America and unity among Americans; to encourage a massive expression of appreciation for the blessings and strength of our country. The Honor America program will extend until July 4.

This year will mark the first peace-time observance of Flag Day and Independence Day in more than a decade. Every American should take part in this program by displaying the flag, honoring it, and giving thanks for the blessing of freedom and liberty which has been so dearly purchased for us all by the brave men and women who have worn the uniform of their country, and by those who have served in civilian pursuits essential to the security and well-being of our country.

All too often, too many of us are prone to talk only of those things which we see wrong about America. It is time to see, and discuss, and uphold the things which are right about America. The noble goals set forth nearly 200 years ago by the founders of the Republic are with us still. It is time for reaffirmation of our beliefs in them and of our determination to uphold them. It is worthy to note that

our Constitution does not suggest the United States has to be a perfect Nation. In the preamble it is stated that our objective is to form a more perfect Union.

Instead of standing idly by while others attempt to prevent the playing of our national anthem at public events, or to prevent prayer in the schools, or even to outlaw the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, let those who believe in America speak up for America. Faith in America is also an affirmation of faith in God, because this country was founded in part on the tenets of religion. Let us state again and again those who have warped this country's greatness and tolerance to their own selfish purposes do not speak for America. This is still a great land of opportunity for all the people who seek opportunity. A commitment of the American people to historic ideals is needed. All of this is part of the fight for America, the kind of America in which we grew up and which we love, for its greatness, and its traditions, and its opportunity.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT EXTENSION

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3926) to extend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 3926, with Mr. YOUNG of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) had 17 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) had 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 221]

Abzug	Dingell	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Kluczynski
Ashbrook	Erlenborn	Kuykendall
Badillo	Esch	Litton
Baker	Fisher	Lujan
Blackburn	Foley	McKinney
Brown, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	Mathis, Ga.
Burke, Calif.	Gubser	Mills, Ark.
Chisholm	Hanna	Moorhead, Pa.
Clark	Harsha	Murphy, N.Y.
Daniels,	Hawkins	Nedzi
Dominick V.	Hebert	Owens
Danielson	Heckler, Mass.	Patman
Davis, Ga.	Howard	Podell
	Johnson, Pa.	Powell, Ohio

Rees	Sandman	Waldie
Roncalio, Wyo.	Shuster	White
Rooney, N.Y.	Sikes	Widnall
Rosenthal	Sisk	Wiggins
Roybal	Smith, Iowa	Wilson
Ruppe	Steelman	Charles, Tex.
St Germain	Teague, Tex.	Wright

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, 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. 3926, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, when 370 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absenteess to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order of no quorum was made, the Chair had recognized the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is particularly appropriate on Flag Day that we should be discussing the future of the arts and humanities in this country. I see in this vote on the arts and humanities and the Bicentennial, which happens to be part of this program, a vote of confidence in the past and in the future of the United States of America. I see this as an expression to the world that we in Congress, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, are willing to extend ourselves in order that our own people can know more of their great heritage and more of our culture.

We spend billions of dollars in fighting crime and in trying to break the poverty cycle that so many of our people are trapped in today. The relatively few millions that we will be spending on the arts and the humanities I believe can do more to motivate the people out of their poverty cycle and can do more to lead our young people away from crime than any comparative expenditure that we can make.

To move some of our people, particularly our young people away from the unfortunate subcultures that they have gone into, we must show them the real culture of America. I know of nothing that brings people together with a better feeling than great artists, writers, and performing groups expressing themselves before the public.

Some people feel we are talking about only a small segment of our people that has any interest in the arts and the humanities. I have heard people say this is just for the rich. This is a ridiculous statement. Overwhelming majorities of the American people in every economic sector would like to be able to take an active role in the arts, and in the humanities of our country.

We will hear, I am sure, later about the need for savings. I certainly support the need for savings and fiscal responsibility, but I also support the real need for the better things in life that we can give our people through this program.

If I may quote an Old Testament saying, "Man does not live by bread alone." I think that is very true, and certainly true in relation to this bill.

Therefore, I urge that we support, enthusiastically support this legislation to further the goals of the arts and humanities in our country. I can think of no better or more worthy cause to support nor a better action than we can take today than to overwhelmingly pass this bill, as the Senate has previously done.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, testimony before the Committee has convinced me that both endowments are doing an outstanding job. Programs which were begun on a limited basis several years ago have proved their worth. The stimulus of small amounts of Federal money has resulted in a tremendous surge of interest and participation in the arts and humanities across the Nation. In the arts and artists endowment alone, for every \$1 of Federal money spent, \$3 or \$4 is being raised to match it.

Despite the small size and relatively short life of the endowments, each has won acclaim and strong support from public and private leadership as well as from grassroots citizenry across the country, because each is doing the quality job which Congress demanded.

Over the short years of the life of the Arts Endowment, it has provided assistance to a wide range of artists and art institutions. But it did not try to do everything all at once. With a good sense of priorities, it first assured the continued existence and capacity of our major cultural institutions to provide employment for artists and service to the public. The endowment has also helped preserve and strengthen hundreds of such institutions in communities throughout the country—theater groups, orchestras, museums and the like.

It has specifically helped all types of arts institutions extend their services to much broader audiences, extending the hours or the weeks of operation, taking performances and exhibitions into the parks, the streets, schools, churches, offices and factories—making the arts a part of the daily life of the people. This was the intent of Congress which was impressed upon the endowment, and such activities will be expanded in the new year.

A great many endowment grants which by name appear to benefit a symphony orchestra, or a theater, or dance company, or a museum, in fact provide funds specifically for performances or other activities in disadvantaged urban or rural areas, in hospitals, prisons, and other places where people need but lack the sustenance of the arts.

Stimulated by decentralization of arts exposure of national touring companies, cities and towns in every part of the country are sprouting their own companies and strengthening those already in operation. Thus more people are becoming not just audiences, but direct participants in the arts. And our total culture is enriched by this broadening of the base of participation. This, again, was the intention of Congress in writing this legislation, and the endowments have pledged to redouble their commitment in this area.

The Humanities Endowment, at the insistence of the committee, in 1970 also broadened its base of citizen participation and will expand these programs in fiscal 1974.

Dr. Ronald Berman, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, in testimony before the committee, said that he was proudest of NEH programs which worked toward the dissemination of humanistic works among our people. This NEH division of public programs—at \$28 million the largest item in their proposed budget—makes possible projects in adult education at local museums, on campuses, in historical societies and libraries. It also allows for education at home by means of television—a series of fine historical films is currently being seen on public television. It has also been possible to bring both the old "Civilization" television series by Kenneth Clark—as well as a new series on painting—to hundreds of communities, and literally millions of viewers at virtually minimal cost.

Dr. Berman testified:

Our interest is not esoteric, but to bring our knowledge resources to bear on the conduct of national life and the rational setting of goals . . . to enhance the national capacity for anticipating and understanding problems by applying value judgments rooted in history, philosophy and ethics.

Through the NEH State-based programs, \$160,000 will be made available to each State, to set up statewide forums to discuss important public issues. This was first begun on a small, pilot program and should be in place in all 50 States by the end of fiscal 1974.

This program has great potential for citizen participation and enlightenment. Historians, philosophers, and other humanists will share their knowledge and insights in these forum sessions with their fellow citizens from every walk of life, addressing critical problems of the State and Nation.

Another program of great potential is the newspaper 20-lecture series which will begin this September, to make available to the general public, in 150 newspapers across the country, the best in scholarly thinking in the history of the country. The course will also be available for college credit, if the reader wants it.

The NEH is commissioning a television series of historical films—looking toward the Bicentennial—of great artistic merit and historic significance. There will be one on the Adams family, on George Washington, on Jefferson. Scholarly works are being prepared on other important 18th century figures. Plans are in the works to write scholarly histories of each State, each county.

The thrust of the two endowments has been to extend the arts and humanistic knowledge beyond the relatively small groups of people who, because of their own private financial resources, have always been able to enjoy the art and culture of our society.

Without the NEH, the New York Public Library would have closed the doors to some of its collections; without the NEH, valuable archives would not have been restored from the ravages of Hurricane

Agnes; without NEH, the biography of the Wright Brothers and Lorraine Hansberry would not have been on the Nation's television screens; without the NEH we would scarcely have begun to examine the ethical implications of advances in biomedical science and technology; without the NEH we would still be without authoritative editions of our great 19th century American authors, without new collections of the letters and papers of our Founding Fathers; without the NEH we may never, as a nation, compile the histories of our States, and, without the NEH, the understanding of our origins, our growth, and our purposes as a nation, is never likely to grow, nor will the Nation's Bicentennial be an occasion worthy of note.

The work of the National Endowment for the Arts is perhaps better known than the Humanities. Both are to me of equal importance in tapping the creative potential of our people, and the bringing of culturally enriching programs to those who are not located in the cultural centers of this country.

In my own State of Minnesota, for example, the fine Guthrie Theatre, with the stimulus of a \$50,000 NEA grant, was able to make a six-State tour early this year, with John Steinbeck's "Of Mice and Men." The tour cost over \$200,000 and the players traveled to areas which never had seen live theater. An article in the Minneapolis Tribune said that—

It was a 15-city, 57-performance tour . . . Nearly 60,000 people saw the company perform, give classes, hold seminars . . . fewer than a third of those people had ever seen the Guthrie Theatre before . . .

Our people have felt a growing gap between the rising demand for the arts and the highly restricted means and opportunities for meeting that demand. They have seen even our most successful and famous orchestras, theaters, opera and dance companies, museums and other cultural institutions, in economic trouble, many operating on the verge of bankruptcy. They have seen actors, musicians, painters, sculptors, poets, dancers, and other talented artists out of work or working at the margins of economic existence. They have seen poor youngsters with great talent unable to gain training, experience, and creative opportunities, while others of equal talent turn away from such opportunities because they know that even successful artists often have a hard time supporting their families.

The National Endowment for the Arts was created by an Act of Congress to provide the focal point of leadership in responding to this broadly felt need for strengthening the arts in America. I believe that Miss Nancy Hanks, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, has done a remarkable job in obtaining State and private matching funds for the relatively small Federal amounts involved.

Decentralization of the arts activity is not only bringing art into remote and disadvantaged areas of the country, it is also generating the flow of creative art forms coming out of such areas. Folk music and crafts of all kinds, springing from proud regional or ethnic tradition

deep in our Nation's history, are being rediscovered, brought back into the life of our communities, and preserved for future generations. The cultural traditions of Appalachia, the American Indian, Black Americans, Spanish-speaking communities, and the host of national and ethnic groups which have made up our great country, are a part of the agenda for the NEA.

Artists in every field are taking up residence in schools, developing colleges, and other institutions where they can involve others directly in the creative process. Most Members are familiar with the artists in the schools program. My own State of Minnesota has had great success with this program, and the relatively small amount of Federal seed money has generated matching amounts of like or greater amounts in many areas.

This is one of the most exciting aspects of funding these programs, for we are finding that Federal stimulus money has been generating private contributions and an ever-increasing willingness on the part of the States to appropriate matching money, as well.

Ms. Molly LaBerge, director, St. Paul Council on the Arts and Sciences, testified before our committee on March 8:

The Endowment gave a grant of \$5,000 to the Minnesota poets in the school program to keep us alive while we found major funding. As a result of that, we raised \$34,000 to match that \$5,000. So if you need an example of seed money from the Endowment making possible a large amount of local money, that is a good one . . .

The artists in the schools program has met with great success everywhere and the schools are clamoring for it. The NEA has budgeted \$3 million for fiscal 1974 for expansion of this program. It puts professional poets, artists, dancers, filmmakers, sculptors, et cetera, into public schools for a minimum of 1 week. As Ms. LaBerge said:

We figure in Minnesota we will reach over 10,000 young people with the poetry program, alone, and many hundreds of teachers in the schools.

Witnesses also testified that these programs tap the creative potential of many heretofore unreachable young people. In the 1972-73 school year, with the help of additional funds from the Office of Education and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the visual arts component alone of this program involved 325 artists, craftsmen, and sculptors working directly in 525 schools with more than 7,500 teachers and nearly 175,000 students. The poetry component of the artists in the schools' program involves some 1,200 poets, many of them working with youngsters in extremely disadvantaged areas whose response to the individual attention afforded by the poet's presence is heartwarming.

Every State and the five special jurisdictions are included in the artists in the schools program. This nationwide involvement is an important barometer of both the need for the work being done and its acceptance by local educator groups who work closely with the State arts agencies.

I have encouraged the growth of this program, knowing its value to the young-

sters and schools of this Nation—it is in only 2,700 of America's schools, but will be greatly expanded this coming year if funds are authorized.

Currently, two Minneapolis-based companies, the Minnesota Dance Theatre and the Guild of Performing Arts, are performing in Minnesota and in five of our neighboring areas—another example of the regional creativity which has given Minnesota strength in the arts in the Midwest.

The Minnesota Orchestra has been the great pride of our State for about three-quarters of a century, and has been led by some of the world's greatest conductors—among them Eugene Ormandy, the late Dmitri Mitropoulos, Antal Dorati, and our present musical director, Stanislav Skrowaczewski. The orchestra has been assisted by the Arts Endowment for a 4-year period to make tours into four neighboring States—Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, and Iowa—in addition to expanding its touring capabilities within our own great State of Minnesota. The opportunity to hear this orchestra, undoubtedly one of the finest in the country, is an experience of musical fulfillment in many of the smaller towns in my part of the country. No recording and no television presentation can possibly create the same magic that an audience feels when hundreds of people come together to share a common experience and a common love for great music played by a great musical ensemble.

Another program which has been assisted for several years by the arts endowment is Young Audiences. This organization has affiliated chapters throughout the Nation, and brings the experience of live music and dance, performed by top quality professional groups, into schools in 34 States. Young Audiences receives financial aid not only from the Arts Endowment, but from other public and private philanthropic organizations, major foundations, the business community, the music performance trust funds, and individual contributors. The program epitomizes the cooperation of these groups with the Federal Government in making valuable educational tools more broadly available.

One of the first—of the expanding regional programs—is the Artrain. It began in Michigan; its purpose to tour rural and out of the way cities which do not often enjoy the advantages of seeing great works of art. An endowment grant of \$50,000 generated \$680,000 for the six-car program of art work and educational film and other projects. The train is touring in the Rocky Mountain region now, and will move to the Southeastern part of the United States next year. Programs such as this will expand if authorized and appropriated amounts are increased next year.

Why, you might ask, is it important for the Federal Government to encourage the arts—the writers—the historians? I have just re-read the 1970 Nobel Lecture in Literature by the great Russian author, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. He wrote about the value to mankind of the creative writer in a way which had validity to me, and I should like to share excerpts of that speech with you. His

words, I believe, have a bearing on our need as a nation to support the creative artists—and the humanists—in our midst. Solzhenitsyn maintained that creative artists can be a powerful force in bringing mankind together, and I for one believe his words should be heeded by this Congress.

Excerpts from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's Nobel Lecture:

"Imperceptibly, suddenly, mankind has become one—hopefully one and dangerously one—so that the concussions and inflammations of one of its parts are almost instantaneously passed on to others . . . not yet through possession of a common native language, but surpassing all barriers, through international broadcasting and print.

He then moves on, describing how the different scales of values throughout the world have caused such misunderstanding and violence—revealing his own pain over the incarceration and institutionalizing of dissenters in his native land. He goes on:

But for the whole of mankind, compressed into a single lump, such mutual incomprehension (because of differing scales of values), presents the threat of imminent and violent destruction. One world, one mankind cannot exist in the face of six, four or even two scales of values; we shall be torn apart by this disparity of rhythm, this disparity of vibrations.

Who will, then, coordinate these value scales, and how, Solzhenitsyn asks?

Who might succeed in impressing upon a bigoted, stubborn human creature the distant joy and grief of others an understanding of dimensions and deceptions which he himself has never experienced? Propaganda, constraints, scientific proof—all are useless.

But, fortunately, there does exist such a means in our world. That means is art. That means is literature.

Solzhenitsyn maintains that—

They can perform a miracle: they can overcome man's detrimental peculiarity of learning only from personal experience so that the experience of other people passes him by in vain.

From man to man, as he completes his brief spell on earth, art transfers the whole weight of an unfamiliar, life-long experience with all its burdens, its colors, its sap of life; it recreates in the flesh an unknown experience and allows us to possess it as our own . . .

They (art, literature) possess a wonderful ability; beyond distinctions of language, custom, social structure, they can convey the life experience of one whole nation to another . . .

Literature conveys irrefutable, condensed experience in yet another invaluable direction: namely, from generation to generation. Thus it becomes the living memory of the nation. Thus it preserves and kindles within itself the flame of her spent history, in a form which is safe from deformation and slander. In this way literature, together with language, protects the soul of the nation.

Our twentieth century has proved to be more cruel than preceding centuries, and the first fifty years have not erased all its horrors. Our world is rent asunder by those same old cave age emotions of greed, envy, lack of control, mutual hostility which have picked up in passing respectable pseudonyms like class struggle, racial conflict, struggle of the masses, trade union disputes. The primeval refusal to accept a compromise has been

turned into a theoretical principle and is considered the virtue of orthodoxy . . ."

He is critical of our dependence on scientists. He says:

It would seem that the appearance of the contemporary world rests solely in the hands of the scientists; all mankind's technical steps are determined by them. It would seem that it is precisely on the international goodwill of scientists, and not of politicians, that the direction of the world should depend.

All the more so since the example of the few shows how much could be achieved were they all to pull together. But no: scientists have not manifested any clear attempt to become an important and independently active force of mankind.

He speaks harshly as well of the role of writers in allowing violence and terror to reign and says they are as culpable.

But, finally, he says that he personally was saved by the writers of the world, who came to his defense and in this, he says, there is hope.

Thus, I have understood and felt that world literature is no longer an abstract anthology, nor a generalization invented by literary historians; it is rather a certain common body and common spirit, a living heart-felt unity reflecting the growing unity of mankind.

Mankind's sole salvation lies in everyone making everything his business; in the people of the East being vitally concerned with what is thought in the West, the people of the West vitally concerned with what goes on in the East. And literature, one of the most sensitive, responsive, instruments possessed by the human creature, has been one of the first to adopt, assimilate, to catch hold of this feeling of a growing unity of mankind.

I believe that world literature has it in its power to help mankind . . . to see itself as it really is, notwithstanding the indoctrinations of prejudiced people and parties. World literature has it in its power to convey condensed experience from one land to another so that we might cease to be split and dazzled, that the different scales of values might be made to agree, and one nation learn correctly and concisely the true history of another with such strength and recognition and painful awareness as it had itself experienced the same, and thus might it be spared from repeating the same cruel mistakes.

Solzhenitsyn, has, I believe, made his readers in America share the agony of his own and his country's suffering in such books as "A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch," and, a more important work, "The First Circle."

In "The First Circle," particularly, he has shown us something of the glory and the indomitability of the human spirit under heavy oppression and, thereby, to me he illustrates the oneness of man in his striving to be free, to be creative.

This is what our gifted artists, poets, playwrights, authors, musicians are also about. With Solzhenitsyn, I, too, believe that our creative artists have a vital role to play in helping to show mankind the way to oneness, brotherhood, and peace with those whose value systems are different from ours.

Another insight shared by Solzhenitsyn and most of us in this quote:

Literature (art) conveys . . . condensed experience . . . from generation to generation

. . . thus it becomes the living memory of the nation. Thus it preserves and kindles within itself the flame of her spent history . . . literature, together with language, protects the soul of the nation . . .

The increases in the endowment funds, \$32.5 million for each, to my mind will be spent to "preserve and kindle the flame of our spent history."

For these additional funds are for the Bicentennial and are, I believe, vitally necessary expenditures in a time of great spiritual upheaval in our Nation.

I believe that we need to rekindle faith in ourselves and look back to our ideological roots. We need to read about, to see films about, the leading figures of the days of our revolution. This is what the endowments will be doing and encouraging.

We need to read again the words of Sam and John Adams, of Paine, of Madison, of Franklin, Jefferson.

We need to listen to stirring music which is yet to be composed, to view drama which will reawaken our sense of pride and purpose and hope in our country's history and future. And perhaps in our restudy of history, which the endowments will encourage and support, perhaps we will be given the insight to understand the struggles of those in the world's underdeveloped countries toward freedom and independence and see in it something akin to our own struggle.

To me the Bicentennial thrust of the endowments is justification enough for spending this additional money. \$55 million which is roughly the increase, is very little money compared to the multibillions we spend on science and technology.

Our country needs to hope again. To feel pride again in itself and in its democratic mission and vision for the rest of the world. I believe that this bill will be part of restoring that hope, faith, and pride in ourselves. And, rather than viewing the expenditures as uncalled for in a time of budget constraints, I would urge you to view it as an investment. An investment which will be returned in dividends many times over throughout all the United States by the outpouring of creative efforts in the arts and humanities by a large segment of our population.

INCREASES IN AUTHORIZATIONS

I have suggested to you something of my feeling of why we should increase the authorizations for this program, that the \$55 million additional which the administration is asking will go for Bicentennial thrusts. And I have suggested the responsible manner in which both endowments will fund the programs—with in guidelines of a criteria of excellence. The endowments started with low funding in 1966—\$5 million—and have moved forward cautiously in spending taxpayers money. In 1967 we appropriated \$10 million; in 1968 \$10.9 million; in 1969 \$12.7 million; then \$16.3 million in 1970; \$57.7 million in 1972 and \$76.4 million in 1973. There have been dramatic increases in these programs since the advent of the Republican administration. Some mistakes were made in the early

days, and the committee moved to make sure mistakes would not be repeated—the emphasis is on excellence.

And compare with other nations, the U.S. Government has a long way to go in matching in Federal contributions to the arts. The President has requested \$72.5 million for the Arts Endowment in fiscal 1974, not quite double the fiscal 1973 amount. Canada, with nearly 22 million people, spent \$26.5 million in 1972 compared to our \$29.7 million. Great Britain, with some 54 million people spent \$66 million. And West Germany with 55 million people, spent \$134 million.

There is a group called the Partnership for the Arts, a private organization of citizens, which is asking us to increase support for the Arts Endowment of \$200 million by 1976, the year of our Bicentennial, or roughly \$1 per head. We spend roughly 40 cents per person. Compare this with West Germany: \$2.42 per capita; Austria \$2 per capita; Sweden \$2; Canada \$1.40; Israel \$1.34; and Great Britain \$1.23.

The \$55 million increase over the 1973 budget reflects plans and programs for the 1976 Bicentennial; \$30 million for the Arts and \$25 million for the Humanities. The Humanities budget reflects that \$28 million will go into public programs, some of which I have mentioned: television films on the Founding Fathers; scholarly works on 18th century men and women; histories of States and counties, etc.

NEH will be spending \$20 million for

its division of education, working through the colleges and universities. The division of research—\$14 million—fosters scholarly investigation and creativity, and the division of fellowships—\$10 million—provides for the training of people in the humanities.

For the National Endowment for the Arts national programs, we authorized \$54 million. For State programs \$11 million.

We require that Federal funds from the NEA be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The States, for the most part, have done well. We were told during committee hearings that they have been averaging \$3 to \$4—either privately or publicly raised—for every Federal dollar contributed.

The fact that more State legislatures are moving to appropriate increasing amounts for these arts programs is a good indicator of strength in the States, and speaks well for the efforts of the endowments in stimulating these vitally needed cultural programs within and between the States.

Both endowments have been swamped with applications for funds and have had to turn down outstanding projects for lack of money. These pressures for funding will increase as we approach the Bicentennial. Attached is a table from each of the endowments, listing the number of applications, those highly rated by their panels of experts, those which have been funded and the total left unfunded.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
FISCAL YEAR 1973 APPLICATIONS REVIEWED BY NATIONAL COUNCIL THROUGH FEBRUARY 1973

Division	Applications	Number highly rated	Number approved	Gap
Research	373	174	116	58
Education	409	134	99	35
Fellowships	3,092	1,478	662	816
Youth grants	239	58	31	27
Total	4,113	1,844	908	936

With the year only two-thirds over, therefore—and with more applications yet to come—an additional \$46 million is already necessary in just these programs if all the top-rated applications were to be funded. In view of the pressing current need for a deeper and richer understanding of our past, the present, and our possible future, it is especially disturbing to realize that more than half of our most highly regarded institutions and individuals who seek the endowment's assistance are being refused for lack of funds.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—REQUESTS VERSUS GRANTS

Despite the fact that the endowment is forced to discourage thousands of artists and arts groups from even applying formally for assistance, formal applications to NEA still far exceed its ability to help. For example, the 1973 figures below do not include the nearly 800 written requests for assistance—not to mention phone inquiries—received in the past 4 months which never reached the application stage:

	Number of formal applications	Grants		Amounts requested in formal applications		Granted	
		Number	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1970	1,383	711	51	\$25,765,000	20	\$12,903,000	
1971	2,076	699	34	54,957,000	32	17,337,000	
1972	4,216	1,543	37	82,432,000	39	32,220,000	
1973 as of May	5,486	1,591	29	90,022,000	37	33,195,000	

Projecting the 4 months/800 to 12 months/2,400, takes the 1973 total alone up to nearly 8,000 formal and preliminary written requests for assistance, of which NEA can assist less than one-fourth.

Some have asked us why authorizations have been increased when some programs for the poor are proposed to be cut. May I point out that in 1970 the total budget authority for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was \$58,312,873,000; in 1971 it was \$65,828,801,000. In 1972 it was \$75,708,334,000; in 1973 \$87,859,096,000—estimated—and in 1974 \$101,879,729,000. This includes trust funds and lending authority.

Total spending for human resources programs has not been reduced; We have reduced defense expenditures from 45 cents of the Federal dollar to 30 cents; and increased human resources programs from 32 cents to 47 cents.

Many of those who are criticizing the rise in authorizations for arts and humanities were the same who in 1969 were

critical of this administration, expressing fear that the budget for this program would be cut because, they said, the Republicans did not have any interest in arts and humanities. I have already pointed out the dramatic increases in the past few years. From \$5 million in 1966 to \$12.7 million in 1969. Since 1970, the budgets have roughly doubled: \$16.3 million in 1970; \$28.6 million in 1971; \$57.7 million in 1972 and \$76.4 million in 1973.

Many of our colleagues do not want to authorize \$145 million for fiscal 1974. There are others who want a dramatic increase. For instance, the Senate passed a measure which has a total authorization of \$840 million: \$160 million in 1974; \$280 million in fiscal 1975 and \$400 million in fiscal 1976.

H.R. 3926 is in line with the administration request. It is a compromise between two extremes on this issue. Some might say that there should be some limitation on 1975 and 1976. However, you should recognize that when the Education and Labor Committee comes to

this House with wording "such sums as Congress may appropriate"—now this is a very great step forward.

Usually, our committee holds out false hopes with authorizations which are way beyond that which can be funded. In H.R. 3926 we have made a case for full funding, and we will leave it to the judgment of this body in the coming fiscal years for the amounts which should be appropriated.

Our committee did not agree entirely with the administration on language in this bill. We made changes, with special emphasis on the role of the States, to strengthen the States.

To add to the encouragement of the Arts Endowment program to strengthen and stimulate individual States' arts programs, we increased the amount of money which each State will receive to \$200,000. And to assure that each State receives \$200,000 in fiscal 1975 and 1976, we require that no less than 20 percent of total appropriations for the endowment for the arts shall be made available for State programs carried on un-

der section 5(g). Of that 20 percent, 75 percent will be divided equally among the States and 25 percent will go to regional programs and exemplary State programs.

The Arts Endowment says that—

Only at the \$72.5 million fiscal 1974 level can the Arts Endowment make major headway in developing State and regional activity.

This is essential to strengthen the development of local community groups and provide increased opportunities for participation of individuals in all geographic regions.

The Endowment plans to encourage this through increasing the block grants to all the State Arts Agencies, plus providing additional funds to assist their administrative development and to further special quality State agency projects throughout the Endowment program areas.

We have added language to the bill which stipulates that the national advisory panels, which are responsible for making judgments on the expenditure of grant money, shall have broad geographic representation. We want to make sure that talented persons from across the country will be represented on the panels to insure that the interests of the less heavily populated States are considered in making grants.

We have stressed the need for greater development of regional programs. These are now at the beginning stages, and the arts endowment will provide technical assistance to the States to bring more into being.

We have stipulated that a limit of \$250,000 be placed on renovation and that construction money will be available only for unusual circumstances. We have set a limit of 10 percent of appropriations on what the chairman of each endowment may spend on chairman's grants.

We have, I believe, produced a sound bill, one which continues the stimulus of Federal aid in the various States. It is important that such a Federal stimulus be continued. I believe we used good judgment in changes which we felt were necessary to make the programs work better, and I am convinced that this time the Education and Labor Committee comes to the House with good, conservative authorization figures. You should support our efforts as future encouragement to this Committee to follow the same pattern on legislation which will follow.

This is a year in which Congress must weigh national priorities carefully to assure that the programs we authorize are focused on the real and urgent needs of our people. I believe that, in the very deepest sense, enriching the quality of life through preservation and advancement of our cultural heritage meets the test of relevance and priority which we must apply.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3926 which I cosponsored with Mr. BRADEMAS to extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act.

The arts and humanities enrich all of

our lives. They influence every phase of our activities.

Exposure to the arts gives people experience in new ways of looking at their world. The arts broaden a person's outlook and provide a means for self-expression.

Today, many countries which lack our riches are spending far more per person in support of the arts. The increases in this bill for funds to aid the Arts and the Humanities Act merely to catch up to a level more suitable to our position as the leading industrial nation in the world.

The Saturday Review of April 22, 1972, notes the spending of other countries in their arts programs. Israel with its massive defense burden spends \$1.34 per person. In Western Europe, the now-prosperous nation of West Germany spends \$2.40 per person. Compare this to the \$0.15 per person spent by the United States.

The passage of this bill is of special importance to the citizens of Florida.

From the National Endowment for the Arts, alone, Florida will receive almost \$370,000 in Federal funds this year. The increased funds provided in this bill should add at least \$100,000 more to that figure.

Recipients of aid from the National Endowment for the Humanities will also receive increased assistance totaling in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Many fine organizations and groups in southern Florida are recipients of this aid. The Miami Philharmonic Orchestra has fulfilled a cultural need in Dade County for many years. The Miami Opera Guild sponsors a comprehensive operatic and musical program for Dade and Broward counties each season. The University of Miami School of Music is one of the outstanding music schools in the country with programs available for the enjoyment of the entire community. Since its inception, Miami-Dade Community College has offered a community-wide cultural arts and music program. And the list also includes many smaller groups which benefit from this Federal aid program.

The bill before us today would greatly increase the Federal contribution in support of these and other programs. Southern Florida in particular has needs which could finally be realized with an increase in available Federal assistance.

I am speaking specifically of greater Federal funding for the visual arts. In the contemporary world of art, the visual arts encompass a great many areas; not only painting and sculpture, but photography, graphics and even architecture and civic planning. All over this country there are people working to create what can be called an entire art environment.

Miami has long needed a centrally located municipal fine arts museum. The increased Federal funds which this bill will provide could possibly give important assistance to establishing this facility.

Mr. Chairman, this bill to extend and increase the funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities is important not only to southern Florida, but to the Nation. I strongly support its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from Joan Lehman to the Florida delegation.

MIAMI, FLA.,
May 7, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I introduce myself. I am the wife of Congressman William Lehman who represents the 13th District from Dade County Florida. Also, through many years of work, I have developed a career as a metal sculptor and am known quite widely because of my work.

I would like to urge you to vote for extension of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

With our concern today for helping the unfortunate people of our country with education, it is also very necessary to enrich our American life with art which gives riches of life. In all the history of our civilization, this has proved a necessary part to life and growth.

Sincerely,

JOAN LEHMAN.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I should like to reiterate my further support for the bill, and ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BRADEMAS, to yield for a question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) are the university presses throughout the Nation provided for in the bill under consideration?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ANDREWS) that although there is no specific provision for university presses in the bill under consideration, that we have discussed their problems at length with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN) who is most concerned with the well-being of our university presses. In the committee report, on page 19, under the hearing, "Historic Documents," there is a quotation from a letter to the subcommittee from Dr. Ronald Berman, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, outlining endowment support, through the National Historical Publications Commission, for the editing and publication of historic documents.

It would be my own hope that the National Humanities Endowment and the National Historical Publications Commission will agree that the university presses of the country should play a vigorous and constructive role in the editing and publishing of historic documents.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. That is the gentleman's understanding, then, of the meaning of the subcommittee's presentation?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I should at this point, stress the intent of the committee with reference to another of the issues surrounding the extension of this act.

I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the testimony before the committee of both En-

dowment Chairmen, stressing the anticipated involvement of the Endowments with the Bicentennial celebration.

As my colleagues may know, considerable concern was raised, by me and other members of the committee during the hearings, that such involvement might lead to the use of the Endowments' funds for purposes unrelated to their major work, and might indeed lead to partisan consideration in the making of grants. The committee was particularly concerned that the addition of a criterion that preference be given to Bicentennial-related applications could adversely affect the quality of the artistic and scholarly work supported by the Endowments.

I should tell my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that each Chairman gave assurances that no changes in grantmaking procedures, with respect to quality would occur.

In this regard, I cite a letter from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, Mrs. Nancy Hanks, to the ranking minority member of the committee. Said Mrs. Hanks:

There will be no special "earmarking" within the Endowment that would force any applicant into dreaming up Bicentennial programs;

All applications which reflect a Bicentennial relationship will be treated in exactly the same manner as those which do not, i.e., they will be reviewed by the appropriate professional staff, the appropriate Panel, and by the National Council;

We cannot stress too strongly the Council's commitment to the potential for making a long-range contribution to the nation's cultural life, for avoiding razzle-dazzle one-shot activities, for bringing the highest level of quality and citizen involvement possible to all Americans—quality and involvement which will continue long after the 1976 festivities have ended.

Based on commitments such as these, Mr. Chairman, the committee did not choose to restrict the Endowments' involvement with the Bicentennial celebration, but I want to assure my colleagues that I intend to closely follow the Endowments' programs in the next few years to insure no changes with respect to quality, or political involvement, occur.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of H.R. 3926, a bill to reauthorize the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

I am both impressed and heartened by the scope and diversity of efforts supported by the National Endowment for the Arts under the direction of Nancy Hanks with the very limited funds available to them. I believe the endowment has written a proud record of large achievement with small resources.

The wide variety of well chosen projects can be illustrated by looking at southern California. In this area, the endowment provided critical assistance to such important institutions as the Los Angeles Philharmonic, and the Los Angeles County Museum, and has made it possible for them to reach out and serve a much wider audience, including espe-

cially young people and those who have not had access to such cultural enrichment in the past.

This wider availability of the arts is being served even more broadly by a splendid film showing the Los Angeles Philharmonic preparing for and then presenting a performance of Ravel's stirring "Bolero." This extremely valuable insight into the creation and the meaning of great works of art was made possible by a unique partnership between the National Endowment for the Arts, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the American Federation of Musicians local in Los Angeles. The film is now being aired throughout the country for millions who have never had the opportunity to see and hear the Los Angeles Philharmonic at work.

Another great cultural resource located in southern California is of course the film industry. A uniquely American art form has grown up here and has been a major influence not only throughout America but around the world. However, the wealth of outstanding entertainment produced over many years is being lost to us and future generations as old film deteriorates. The National Endowment is providing funds to the American Film Institute for the costly process of preserving these films, and for other projects which assure continued availability of our unique film heritage, as well as the continuing development of our national film art and industry.

Mr. Chairman, the national significance of such major projects is more than matched by the cumulative effects of hundreds of local projects aided by the Endowment for the Arts—projects which give recognition and support to high-quality, artistic achievement, and enhance the quality of life for individuals and entire communities.

In southern California, as in other parts of the country, Endowment grants are helping to expand involvement and participation in the arts to include thousands of people, and whole communities who have lacked opportunity for such involvement in the past. Concerts and exhibits in both inner city and outlying communities are only part of the picture—but a new and promising part. Even more encouraging is the growth of projects such as the Inner City Cultural Center of Los Angeles, the Studio Watts Workshop, and the Mechicano Art Center which are providing a wide range of direct and high-quality arts experience for disadvantaged young people and our great minority communities with help from the Endowment.

A fine editorial in yesterday's Los Angeles Times makes the point most eloquently, concluding with this important thought:

Beyond the intrinsic value of these programs, however, is something more important. That is the commitment of the federal government, however modest the amount, to the arts and the humanities. It is recognition that this is not just a nation of science and technology even though, perhaps inevitably, science and technology receive more generous federal subsidy. It underscores the importance of the arts and the humanities to the quality of American society.

I include the full text of the editorial into the RECORD:

SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

President Nixon has given strong leadership to the rapid expansion of federal support for the arts and the humanities. He has proposed almost doubling the funding in the coming fiscal year. His proposal is a good one. It deserves the support of the House of Representatives when it comes to a vote Wednesday.

The two programs were initiated on a modest scale by President Johnson seven years ago. They remain, in relation to the rest of the federal budget, modest in amount. But useful.

There are two administering agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. In the current fiscal year, each received \$38.5 million. Mr. Nixon has proposed increasing the money for each to \$72.5 million next year.

His proposal still recognizes that the federal government cannot and should not become the major source of funds in these areas. On the contrary, the arts and humanities remain dependent on local government and private sources for their support.

But the availability of federal money has already become an important element in both the arts and the humanities, stimulating innovation and experimentation, broadening public involvement, making possible new programs that otherwise would go untried, rescuing others, like the New York Public Library, that are caught in financial crises.

The arts program is surprisingly varied, including community-based programs for minority groups, touring dance companies, opera, graphic design for the federal agencies, with about one-third of the support going to the states for their special programs. The fastest-growing program is strictly behind the scenes—helping museums improve the storage of priceless works of art, adding fire protection, air conditioning and security.

In the humanities, a general effort has been made to involve all Americans, not just scholars, in more serious consideration of the humanities. Teachers, but also journalists and lawyers, have been given fellowships. A \$600,000 grant to KCET in Los Angeles financed the humanities film forum. State-based humanities programs are being organized to bring scholars and other citizens together to consider such critical issues as the role of law in American society.

Beyond the intrinsic value of these programs, however, is something more important. That is the commitment of the federal government, however modest the amount, to the arts and the humanities. It is recognition that this is not just a nation of science and technology even though, perhaps inevitably, science and technology receive more generous federal subsidy. It underscores the importance of the arts and the humanities to the quality of American society.

Mr. Chairman, the programs of the National Endowment for the Arts speak directly and effectively to some of the most vital needs for enhancing the quality of life in America today. I think we are all in agreement that when we look upon the history of countries throughout the world, the outstanding thing that we can point to and that we can discuss is its culture, and certainly we would like to enhance the culture of this country for generations to come.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are debating amendments under the 5-minute rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr.

KEMP) will offer an amendment which I support, which will reduce the authorization for the Arts and Humanities Foundation from the level in the committee reported bill of \$145 million to \$80 million, or the same level as in fiscal year 1973.

I must say I think on balance the work of this Foundation has been helpful but I think at some point in time it is important to step back and assess whether or not in our list of priorities it is legitimate or appropriate to increase the authorization for this program by almost 80 percent.

On balance, in my judgment, in the list of priorities it is simply not appropriate at this point in our history and it is for that reason that I will support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. There is one other reason I want to mention, and then I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

When we are looking at the two bills, that is, the one reported by the other body and this one, the level of authorization in the other body's bill is \$160 million. The way to hold down the level to be reported to the President when it gets there is to cut this one back so that we have some opportunity to negotiate with the other body without finding ourselves in a position of accepting a level of authorization that is simply too high.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) a question concerning the bill. Am I correctly informed that the travel expenses for the so-called arts and humanities experts is substantially increased in this bill? In other words, there is an increase to \$852,000 from \$502,500. Could that possibly be true?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If I may say so, in view of the fact that, if there is an increased authorization for the activities under the two endowments, there would be required increased activity on the part of the several expert advisers on the panel.

Mr. GROSS. And the travel expenses for the staff will be in the amount of \$467,900 or almost \$468,000, up from \$282,700 last year?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am sure my friend from Iowa would want to applaud our efforts to reach the smaller communities of our country with the programs contained in this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. There is no assurance that it will reach the smaller communities, but it is assured that this will be probably one of the most traveled staff known to Congress under the terms of this increase.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his interest.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in giving full support to this bill authorizing funds for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities for fiscal year 1974.

This legislation will allow this country to continue developing its cultural offerings not just to the rich, but extending cultural education and opportunities to the disadvantaged, as well.

Certainly this is a goal which deserves its fair share of Federal support. I understand that much of the controversy over this legislation is the question of whether it is legitimate in a fiscally tight year to increase from \$80 to \$145 million the authorization for Arts and Humanities. As a Republican and as a fiscally conscious Representative, I can say this is a legitimate expenditure.

The reason we see such an increase in the level of funding is that the program is just developing, having only been in existence a few years. Thus, it is difficult to compare its level of increases with programs that are well-established and whose needs are relatively stable, rather than growing.

Figured out on a per-person basis, this authorization comes to about 63 cents per U.S. citizen in fiscal year 1974. Compare this with \$1.40 spent for each Canadian and \$2.40 for each West German citizen. This country must watch its budget closely, but let us not forget that this is the richest country in the world—surely we can afford 63 cents per individual to raise the cultural level of our Nation.

It boils down, as always, to a question of priorities, and I would put this way above several programs for which this country is spending far more money.

I am sure we have all heard time and again from constituents who have visited European nations and come back wondering, "Why can we not provide our citizens with the same type of cultural opportunities? Why can we not buy theater or concert tickets at reasonable rates? Why can we not have more groups active in the art field?"

Surely this country can afford some modest assistance program like the one proposed today to help struggling cultural institutions and groups manage to keep up with rising costs without pricing admission tickets or costs of art objects way above the heads of most citizens.

I have also received comments from teachers in schools involved in this program asking that it be continued—pointing out that without such assistance, the school could not possibly offer the level of cultural education it considers adequate. Again, looking at priorities, I feel we can afford this expenditure. And obviously so does the President, who has shown great leadership in cutting the budget where he deemed it necessary, but requested this full \$145 million for the arts and humanities. To me, this says a great deal.

I hope my colleagues will find that this country can afford this authorization for the cultural advancement of our citizens.

I believe the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities has done a fine job in its short life span and would like to see its role continued and expanded.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GAIMO).

Mr. GAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I want to commend the full committee and the subcommittee, led by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) for what I think has been heroic work in this field for many years.

I recall the days years ago when I had the privilege of serving on this committee and we were dreaming about this kind of legislation. At long last the United States has made a great effort in the area of the arts and humanities.

I believe, as I then did, that the great nations will be remembered more by their contributions to the arts and humanities than by perhaps anything else.

It has taken the United States a long, long time to adopt this attitude, but at long last we are moving in that direction.

It is a pleasure to see this legislation which, in my opinion, authorizes substantial increases for the arts and the humanities, and it behoves us to see that they are expended in a way which will nurture the arts and humanities and which will benefit the culture of the land and the people as a whole.

There are some items which concern me, however. I am delighted that the committee has made reference to some of them in its report. I would like to stress them here today with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) because I know he shares the same concerns—at least in some of these areas.

As we know, most of the professional artists in this Nation are represented by cultural unions, and yet I am concerned that the members of the National Council on the Arts and the National Council on the Humanities, all of whom are appointed by the President and none of whom need confirmation by the Senate, constitute in my opinion, the development of an insular type of council. For example, I am told that for some three or four years there has been no individual among the 26 Arts Council members who could represent the unions in this field. The unions that represent the artists. Is that correct?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I share the concern the gentleman has raised. I might interject, Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for the leadership the gentleman has given to these programs over the years, both as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

I share the concern of the gentleman from Connecticut about the problems of representation on the Advisory Council. I am glad to advise the gentleman that in our committee report we took specific notice of this problem, on page 7. We noted that the committee received testimony and correspondence indicating that the membership of the National Arts Council and the several advisory panels on the endowments, are

not representative in that the constituency, to which the gentleman from Connecticut refers, labor unions representing performers, are not represented.

We went ahead to point out that while we did not require such representation in the bill, nor did we specify quotas for any constituencies, that we did want to stress that, in order for the Council to be genuinely representative of the arts, it should be aware of all relevant viewpoints. We added that we hope any imbalance presently existing on the Council will be corrected when nominations are next considered for the Council.

Mr. GIAIMO. Not only the Council, but as I understand it many of the panels which represent about 185 people have few if any of them. Is that correct?

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct.

And in the next sentence, on the same page of the report to which I have made reference, we made that same point.

Mr. GIAIMO. Another area of concern to me, and I am sure the committee is also familiar with this, is that the authorizing legislation for the Arts Endowment since its inception has included a provision that forbids the Endowment to give grants to organizations that do not provide basic prevailing standards for the income, safety and health of their artists as determined by the Department of Labor. This provision was fairly well enforced in the early years.

In 1961, after I had expressed deep concern about various activities which seemed to undermine artists' salaries and welfare, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) exercised great leadership in his subcommittee's subsequent investigation of these activities. The subcommittee's findings led to the legislation creating the Arts Endowment. At that time, the artists' health, safety, and economic well-being were at the forefront of our thoughts. However, in recent years, programs involving so-called avant-garde, experimental theaters, choruses and so forth—that have not at times met the minimal standards set by the Labor Department—have been granted funds. When called on, the Endowment has procrastinated and generally avoided doing anything to correct this. As a result, this has become a serious matter, especially now that we are asking for increases in funding and the programs for the arts and humanities are well on their way. A too lax attitude in this area would subvert the original congressional intent to insure better conditions for our country's artists. I think this should be curtailed.

Again I note that it has been referred to in the committee report, but I would like to hear the comments of the gentleman from Indiana as to how it is proposed to correct this situation.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The committee came to the same conclusion as the gentleman from Connecticut reached with respect to the question of labor standards. Although we did not recommend changes in the bill on this matter, the reason we did not do so is that we believe the language in the bill is adequate in the protection it provides. And we believe the existing language requires the endowment to follow

the procedures that are mandated by the law.

I would join the gentleman from Connecticut in urging that the endowment be much more vigorous in following the intent of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman for his response. I do want to comment on several other areas of concern to me which I believe the committee should consider, as I am sure they will, in the future as they maintain oversight of this legislation. One is that some reference has been made to geographic representation concerning the Arts Endowment. I believe this could become dangerous, because I think we have to use the artists as we find them and disseminate the best of the arts throughout the land. Certainly, those who are employed and who are used in the arts as performers come from all over the United States and in that way we can get a better quality of art performance which should be made available throughout the country. But if we try to get geographical representation in the expenditure of these moneys we are going to find that we will be spending much money frivolously, because in some areas there will not be a professional or near-professional type of performance, and that will not improve the culture opportunities of the land.

There is another matter of concern to me, and that is that we are always faced with the question of whether or not we are funding too much in this area. I certainly do not think we are. I commend the committee for adequate funding, as it has now.

Another area of concern, however, is that Congress, which has given away so much of its power to the Executive, should consider at some point in the future appointive procedures for the Councils on the Arts and Humanities. In my opinion, this legislation was a creature of the Congress more than of the Executive in its inception many years ago. We have given away the powers of appointment on our regulatory boards and on many of the other boards which we have created throughout the decade.

I would hope this committee could study the possibility of perhaps the President appointing some Council members and the Congress others.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his suggestion and simply say that, in my judgment, it is a most constructive one. I would hope that next year we might hold hearings on the desirability of giving Congress a voice in the appointments to the Councils.

Mr. GIAIMO. If we are ever to regain our congressional prerogatives, I believe we have to approach and attack this on the broad-base front, and I think we can. I see no reason why Congress could not participate in the selection and designation of Council members.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman will yield, I think he has made several most constructive observations.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his cooperation.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Advisory Committee Act of last year says that Advisory Committee meetings shall be open to the public unless it is determined that a meeting is concerned with matters that are exempt from mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

I have been disturbed to find out that in spite of that language, Advisory Committees to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities have been holding nothing but closed meetings, completely closed meetings, on grounds that the only thing they are doing is reviewing grant applications. I, frankly, doubt that. Even the Public Media Advisory Panel to the National Endowment for the Arts held a closed meeting on May 30. The notice was not filed with the Federal Register until 15 minutes before the meeting began, and, hence, it was not published until the day after the meeting took place.

Yesterday I passed this information along to the gentleman from Indiana, and I am pleased to say that I have been advised this morning by the Endowment for the Humanities that at least two of their panels, the one on science and the new one on ethics and human values, will hold public sessions for everything that is not a review of a grant application. I have also been told by the people involved that the arts group will also try to cooperate in meeting statutory requirements on this in the future.

Under those circumstances I will support this bill, but I want it known that my attitude on appropriations in future years on this measure will be determined in large part by the degree to which the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities abides by the spirit as well as the letter of the law. I do not think it should just be congressional committees who are required to hold open sessions.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I take this time only to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his very constructive observations. He has already observed that he has been able to induce some constructive response.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if one were to follow the Biblical injunction of tying together where one's treasure is and where one's heart is, one would be truly deeply concerned in looking at our national budget. I am not talking about a specific discussion of individual programs, because I have been strongly supportive of reducing spending in a number of areas. I've voted for a number of cuts in military spending and a series of other programs. But let us just take it on balance at this time and ask what really is America's interest, what are we interested in. Let us, too, simplistically break it down into the scientific field and the

arts and humanities field of concentration and—thinking of spending of treasure, are we interested in what is embodied in the arts and humanities?

Let us see these figures in balance against each other. The balance is an appalling one because we have on the one hand scientific research and development expenditures for the last year which approximated \$17 billion. Set off against that we have arts and humanities expenditures which approximated \$80 million. We set a balance of \$17 billion off against \$80 million.

If we look at the foundations which have been created by the Congress, on the one hand we have the National Science Foundation and on the other hand the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, and we can see what sort of comparison we have. The National Science Foundation expenditures are approximately \$600 million, and the Arts and Humanities are approximately \$80 million.

What we are talking about therefore is not what we may say about how deeply concerned we are in what happens in given programs in the fields of arts and humanities or in the scientific field, but what we are saying is through the actions of this Congress we are setting up comparable figures which if some stranger were to appear upon the scene and just look at the budget figures and try to make some determination of what America is basically interested in and what Congress feels we ought to be concentrating our treasure on, the figures are approximately \$600 million in the field of science versus \$80 million in the field of the arts and humanities.

We have seen we have \$80 million, and if we look back over the record we can see how that has grown. We have since 1966 seen the figures for the various arts and humanities grow from \$5 million to approximately \$80 million last year. This has enabled us to do a great many things. We have seen basic research and creativity stimulated and advanced. We have seen our best young performers and scholars encouraged and developed. We have seen institutions which preserve and transmit cultural wealth extended and strengthened. Probably more than anything else we have seen the best results of humanistic and artistic achievements brought in an unprecedented way to ever larger numbers of the American public.

So, we have made strides in this particular area. Each of us is most familiar with the situation in his or her respective State.

In my own State of Oregon, for example, a vigorous State-based program in the Humanities has been established encouraging direct involvement of the general public in the serious discussion of public policy issues in a humanistic context and from a humanistic perspective.

In Oregon we are deeply concerned with the uses to which the land, our most valuable natural asset, is being put. With the assistance of a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the citizens of Oregon have become engaged in a statewide examination of

man's relationship to the land. This examination is not being conducted by ecologists, planners, scientists and technicians, but rather by groups of citizens and professional humanists who are concerned to discover and to understand the ways in which man has related to the land throughout history and in differing cultures. The intent of this effort is not to solve the current and urgent question of land use in Oregon, but rather to equip the citizenry with the perspective and the understanding necessary to the informed voter if he is to address himself to these questions as a responsible citizen.

Yet another grant illustrates, I believe, the way in which the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities extend humanistic understanding among the general public—in this case young people in the elementary and secondary schools. For some years the Oregon Shakespearean Festival has been a major cultural resource in the Northwest. The Endowments have provided support for a project whereby teachers in the schools of Oregon, Washington and northern California were assisted in developing in their students an appreciation of theatre as a dramatic as well as literary form. Study guides were prepared and teams of actors and teachers toured the area conducting workshop training sessions for teachers in the schools. In this way, large numbers of teachers and a much larger number of students benefited directly from the resources of the Oregon Shakespearean Festival which might otherwise not have been accessible to them.

Such programs fulfill the earliest intent of Congress in creating the National Foundation—namely, that the best understanding, and indeed, the best solution of the problems which we face be secured through the careful exploration of our cultural origins, our history, our literature, our art and our systems of value.

Yet we must acknowledge that even today Federal support for the arts and humanities remains a small and almost negligible fraction of the support provided for science and technology. The increased funding which the present bill entails only very slightly redresses that imbalance, but it does insure that over the next 3 years a continuing and intensified effort will be made to develop the deepest roots of our culture and to extend a deeper understanding of those roots to ever greater numbers of the American public.

I would urge the Members of this body to see how much we have done, not only in the sense of what it has accomplished—and that is significant—but what yet remains to be done. We should see what it is that we have put in treasure into this field, balanced off against the scientific, and we should not make any attempt to reduce the \$145 million called for by this particular bill. This is, at best, an inadequate amount.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the strong support of this legislation as it stands before us.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of H.R. 3926, the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities Amendments of 1973, and urge my colleagues to lend their support to this important legislation, and to oppose any amendment which would weaken its provisions or reduce the funding proposed.

The increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the twin Endowment for the Humanities over the years from their relatively humble beginnings has made it possible for the endowments to accomplish their objectives with commendable success. The National Endowment for the Arts has worked very effectively toward its congressional mandate of encouraging the highest quality while making the arts more widely available. The National Endowment for the Humanities has acted with energy and imagination to provide leadership to the institutions and professions in the humanities;

Expand traditional concepts and contingencies of the humanities in order to obtain greater participation in them by the American public; and

Direct the attention of persons and institutions involved in the humanities to questions of pressing social concern.

In fiscal year 1973, the Iowa Arts Council received \$127,250 of section 5(g) funds from the National Endowment for the Arts. It has made excellent use of these Federal funds and the \$185,617 appropriated by the State of Iowa.

As a long-time supporter and past president of the Sioux City Symphony Orchestra Association, I am especially proud of the council's "Orchestra Student Audience Program," whereby the council helped 10 community orchestras throughout Iowa by matching the amount of ticket costs for elementary, secondary and college students to attend their concerts. Under the plan, students pay only half the adult price and the council's grants to the 10 orchestras made up the other half. Through this total payment of \$6,042.50 to orchestras at Fort Dodge and Sioux City in my Sixth Congressional District and to eight other leading community orchestras throughout Iowa, not only were these orchestras given needed financial assistance but also many boys and girls saw and heard live orchestras for the first time, many of them to become interested in becoming musicians themselves and all of them broadening their horizons.

Iowa Arts Council grants made it possible for the Iowa State University choral group, the Cardinal Keynotes, to tour reformatory and prisons in Iowa. Another grant enabled Iowans to learn more about the music of the black culture through the Fajilawa Seminar tours. Council grants to the Iowa Educational Broadcasting Network financed funds for three television specials on the arts in Iowa which were shown on educational television and also made available in film and tape forms where ETV does not yet reach.

The Iowa artists in the schools program of the Iowa Arts Council has been especially outstanding. Four special grants from the National Endowment made it possible for the council to place a visual artist, Ray Frederick, at Fort Dodge High School for a year; to send

a national dance company to Waterloo, Iowa for 6 weeks to work with teachers and students, demonstrating how academics can be taught through movement; to finance filmmaking programs at an elementary school in Red Oak and at the high school in Osceola; and to provide recognized writers for a period of 3 to 5 days on each high school campus at Lawton-Bronson and at Estherville, both in the Sixth District, and at Keokuk, Maquoketa, and Charles City. The proposed increase in funding will enable this program to provide even greater benefit to the growing generation and to future cultural patrons.

Also in the Sixth District of Iowa, council grants helped finance, together with local funding, a program on the Indian and the arts sponsored by the LeMars Arts Council; the Morningside trio workshop at Morningside College, Sioux City; the tour of Iowa landscapes: Graphic and photographic under the auspices of Morningside College; artists demonstration workshops at Morningside College; art classes in the toymakers art at Sanford Museum in Cherokee; a joint workshop and concert of the Sioux City Symphony and the Sioux County Orchestra at Northwestern College, Orange City; and participation by art councils, colleges, and schools throughout northwest Iowa in the many touring groups and workshops made available by the Iowa Arts Council, including the famed Stradivari Quartet of the University of Iowa which so many of us have enjoyed in concerts at the Corcoran Auditorium here in Washington.

Iowa has one of the highest percentages of population aged 65 or older. It is therefore particularly fitting that the Iowa Arts Council this year provided assistance to the Iowa State Commission on the Aging for a senior citizen arts festival, an event which proved highly successful and which I hope will be repeated yearly. We have an immense reservoir of training, experience, and talent in older Americans—upon retirement they have increased time to devote to these talents, to their crafts and hobbies. The Federal, State and local programs in the arts should take particular cognizance of their needs and their potentialities.

The efforts of the Iowa Arts Council, of its advisory committees, of the many local arts groups and many individuals engaged in this great undertaking has resulted in great progress in Iowa. This progress is easily observed in the rising quality of arts proposals submitted to the council for consideration and in the wider appreciation of excellence. Iowa's college and university towns have always promoted the arts vigorously, but the programs made possible by the grants of the National Endowment for the Arts, matched by State grants through the Iowa Arts Council, have made Iowa's nonacademic communities of all sizes increasingly concerned with the arts and involved with them as participants and audience.

Iowans and Iowa are alive to cultural experience, from the best of the traditional to the latest avant-garde wave. I am sure this is true in every other State

benefiting from participation in programs for the arts with National Endowment for the Arts assistance. As Julie McDonald, chairman of the Iowa Arts Council, said in the council's biennium report:

It's a good time to be at work in the arts; an exciting time, a fulfilling time when Iowa has every hope of high yields in cultivating the spirit of man through the arts. Let us hurry to the harvest and plant anew.

In the same report, Iowa's Gov. Robert D. Ray commended the Iowa Art's Council for its purposes and achievements in:

Helping to bring to Iowans the plays, recitals, concerts, exhibits, and discussions which in total monitor the inexorable advance of our culture. This is truly one of the important works being done anywhere, simply because the arts is one of the most positive human forces operating in society today. I agree with the affectionately remembered American who said that art and encouragement of art are political in the profoundest sense—not as weapons in a struggle, but as an instrument of understanding which binds together all who share man's faith.

All Iowans have good reason to be very proud of the Iowa Arts Council and of its very capable and distinguished officers: Chairman Mrs. Julie McDonald of Davenport, Vice Chairman Donald Maiwurm, an ardent, hard-working supporter of the arts in Fort Dodge in the Sixth Congressional District, and Executive Director Jack E. Olds. I want to acknowledge the outstanding leadership in the Arts provided by the following dedicated Northwest Iowans whom I have the honor to represent: Mrs. Kathryn Graham, Sioux City; Frank Summerside, Westmar College, LeMars; Mrs. Lois Bliesman, Denison; and Dr. Don Koser, Cherokee, all of whom have served or are serving as members of the Iowa Arts Council. Lyle Fisher, Sioux City, member of the Council's Theatre Advisory Committee; Willis Schellberg, Forest City, member of the Advisory Committee on Architecture; and David Albert, William F. Turner, Stanley W. Evans and William F. Turner, Sioux City, and Lee Bliesman, Denison, all of whom have been active members of the Iowa Arts Council's Advisory Committee on Business and the Arts.

The seed sowed by the twin endowment, the National Endowment for the Humanities, has fallen on fertile ground in Iowa. Although it took longer to germinate, it has taken root and is rapidly growing at a pace which may in time excel that of the arts.

From an initial experimental base of six State humanities committees in 1971, the National Endowment for the Humanities State-based program has grown State by State to 42 State committees, with plans to be in all 50 States and territories by the end of 1973. This highly focused program's attempt to make the humanities more accessible to the adult citizens of Iowa and to the rest of the country has been one the most valuable ventures undertaken by the endowment.

As representatives of the public in our respective districts, we are all cognizant of the sense of unease in our local communities with the way public issues are discussed, with the stridency and the im-

mediate taking of sides so prevalent in public forums, and the unavailability of a systematic public format through which the average citizen can participate in public dialog, beyond voting and reacting to media presentations and surface interpretations of public concerns.

The National Endowment for the Humanities' State-based program may be just what we have been looking for to begin to overcome these widespread problems of our times. The various State committees for the humanities regrant funds received from the National Endowment, to local organizations and institutions to encourage the historian, the philosopher, the scholar in literature and linguistics to participate with local communities in public forums and town meetings, in seminars and in conferences, and in the media—in an effort to create a broad context for understanding of our most pressing problems, problems which cannot be resolved on technical or scientific bases alone.

The National Endowment for the Humanities provided a \$10,000 planning grant in fiscal year 1971 to Dean Robert F. Ray of the University of Iowa, whose Iowa Committee for Public Programs in the Humanities designed a State-based program for the humanities. The Iowa Board for Public Programs in the Humanities was appointed by Governor Ray with Dean Ray as chairman, and the endowment provided the board with a \$157,290 operations grant in fiscal year 1972.

Dean Ray, head of the Division of Extension and University Services for the University of Iowa, has continued to serve as chairman of the Iowa board, with Philip L. Shively serving as executive secretary. The board chose as its theme "Awareness of Human Needs on the Eve of American Century III." After assessing grassroots needs, the board made grants to local communities throughout Iowa to discuss the important and timely topic of the aging in our society. The Decorah Humanities Committee is conducting public discussion sessions throughout the community with the help of its grant, with the topic of social attitudes toward the elderly. These sessions involve historians, writers, and as many as 500 local citizens, reaching a significant cross section of the adults of the Decorah community.

Another board grant to Kirkwood Community College in Cedar Rapids will enable holding a 2-day symposium on public policies affecting the aging. The symposium will be broadcast on local television at a later date, thus greatly expanding the audience reached. Regional forums on "Awareness of Human Needs" were held during the fall of 1972 at Wartburg College, Waverly; at Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant; at Southwestern Community College, Creston; at the public school in Oakland; and in Northwest Iowa, at Morningside College, Sioux City, and at Buena Vista College, Storm Lake.

"Family Survival" was the specific topic for the very successful regional forums held at Morningside College and at Buena Vista College. Under the chairmanship of Dr. Raymond S. Nelson,

dean of humanities at Morningside College and member of the Iowa Board for Public Programs in the Humanities, the northwest Iowa regional planning committee included as members Mrs. Margaret Midland, Cherokee; Lloyd M. Reid, and Kermit Smith, Fort Dodge; Ronald Dubberly, Leo Frommelt, Thomas Geelan, and Roger Iverson, Sioux City; Jim Nuss, John P. Williams, Leonard J. Martz, Jr., Mrs. O. D. Trudo, Lester E. Williams, and Wyatt S. Yon, Jr., Storm Lake; W. John Johnson, Jr., Spencer; John Stapert, and George DeVries, Orange City; and M. H. Patterson, Estherville.

I commend the dedicated efforts of these northwest Iowans in getting this valuable program underway in my home district, and I wish to take special note of the fine work and achievements of the two northwest Iowa members of the Iowa Board for Public Programs in the Humanities, Dean Raymond S. Nelson and Mrs. Robert E. Gleeson, both of Sioux City.

Direct grants to groups and individuals within Iowa also have been made, in addition to the grants to the Iowa Board. The Endowment has provided substantial support for the University of Iowa's "Ancient Iowa Film Series," under which the university is producing a series of eight documentary films describing prehistoric cultures and Iowa's historic frontiers. Two films in the series were completed prior to Endowment funding. According to the project director, Dr. Marshall McKusick, State archeologist and associate professor of Anthropology at the university, the films will be used in almost all of the 1,200 elementary schools in Iowa, reaching 25,000 schoolchildren a year and providing them with their first introduction to the humanities.

Another direct grant by the endowment, recently renewed, has provided support for the University of Iowa's Afro-American studies program, financing minority group Ph. D. candidates in Afro-American studies and bringing specialists to the university for short courses and lectures. A direct grant to Coe College has supported a 3-year planning project for the revitalization of the humanities within its curriculum. The National Endowment has financed the six-part series written and narrated by Kenneth Clark, "Pioneers of Modern Painting," and the showing of this remarkable film throughout Iowa as well as other States. The endowment has also made it possible for various Iowa colleges and schools to view the much heralded Civilisation film series produced by British Broadcasting Corporation's Kenneth Clark. Earlier, Cherokee, Iowa, civic leader Mrs. Margaret Midland and others in the community held the "National Humanity Series" at Cherokee with the assistance of an endowment grant. The endowment's grants to Iowans and Iowa institutions for younger humanist fellowships, junior college teacher fellowships, senior fellowships, education programs, research programs, and youth grants in the humanities have made it possible for Iowans to pursue studies and research

in the humanities, with particular stress in problems of Iowa.

I am sure that the demonstrated success of the programs of the National Endowment for the Arts under the very capable and efficient chairmanship of Nancy Hanks, and of the programs of the National Endowment for the Humanities under the equally commendable chairmanship of Ronald Berman, has not been unique to Iowa, and that the increases in Federal funding requested by President Nixon and voted by the Congress for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities have brought similar benefits throughout this great country. The Foundation and its twin endowments have proved their worth over and over again, making it a distinct pleasure for me to invite my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3926.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I believe the reasons for support of the bill before us, Mr. Chairman, and of the level of authorization which it contains, have been forcefully put by such remarks as we have heard from the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), and even yesterday the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) all speaking of the valuable and constructive impact of these programs in their States.

To reiterate, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains the amount of money which has been requested by President Nixon and the administration. The bill enjoys widespread support in our committee and I hope it will enjoy similar bipartisan support here in the House.

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I hereby salute the work of the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities. I stand in support of efforts to expand its growth and lend a hand to extend the valuable work of the Foundation.

In the realm of Arts and Humanities the United States has taken a "great leap forward" with the creation of a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities.

In the last generation, science took a great leap forward and through well-deserved government support and encouragement science gained preeminence in our national personality. As a nation marked by this continuance of technological and scientific advancement we must now direct our concern more vigorously to the development of our culture.

I think Members of Congress can take credit where credit is due for initiating and creating the National Foundation, begun as an independent Federal Government agency in the executive branch of Government in 1965. As critics have said, the Foundation seemed in its beginnings to have such vague purposes—it seemed vague and perhaps properly so because there is no precise formula telling one how to paint a masterpiece or how to write a great play.

Thus, there seemed to be no precise formula for spurring and encouraging

the arts. The purpose of the Foundation was to give new breath to the cultural climate of this country.

For many years the Federal Government ignored any suggestion that it had any responsibility for the country's art endeavors, and it was not too many years ago that people ridiculed others for proposing to create a council that would simply advise the National Government in its relationship to the arts. Although legislation to commit Federal support for the arts was placed before every Congress since 1955, the House of Representatives remained unconvinced of the need of such support until 1964.

The goals cited by the late President Johnson when he signed the bill in 1965 are admirable ones. The United States, he said, should be able to build a national theater, to start national opera and ballet companies, and in his mind it was most fitting that the movies, our Nation's particular contribution to the arts be recognized by the creation of the American Film Institute. At the time President Johnson signed this National Foundation Act he also remarked that—

It may well be that the passage of this legislation, modest as it is will help secure for this Congress a sure and honored place in the story of the advance of our civilization.

As I know you are well aware, the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities acts as an "umbrella" covering its two component parts, the Endowment for the Arts and the Endowment for the Humanities. These two endowments are advised in turn by the National Council of the Arts and the National Council on Humanities respectively.

To consider first the Endowment for the humanities, it has become one of the world's largest clearinghouses for intellectual affairs. To focus on projects in the humanities for a moment, the endowment has made great strides in starting State-based humanities programs in 40 States and in a matter of a short span of time, perhaps by the end of 1973 will encompass all 50 States with programs. Youth grants in the humanities is an up and coming project to encourage our school youth to design seriously disciplined work in humanities. To mention just a few more worthwhile projects, there are film-TV grants, museum grants, and Jefferson lectures. The Endowment will of course be making extra allowances for programs allied with the Bicentennial as the time approaches. Under the auspices of the Endowment, a humanities film forum has begun in which the Public Broadcasting Service provides the American public with access to films which this year include *Richard III*, *Hamlet*, *Rise of Louis XIV*, and *Andersonville* Trial to name a few.

To give you a for instance of the importance of the Endowment to each State, in my State of Alabama, in fiscal 1972, the education programs funded by the endowment included projects at Alabama State, Tuskegee Institute, and the University of Alabama to the tune of \$82,294.

Our new program specifically aimed at assisting professionally directed community based arts programs is called Ex-

pansion Arts. The Endowment has also revised the architecture programs now called Architecture plus Environmental Arts. Likewise, the Endowment has made great strides in fellowship programs for filmmakers through the American Film Institute and in fellowships for singers through the National Opera Institute. Artists-in-Schools program is another exciting innovation and I can see much evidence of its success in the Alabama schools.

According to Nancy Hanks, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, for the first time in history both major political parties have recognized the role of the arts in our national life by including positive strong planks in support of the arts in their convention platforms for the last election. Culture has in this case transcended partisan politics.

In spite of this positive outlook, an article in Saturday Review, April 1972, indicates that our Government spends less per capita—approximately 15 cents per person—than almost any major nation in the Western World. For example, in comparison, West Germany spent \$2.42 per capita, Austria \$2, Sweden \$2, Canada \$1.40, Israel \$1.34, and Great Britain \$1.23.

We should expand our support of the arts and humanities and certainly the Foundation for the Arts and Humanities is the best tool we have to stimulate the widest range of artistic and scholarly expression.

As Thomas Jefferson once said:

Our wisdom will grow with our power. It is safer to have a whole people respectably enlightened than a few in a high state of science and the many in the ignorance.

It is only through our support of the two endowments and that secure umbrella of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities that we can revitalize the best in our traditions and bring humanistic and artistic achievement.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3926 to extend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and to authorize \$145 million for fiscal 1974.

Thank you.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, today H.R. 3926 authorizing a 3-year extension of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act, comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, the House authorization version is less than either the corresponding measure passed by the Senate or the amount requested by the President. The point has been made that in a country of 230 million people, even the proposed Federal allowance of \$72.5 million for the arts will come to about 32 cents a head, compared with the \$1.40 put up by each Canadian and the \$2.40 by each West German.

However, the passage of H.R. 3926 by the House represents another significant step in Federal support of the basic creative expression of any civilization—its performing arts.

New York is the cultural capital of the world. Among its attractions are Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts which houses the New York Philhar-

monic and the Metropolitan Opera, Broadway's legitimate theater district, off-Broadway theater, Carnegie Hall, New York's City Center, Juilliard School of Music, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the New York City and Joffrey Ballet Co. New York City has nurtured one of the most exciting theaters in the Nation—Joseph Papp's Public Theater and his free summer Shakespeare adaptations presented in the borough parks of New York City.

Increased Federal support of the arts and humanities is crucial to increased free and low-cost cultural activities. Music, theater, dance, opera, film, and museums must be made accessible to all Americans, regardless of income. Steps must be taken to remedy the high rate of unemployment common to those involved in the arts. Typical of the job situation is the unemployment rate among actors. Theodore Bickel, president of the Actor's Equity Association indicated in testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor that 75 percent of Actor's Equity members earn less than \$2,500 annually, well below the national poverty level.

In expressing my support for this bill I want to commend Ms. Nancy Hanks, who heads the National Endowment for the Arts and whose fine leadership has long been its mainspring.

A letter to my office from a New York sculptor expressed his thoughts candidly:

Think what would happen to this society if artists were supported in their work by public assistance programs. Public buildings could be beautiful instead of eyesores. Works of art could be on display in citizens' houses. Movies and museums could be free. Our parks could be adorned with sculpture.

I fully support programs of Federal assistance to the arts and humanities, and look forward to the day when, in John F. Kennedy's words, America "will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft."

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of the House today to give their wholehearted support to a renewed and expanded commitment to the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. The arts and humanities form an integral part of what we, as a people and a nation, are and wish to become. H.R. 3926 is requesting an authorization of \$145 million without illusions that it can save all of our theater groups or support all of our opera and ballet companies or aid all of our talented musicians, actors, filmmakers, scholars, and writers. The intent of this legislation is not to subsidize but to vitalize, to provide a spark and a substantial sense of commitment, which will create an atmosphere of support and encouragement.

We know that great achievements in the arts and humanities were rarely isolated moments or the products of isolated individuals—they were eras of unusual achievement, when artists and scholars and the communities that supported them seemed to draw inspiration and sustenance from one another.

Community support has always been a critical ingredient in creative achievement and that is, essentially, what we hope to contribute. Those of us who have

been in Washington for sometime have noted its vigorous cultural growth and the deepening belief in itself as a national center for American culture. There is a virtually palpable air of creativity and life to this city: one achievement sparks another.

The work of the endowments here and elsewhere has laid the groundwork. There is the American Film Institute's work in preserving our film heritage and training and assisting future generations of film artists. American film is a dynamic art and yet by its very nature it is a complex and very expensive art form whose sheer costs would deter individuals from developing their talents.

I am hopeful of seeing even greater support for ethnic and regional projects. Without endowment interest and support, the simple lack of money may well condense our diverse and farflung cultural experience to the isolated pleasures of upper class residents of large metropolitan centers. The work of the endowments insures that our many, many resources are tapped and that the expression of our multifaceted talents is the property of all our people—whether they live in New York City or Wailuku, Maui.

The President requested \$145 million to meet the needs of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities. This is the amount H.R. 3926 proposes to authorize. Frankly, I can think of few other investments in our people, in our Nation and its continued vitality, which give a greater assurance of lasting rewards and satisfactions. This money is intended as an impetus to greater American achievements in the arts and humanities; the impact of our commitment will not be limited to those receiving direct grants. We hope to nurture—to share in the nurturing of the American spirit and its creative expression.

I urge you to approve H.R. 3926. The extension of the national endowments at an authorization level of \$145 million for fiscal year 1974 and levels to be determined by Congress for fiscal year 1975 and fiscal year 1976 gives us flexibility as well as the opportunity to expand a vigorous and valuable program.

We are discussing a program which is fundamentally and vitally involved in the life of our Nation. We are talking about a purpose and understanding of life on which our Nation was built. We are talking about human expression and shared humanity. We are talking about American culture: its past, its present, its future, and its continuing diversity.

I would like to stress, as strongly as possible, that the endowments themselves have been and shall continue to be a means of perpetuating the richness of American life and the tenacity of her ideals. I urge you to consider this legislation with a full awareness of its import. I urge you to approve H.R. 3926.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the encouragement of artistic and other cultural achievements is certainly within the role of the Government. There is no question that the country that advances materially without corresponding cultural progress will remain a deprived nation.

We have excellent programs which assist the arts and humanities in the State of Maryland and in my home counties of Anne Arundel and Prince Georges. The Maryland Arts Council under the direction of Mr. James Backas and the Anne Arundel Arts Association under the direction of Laura Brown and Jeanette Stanford and the arts division of the recreation bureau of Prince Georges County have amply demonstrated their worth to the community.

Today I reluctantly find myself in a position where I must vote for the Kemp amendment which reduces the authorizations for the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities. I cannot support this bill as it was reported out of committee because I feel that it is fiscally irresponsible to increase program authorizations by 80 percent during a time when we are trying to hold down Government spending. The other body's authorization was \$160 million for fiscal year 1974.

President Nixon urged "the most important single thing the Congress can do in holding down the cost of living is to hold down the cost of government."

Congress must accept this challenge.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred sixteen Members are present, a quorum.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3926

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 "National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Amendments of 1973".

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

SEC. 2. (a) The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended in the following respects:

(1) Clause (7) of section 2 of such Act is amended by striking out all that appears after "a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "purchase, renovation, or construction" and inserting in lieu thereof "or purchase", and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such term also includes—

"(1) the renovation of facilities if the amount of the expenditure of Federal funds for such purpose in the case of any project does not exceed \$250,000; and

"(2) the construction of facilities of such construction is for demonstration purposes or under unusual circumstances where there is no other manner in which to accomplish an artistic purpose."

(3) (A) That part of subsection (c) of section 5 of such Act which precedes clause (1) is amended by striking out "the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities and".

(B) In clauses (1) and (2) of such subsection (c) such Act is amended by striking out "productions" each time it appears and

inserting in lieu thereof "projects and productions"; and, in clause (3) of such subsection, such Act is amended by striking out "projects" and inserting in lieu thereof "projects and productions".

(C) Clause (5) of such subsection (c) is amended by striking out "and planning in the arts" and inserting in lieu thereof "planning, and publications relating to the purposes of this subsection".

(4) (A) Paragraph (1) of subsection (g) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities and".

(B) That part of paragraph (2) which precedes clause (A) of such subsection (g) is amended (i) by striking out "such assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "assistance under this subsection" and (ii) by striking out "prior to the first day of such fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "at such time as shall be specified by the Chairman".

(C) Clause (B) of paragraph (2) of such subsection (g) is amended by striking out "except that in the case of the first fiscal year in which the State is allotted funds after the enactment of this Act, a plan may provide that not to exceed \$25,000 of such funds may be expended to conduct a study to plan the development of a State agency in the State and to establish such an agency;".

(D) Such subsection (g) is amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Of the sums available to carry out this subsection for any fiscal year, 75 per centum shall be allotted among the States which have plans approved by the Chairman, in equal amounts, except that each State shall be allotted at least \$200,000. If the sums so appropriated are insufficient to make such allotments in full, the sums so appropriated shall be allotted among the States in equal amounts. Any sums remaining after making the allotments provided for in the preceding sentence shall be available to the Chairman for making grants to such States and to regional groups.

"(4) (A) Amounts made available for any fiscal year under this subsection shall be used to pay not more than 50 per centum of the total cost of any project or production described in paragraph (1), except that of the amounts granted a State from funds made available under the third sentence of paragraph (3) an amount not exceeding 20 per centum of the State's allotment under the first sentence of paragraph (3) may be used, at the discretion of the Chairman, to pay up to 100 per centum of such costs of projects and productions if such projects and productions would otherwise be unavailable to the residents of that State, but only if the State has utilized the full amount of its allotment under the first sentence of paragraph (3).

"(B) Any amount allotted to a State under the first sentence of paragraph (3) for any fiscal year which is not granted to the State prior to sixty days prior to the end of the fiscal year for which such sums are appropriated shall be available for making grants to regional groups.

"(C) Funds made available under this subsection shall not be used to supplant non-Federal funds."

(D) Paragraph (5) of such subsection (g) is amended by inserting after "allotted" the following: "or made available".

(E) Subsection (j) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15".

(5) Subsection (f) of section 6 of such Act is amended in the third sentence thereof—

(A) by striking out "\$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,000"; and

(B) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That the terms of any

such delegation of authority shall not permit obligations for expenditure of funds under such delegation for any fiscal year which exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of the sums appropriated for that fiscal year pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of section 11(a)."

(6) (A) That part of subsection (c) of section 7 of such Act which precedes clause (1) is amended by striking out "the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities and".

(B) Clause (2) of such subsection is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "any loans made by the Endowment shall be made in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Treasury;".

(7) Subsection (f) of section 8 of such Act is amended, in the third sentence thereof—

(A) by striking out "\$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$20,000"; and

(B) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That the terms of any such delegation of authority shall not permit obligations for expenditure of funds under such delegation for any fiscal year which exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of the sums appropriated for that fiscal year pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of section 11(a)."

(8) The first sentence of section 9(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Council shall be composed of the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the United States Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the National Gallery of Art, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, the Archivist of the United States, the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, a member designated by the Secretary of State, and a member designated by the Secretary of the Interior".

(9) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting after "purposes of the gift" the following: "except that a Chairman may receive a gift without a recommendation from the Council to provide support for any application or project which can be approved without Council recommendation under the provisions of sections 6(f) and 8(f), and may receive a gift of \$15,000, or less, without Council recommendation in the event the Council fails to provide such recommendation within a reasonable period of time".

(10) Clause (4) of subsection (a) of section 10 is amended by deleting the semicolon at the end thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, however, That any advisory panel appointed to review or make recommendations with respect to the approval of applications or projects for funding shall have broad geographic representation".

(11) Section 11 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu of the following:

"Sec. 11. (a) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the sum of \$54,000,000 to carry out section 5(c), \$11,000,000 to carry out section 5(g), and an amount equal to the total amounts received by such Endowment during such year under section 10(a)(2), but not to exceed \$7,500,000. For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, and June 30, 1976, there is authorized to be appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 5(c) and 5(g), and an amount equal to the total amounts received by such Endowment during each such year under section 10(a)(2). Not

less than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated under the preceding sentence may be used only to carry out section 5(g).

"(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the National Endowment for the Humanities to carry out section 7(c) the sum of \$65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the two succeeding fiscal years. There is also authorized to be appropriated to such Endowment for each such year an amount equal to the total amounts received by such endowment under section 10(a)(2) during such year, except that the amount so appropriated shall not exceed \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

"(b)(1) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall remain available for obligation and expenditure until expended.

"(2) In order to afford adequate notice to interested persons of available assistance under this Act, appropriations authorized under subsection (a) are authorized to be included in the measure making appropriations for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such appropriations become available for obligation."

(12) Sections 13 and 14 of such Act are repealed.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective on and after July 1, 1973.

Mr. BRADEMAS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KEMP

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEMP: Page 11, line 9, strike out "\$54,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$28,625,000"; line 10, strike out "\$11,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,875,000"; line 13, strike out "\$7,000"; line 24, strike out "\$65,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$35,500,000"; and on page 12, line 5, strike out "\$7,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000".

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply maintain Federal support for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities at the current funding level, which is approximately \$81 million.

I think it is ironic, to say the least, to be considering an 80-percent increase, on the heels of the President's address to the Nation last night. The freeze that he asked for in phase IV is a dramatic reminder that the economy and Government spending continue to be our No. 1 problem.

If our economic stability is so imperiled that the President is prompted to abandon, even temporarily, our productive and traditional free market philosophy in order to freeze prices, an unprecedented action in peacetime, then surely we have long since passed the point at which the growth of Government spending should have been frozen. The 93d Congress needs a spending stabilization program to supplement the President's economic stabilization program.

Mr. Chairman, the President admon-

ished us not to use controls as narcotics, because, he said, the risk of addiction is too great. I think we in the Congress have already become addicted to compulsive spending. The programs offered are too attractive, and we cannot say, "No." Like any addiction, the withdrawal symptoms are painful. But it is a discomfort that we can and must live with to help restore our system's health and stability.

Paying lip service to budgetary reform and fiscal discipline is not sufficient. Every authorization on the floor of this House and every appropriation which comes before us must be challenged. Every proposed expenditure should be similarly probed, dissected and analyzed, and our approval should be reserved for only those measures which withstand the most strenuous challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the commitment to promote the arts and humanities, or with the Government's rightful role in that commitment. In western New York, we are fortunate to benefit from many fine programs that are funded by the Foundation. The Buffalo Philharmonic, in particular, is a special source of pride to us. I think that all of us in the Buffalo area have a keen appreciation for the Federal support which the Philharmonic has received. Government assistance for the Buffalo Philharmonic matches the amount given the New York Philharmonic, and has been responsible, to a large extent, for enabling the Buffalo Philharmonic to tour the country. Western New Yorkers are proud to have the opportunity to share their treasure with the rest of the country. The Albright-Knox Museum in Buffalo is another outstanding example of the excellent use to which these funds can be put. Moreover, endowment grants have given valuable assistance to the Research Foundation of State University of New York, the Polish Cultural Foundation Concerts, the Buffalo Museum of Science, Buffalo State College, the Studio Arena Theatre and the Williamsville Group to support Alvin Ailey Dance Company performances.

I do not think we even need debate that Federal support for the arts and humanities is essential.

I am primarily concerned with the effect of this authorization on the total budget. I see no profit in approving programs that will compel us, if we honor the authorization, to make appropriations that are excessive, that lead to more borrowing, erode the dollar's value, and thus increase inflation.

It also makes our determination to exercise fiscal discipline and fiscal restraint meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that this Congress will adopt a spending ceiling. I am certain that when we succeed in doing so, we will be forced to make some very difficult and painful priority judgments. There are other programs with equal merit. There are other services of Government just as valuable that we are not increasing, because an increase would simply exceed the limits of our current resources. Recognizing the need to exercise restraint, we substantially reduced funding levels for older Americans, voca-

tional rehabilitation and other important programs.

Now, the arts and humanities are not—I repeat—are not withering on the vine. The Internal Revenue Service estimates that the amount spent for arts and humanities, through the provision of tax deductions for individual contributions is about \$2 1/2 billion or \$12 per person in the United States, far more than in any other nation in the world. It is estimated that as much as \$1 billion a year in tax receipts which would otherwise come to the Government now go as a subsidy to arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I support and encourage that private approach, as well as the Government approach. Proponents of the committee bill will point to the very modest proportion of the total expenditures in the arts and humanities which government support represents. Committee estimates indicate that nonfederal sources contribute annually, at a minimum, over \$3.4 billion to the humanities alone, and this is as it should be. It insures that decisions and judgments will be kept in private rather than in Government hands. I would have the most serious reservations about allowing this power to seep away from the private sector.

In those instances where the Government does play a role in the decision-making process, we should be diligent in insuring the high quality of the programs selected for support. I think the committee was wise to limit authority for "chairman's grants" under section 5(c) and 7(c), of the committee bill, to 10 percent of the amount of the program.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the committee saw fit to increase the size of these grants to \$20,000. I would prefer a limit to their authority of \$10,000 or less for those grants which may be made without prior approval of the councils of the Endowment for the Arts and the Endowment for the Humanities.

Since its inception, funds for the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities have grown from \$22 million to \$80 million in 1973.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KEMP was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, this is a growth rate of roughly \$20 million a year. At a time when public pressure and the demands of our economy for fiscal restraint are at a peak, I cannot personally support a \$65 million increase.

Trite as it sounds, if there was ever a time for reexamining our spending priorities, it is now. While preservation of our cultural heritage and encouragement of our creative development are extremely important not only to our country but to those of us in Buffalo and Erie County, N.Y., they cannot overshadow other basic and vital human needs, and certainly not at a time when the administration feels it is necessary to administer shock treatment in order to emphasize the serious threat of inflation.

I will reiterate that there are many fine programs being funded in my area in western New York, which I enumerated earlier. But the worst thing that I can do as a representative of my district, I believe, is to allow this country's fiscal situation to deteriorate any further. The worst thing I can do as a representative of the people is to allow the bankruptcy of this country to come about. I will not stand by in doing that and urge support of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement and be associated with his remarks.

After last night's television address by the President where he said that he wanted to cut all unnecessary programs and expenditures, I think this is a good place to start.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from New York (Mr. KEMP).

I find it somewhat interesting to see at the outset of this debate that the gentleman from Buffalo is taking a position in opposition to the President, who strongly supports this increase and indeed Nancy Hanks, also of New York, who has done an outstanding job in developing this critically needed and vitally important program.

Let me say to the gentleman from New York, also, that if he would take a look at the figures of the Buffalo symphony, he would find it is in a deficit operation in terms of operating expenses, and it is critically needed there.

Mr. KEMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID. Not at this point. Let me make four quick points, and I will be happy to yield.

First, there has been a very interesting and revealing study made of the State of New York by the American Council for the Arts in Education. The results have been compiled by the National Research Center for the Arts. Specifically, this survey points out a majority of New York State residents have a decidedly positive outlook toward the arts and favor increased cultural facilities in their communities; moreover, it stresses strong support for additional arts funds comes from blue collar workers, among others.

Let us take a look at exactly what we are doing. I remember in the days when the arts only got \$2.5 million, but here we are increasing Federal funds for the arts from \$38.2 million to \$72.5 million. That sounds like a lot. However, let me call your attention to one very simple figure. The \$72.5 million represents only 32 cents per person nationally. If you were living in Canada, you would be spending \$1.40; if you were living in West Germany, it would be \$2.40 per person; and if you were in Vienna, one of the great artistic centers of the world, people spend \$5.50 for the arts. Yet in the most affluent nation in the world we are starting to haggle about spending 32 cents per person.

For those concerned about the artists, let me point out that three out of four artists in the professional theater today are without jobs—55 percent of equity members lack jobs.

In terms of operating costs, in the Metropolitan Opera—an entity of cultural merit which I am sure everyone in this House believes has great value to our country and to the cultural world—the box office income covers only 47 percent of the operating costs.

The same is true of dance and orchestras, and in the State of New York the operating deficit in terms of box office sales is on the order of \$70 million. Major and metropolitan orchestras have a shortfall of about \$40 million, or almost 50 percent.

This is true of the Metropolitan Opera, the Museum of Modern Art, the Buffalo Symphony, and all kinds of museums and artistic endeavors. We are not doing what we should for our working artists, or for residences for artists, or studios with good light, and when we look at the case of the humanities we are still spending a fraction of what we should spend.

A few years ago we were spending \$5 million on the humanities, and \$15 billion on the sciences. What we are really saying is that the future of our country depends on the cultural quality of our life, and try to cut back one program that has been a distinct success, that is supported by a majority of Americans, is essential to our cultural well-being and, indeed, to our national decisions, would be very, very foolish in my judgment, and it would be a travesty to our commitment to artistic endeavor and to the humanities.

I say to the Members today that to haggle over 32 cents is a very unwise decision to take. As regards the State of New York, I think it is essential not only for purely cultural reasons, but also for the economic benefits provided the communities by these Federal funds. In Buffalo, for instance, I am certain that the Buffalo Philharmonic attracts tourists, visitors, and increases business in restaurants and other businesses. Further, I would note that 35,000 jobs in New York State are directly related to the nonprofit arts.

I believe the bill should be strongly supported and the amendment soundly defeated.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned in my remarks that I am a private and public supporter of the Buffalo Philharmonic. I recognize the trouble they are in. But, I think, in this country, tremendous contributions are made for the arts and humanities, by indirect Government subsidy via tax deduction provisions. Contribution made in this way enable us to spend \$12 per person nationally on the arts and humanities. Therefore, I think it is unfair to equate us with West Germany, with \$1 per person, or Sweden with \$2 per person. The amounts this country has contributed are substantially more than any other country in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. REID. I have asked for this time in order to answer the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield further, we are not gutting the program, we are continuing it, at the present funding level.

At a time of extraordinary economic conditions, in which we have had the imposition of a freeze during peacetime, I find that I cannot support an 80-percent increase. I would add further to the gentleman from New York that the worst thing we could do to the Buffalo Philharmonic is to allow this country to go into bankruptcy.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman, but the Buffalo Philharmonic, whose operating deficit is around \$700,000, or 45 percent, needs this program very badly. So, I believe, does Buffalo. The U.S. Government spends only a fraction of that spent by other nations in the world for the arts. If we would readjust our priorities we would find more than enough to help the arts and the humanities in this country, and to significantly improve the quality of our lives and the character of our civilization.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the eloquent arguments pro and con in behalf of the Endowment, and must say I was greatly impressed by the defense of this expenditure at so minimal a level as 32 cents per capita, mentioned by my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

An examination of some of the specific programs gives anyone pause who is inclined to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP). Let me enumerate some of these grand programs.

I think that virtually any one of the Members would have great difficulty going back to their district and saying, "Yes, I voted against spending \$31,912 to Aldo Bernardo and Bernard Hoppe of the State University of New York at Binghamton to microfilm the principal archives of the Island of Malta."

That is one of those indispensable programs that I think all of us who are worried about the arts and the humanities must recognize the importance of.

Another program involved giving \$75,000 to the Dallas Public Library to help workers, housewives, and businessmen follow their own courses of study for college credit.

Surely we all believe in education. Forty-five thousand dollars went to the Japan Society and Michael Hoffman of New York to develop a program for providing a central promotion, distribution, and billing organization for small publishers and literary magazines.

Columbia University got \$42,790 for

a new program to improve the quality of literary translation.

Our own Chicago Historical Society got \$8,000 to survey its costume collection.

I think in addition to this we have got to recognize the merit of some of the youth grant funds that were distributed under this program last year. For example, \$3,992 went to Stephen B. Wright of Los Angeles for a study of high school student racial stereotypes, obviously another one of those indispensable programs; \$6,252 to Glenn H. Jordan of Sacramento for a study of the Black Holiness Church; \$8,079 to Joan W. Cove of Potomac, Md., for a historical study of Toby Town, Md.

I think all of us, notwithstanding the fact that most of us do not come from Maryland, can appreciate that unique program.

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

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

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder if somewhere in that list the gentleman was just enumerating he found any allowance for Buck Owens, Merle Haggard, or Grand Ole Opry?

Mr. CRANE. Unfortunately, I looked through the bill, and I could not find that kind of commitment. The gentleman raises a very significant point.

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CRANE. Frankly, I think it is horrifying. Historically, under a free market of economy, we have subsidized the arts and humanities by casting these little green backed ballots in the marketplace. We have done that in the area of country and western music. They are not down here seeking to have us bail them out.

Socialist Michael Harrington, not to be confused with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) in his book, "The Other America?" discusses the congressional practice of creating programs that represent socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. I do not think there is any more classic illustration of that than in this particular program.

Let me go on with other cultural education programs: \$52,050 was paid to Desmond Clark of the University of California for a study of early man in the Dordogne Valley of France; \$30,000 to Arthur Puotinen of Suomi College of Hancock, Mich., for Finnish folklore and social change in the Great Lakes mining region.

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

Mr. CRANE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Somebody here by the name of Ms. Nancy Hanks is listed in the report. I do not know whether Ms. means Miss or Mrs.

Mr. CRANE. Master of science, I suppose.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know, but as her contribution, she says:

We cannot stress too strongly the Council's commitment to the potential for making a

long-range contribution to the Nation's cultural life, for avoiding razzle-dazzle one-shot activities. ***

I do not know what this means exactly, and I would like to have someone explain it.

Mr. CRANE. I cannot explain it either.

The Illinois share of the total national tax burden is 6.49 percent. Our share of funds under this program is 1.8 percent. It strikes me we are paying out between \$3 and \$4 in Illinois to get a dollar back under this program. A program of this nature is positively injurious to the arts and humanities in my State of Illinois. Amongst other things, I think it is questionable in its initial premises, but reason dictates in our present economic circumstance, support for the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, at a time when many federally supported programs are experiencing cutbacks and reductions in the levels of funding, it may be difficult to appreciate the importance of increased support for the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. Yet I would urge that such support is essential, especially at a time when reductions are being made elsewhere.

We find ourselves, in fact, at a time when the government and, indeed, the entire country, are engaged in a review of the way in which public moneys can best be expended in support of public needs. I would urge that such a review cannot be well undertaken without at the same time insuring that these needs and issues be understood in light of our past and in light of the values which have guided our development as a people over the past two centuries.

The efforts of the national endowments to make our heritage a living reality and a source of guidance have been substantive and remarkably effective in recent years. Increasingly, the National Endowment for the Humanities has addressed itself to the need to extend to the entire Nation a richer understanding of our origins, our purposes, and the values by which we seek to determine the best course of action.

To restrict or to deny the development of such efforts or the informed and serious-minded exploration of such questions would be shortsighted at any time in our history; it would be especially misguided at a time when we are together engaged in reconsidering priorities and the strategies by which our shared objectives are to be reached. The National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities alone among all Federal agencies is charged with the responsibility to advance such understanding among the general public. Without the support recommended for the foundation, this effort will not only be impaired, the achievement to date will itself be placed in jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the very awkward position of opposing an amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP). I know that in his remarks he has stated some figures were procured from the Internal Revenue. As a former Revenue agent I can assure the gentleman it is almost impossible to get the correct fig-

ures about what are not donations or contributions as to specific organizations and allowed as a tax deductible item. Charities are all combined but there is no separation of any figures the Internal Revenue can present that will be authentic. I am sure the gentleman has some figures from the Internal Revenue.

Another point the gentleman was very much disturbed about is the budget. I am sure the gentleman from New York is a strong supporter of the administration and the administration favors this legislation as the program has done a great deal for this country and as related by other speakers. The increases and comparisons with other countries, we find ourselves in the 34-cent bracket as compared to \$1.40. The President in his judgment felt that \$80 million was not sufficient so he asked an increase to \$145 million.

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

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I have great affection for my colleague from the city of Buffalo. We have worked together on many projects in the past and hopefully we will work together in the future for our communities.

What I was alluding to in my remarks about the estimates of the IRS was that in a public statement given in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE made the following statement:

While only the most rudimentary estimates are available publicly, close to \$15 billion a year is given to charitable groups, which contributions to literature, museums, educational foundations, libraries, galleries, orchestras, and so forth, probably amount to \$2 billion to \$2.5 billion.

I was not trying to suggest it was given just to the Buffalo Philharmonic.

I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and I just wanted to answer on that one point. I was not talking about only the Buffalo Philharmonic.

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

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) referred to a remark made by a gentleman from Wisconsin in the other body in respect to this matter. I might point out with reference to the colloquy and the statement made, that officials in the Arts Endowment were also somewhat surprised and inquired where this figure came from, and the IRS officials said they did not know.

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

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, that may be so. I do not think they know a great deal at times over there anyway, but it is obvious this country supports in many different ways charities ranging from hospitals to orchestras, and I am sure the figure is closer to \$15 billion than zero as suggested by the chairman of the sub-committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out one institution in Buffalo, the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy has \$3,000, and there is another, the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy for \$8,500, and the Buffalo Historical Society for \$10,000, and the Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences has \$3,125, and the Buffalo State College Alumni Foundation has \$5,000.

They are all receiving these funds, and they are in dire need of funds. People from Buffalo were in my office this afternoon asking for this legislation and to oppose any cuts from the bill.

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

Mr. DULSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I too fight to uphold the Philharmonic and the art museum in Buffalo. I am only suggesting that we have the program, but in view of the extraordinary freeze put on last night by the President, the Congress should act in the spirit of that freeze.

Mr. DULSKI. We have given the President sufficient power. He waited all this time and yesterday he invoked a 60-day freeze. Much too late. I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, over the years I have learned, I suspect as others have, that when one is not an expert on the subject matter, one should do one of two things: Not speak; or if one does speak, speak for a very limited period of time.

I am going to violate the first recommendation and will try to limit my remarks under the second.

I confess that I have no expertise in the field of the arts, and I use that in the broadest sense. However, I must confess that in more recent years I have more thoroughly enjoyed the arts in its widest ramifications. I suspect that that has been true because I have had an opportunity at the local level in my home town to have greater and more exposure to the arts.

We have a fine civic theater, and the attendance at their various performances over the years has zoomed upward. I have been privileged to see more there in recent years than I ever did in the past, and with much more appreciation.

We have had a fine museum in Grand Rapids, but the attendance at that museum, primarily by school children as well as others, has increased significantly. I think that is a wholesome sign.

We have had a fine art museum. We have a great tradition of furniture, and certain related areas of art and design, and I am glad to report that public support for this part of our community has gone upwards substantially.

We have an outstanding community symphony orchestra. I cannot judge whether everything that is put on or exhibited by these various local operations is the best—or whether it is real good—but I can tell you that there is a growing public interest in these fields and that is most important.

Rather than restrict them, I think we ought to gamble a little extra investment and probably expand the operation. Let me say—and this is a confession—when this program started, I think 6 years ago, I did not support it.

However, we were fortunate in Grand Rapids, Mich., to get an award for a joint venture between the city of Grand Rapids, or its citizens, and the Federal Government. As we developed our urban development area downtown with a new county administration-city hall, three new bank buildings, a new Federal building, and a number of other attractive facilities of what was once a rundown part of the community, we purchased what is called "a Calder."

At the time I did not know what a Calder was. I doubt if many people here do today. It was somewhat shocking to a lot of our people out home. I must say that I did not really understand, and I do not today, what Mr. Calder was trying to tell us, but I can assure the Members that Calder in the center of the city, in an urban redevelopment area, has really helped to regenerate a city, and particularly a part of it. The Federal arts and humanities program was a participant and it was a good investment both locally and federally.

I praise the people who had the foresight to undertake this program, just as I praise the people who convinced the arts and humanities people down here that they ought to get a Federal grant for a children's theater. As a result of that grant we have a fine children's theater program in the city of Grand Rapids. The response has been overwhelming.

Instead of an opponent, as I was, of the program at its inception, I am a supporter.

I must say that this relatively small increase—I say "relatively," and one can get different interpretations of the amount—in my judgment is a worthwhile investment.

Therefore, in support of a first-class head of this agency, Nancy Hanks, who in my judgment has done a fine job, I am an enthusiastic supporter of the bill as it came from the committee. I regretfully oppose the amendment of my good friend from New York.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the Kemp-Steiger amendment to reduce the authorization for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. My reluctance is based on my strong desire to maintain closer and more reasonable controls on Federal spending. It is therefore difficult for me to resist an amendment which seeks to reduce a spending increase of 80 percent over the past fiscal year.

Every Member of this body realizes that few programs ever receive these kinds of increases, and none receive them very long. But there are a couple of reasons why I shall vote against the amendment.

In the first place, a national program

in the arts field cannot really be national in scope if it does not have a reasonable financial base. I do not suggest that we do away with this program, or any other underfinanced program. But in some respects, it is almost better to have no program than to tease possible recipients into believing we are operating a good program and then provide little funding. In my judgment the expanded authorization is necessary to maintain a national program. At current levels there is simply not enough money to encourage participation in the arts with adequate geographical distribution. Reductions will simply mean reduced participation, particularly in the smaller areas where the needs are greatest.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I am persuaded that the arts have never received adequate Federal interest and encouragement. I would like to see Federal participation expanded to a level which would show real Federal interest in the arts. The extra dimensions added to the lives of the American people by the incentive grants of the National Foundation is something I cannot describe because those dimensions are lacking in my education and experience. I feel that lack and wish there had been more opportunities in the arts in the past.

My opposition to this amendment does not mean that the Government should take a dominant role in the arts of this country. I hope its role will always be supportive and minor. I expect, and strongly desire, that the arts will be privately and/or locally supported rather than funded by massive appropriations from Washington. I do not want Washington arts decisions imposed on the general public. That is one of the reasons why I support the foundation because it responds to local needs rather than determining them.

In America we have used tax deductibility to allow private citizens to manage our arts programs. I want to see that principle maintained. For this reason I will probably be concurring in future Kemp-Steiger amendments. But for now I think we have not demonstrated enough encouragement and incentive at the Federal level, and I urge that the Kemp-Steiger amendment be defeated.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time of concern about congressional prerogatives and budgetary priorities, it is especially important that we support H.R. 3926 as reported by the committee.

The National Endowments on the Arts and on the Humanities have so well and ably and with such fiscal responsibility carried out the congressional intent in the purpose of this legislation, which was "to complement, assist, and add to programs for the advancement of the humanities and the arts by local, State, regional, and private agencies and their organizations," that they have earned the respect of both the Congress and the executive branch.

In the committee bill there is no discrepancy between the two branches on either priorities or the amount budgeted, and this is true because the arts can do so much for us all, and we are being asked to do little in relation to the benefits,

tangible and intangible, that will reach out and touch all Americans now and for generations to come.

This is a matter we must not treat lightly, if we believe as we say we do, and as we reaffirmed in this Chamber at noon today, with our Flag Day exercises, in the limitless potential of the human mind and spirit.

Louisiana is a State with a long, rich, proud and diverse cultural heritage. Because of this, the citizens in our State have been aware of the activities of the National Endowment for the Arts since its inception. We were so pleased to be able to greet the members of the National Council early in 1968, at their national meeting in New Orleans. And so much has happened since then. With the growth of the arts endowment, its steadily increasing resources and excellent leadership have begun to make a major impact on the lives of millions of Americans.

In Louisiana alone the endowment has helped to make possible an amazing variety of activities in cities and towns and farmlands all over the State. We now have professional artists working in our schools. We have any number of jazz projects from Houma to Baton Rouge to New Orleans, including public school workshops and concerts, as well as oral histories of some of our great old jazz musicians.

We have dance companies touring in Lake Charles, Natchitoches, Hammond, Lafayette. We have the New Orleans and Shreveport Orchestras commissioning new works, performing community concerts, and touring their regions.

Mr. Chairman, we have the Free Southern Theater bringing timely and meaningful experiences to people in guild halls, fields, and community centers. We have seen our State arts council, the Louisiana Council for Music and Performing Arts, of which I am a member, assisted in a wide variety of programs. The New Orleans Museum of Art, whose new wings were dedicated by Hale in 1971, was aided in presenting a special exhibition on "The Art of the North American Indian and the North American Indian in Art."

We have a number of photography fellowships in the State, and we have assistance to the Council of the Arts for children in New Orleans, which will enable 3,000 youngsters, disadvantaged by economic or physical handicaps, through the ages of 4 to 18, to have professional artist-teachers working with them and developing their skills, perception, and, most of all, their sense of self.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard it said that the arts are for the elite, but that is certainly not true, as one can see from what is happening in my State. We have been told that the arts is a priority only for the educated, but that again is simply not supported by the evidence I see all around me.

It has been suggested that it is inappropriate to increase the arts program by \$72.5 million when social programs are being held or reduced, but the arts endowment's programs play an integral part in the social and economic betterment of people, bringing benefits to all,

and enriching so many lives for so small an investment.

Some "doubting Thomases" say that no agency can handle growth at such an accelerated rate, but the arts endowment has handled growth, particularly in the past few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Mrs. BOGGS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. BOGGS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, under the leadership of Nancy Hanks and Ronald Berman, yet it has never lost its personal touch nor its ability to serve its wonderfully diverse constituency. So impressed have been the businessmen of our State that they have sponsored for 2 consecutive years the National Conference of Business and the Arts in New Orleans.

Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from Iowa, who is the most faithful watchful guardian of this House, but I would like to assure him that the letter he quoted from Nancy Hanks about our bicentennial celebration was only to say that the ongoing arts programs that would be really essential to the betterment of the understanding of our 200th birthday would have the respect of our council and not the programs that may pop up at the last minute to be endowed by the council.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me today in voting for the bill, as reported out of the committee, thereby making it possible for the National Endowment for the Arts to continue its fine work and to expand its important programs.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the statements that have been made on the floor of the House today by those who would oppose the amendment. That is, I would have no quarrel if we had unlimited funds.

I do not think there would be a person in this House who, if our funds were unlimited, would not vote to double or quadruple the money to the arts and humanities. Certainly it is true that man does not live by bread alone.

But, Mr. Chairman, when this administration is recommending sharp cuts in other very essential areas and is, in fact, taking the bread itself away, I suggest that we had better look at our priorities.

I do not understand the logic of this administration in saying that we will double the amount for the arts and humanities, or almost double it, and that we will cut mental health training \$10 million below last year's level.

Arts and humanities are very nice as previous speakers have said, but I suggest for the person who is mentally ill that mental health centers and mental health personnel and other programs might be even more important.

Medical facilities construction—the administration recommends that be cut by \$200 million. Disease control research grants, cut \$2 million; project grants cut

\$2 million. They do not recommend we double the funding for them, but rather, let us cut it below last year's expenditures. Preventive health services, which are pretty basic to any American person, and nutritional and chronic diseases, the administration recommends that we cut \$3.5 million below last year's appropriation. Dental research to be cut \$2 million; arthritis and digestive diseases of the National Institutes of Health cut \$6 million.

Mr. Chairman, I could go down the list; program after program after program where this administration and this Congress are not funding programs to the level of last year. Then should we ask ourselves in terms of priorities is the arts and humanities endowment the one and only program in the Federal budget to be increased by 80 percent? If so why? Is it more important than health programs? More important than education? More important than cancer research? Are the arts and humanities more important than leaving libraries open and making books available to people who want them? Why cut library resources back so we can double last year's funding on arts and humanities.

Yesterday we talked about the national deficit, about the Congress setting a budget ceiling. Are you going to be willing to double the amount of money over last year for all of these other programs? Will Congress double last year's level of funding in nurses training, in training of doctors and dentists, in research, in heart disease and stroke? Will we double last year's level of funding for all environmental programs? Will we double last year's level of funding for clean air and the water quality act? Are you willing to double last year's level of funding for impact aid, for education for the disadvantaged, for the physically and mentally handicapped? Surely these programs are as important, at least, as the endowment for the humanities.

And if we double the level of funding for all, where does that place the national budget, the national deficit?

Let me turn to a second point. In the endowment for the humanities there is a fellowship program. These, to the best of my knowledge, start at \$12,000. What are these fellowships for? For history, for psychology, for sociology, for English. Everyone knows we have a surplus of Ph. D.'s in these disciplines. We have Ph. D.'s, in these fields I have just mentioned, out on the streets looking for jobs. Yet under the committee's recommendation for the humanities the fellowships in those areas where there is a surplus would be doubled. Yet in health personnel, where there is a shortage and where we do not have enough nurses and doctors and other health personnel in those and allied fields, the administration is recommending that we cut the new starting fellowships down to zero. Can anyone explain the logic of doubling fellowships in the areas where we have a surplus and cutting the fellowships in the health fields where we have a shortage—cutting them below last year's level? This is a question of priorities.

This is the basic issue that confronts us.

It is not because anybody is opposed to the arts and humanities; heaven knows that. My district and my State and other States of the Union have all benefited, especially by the Endowment for the Arts—and to some extent by the Endowment for the Humanities. But that is not the issue. The gentleman from New York is not recommending a cut. He is recommending that we do not increase the funds over last year's spending by 80 percent.

May I suggest this, also. I have been on the Committee on Education and Labor when we went to conference with the Senate, and we have ended up with the Senate figures, and in this case that may involve \$400 million and not \$145 million or \$165 million.

May I remind my colleagues, also, that the Foundation for the Humanities financed a great poem a year or so ago. I believe one of our colleagues called our attention to it, and the person who wrote this great poem received \$750 from the Endowment for the Humanities. That poem consisted of one word: Light. That was the only word in the poem. They had so much money they gave that person \$750 for making that great contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I suggest that a foundation that has money so that it can give \$750 away for a one-word poem has too much money already and they had better start looking at their own priorities as to whom they are going to finance and to what extent.

But it is not because of that one particular poem that I would support the amendment which the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is offering. I support that amendment because I think that we must decide what our priorities are. If we have unlimited funds then, yes, let us go ahead and double the funding for all health programs, for all education programs, for all programs for the elderly; but if we are going to have a budget ceiling established in the Congress, if we are going to cut other basic programs, nutritional services for children, programs for health personnel, programs to clean up our environment, then I cannot for the life of me understand how we can almost double this program. Neither do I understand how the constituents in our home districts could agree to these kind of priorities. I know how the majority of my constituents would vote. They would say education, basic health programs, programs for the elderly, programs to clean up the environment should be increased, and yes, keep the endowment for the arts and humanities but not with a 100-percent increase.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Oregon yielding to me. I want

to commend the gentlewoman for the statement she has made.

It seems to me that the basic issue we are faced with is essentially the one the gentlewoman from Oregon has portrayed for us, and that is how do we determine our priorities? Let me go to one that the gentlewoman mentioned. I am concerned in terms of the district that I represent where we do not have the large symphonies, and the large art museums, but do have outstanding community organization and institutions for arts and humanities, and that is the library program, which is being very substantially reduced.

The kinds of programs which have received large sums take place in Boston, and New York, and other large cities where they are enjoyed by the people in those communities, but they do not benefit to the same extent the people in smaller areas. But the one program that does is the library program. And I am talking about not just the large city libraries, it is those small libraries that I think we have to take care of. I believe it is important that we decide how best we can allocate with the limited resources we have the best possible benefits to all of our people in this country.

I believe that the gentlewoman from Oregon has been on target in her comments, and again I commend the gentlewoman for her statement.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I find it difficult to rise, particularly in opposition to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) whom I have learned to respect and admire in our sessions while working together on the Committee on Education and Labor for the past several years.

However, I must take complete exception to what the gentlewoman has said, and what has been said in support of the amendment.

It seems that one of the arguments that have been extended is that we should not be putting money into this program because it appears as though we are not supporting adequately our senior citizens program, and that we are not adequately supporting the vocational rehabilitation and other programs. I happen to support those other programs as well. But one of the things we should remember is that this program of the Endowment of the Arts and Humanities reaches out to these very people we have been talking about. This program, if we were to talk to the senior citizens groups, we would find that they are taking advantage more and more of these programs that are supported by the arts and humanities, and the vocational rehabilitation programs that are using these programs to help rehabilitate their people. I think that you would find that this is one of the most inexpensive ways of offering support to the very things that we have been talking about.

I have heard a comment that was something to the effect that the rural

areas were not being reached. There is nothing that could be further from the truth than that. The rural areas are being reached in this country by this program.

One of the problems is, as one of the Members said, that a dance group is getting money, and it is based in New York, and that benefits New York, and becomes New York money.

Let me say that that dance group travels all over the country. It goes into these small towns, goes into places that have never had the opportunity of seeing this type of program before.

The poet in schools program that primarily reaches out into the rural areas has been a tremendous success. Literally thousands and thousands of young children in small communities who have never had the opportunity of hearing and working with a poet, with a writer, with someone who is skilled in the arts, are really finding new horizons opening up to them. I think this is tremendous. We have done so little in this country for the arts and humanities, right now we are finally moving forward. I hope that we are not going to stop on the grounds that this increase is just too much of a percentage increase.

We did not have enough in the program to start with. Now we are getting some money in there that is going to reach the children, the people who are disadvantaged, all economic levels. This is not a rich man's bill.

Just 2 weeks ago in New York City a concert was given in the park with 70,000 people. It was interesting to note on the police report that not one crime took place in Central Park with 70,000 people there. It does not happen often in Central Park, unfortunately. The program of the arts and humanities is one that is going to be a motivating force for good. It is a way of letting people see a new world for people who have never seen it before.

I hope we are going to support this bill to the fullest, and that we will defeat this amendment.

Incidentally, I am sure the Members are aware that Senator PROXIMIRE, who has been mentioned here earlier, offered an amendment to cut this program, and, if I am correct, it was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 75 to 14, which was an overwhelming defeat. I hope we do as well right here.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Is it not true, however, that HEW appropriates other dollars for the arts humanities in many other ways, so this is not an end-in-all bill itself? The arts and humanities receive money from other appropriations, so if a person wanted to vote to keep the funding of the authorization at the same level as fiscal year 1973 he would not be denying these children this fine musical training, as the gentleman has implied? It would merely mean there would be no inflationary increases.

Mr. PEYSER. No, I do not agree with

that. I do not agree with that at all. There is no other area that has reached out either to the same population or in the same way as this particular program. Congress in its wisdom enacted this program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes. I rise in opposition to this amendment. On the surface it is always popular to cut a program such as this. I would once again remind the House this is not a budget-breaking authorization. The bill passed by the other body was budget-breaking. The bill that first started in this House in committee was budget-breaking, but this is the one bill that is within the budget authorization figure.

Most of the increase from this year, for the 1974 fiscal year over the 1973 fiscal year, is for the Bicentennial in the making of films and television programs. In other words, it will not be consumed entirely next year. I submit to the Members that I would guess that close to 200 million people in this country will view those films and those TV programs in 1976.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ESHLEMAN. If I can answer the question, I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He serves on the same Committee on Education and Labor as I do.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), mentioned that the bill passed by the Senate has in it for fiscal year 1976 a total of \$400 million. The gentleman is aware, having served on the Committee on Education and Labor, of what happens when our committee goes to conference with the Senate. Does the gentleman think that the House will prevail or the Senate will prevail?

Mr. ESHLEMAN. I do not mean to be facetious with this answer to the gentleman from New York, but if the right House Members get on that conference committee, we will not concede, or the conference committee could last the balance of the year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I should like to make two points very quickly. First of all, we have heard a lot about priorities. I think I have some of the same priorities as some of the people who spoke earlier about cuts in libraries, health, education, research, and a number of other areas, but I should like to point out that we are talking today about congressional priorities. These are our priorities. We are not talking about the budget. We are not talking about what the President has recommended in terms of cuts. We are talking about what we in the Congress are going to do. I think if we fail to make the arts and humanities, one of the priorities of this

Congress, we will have lost a golden opportunity to establish this Congress as an effective Congress.

The second point I would like to make is that when we talk about cutting, as the gentleman's amendment would, \$65 million from this program, that is not the end of it. I would like to point out that for every dollar that we appropriate for this program we induce the raising and expenditure of \$5 additional from States and private organizations. So while we may be discussing here a \$65 million cut in the arts and humanities, in terms of what this will do in America we are talking about a slash of \$325 million in the arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we cannot afford that kind of cut in programs which very badly need some priorities in this country.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there has been some mention of the Buffalo Symphony in this debate. I think it is important because it is one of the great orchestras in America and it is widely supported in the Buffalo area and throughout New York. The Buffalo Symphony budget is \$1.6 million currently. Of this there is a deficit of \$720,000. That has to be made up from sources other than box office.

Fortunately this legislation in the past has provided \$97,300 in terms of the funds that help meet the deficit, but even with that amount the Buffalo Symphony faces a deficit in excess of \$600,000. I think this is illustrative of the problems facing our orchestras and operas and dance companies across the country and it is a valid reason why this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MEEDS. Indeed it is an excellent illustration, but Mr. Chairman, I think while this is an excellent illustration it is totally impossible to measure the value and the motivation this program provides for a youth who, being subjected to this program becomes a fine violinist.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be totally penny wise and pound foolish to limit our priorities so that we cannot extend that kind of help to the human needs. We have heard a great deal about human needs. I think this program enriches human needs. I think we need to continue it.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would say to my friends, the gentlemen from Washington and New York, and all others who are concerned about the Buffalo Symphony, that I share their precise concern. The Buffalo Symphony is \$700,000 in debt and it is receiving \$97,000. Does the gentleman suggest that the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities is going to make up the deficit? Obviously they are not.

Mr. MEEDS. I am suggesting if every-

one who is reporting contributions to the arts and humanities was really making the contributions we would probably not need this bill, but obviously that is not happening.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, last night President Nixon spoke on television and for the edification of the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and others in the House who support this outrageous spending bill I would like to read specifically what the President had to say on this subject—not on the particular subject of this bill but on the subject of spending. He said:

The battle against inflation is everybody's business. I have told you what the Administration will do. There is also a vital role for the Congress. The most important single thing the Congress can do in holding down the cost of living is to hold down the cost of government. For my part, I shall continue to veto spending bills that we cannot afford, no matter how noble sounding their names.

This bill qualifies on both counts, both as to "noble sounding names" and for a veto. Either President Nixon means what he said last night or he does not.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read a few examples of what goes on under this program. I do not know what specific grants these do-gooders have made or will make with the money being thrown at them here today, but I can give you a few examples of how the taxpayers' dollars went down the drain in 1972 in this boondoggle.

The humanity bureaucrats have spent money for "a pilot program on Religious Studies for Alabama Public School Teachers". I thought religion in the public schools was banned.

They paid for something called a "Study of Family Structure on the Overland Trail," and another study of "Early Man in the Dordogne Valley of France."

There was a study of "Medieval Philosophy," a study of "The Black Holiness Church," and something titled "Filmic Portrait of Frostburg, Md."

One fellow got a grant to study the "History of Religion" and I suspect anyone can go to any library and find a history of religion—any library in the country.

A woman in Iowa got a grant for a "History of Music," and I bet anyone can find a history of music in any library.

A man in Baltimore received a grant to study "Ancient Archaeology." The spenders also subsidized a conference on civil engineering and provided money for "Cultural Enrichment in a University Museum of Anthropology," whatever that is.

One man got money for a project called "Cinema Studies." Another was subsidized to make an "Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of Cinema."

They also paid for a "Current Digest of the Soviet Press," as if the CIA was not already spending plenty of money on that project.

A man at Kent State University got \$20,000 for a "Program of Study and Research in Peaceful Change." Another college student was paid to make a study

of "American Munitions Industry in the Post-Civil War Period."

One woman was paid to do "Japanese Studies," and a footnote to the grant explains that she "is an American citizen residing in Japan," which apparently is all that is needed to qualify for a handout.

These humanists—I believe that is what they call themselves—spent \$27,600 on the Summer Institute on Roman Law and \$20,767 on the Summer Institute on Roman Culture.

They paid the Chicano Film Institute more than \$25,000 to make a movie on "The History of San Francisco." Earthquakes and all, I suppose.

Former Postmaster General and one-time Ambassador to Poland, John A. Gronouski, is currently dean of the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, and his background evidently qualified him for \$140,940 grant to operate a State-wide bicentennial program. I do not recall that he was especially distinguished as a mail handler, but he did manage to find out how the gravy train operates.

The University of Arizona got more than \$66,000 for a project entitled "Progress in Arizona: The State's Crucial Issues." Apparently, nobody in the State knows what they are now.

The Ohio State University Research Foundation received \$47,000 to study or explain, or something, the Social Relevance of the Afro-American Experience.

The University of North Carolina got \$30,000 for a project which is called, believe it or not, "A Multimedia Presentation to Recollect the Experience of the Great Depression and the New Deal."

(By unanimous consent Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest with respect to the great depression and the New Deal, that those recollections are better left unrecalled.

The list goes on and on, perhaps to infinity for all I know. The tragic part of all this is that every dime spent on these projects had to be borrowed and future generations, the alleged beneficiaries of this latter day WPA arts program, will have to pay the enormous bill.

I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) even though his attempt to hold this wasteful spending to approximately the amount expended this year, does not cut deep enough.

Only yesterday did the majority in the House approve an extension of the Federal debt ceiling and I repeat that only last night did President Nixon call on Congress to help stop inflation by cutting expenditures. If the President had not approved the doubling of this authorization, the amendment of the gentleman from New York probably would not have been offered.

Unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, this bill may well provide a clear test of whether the President means what he says and says what he means.

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

Mr. Chairman, like all members of the

Committee, I always look forward with great interest to hearing my beloved friend from Iowa speak, and listening to him recite the litany of outrages that, in his view, have been committed by those responsible for these programs.

I also recall, Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon listening with great interest, and considerable edification, to the recitation of achievements that have been made possible in the State of Iowa, a listing that was recited by another able gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

I listened with great interest to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER) tell us of the impact for good of these programs in the inner city of Los Angeles. Yesterday I listened to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), tell us of the positive contribution made by the Arts and Humanities programs in his great State; and I listened to the three gentlemen from New York (Mr. PEYSER, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. REID) tell us of what these programs have meant in their State.

Let me also, Mr. Chairman, pay tribute to the distinguished gentlelady from Louisiana (Mrs. BOGGS) for her most eloquent and thoughtful statement on behalf of these programs, and their enormous value to the people of her State.

One could go on and on, on both sides of the aisle, listening to a recitation of what great good has been accomplished, under these programs, which some years ago were the object of scorn and ridicule and derision, but which now have come to command the support of a majority of both Republicans and Democrats, in both bodies of the Congress, and of every President of the United States, Democrat and Republican, since the program became law.

PUBLIC SUPPORT OF THE ARTS

Perhaps Mr. Chairman, the extraordinary support for artistic and cultural programs is best exemplified by an important new study just released by the National Research Center of the Arts, an affiliate of Louis Harris and Associates. This study of 1,531 New York City residents shows a real thirst for far wider access to a variety of cultural activities.

The study shows:

People showed a greater preference for first class theater and arts and crafts workshops, than they did for sports stadiums;

The public strongly favors their children developing skills and participating in the arts at all levels;

The public wants more arts courses offered as part of the central school curriculum;

One-quarter of the respondents expressed a desire to learn how to play a musical instrument while others wish they could paint, draw or sculpt.

I, too, listened to the speech of the President of the United States last night, and I recall what the President said in warning of the danger of his vetoing spending bills we could not afford.

But the President went on with another sentence, which my good friend from Iowa did not mention. He warned about budget busters becoming law. But Mr. Chairman, the bill under considera-

tion today is not a budget buster. The bill under consideration today contains the amounts of money recommended by the President of the United States.

I listened with great interest to, and I was powerfully moved by, the eloquent words, obviously spoken from the heart, by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), who said he had not, when he was first afforded the opportunity to vote on these programs, supported them. But now, having observed the impact for good of these programs in his own home community, he was going to support the recommendation of the President of the United States.

The able minority leader went on to remark, and I made a note of what he said, that this was a relatively small increase.

Oh, I know, in percentage terms it seems like a lot, but look at it in dollar amounts. In dollars it does not amount to very much, because we are talking about an increase of less than \$70 million, to be divided between the Arts Endowment and the Humanities Endowment.

Mr. Chairman, at the moment our Government spends less per capita on the arts—just 18 cents—than almost any major nation in the Western world. A recent survey showed per capita outlay in other countries running this way:

West Germany	\$2.42
Austria	2.00
Sweden	2.00
Canada	1.40
Israel	1.34
Great Britain	1.23

In fiscal year 1974 if full funding—\$145 million—is achieved, our per capita investment in the arts would be 35 cents.

Mr. Chairman, thus we see that compared to other Western countries, our support for the arts is not impressive at all.

DEMANDS FOR PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, the demands for programs funded by the endowments have increased rapidly. Arts endowment applications have increased from 1,383 in fiscal 1970 to 7,000 in fiscal 1973—a five-fold increase. The endowment was able to approve only 1,800 of the applications. Far from being excessive, therefore, the authorized funding for the arts in a realistic estimate in the needs in this area.

Mr. Chairman, in the area of the humanities, only 908 of the 4,113 applications received by the humanities endowment could be funded—22 percent of the total.

I recall a letter from our distinguished former colleague on the other side of the aisle, now Governor of West Virginia, Gov. Arch Moore. He told us that he is seeking an increase in the State arts appropriation in the State of West Virginia of 200 percent, indicating thereby his confidence in the importance of these programs to the lives of the people of his State.

I think of a letter I have received from Mr. Biemiller of the AFL-CIO, commenting on how much these programs mean to working people, and a letter from Mr. Brickfield, of the American Association of Retired Persons, remarking on how

much the arts and humanities programs mean to enriching the lives of the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, let me say just a word about the importance of the arts in our cities. As a December 1972 article in the *Economist* stated—

The arts are being seen increasingly as an answer to some of America's urban ills.

The article went on to note that the arts makes cities more attractive, counter the flight to the suburbs, break the isolation of the ghettos and ethnic groups, and involve young people in community activities.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I should tell my colleagues that Robert Hooks, of the District of Columbia Black Repertory Co. on March 14 of this year told my subcommittee:

I can guarantee you that our tuition-free workshop training program has been responsible for providing positive outlets for delinquents, high school drop outs, drug addicts, potential criminals, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I also refer to a letter I received from the principal of an overwhelmingly black school in the city of Chicago in which he talks about the importance of these programs to the children of his school. And I have a letter, as well, from Stansfield Turner, the president of the Naval War College, and I will quote from the letter, in view of our conversation about priorities.

He said in his letter to me as follows:

It has been my view that an understanding of the humanities is just as vital to national defense as is comprehension of the many technical fields in which we are involved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter, as my colleagues are aware, of adequate funding for health, for dealing with problems of the handicapped, for dealing with the problems of education.

But when we are talking about the arts and the humanities, we are not talking about the frills we are talking about the meaning of our culture, which was the central theme of our flag ceremony here this morning. We are talking, as our speakers did this morning, about the meaning of the heritage of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the arts and humanities are not marginal activities to be supported out of some vague sense of responsibility. They should and must be supported because they are essential in their own right and essential, as well, to the "quality of American life."

For as President Nixon noted in his March 1973 state of the Union report on human resources:

Renewed faith in ourselves also arises from a deeper understanding of who we are, where we have come from and where we are going . . . an understanding to which the Arts and Humanities can make a great contribution.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the arts and humanities are all about, and I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a first term Member of this body, I never cease to be in-

spired as well as bewildered by the actions that take place here in this Congress. Already today I was inspired by the Flag Day ceremonies, and I was inspired, as usual, by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I was inspired by what a good job obviously the Buffalo Symphony has been doing. But there are 49 other States involved in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am really bewildered that we as first-term Members, after having been asked to cut back the funding for programs like older Americans and vocational rehabilitation and the Economic Development Act and the rural programs that mean so much to my State and my districts and to a lot of other areas in this country, are now asked to double this particular program.

Maybe I have not been here long enough to consider \$80 million very much money, but to me it is a great deal of money. I have heard that this program may only cost 32 cents, another program 3 cents, and \$1.50 for another one, but they all add up to a lot of money.

Mr. Chairman, I know the people of my district, after having checked on the programs which are being carried out by this particular bill, would not support doubling the funding at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote in support of this amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT). This cutting back and restraining of funds has been something that has been talked about many times, and then when I come in today and find out that we started out with about \$2½ million several years ago, and we are now up to \$80 million, and in 3 years up to \$400 million, then I cannot reconcile myself to it.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter today from HEW telling me that we cannot get \$15 million in the State of New Jersey to finance psychiatric and mental disturbance centers which are needed so very badly.

Do I have to go out in Central Park and meet some strange individual beating on Tom-Toms in order to get an inspiration? What I want to see is something that is done sensibly with the money so that we can get some value out of it, something that is good for all citizens not just for people going around the park in tippy-toe shoes or having grants given to them at the University of Maryland in order to find out what is wrong in the State of Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I wish to urge the Members that we should vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 248, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

AYES—141

Abdnor	Gross	Price, Tex.
Alexander	Grover	Quillen
Archer	Gunter	Randall
Arends	Haley	Rarick
Armstrong	Hammer-	Regula
Baker	schmidt	Rhodes
Beard	Hanrahan	Rinaldo
Bennett	Hebert	Roberts
Blackburn	Hinshaw	Robinson, Va.
Bray	Hogan	Roush
Breaux	Holt	Rousselot
Brinkley	Hosmer	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Huber	Ryan
Bryohill, N.C.	Hudnut	Sarasin
Bryohill, Va.	Hunt	Satterfield
Burgener	Hutchinson	Saylor
Burleson, Tex.	Ichord	Scherle
Burlison, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Schneebeli
Butler	Kemp	Shipley
Byron	Ketchum	Shuster
Camp	Landgrebe	Snyder
Casey, Tex.	Latta	Spence
Cederberg	Lot	Steed
Chamberlain	Lujan	Steiger, Ariz.
Clancy	McCollister	Steiger, Wis.
Clark	McEwen	Stuckey
Clawson, Del	McSpadden	Symms
Cochran	Madigan	Taylor, Mo.
Collins, Tex.	Mallary	Taylor, N.C.
Conable	Maraziti	Teague, Calif.
Conlan	Martin, Nebr.	Thomson, Wis.
Coughlin	Martin, N.C.	Thornton
Crane	Mathias, Calif.	Towell, Nev.
Daniel, Dan	Michel	Treen
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Milford	Ullman
Delaney	Miller	Waggoner
Dennis	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wampler
Derwinski	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Dickinson	Moorhead,	Wilson,
Downing	Calif.	Charles, Tex.
du Pont	Murphy, Ill.	Winn
Duncan	Myers	Wydier
Forsythe	Nelsen	Wylie
Fountain	O'Brien	Wyman
Froehlich	Parris	Young, Fla.
Ginn	Passman	Young, S.C.
Goodling	Pettis	Zion
Green, Oreg.	Poage	
	Powell, Ohio	

NOES—248

Abzug	Clay	Fraser
Adams	Cleveland	Frelinghuysen
Addabbo	Cohen	Frenzel
Anderson, Ill.	Collier	Frey
Andrews, N.C.	Collins, Ill.	Fulton
Andrews, N. Dak.	Conte	Fuqua
Annunzio	Conyers	Gaydos
Ashley	Cornman	Gettys
Barrett	Cotter	Gialmo
Bergland	Cronin	Gibbons
Bevill	Culver	Gilman
Biaggi	Davis, Ga.	Goldwater
Biesler	Davis, S.C.	Gonzalez
Bingham	de la Garza	Grasso
Blatnik	Dellenback	Gray
Boggs	Dellums	Green, Pa.
Boland	Denholm	Griffiths
Boiling	Diggs	Gubser
Bowen	Dingell	Gude
Brademas	Donohue	Guyer
Brasco	Dorn	Hamilton
Breckinridge	Drinan	Hanley
Brooks	Dulski	Hansen, Idaho
Broomfield	Eckhardt	Hansen, Wash.
Brotzman	Edwards, Ala.	Harrington
Brown, Calif.	Ellberg	Harvey
Brown, Mich.	Eshleman	Hays
Buchanan	Evans, Colo.	Hechler, W. Va.
Burke, Fla.	Fascell	Heinz
Burke, Mass.	Findley	Helstoski
Burton	Fish	Henderson
Carey, N.Y.	Flood	Hicks
Carney, Ohio	Flowers	Hillis
Carter	Flynt	Holifield
Chappell	Foley	Horton
Chisholm	Ford, Gerald R.	Howard
Clausen,	Ford,	Hungate
Don H.	William D.	Jarman

Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Smith, N.Y.
Jones, Ala.	Murphy, N.Y.	Staggers
Jones, Okla.	Natcher	Stanton
Jones, Tenn.	Nichols	J. William
Jordan	Nix	Stanton
Karth	Obey	James V.
Kastenmeier	O'Hara	Stark
Kazen	O'Neill	Steele
Keating	Owens	Stephens
King	Patten	Stokes
Kluczynski	Pepper	Stratton
Koch	Perkins	Stubbfield
Kyros	Peyser	Studds
Landrum	Pickle	Sullivan
Leggett	Pike	Symington
Lehman	Podell	Talcott
Lent	Preyer	Thompson, N.J.
Long, La.	Price, Ill.	Thone
Long, Md.	Pritchard	Tierman
McClory	Quie	Udall
McCloskey	Railsback	Van Deerlin
McCormack	Rangel	Vander Jagt
McDade	Rees	Vanik
McFall	Reid	Veysey
McKay	Reuss	Vigorito
McKinney	Robison, N.Y.	Walsh
Macdonald	Rodino	Ware
Madden	Roe	Whalen
Mahon	Rogers	White
Maillard	Roncalio, N.Y.	Widnall
Mann	Rooney, Pa.	Williams
Matsunaga	Rose	Wilson, Bob
Mayne	Rosenthal	Wilson,
Mazzoli	Rostenkowski	Charles H.,
Meeds	Roy	Calif.
Melcher	Runnels	Wolf
Metcalfe	St Germain	Wright
Mezvinsky	Sarbanes	Wyatt
Minish	Schroeder	Yates
Mink	Seiberling	Young, Alaska
Minshall, Ohio	Shoup	Young, Ga.
Mitchell, Md.	Shriver	Young, Ill.
Moakley	Skubitz	Young, Tex.
Mollohan	Slack	Zablocki
Morgan	Smith, Iowa	Zwach
Mosher		

NOT VOTING—44

Anderson, Calif.	Esch	Patman
Ashbrook	Fisher	Riegle
Aspin	Hanna	Roncalio, Wyo.
Badillo	Harsha	Rooney, N.Y.
Bafalis	Hastings	Roybal
Bell	Hawkins	Ruppe
Burke, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Sandman
Daniels, Dominick V.	Johnson, Pa.	Sikes
Danielson	Jones, N.C.	Sisk
Davis, Wis.	Kuykendall	Steelman
Dent	Litton	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Mills, Ark.	Whitten
Erlernbor	Mizell	Wiggins
	Moorhead, Pa.	
	Nedzi	

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

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 11, lines 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19, strike out the language which reads as follows: "For the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, and June 30, 1976, there is authorized to be appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 5(c) and 5(g), and an amount equal to the total amounts received by such Endowment during each such year under section 10(a)(2)." "And on page 11, line 25, and page 12, line 1, strike the following language: "and such sums as may be necessary for each of the two succeeding fiscal years."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is not at all complicated. This bill is wide open as to spending for the fiscal years 1975 and 1976. It is completely open end. The sky is the limit. The Senate has passed a bill, as I understand it, to provide for \$400 million in 1976 and \$300 million in 1975. Unless this amendment is adopted,

somewhere between zero and \$400 million would be the price tag on this bill in 1976 and somewhere between zero and \$300 million in 1975.

I have no hope that this amendment will be adopted. I doubt very much there is that much sense of fiscal responsibility left in the House that it put a limit on the amount of money that can be spent in 1975 and 1976, even though there is not a soul here today who has the slightest knowledge of what the financial situation of this Government will be in either of those years.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state what his amendment does precisely?

Mr. GROSS. It strikes the open end provisions for 1975 and 1976.

Mr. HOSMER. Does it authorize any figure?

Mr. GROSS. No; the bill provides no limit whatever for those 2 fiscal years.

Mr. HOSMER. In effect it reduces this to a 1-year authorization?

Mr. GROSS. My amendment would reduce this to a 1-year authorization, which unfortunately it is almost double the spending for this purpose over the current fiscal year. It would make the committee come back next year to justify the spending for this purpose.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Once again I know there is a great deal of restlessness and everyone wants to get on with it, but the point is the President tried to make the point last night that we ought to quit engaging in budget busting. The gentleman is trying to prevent this from becoming budget busting in future years.

Mr. GROSS. Hopefully, yes. I do not know what the budget will be in future fiscal years. I am amazed that President Nixon, having imposed cutoffs and cutbacks on many other domestic programs, including agriculture, would put his stamp of approval on the expenditure of \$145 million on this program in the next fiscal year. The \$145 million is almost double the amount spent this year and this is a program that could be wiped out altogether and less than 1 percent of the population of this country would know that it had disappeared.

The budget this year permitted doubling of this expenditure over the last fiscal year, the expenditure for this purpose.

The arts and humanities have gone in 7 years from \$5 million in 1966 to the present \$145 million. If this remains openended, it could be \$300 million in 1975 and \$400 million in 1976.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman. I know that the other body tops everything we do, and I am sure this will be a constructive amendment.

Mr. GROSS. The House Labor and Education Committee knows few limits in the spending of money and you better believe that the sky will be the limit

with this boondoggle if there are no restraints.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my colleague can tell me why the Arts and Humanities appears to be such a sacred cow. It is the only piece of legislation we have which carries a 100-percent increase over last year. Yet, by the same token, we have cut back on housing, on veterans hospitals, on the EPA, on education, on regional medical centers; you name it all the way down the list.

All of a sudden, this bill surfaces carrying the prestige of the administration. I wonder what there is in this bill that perhaps some of us might have missed.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot read the minds of some people, including the President. The gentleman will have to employ a mindreader or someone who has some power of clairvoyance.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, if I am not mistaken, I heard someone earlier state that a \$1 expenditure will generate a \$5 additional expenditure. On permanent conservation programs which were terminated, the farmers pay 70 percent and the Government 30 percent, they thought that was inflationary. Fiscal responsibility? Not with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. This is one of the most open-ended authorization bills I have ever seen. If Members of the House are opposed to wide-open authorization spending bills here is your opportunity to prove it by voting for my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to vote against this amendment for this reason: If the Members will think about the Committee on Education and Labor, they will remember that we have usually put authorizations in subsequent years way beyond that which could be appropriated. It was held up as a goal for everybody to shoot at; and resulted in harassment of the Committee on Appropriations.

What our committee did this time was to say, "We authorize such sums as may be necessary." The Members do not feel, do they, that the Committee on Appropriations is going to let this get out of hand? Not a chance. We are going to have a tough enough struggle to get \$145 million for this coming year from the Committee on Appropriations. What we need to do is to authorize this for a period of time, not 1 year at a time.

The Members know what has happened to programs when the agencies do not know what is going to happen to them. How can they plan? We need to let the endowments plan, plan through 1976, the year of the Bicentennial. At that time we will take another look at it and see how much money ought to be in the arts and humanities program. We need authorizations for this length of time.

I think we need to have adequate authorizations, because the programs of arts and humanities are probably more important in our Bicentennial than anything else. When we look at this program, remember that we are talking about the

quality of our national life. We have not done enough in America through Federal funding what many of us feel we should have done in this area.

When the program began, there were reservations, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), our minority leader, indicated. I had those reservations. I opposed some parts of the program. These have been corrected. I think we have a good program now, one that we can feel confident about.

Therefore, I urge the Members to vote down this amendment. Look back at some of the things the gentleman from Iowa mentioned, such as the great depression. During the depression I heard, as a child, scoffing at the artists who were painting murals on public buildings. People thought they were a bunch of loafers, painting on buildings and working in this area. Now, as we look back on it, we are proud of what they have done. We saw what some young people, some kids, learned from WPA artists. They learned to be good artists who have led to enhancing the quality of life in America.

A good part of Endowment programs, I believe, will enable us to look at our past from the time of its beginning in 1776, down through the years of this tremendous experiment in democracy. We can build on that strength from the arts and humanities program, and I should like to note at this point some of the plans of the National Endowment for the Humanities for the celebration of our Bicentennial.

State-based programs: In addition to the approximately \$160,000 which is available to each State for the support of community-developed programs in which the resources of the humanities are used to inform dialog on issues of local public policy, each State will in 1974 be eligible to receive \$40,000 for the planning and testing of pilot programs related to the Bicentennial, in preparation for completely Bicentennial-oriented public programs in the State during the Bicentennial year.

Film-TV program: \$6 million will be devoted to the production for public television of major series related to the Bicentennial era. These will include the already started series: On America in the world of the 18th century, a major biographical series on George Washington, a major series on the Adams family, a device to explore the unfolding of America through the generations of the Adams family; as well as a number of short series on Bicentennial themes, important figures like Jefferson and Hamilton, major events like Valley Forge and the Revolutionary War west of the Hudson, and significant themes like equality, democratic government. In addition the endowment will be supporting the adaptation and serialization on television of major works of American literature and drama which display fundamental aspects of the American character and the American experience.

Museum grants: Approximately \$1.7 million will be spent in the coming year for the development of programs in museums throughout the country relating their own exhibits to the Nation's history

and developing public educational programs around them. Significant among these will be the major program to send combination museum-and-debate programs which, aided by physical exhibits, will recreate for audiences in various parts of the country the spirit and action of the time of the Revolution.

National Humanities Series: The National Humanities Series, which sends teams of scholars and actors into small communities nationwide, will spend approximately \$1 million on historical programs or comments on American life.

Great issues in the American experience: \$1 million will be reserved to provide grants to large urban areas for the mounting of communitywide projects around major themes suggested by the great Bicentennial documents, the Preamble to the Constitution, the Revolution and minority experiences, the Revolution—episodes and crises, the Republic, freedom and responsibility. These will seek to reach over a million people in each of five major metropolitan areas through communitywide forums and discussions and the use of local media.

College and school curricula: \$3 million will be reserved to support teachers and students in high schools and colleges who plan to develop new American studies curricula, encouraging exploration of their local or national history and developing such study into new American history curricula which will have lasting impact on our educational system. A further \$700,000 will be reserved for a series of institutes and visiting professorships at the university level to revitalize traditional approaches to the study of American independence and its implications.

Fellowships for America's future: While many scholars and teachers seek fellowships to study American history and subjects which will be of unusual interest during the Bicentennial period, the endowment proposes to reserve something over a quarter of a million dollars specifically to support a small number of fellows in the study of America's future—that is, the relationship of the Nation's past principles and ideals to the demands of the modern world, modern technological advances and modern politics.

Research and editing: During the Bicentennial period the endowment will give priority funding at the level of about \$3 million to projects of serious scholarly research in the Bicentennial period and to the continued editing of publication of the 19th-century American classics and the papers of the Founding Fathers.

Bicentennial conferences: \$500,000 is reserved to underwrite the initial expenses of a number of major international conferences of scholars and public figures to be held in this country in the Bicentennial year. These will include conferences representing the disciplines of the humanities—philosophy, history, et cetera—as well as special conferences drawing international scholars to the consideration of the implications of the events of America in 1776 for the rest of the world and the continuing relationships between the culture of this country and others.

State guides and histories: In fiscal

year 1974 the endowment will initiate the preparation of an historical guide to each State for interest in the Bicentennial year. At the same time it will begin, in honor of the Bicentennial, the refurbishing of archives in every State as an initial step toward the preparation of complete, fully documented and authoritative histories of the Union. \$2.5 million is reserved for these two activities in fiscal year 1974.

Courses by the media: Following the introduction of "Courses by Newspaper" this year the endowment in fiscal year 1974 will reserve \$750,000 for development of a course, to be published by newspaper and available as a means of acquiring university credit, on the American Revolution. At the same time the endowment will also support the development of televised multidisciplinary experimental courses on early American history.

Bicentennial youth debate: The endowment will inaugurate a national debate to encourage high school and college students to research and argue again the issues which were precursors of the Declaration of Independence. \$3 million will be reserved in fiscal year 1974 to start competitive debates on the local, State, and regional levels which will culminate, by the usual process of elimination, in a final national debate between two sets of winning teams, to be broadcast over public television during 1976.

Bicentennial youth grants: Special funding of \$200,000 is reserved in 1974 for projects by young people—in or out of school—dealing specifically with research on national and local history of the revolutionary period, on the historical development of local institutions since the Revolution, or concerning philosophical ideas and issues associated with the Revolution.

The strength we gain from this study of our ideological roots will let us go into the next century a lot more united as a people, I believe.

We need these programs just as much as we need brick and mortar programs.

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota.

I want to reiterate that the administration has requested a 3-year bill, even as we here have. I, too, hope the amendment will be rejected.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman knows what the Appropriations Committee is going to do, why did he not put their figures in this bill?

Mr. QUIE. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee is going to do. We do not have any idea, really, what amount of money they ought to be appropriating in 1975 and 1976.

The gentleman from Iowa does not know. The gentleman from Indiana does not know. The administration does not know. Nobody does.

We want the program authorized. In 1975 and 1976 the administration will develop its program and will come up with budget recommendations. The administration will go to the Appropriations Committee with that, and the people we have elected to that Appropriations Committee will consider the matter and make their best judgment and present it to this body.

Mr. GROSS. Why not leave it to the Appropriations Committee to set the spending figure for this year?

Mr. QUIE. The reason for this year is that the administration has said \$145 million is the amount they think we ought to appropriate for fiscal 1974. We agreed with that.

Many members of our committee wanted a higher figure than that, feeling that \$145 million was not enough.

We decided to stick with the administration. The administration put the budget in balance. We may not agree with them completely on the budget that has been presented, and we have an opportunity to change that, but we do not want to second-guess them on the authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Nixon administration controls the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. QUIE. No, it does not. The administration and a majority of the Committee on Education and Labor made a wise decision at \$145 million.

As I have said, some feel they want less than that, as is evident by the amendments, but by the same token Members ought to know that some wanted more. Those individuals agreed to go along with the \$145 million. Therefore, I believe this body ought to as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I had walked into the Chamber blindfolded and if I had not known the voice of the previous speaker I would have sworn that I was listening to an approved spokesman for the administration position, which is clearly the case, but then I would have wondered what was going on in a Congress which is supposed to be reasserting its rights and prerogatives.

Here is a limitation presented by the gentleman from Iowa, a limitation of an authorization to 1 year. He would have an authorization for 1 year, which would mean that the Congress would get another look at the program 1 year from now.

If we are ever going to assert any balance against the executive branch, as so many Members wish to do these days, we shall have to do it on items like this, and not just on one or two foreign policy items.

I believe the gentleman from Iowa has an amendment which carries a practical effect. I believe it is an amendment which deserves support, because it maintains in the hands of the Congress an annual authorization.

It strikes me as being very amusing to hear a tremendous, flamboyant, almost emotional argument for an unlimited authorization at a time when it seems the mood in Washington is, "Let us get our

hands on this bureaucracy, let us get our hands on the executive branch."

I say to those Members who have been saying that the Congress has to reassert itself that they should support the Gross amendment.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. I believe we have to know the facts with respect to arts and humanities and how long they need in terms of leadtime to prepare American history.

I am supporting the bill, and I am against the amendment, for this is a chance for us to have an opportunity for history to write itself correctly.

It will take at least until 1975 for a playwright now working on it to come up with an explanation of how the full employment budget is saving the American economy through unemployment.

The playwright is already working on his play; Lewis Carroll is producing his great work, "Alice in Wonderland," and he is coming out with a new one for 1975.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, that sounds like an argument for the Gross amendment.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 235, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—146

Abdnor	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead, Calif.	Widnall	Wydler
Alexander	Griffiths	Mosher	Thomson, Wis.	Wylie
Archer	Gross	Murphy, Ill.	Towell, Nev.	Wyman
Arends	Grover	Myers	Treen	Young, Alaska
Armstrong	Gunter	O'Brien	Waggoner	Young, Fla.
Baker	Guyer	Parrs	Walsh	Young, S.C.
Beard	Haley	Passman	Wampler	Zion
Bennett	Hammer-	Pike	Whitehurst	Zwach
Blackburn	schmidt	Poage		NOES—235
Bray	Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio	Abzug	Fountain
Breaux	Hays	Price, Tex.	Adams	Obey
Brinkley	Henderson	Quillen	Addabbo	O'Hara
Broyhill, Va.	Hicks	Randall	Anderson, Ill.	O'Neill
Burgener	Hinshaw	Rarick	Andrews, N.C.	Owens
Burke, Fla.	Hogan	Regula	N. Dak.	Patman
Burleson, Tex.	Holt	Rhodes	Annunzio	Patten
Butler	Huber	Roberts	Ashley	Pepper
Byron	Hudnut	Rodgers	Barrett	Perkins
Camp	Hungate	Roselli	Bergland	Pettis
Casey, Tex.	Hunt	Rousselot	Bevill	Peyser
Clancy	Hutchinson	Runnels	Blaggi	Pickle
Clausen,	Ichord	Scherle	Blister	Podell
Don H.	Jarman	Schneebell	Bingham	Preyer
Clawson, Del.	Johnson, Colo.	J. William	Blatnik	Price, Ill.
Cochran	Kemp	Michel	Boggs	Pritchard
Collier	Ketchum	Shedd	Boland	Quile
Collins, Tex.	King	Snyder	Bolling	Railsback
Conlan	Landgrebe	Spence	Brown, Calif.	Rangel
Conyers	Latta	Stanton	Brown, Mich.	Rees
Crane	Lott	Sebelius	Broadhead	Hansen, Idaho
Daniel, Dan	Lujan	Shipley	Brown, Ohio	Reid
de la Garza	McCollister	Shoup	Brown, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.
Delaney	McEwen	Shuster	Brown, N.Y.	Reuiss
Dennis	McSpadden	Skubitz	Brown, N.C.	Rinaldo
Derwinski	Mallary	Snyder	Brown, N.Y.	Robison, N.Y.
Downing	Maraziti	Spence	Burke, Calif.	Rodino
Duncan	Martin, Nebr.	Stanton	Burke, Calif.	Roe
Evins, Tenn.	Mathias, Calif.	J. William	Cochran, Calif.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Frey	Michel	Steed	Conlan, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.
Froehlich	Milford	Steiger, Ariz.	Conlan, Calif.	Rose
Gilman	Miller	Stubblefield	Cochran, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Ginn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stuckey	Conlan, Calif.	Roth
Goodling	Montgomery	Taylor, Mo.	Cochran, Calif.	Rosenthal
			Cochran, Calif.	Rosenthal
			Cochran, Calif.	Roush
			Cochran, Calif.	Roy
			Cochran, Calif.	Seiberling
			Cochran, Calif.	Shriver
			Cochran, Calif.	Slack
			Cochran, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
			Cochran, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
			Cochran, Calif.	Staggers
			Cochran, Calif.	Stanton, James V.
			Cochran, Calif.	Stark
			Cochran, Calif.	Steele
			Cochran, Calif.	Steiger, Wis.
			Cochran, Calif.	Stephens
			Cochran, Calif.	Studs
			Cochran, Calif.	Sullivan
			Cochran, Calif.	Talcott
			Cochran, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
			Cochran, Calif.	Thompson, N.J.
			Cochran, Calif.	Thorne
			Cochran, Calif.	Tiernan
			Cochran, Calif.	Udall
			Cochran, Calif.	Ullman
			Cochran, Calif.	Van Deerlin
			Cochran, Calif.	Vander Jagt
			Cochran, Calif.	Vanik
			Cochran, Calif.	Veysey
			Cochran, Calif.	Vigorito
			Cochran, Calif.	Ware
			Cochran, Calif.	Whalen
			Cochran, Calif.	White
			Cochran, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
			Cochran, Calif.	Wolff
			Cochran, Calif.	Wright
			Cochran, Calif.	Wyatt
			Cochran, Calif.	Yates
			Cochran, Calif.	Yatron
			Cochran, Calif.	Young, Ga.
			Cochran, Calif.	Young, Ill.
			Cochran, Calif.	Young, Tex.
			Cochran, Calif.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—52

Anderson, Calif.	Danielson, Davis, Ga.	Hastings, Hawkins
Ashbrook, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Hebert
Aspin, Calif.	Dent, Davis, Wis.	Heckler, Mass.
Badillo, Calif.	Devine, Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.
Bafalis, Calif.	Dickinson, Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Bell, Calif.	Erlenborn, Edwards, Calif.	Kuykendall
Burke, Calif.	Erlenborn, Esch	Landrum
Conlan, Calif.	Fisher, Esch	Litton
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hanna, Fisher	Macdonald
Daniels, Dominick V.	Harsha, Hanna	Maillard
		Mathis, Ga.

Mills, Ark.	Royal	Symms
Mizell	Ruppe	Teague, Tex.
Moorhead, Pa.	Sandman	Waldie
Nedzi	Sikes	Whitten
Riegle	Sisk	Wiggins
Roncalio, Wyo.	Steelman	
Rooney, N.Y.	Stratton	

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: Page 11, line 16 strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert "\$64,000,000 each year".

And at page 11, line 25, strike out "Such sums as may be necessary" and insert "\$65,000,000".

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, the bill as now before us authorizes \$145 million for the year 1974, but such sums as may be necessary for 1975 and 1976. When the Kemp amendment came up, I voted to cut back the amount of the authorization, believing economic conditions warrant it. However, the majority of this House seems to feel that \$145 million is the proper authorization for this year. So, I will go along with that. It also feels that there should not be a bill brought out that limits the authorization to just 1 year, as would have been done by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The amendment I offer simply does this: It takes the \$145 million authorization for 1974 and specifies authorizations the same amount for 1975 and 1976. Therefore, for these subsequent years we come up with a definite authorization, rather than an indefinite and open-ended authorization of such sums as may be necessary. It appears to me that many of those who voted against the Gross amendment did want some kind of a limitation, but they did not want to go back into this every-year authorization business.

What I am offering to the Members is an amount that the majority believed to be reasonable for 1974 as an amount which appears to me to be reasonable for 1975 and 1976. If subsequently the House wished to raise this amount, it could do so next year or the year after. But if it wished not to reexamine this proposition during the next 3 years, there still would be a definite and reasonable and adequate amount authorized; namely, \$145 million. It would avoid the possibility of the other body running wild on appropriations, a danger the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) pointed out.

I suggest the wisdom of putting a definite amount on the authorization rather than retaining the ambiguous language, "such sums as may be necessary."

Mr. Chairman, I urge acceptance of my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

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

I call the attention of the committee to the letter contained in the report from Miss Hanks in response to a request on the part of the committee for an estimate of the funding needs of the National Arts Endowment for 1975 and 1976. In

her letter Miss Hanks points out that the endowment is not able to submit specific figures because the budgeting process for the fiscal year 1975 will begin in July if the appropriations levels for the fiscal year 1974 have been set by that time. She goes on to point out:

The budgeting process at the Endowment is lengthy and involved because we believe it essential to take into account the needs of the various fields and the requirements of the public. We do this through extensive consultation with individuals and with the Endowment's panels and of course with the National Council on the Arts.

So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be most unwise for us to reject the posture which the committee recommends and which is recommended as well by the administration; namely, that of providing in the second and third years of the bill such sums as the Congress may deem necessary.

For that reason I hope very much the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for the reasons that have been previously given on the floor of the House this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having under consideration the bill (H.R. 3926) to extend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. KEMP. 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 309, nays 63, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]
YEAS—309

Abdnor	Baker	Bowen
Abzug	Barrett	Brademas
Adams	Bergland	Brasco
Addabbo	Bevill	Bray
Alexander	Biaggi	Breax
Andrews, N.C.	Blester	Breckinridge
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bingham	Brinkley
Annunzio	Blatnik	Brooks
Arends	Boggs	Broomfield
Ashley	Boland	Brotzman
	Bolling	Brown, Calif.

Brown, Mich.	Heinz	Railsback
Brown, Ohio	Heilstoski	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Hicks	Rangel
Buchanan	Hillis	Rees
Burke, Fla.	Holifield	Regula
Burke, Mass.	Holtzman	Reid
Burton	Horton	Reuss
Butler	Hosmer	Rhodes
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Rinaldo
Carney, Ohio	Hudnut	Robison, N.Y.
Carter	Hungate	Rodino
Cederberg	Jarman	Roe
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers
Chisholm	Johnson, Colo.	Roncalio, N.Y.
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
Clay	Jones, N.C.	Rose
Cleveland	Jones, Okla.	Rosenthal
Cochran	Jones, Tenn.	Roush
Cohen	Jordan	Roy
Collier	Karth	Runnels
Collins, Ill.	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Conable	Kazen	St Germain
Conian	Keating	Sarasin
Conte	Kemp	Sarbanes
Conyers	King	Schneebeli
Corman	Kluczynski	Schroeder
Cotter	Koch	Sebelius
Coughlin	Kyros	Seiberling
Cronin	Latta	Shoup
Culver	Leggett	Shriver
Davis, S.C.	Lehman	Skubitz
de la Garza	Lent	Slack
Delaney	Long, La.	Smith, Iowa
Dellenback	Long, Md.	Smith, N.Y.
Dellums	Lott	Spence
Denholm	Lujan	Stanton, J. William
Diggs	McClory	Stanton, James V.
Dingell	McCloskey	Steele
Donohue	McCollister	Steiger, Wis.
Dorn	McDade	Stephens
Drinan	McFall	Stokes
Dulski	McKay	Stubblefield
Duncan	McKinney	Stuckey
du Pont	Madden	Studds
Eckhardt	Madigan	Sullivan
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Symington
Eilberg	Mallary	Talcott
Eshleman	Mann	Taylor, N.C.
Evans, Colo.	Maraziti	Teague, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, N.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson, Wis.
Findley	Matsunaga	Tiernan
Fish	Mayne	Towell, Nev.
Flood	Mazzoli	Udall
Flowers	Meeds	Van Deerlin
Flynt	Melcher	Vander Jagt
Foley	Metcalfe	Venakas
Ford, Gerald R.	Mezvinsky	Veysey
Ford,	Minish	Vigorito
William D.	Mink	Walsh
Forsythe	Minshall, Ohio	Ware
Fountain	Mitchell, Md.	Whalen
Fraser	Mitchell, N.Y.	White
Frelighuysen	Moakley	Whitehurst
Frenzel	Mollohan	Widnall
Frey	Moorhead, Calif.	Williams
Fulton	Morgan	Wilson, Bob
Gaydos	Mosher	Wilson, Charles H.
Gettys	Moss	Wilson, Calif.
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Gilmian	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn
Ginn	Natcher	Wolff
Goldwater	Nelsen	Wright
Gonzalez	Nichols	Wyatt
Grasso	Nix	Wydler
Gray	Obey	Yates
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien	Yatron
Green, Pa.	O'Hara	Young, Alaska
Griffiths	O'Neill	Young, Fla.
Gubser	Owens	Young, Ga.
Gude	Parris	Young, Ill.
Guyer	Patman	Young, Tex.
Haley	Patten	Zablocki
Hamilton	Perkins	Zwach
Hammer-	Pettis	
schmidt	Peyser	
Hanley	Pickle	
Hanrahan	Pike	
Hansen, Idaho	Podell	
Hansen, Wash.	Harrington	
Harrington	Price, III.	
Harvey	Hays	
Hays	Pritchard	
Hechler, W. Va.	Quie	
		NAYS—63
Archer	Burlison, Mo.	Daniel, Dan
Armstrong	Byron	Dennis
Beard	Camp	Derwinski
Bennett	Casey, Tex.	Froehlich
Blackburn	Clancy	Goodling
Breckinridge	Clawson, Del	Gross
Brooks	Brown, Calif.	Grover
Broomfield	Burgener	Henderson
Brotzman	Burleson, Tex.	
Brown, Calif.	Crane	

Hinshaw	Miller	Satterfield
Hogan	Montgomery	Saylor
Holt	Myers	Scherle
Huber	Passman	Shipley
Hunt	Poage	Shuster
Hutchinson	Powell, Ohio	Snyder
Ichord	Price, Tex.	Steed
Ketchum	Quillen	Steiger, Ariz.
Landgrebe	Rarick	Taylor, Mo.
McEwen	Roberts	Treen
Martin, Nebr.	Robinson, Va.	Waggoner
Michel	Rousselot	Young, S.C.
Milford	Ruth	Zion

NOT VOTING—61

Anderson, Calif.	Edwards, Calif.	Mizell
Anderson, Ill.	Erlenborn	Moorhead, Pa.
Ashbrook	Esch	Nedzi
Aspin	Fisher	Pepper
Badillo	Fuqua	Riegle
Bafalis	Giaimo	Roncalio, Wyo.
Bell	Gunter	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Hanna	Royal
Chappell	Harsha	Ruppe
Clausen, Don H.	Hastings	Sandman
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Hawkins	Sikes
Daniels, Dominick V.	Heckler, Mass.	Staggers
Danielson	Johnson, Pa.	Stark
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Steelman
Davis, Wis.	Landrum	Stratton
Dent	McSpadden	Symms
Devine	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Dickinson	Mailliard	Waldie
	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
	Mills, Ark.	Wiggins

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Mathis of Georgia.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Mizell.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Stark with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Gunter with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Esch with Mr. Chappell.

Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Bafalis.
Mr. Hebert with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Riegle with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Danielson with Mr. Symms.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr.
Mr. Royal with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Steelman with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Litton with Mr. Aspin.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Badillo.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Landrum.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming with Mr. Waldie.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 432, the Committee on Education and Labor is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 795) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BRADEMAS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRADEMAS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 795 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 3926, as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3926) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement concerning the program for the remainder of the day.

We will go forward with H.R. 8152, law enforcement assistance amendments, hoping that the rule will be adopted and then the chairman of the committee will take up the bill for general debate. We anticipate that we will go under the 5-minute rule on the bill on Monday next.

The program for tomorrow will be the agriculture-environmental-consumer protection appropriations for fiscal year 1974.

REQUEST THAT HOUSE CONVENE AT 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Speaker has been very kind to have told all of us that we were going to have Friday sessions during the month of June. We have prepared for that. However, some of us have had some problems. Personally I will be out in my district tomorrow, and I know we are having the agriculture appropriation bill called up. It is not for that purpose, but there are a number of other Members who have made some significant commitments for tomorrow morning. Since it was agreed that we would meet on Friday, we knew we would have a whole day of work on Friday, but I see no reason why we should have to come in

early. Therefore, I regretfully have to object to the request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 211, on Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin's amendment to H.R. 77 on June 12, the RECORD indicates that I did not vote. I was present and I did vote "aye". However, the machine did not record it. I submit this for the purpose of showing I was present and that I did vote "aye."

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 436 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 436

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. 8152) to amend title I of the omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice and for other purposes, and all points of order against section 1 of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 436 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 8152, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

All points of order against section 1 of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill—are waived.

The bill replaces the present system of LEAA administration with an Administrator and a Deputy Administrator. The bill strongly indicates the intention of the Congress that moneys expended under the act address all aspects of the criminal justice system.

H.R. 8152 retains Federal responsibility for administering the program and for assisting the States in comprehensive planning. Approval of State plans is retained as a condition precedent to funding. The bill also reduces the State-local cash-matching-fund requirement to

10 percent, and requires that all planning meetings be open to the public.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8152 is to make a variety of amendments to title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), that established the Federal law enforcement assistance program. Most importantly, the bill would authorize appropriations for the next 2 fiscal years for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—created by the 1968 act as a financial and technical partner for State and local governments in reducing crime and improving the Nation's criminal justice system.

The committee believes the changes in existing law represented by H.R. 8152, as amended, are major steps forward in the fight against crime. Most importantly, the new language addresses those deficiencies that have most severely hampered aspects of LEAA performances in the past.

The bill eliminates the unwieldy "troika" system of LEAA administration, and replaces it with a single Administrator and a Deputy Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Also in this regard, the committee has broadened the definition of law enforcement and criminal justice to include prosecutorial and defender services. The purpose of rehabilitating criminals as well as simply detecting and apprehending them is added to the purpose of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 436 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 8152.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 436 provides for the consideration of H.R. 8152, the law enforcement assistance amendments. This is an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. The rule also contains a provision that waives all points of order against section 1 of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI. This deals with appropriations in a legislative bill.

The purpose of H.R. 8152 is to make a number of amendments to title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, that established the Federal law enforcement assistance program. In addition, the bill authorizes appropriations for the next 2 fiscal years for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA. The total cost of the bill is \$2 billion; \$1 billion for fiscal year 1974 and \$1 billion for fiscal year 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule so that the House may work its will on this legislation. Hopefully the House will defeat the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

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. RODINO. 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. 8152) to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

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. 8152, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI 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 New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

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

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, the House today, in considering the bill, H.R. 8152, addresses as vital an area of concern as any it will consider this Congress. The incidence of crime in a free nation, and the operation of that nation's criminal justice system truly measure the strength of a free society.

In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice told us what every American knew too well:

There is crime in America, more than ever reported, far more than ever is solved, far too much for the health of the Nation.

But the Crime Commission told us something else as well:

America can control crime if it will . . . It must welcome new ideas and risk new actions. It must resist those who point to scapegoats, who use facile slogans about crime by habit or for selfish ends. It must recognize that the government of a free society is obliged not only to act effectively but fairly. It must seek knowledge and admit mistakes.

In 1968, partially in response to the report of the President's Commission, the Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, a comprehensive Federal program to assist the States and localities in reducing crime and improving the Nation's criminal justice system. Approximately \$2 billion has been expended pursuant to that legislation, administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—established within the Department of Justice by title I of the 1968 legislation.

The initial 5-year authorization for the LEAA program expires on June 30 of this year. Beginning on March 15, Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary held 9 full days of hearings on legislation to extend the program. The subcommittee's hearing record comprises 1,000 pages, and is a thorough review of LEAA's achievements and failures to date. Testimony was received from the Attorney General, from Members of Congress, from Governors and mayors, and from representatives of every aspect of law enforcement and criminal justice.

Subsequent to those hearings, the subcommittee met for more than a solid week of markup sessions to produce H.R. 8152, drafted as an amended title I of the existing act, in large part retaining the basic features of that act.

On May 31, the full committee acted favorably on the bill with several amendments. The work of the committee was, at this and at all times throughout this process, greatly assisted by the numerous contributions and wisdom of our distinguished ranking minority member, Mr. HUTCHINSON of Michigan, and by a truly bipartisan commitment to reducing crime and improving our Nation's criminal justice system.

It is the committee's belief that the necessary changes it has made to the 1968 act are major steps forward in the fight against crime. LEAA is authorized appropriations not to exceed \$1 billion for each of the next 2 fiscal years. Equally important, the committee believes it has by this bill addressed, and in large part remedied, those areas of LEAA performance that have been most deficient in the past.

The unwieldy "troika" system of LEAA administration is eliminated and replaced by a single Administrator and Deputy Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The bill makes more emphatic, by numerous new provisions including language adding the words "and criminal justice" to the words "law enforcement" wherever they appear throughout the act, the intention of the Congress that moneys expended under this act address all aspects of the criminal justice system—not merely the police function, though assistance to police remains an important feature of the bill. In addition, the committee has added to the purposes of the act the goal of rehabilitating criminals as well as simply detecting and apprehending them.

Importantly, Mr. Chairman, the committee did not agree to proposals that would have converted this program into a simple "no strings attached" revenue sharing program. In so doing it has retained Federal responsibility for administering the program and for assisting the States in comprehensive planning.

LEAA approval of annual State plans for the use of this money is retained as a condition precedent to funding each State, and LEAA is made more accountable in the performance of this function.

At the same time, new provisions—while assuring appropriate time for meaningful consideration—address the serious problems that have delayed the disbursement of these moneys to the States and localities in the past. LEAA is mandated to review State plans within 90 days of submission, and in turn the States are directed to insure the establishment of procedures that will expedite the flow of their funds to the units of general local government.

It is in these latter regards that I believe this legislation will most greatly enhance the fight against crime. Too often in the past, the Congress has appropriated these desperately needed moneys

only to have the States and localities experience frustrating delays in receiving their funds from both the Federal and State levels. In many cases, these delays have left funds undistributed to the units of general local government over a period of 2 or more fiscal years. Diligent enforcement of the new provisions should result in a faster fund flow, more consistent with the real needs in these areas.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes its bill fairly addresses the needs of all our localities, the needs of our Nation's cities where much of our crime occurs. We have retained the "variable pass-through" formula which, as a national average, assures that about 70 percent of a State's bloc grant must be passed on to units of general local government. The bill also retains the requirement that 40 percent of a State's planning moneys be passed through to localities to insure their input into the planning process, and increases the minimum planning grant to each State from \$100,000 to \$200,000. It provides, as in the past, that before a State plan can be approved, it must assure an "allocation of adequate assistance to deal with law enforcement and criminal justice problems in areas characterized by both high crime incidence and high law enforcement and criminal justice activity."

Other provisions of the bill provide funding incentives for localities that coordinate law enforcement and criminal justice activities with other localities, even where such coordination is achieved over a bistate region.

The complicated matching requirements under the act, the requirements calling for a non-Federal share of the funding, which have traditionally fallen most harshly on the localities, are simplified and made more realistic. All State and local match is reduced to a 10-percent cash match, and the State share of the local match is increased to an aggregate 50 percent. All so-called "soft-match" or noncash match requirements are eliminated, ending what the committee believes are only causes for imaginative bookkeeping by recipients and nightmarish monitoring problems for LEAA.

The committee bill has also removed the limitations on the use of grant moneys to compensate law enforcement and criminal justice personnel other than police. In this regard, States and localities are given greater flexibility in meeting their anticrime needs as they themselves perceive them.

Very importantly, Mr. Chairman, this bill makes the operation of the LEAA program more widely accountable at both its planning and operative stages. The planning process is opened up by new provisions calling for open public meetings when final action is taken on fund applications, and by new provisions mandating the Governor to include on the State planning agency representatives of citizen, professional, and community organizations.

At the operative level, State plans themselves must provide for fund accounting, audit, monitoring, and evaluation procedures necessary to assure fiscal control and proper management of funds.

In addition, ongoing programs and projects must maintain the data and information necessary to allow the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to perform its broadened evaluation role. In this regard, the Institute is directed to evaluate programs and projects funded by the act and to include a summary of its evaluations in an annual report to the Congress, the President, and the State Planning Agencies.

The Institute is also given a strengthened role in developing training programs and serving as a clearinghouse to stimulate research and reform.

Part E of the act, the special section added in 1970 to assure adequate attention to corrections is retained, as is LEEP, the law enforcement education program, strengthened to keep pace with the rise in the cost of living.

The bill also provides that LEAA may make grants from its 15-percent discretionary funds to private nonprofit organizations. Many important programs relating to law enforcement and criminal justice involve more than one State or locality or are national in scope. Such programs cannot be appropriately funded by a single State. Nonetheless, present law requires that LEAA grants be awarded to units of State and local government with the result that a State planning agency must be willing to accept the administrative burden of serving as the conduit for funding to nonprofit organizations which are qualified to operate the multi-State programs. The addition of nonprofit organizations to the list of those entities entitled to receive LEAA funds would eliminate the cumbersome administrative arrangement currently employed and relieve State Planning Agencies of the unwarranted burden of administering grants to nonprofit organizations for programs which may have little direct relationship to the "host" State. The addition of nonprofit organizations is intended to facilitate the funding of programs operated by organizations such as, but by no means limited to: The National District Attorneys Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, the YMCA, and the Urban League. It is not the intention of the committee that private "nonprofit organization" in this context be construed to mean neighborhood, community patrol activities.

For the first time the act itself contains provisions protecting civil rights and civil liberties. In addition to deleting prohibitions against conditioning a grant on the adoption by an applicant of a quota system or other program to achieve racial balance, the bill reiterates the antidiscrimination requirements of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but also prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex. The bill strengthens the ban on discrimination by making clear that the fund cutoff provisions of section 509 of the act and of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 both apply, and that appropriate civil actions may be filed by the administration, and that "pattern and practice" suits may be filed by the Attorney General. The bill would also add provisions guaranteeing the right to privacy

with regard to research and statistical data gathered under the act.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the Nation's bipartisan commitment to reducing crime and upgrading our criminal justice system is well served by H.R. 8152. I urge its adoption by the full House.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Thirty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 225]		
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Moorhead, Pa.
Anderson,	Fisher	Nedzi
Calif.	Ford	Nichols
Anderson, Ill.	Gerald R.	Nix
Arends	Ford	O'Hara
Ashbrook	William D.	O'Neill
Ashley	Fraser	Patman
Aspin	Fuqua	Pepper
Badiilo	Giaimo	Peyser
Bafalis	Gilman	Powell, Ohio
Barrett	Gunter	Pritchard
Bell	Hanna	Railsback
Blester	Hansen, Wash.	Rangel
Bingham	Harsha	Reid
Blatnik	Hastings	Riegle
Boland	Hawkins	Roncalio, Wyo.
Bowen	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Broyhill, Va.	Holfield	Roybal
Burke, Calif.	Holt	Ruppe
Carey, N.Y.	Huber	Sandman
Cederberg	Hunt	Schneebell
Chamberlain	Jarman	Schroeder
Chappell	Johnson, Pa.	Seiberling
Chisholm	King	Sikes
Clark	Kluczynski	Staggers
Collier	Kuykendall	Stark
Collins, Tex.	Landrum	Steed
Coughlin	Lehman	Steelman
Crane	Litton	Stratton
Daniel	McDade	Symms
Robert W., Jr.	McFall	Talcott
Daniels	McKinney	Teague, Tex.
Dominick V.	McSpadden	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Macdonald	Tierman
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Walde
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Nebr.	Whalen
Delaney	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Dent	Meeds	Widnall
Devine	Mills, Ark.	Wiggins
Dickinson	Mitchell, N.Y.	Williams
Diggs	Mizell	Yatron
Edwards, Calif.	Moakley	
Erlenborn	Moorhead,	
Esch	Calif.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8152, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, when 306 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) had concluded his remarks and had consumed 18 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to simply

conclude general debate on this LEAA bill this evening and not go into the 5-minute rule at all. I would yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. RODINO) for a verification of that situation.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, that is entirely correct. I should like to point out to the Members of the House we are under time pressure, so to speak, as authorization for LEAA expires on June 30, and I would hope the House would be indulgent in at least allowing general debate to proceed.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8152, a bill to extend the life of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for 2 years. This legislation is a matter of some urgency because LEAA otherwise expires at the end of this month.

Five years ago we embarked on still another program of Federal aid—law enforcement assistance. Like all Federal aid programs this one has grown, and the bill we now consider authorizes \$1 billion for fiscal 1974 and another \$1 billion for fiscal 1975. But the billion-dollar authorization contained in H.R. 8152 for fiscal 1974 compares with \$1 1/4 billion authorized for fiscal 1973—a sizable reduction.

From 1960 to 1968 the Nation's crime rate doubled. Now, the great volume of crimes are violations of State laws. Most of those accused of crime are charged with violation of State law. They are apprehended by State or local police. They are arraigned before State judges. They are tried in State courts and before State juries. Upon conviction they are sent to State penitentiaries or jails, or placed on probation in the State system. They are paroled to State parole officers. The whole system of criminal justice is overwhelmingly within the jurisdiction of the States.

The Federal role is properly only one of assistance to the States. In the Safe Streets Act of 1968, Congress set out to provide financial assistance. The Federal purpose was to encourage the States and their local subdivisions to improve their law enforcement techniques.

At the outset there was much ground work to do. Generous funding in the beginning would have been wasteful.

Thus appropriations for fiscal year 1969 were \$63 million; for 1970: \$268 million; for 1971: \$529 million; for 1972: \$699 million; and for this fiscal year: \$855 million. A sum of \$891 million is requested for fiscal year 1974.

In the meantime during calendar year 1969 the crime rate rose 11 percent; in 1970, 11 percent; and in 1971, 6 percent. But in 1972 the crime rate actually decreased by 3 percent. And in our Nation's largest cities, the crime rate dropped even more dramatically. In cities exceeding 100,000 in population, the crime rate dropped 7 percent; in cities exceeding 250,000 in population, the crime rate dropped 8 percent; in cities exceeding 1 million in population, it dropped 12 percent.

The skyrocketing crime rate has finally been brought back to Earth.

I believe that LEAA deserves some credit for this. It has had its share of

problems, but I believe that its deficiencies have been, or are about to be, worked out. It has stimulated improvements in law enforcement and criminal justice. At long last there are agencies in every State organized to plan a rational attack against crime. Just a few years ago the various elements were disparate, independent, and isolated; now they are beginning to come together. Now police, courts, and corrections are talking to each other. Local governments are cooperating and combining law enforcement and criminal justice functions. And that is an accomplishment that cannot be overemphasized.

That result has been achieved through State leadership, which is the key to meeting the problem of crime. The Federal Government is too far removed from the locus of crime to assume control of the problem. And if it did, we would witness the unwanted specter of a national police force and all its inherent dangers. At the other end of the governmental spectrum, the units of local government often do not bear responsibility for all aspects of the law enforcement and criminal justice system. Moreover, a great many of the units of local government are operationally too small: crime is not contained exclusively within their boundaries, and the multiplicity of local government breeds fragmentation and inefficiency.

Thus the States emerge as the entity capable of meeting the crime problem and as the entity responsible for meeting it. They alone can make a truly comprehensive attack on crime; they alone can mold into a cohesive whole previously isolated components of the system.

State leadership is evidenced by the State planning agencies that have been established pursuant to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. But in praising these planning agencies I do not mean to pit the States against their political subdivisions. For it is all too often forgotten that these planning agencies that act on behalf of the State are truly local in their composition. Sixty percent of the Board members of the State planning agencies represent local interests. This, I believe, accounts for the success of the State planning agencies. Their existence is a vehicle whereby representatives of local governments help fashion a statewide comprehensive plan to meet the needs of the people residing in the State. If it is claimed that a certain locality did not get a "fair share" of the funds, it should be noted that those funds went to other units of local government and were channeled there by representatives of local governments.

However, it is argued that the funds are not channeled to major urban areas of a State where there is likely to be the most crime. This claim may once have been sound. It no longer is. Congress acted in 1970 to require adequate assistance for high-crime urban areas. The result is that last year these areas which had 49 percent of the population and 70 percent of the crime in their respective States received 71.3 percent of the money made available to all units of local government.

H.R. 8152 as reported makes many amendments to present law. However, to its credit the bill preserves the basic structure of the LEAA program. The amendments are designed to perfect the present program, and most of them, in my opinion, would do so.

The bill encourages LEAA to give greater scrutiny to State comprehensive plans to insure that these plans actually work to improve the quality of law enforcement and criminal justice. In turn, the States are required to offer extra funds or to withhold funds from local governments to encourage them to coordinate or combine law enforcement and criminal justice functions or activities. These "funding incentives" will be made available out of funds required to be passed through to local governments under section 303(a)(2). A similar provision in section 306(a) requires that LEAA use discretionary funds to encourage coordination in an interstate context. It is intended that such grants be made primarily to adjacent jurisdictions in different States that suffer a common crime problem which might be appreciably alleviated by coordinating law enforcement and criminal justice functions or activities.

Another amendment made by H.R. 8152 would simplify the matching requirements. Presently, all recipients of LEAA funds—with the exception of the relatively minor categorical-grant programs in part D of the act—must match the Federal dollars by meeting some of the expenses of a program or project on their own. If my memory serves me correctly, Congress never intended that the match be anything but money. Indeed, it was Federal money that was being matched. But somehow an administrative decision was made to accept what is called a "soft match," or noncash match. Once the practice was permitted, it became difficult to go back entirely to a "hard match," or cash match. So in 1970 Congress changed the matching ratio from 60 percent Federal, 40 percent non-Federal to 75 percent Federal, 25 percent non-Federal but further specifically required that 40 percent of the 25 percent part C block grant match be in cash.

This compromise in principle was financially easier for recipients to accept but was administratively more burdensome. For now we have two kinds of match. And more important, a soft match can be manufactured by clever bookkeeping. For a State or local government can add costs to a program or project which it has already paid or would pay in any case. Then it becomes the task of LEAA to check compliance, and this takes time and effort.

The purposes of requiring a match for Federal funds were: First, to insure State and local legislative oversight and thus guarantee some State and local political control over federally assisted programs; second, to bring into play the State and local fiscal controls to minimize the chances of waste; and third, to underscore the responsibility on the part of State and local government to fight

crime. None of these purposes is served by a soft match. Instead, it fosters imaginative bookkeeping and produces administrative burdens.

H.R. 8152 would put an end to the soft match. Wherever a match is required, it would become a 10-percent hard match—except for part C construction programs and projects which would remain at 50 percent but would become all hard match.

So desirable did it seem to eliminate soft match and transfer to a hard match requirement that H.R. 8152 would make this change with regard to unobligated funds made available prior to July 1, 1973. It should be made clear that funds "not obligated" are those not awarded or committed by the State or local governments. If the State or local government has contracted for a project or has effectively awarded the funds to one of its agencies, the funds are, for purposes of section 523, considered as "obligated."

If a program or project is in operation but not completed, it is not intended that the new matching requirements be applied to the remainder, even though under accounting practices the governmental unit may not be as yet obligated to pay. Likewise, it should be clear that if a State has awarded funds to a unit of local government and the unit has not, in turn, further obligated the funds by award or contract, the funds are not obligated and the new matching requirements would apply. In other words, the fact that the funds in the hands of a unit of local government came through the State does not of itself change the result that would otherwise obtain.

Another amendment, section 524, protects the implied confidentiality of data identifiable to specific individuals that has been gathered for research or statistical purposes. The provision is analogous to that governing data similarly supplied to the Census Bureau. Data gathered for such research or statistical purposes may be used only for the purposes obtained.

Two other amendments were designed to speed the flow of funds to recipients. These amendments are in my opinion either counterproductive or "harmless error." The first amendment would require that LEAA approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, State plans within 90 days. Testimony before the committee indicated that there was no existing problem for States in obtaining a prompt response from LEAA upon the submission of a plan. Current guidelines require a response within 30 days, and I believe that it is generally adhered to. Thus this amendment is "harmless error" unless it is construed to authorize delays short of 90 days in responding to submissions of State plans.

The second attempt to force a swifter flow of funds was addressed to a different juncture. This amendment would require that the States adopt procedures to pass on applications by local governments within 60 days. In committee, it was asked whether this would impose an unreasonable burden on the States since not all applications are simultaneously submitted and thus it would not be possible for the States to fulfill their

mandate to establish priorities and formulate plans. It was then determined that the "procedures" the States could adopt would embrace the establishment of a deadline for the submission of applications and from which the 60 days would run. This should be emphasized because it means to me that the "60 days" may be much longer than 60 days on the calendar.

Even so, a 60-day period between the deadline for submitting applications and the date by which applications must be approved or disapproved is not a long time for those States that formulate their plans on the basis of applications from local governments. Since the amendment would compel such States to develop their plans while they are deciding on applications, those States might find it easier to formulate plans before local governments have an opportunity to express themselves. I doubt that this is the purpose of the amendment, but it may be the result. One solution may be "procedures" to require "phantom" applications to be made before the plan is developed so that the "real" applications can be submitted after the plan is developed. But there we are again—with more redtape.

Other amendments are made by the reported bill which in my opinion fall into the class of "harmful error." These are described in the additional views of the minority members of the committee which appear beginning on page 37 of the report. They are three in number:

First, the failure to preserve intact the present limitations on the use of LEAA funds to pay the salaries of regular personnel;

Second, the requirement that every SPA and every regional planning unit include representatives of citizen, professional, and community organizations; and

Third, the addition to the list of eligible grantees of discretionary funds of "private nonprofit organizations."

I am informed that amendments will be offered to cure these defects in due course, and I urge their adoption.

I recognize that the hour is late and that the matters discussed are highly technical and may, therefore, have not been very entertaining to listen to. But let me assure the Members of this body that I would not have taken the time were it not important to establish a legislative history that evidences our intent in acting on this legislation. I thank the Members for their indulgence.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I support the committee's bill. If adopted, it will, in my opinion, be a substantial improvement over the present law. The provisions for speeding up the approval of State plans and grant applications at both the Federal and State levels, if they are followed in practice, could eliminate one of the most serious problems that has existed in the administration of the law up to the present time, namely the excessive delays in getting LEAA funds down to local law enforcement and criminal justice personnel, where most of the efforts against crime necessarily must be made.

The bill's provisions for expediting the

flow of funds, and for strengthening the oversight role of the Judiciary Committee, have made it possible for the bill also to eliminate some of the rigidities in the present law. This will permit greater flexibility in administration both at the Federal and State levels. The bill also provides for a better balanced program by making explicit the intent of the Congress to improve not only the effectiveness of the Nation's police forces but the entire criminal justice system. In addition, the bill makes provision for open meetings, and for citizen and community participation and strengthens protections for civil rights and the right of privacy.

The chairman and members of the committee are certainly deserving of commendation for these achievements. This is not to say that further improvements are not possible. In fact, I believe one other major change in the present law would be highly desirable.

It is important that we have all possible assurance that the funds authorized by this bill will in fact do something significant about the Nation's crime problem. It is the Nation's problem because even though most crimes are local in character, the problem of crime is national in its impact.

That is why the Congress in 1968 passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, of which the Law Enforcement Assistance Act is a part. Now what do we find 5 years later, after having appropriated over \$2½ billion under this act?

We find that the Nation's crime rate has gone up 29 percent since 1968 and that the rate of violent crime has gone up even faster increasing 39 percent between 1968 and 1972. Last year, violent crimes hit an alltime high.

In the light of these depressing statistics, we certainly have a duty to ask ourselves, when we are considering extending the law enforcement assistance program, whether the taxpayers are getting maximum value from this expenditure of their money.

If there is one outstanding weakness in the existing program it is that it contains no assurance that the States will put their share of law enforcement assistance money to work where it will have the maximum effect in the fight against crime. Obviously, the bulk of this money should go to the law enforcement agencies in the places where the bulk of the crime is.

And where is most of the Nation's crime? Not in the rural areas and small urban centers but in the large cities and their suburbs, where roughly one-half of the Nation's population lives and where the vast majority of the crimes are committed. FBI statistics show that the 155 cities which have a population above 100,000 have 60.8 percent of the violent crime, including 50.4 percent of the rapes, 54.6 percent of the murders, and 73.2 percent of the robberies. A list of these cities is printed at the end of the committee's report on the bill.

The committee's bill, like the present law, requires that the major part of law enforcement assistance fund allocated to each State be passed on to local units

of government. In the committee, I offered amendments, which were not adopted, that would have refined this to require the State to pass on a guaranteed minimum bloc grant of these funds to each metropolitan county with a crime rate above the State average which has a population above 350,000 or which contains a city above 100,000. In determining the amount of the grant, the high crime area's population would be given a weight of one and the crime rate would be given a weight of two. This would not mean that the State could not grant more than this minimum, but at least the high crime areas would be guaranteed no less.

Under the amendments, the funds would be received and distributed by existing regional planning agencies or by a new agency, if the majority of the local governments desired one. This would end the wasteful, costly and inefficient method in the present law, whereby the local governments must process each grant application through multilayered regional, State, and national bureaucratic levels. It would substitute one single level, the regional planning unit, controlled by and responsive to the local governments. The only condition would be that the local unit submit a plan to the State showing how it intends to use the funds. If the central city and the suburbs were unable to agree on a plan, the Governor could authorize the city to constitute itself a separate planning unit within the high crime urban area.

I would like to emphasize that the amendments would not deprive the State of its ability to allocate any law enforcement assistance funds other than those earmarked for high crime urban areas. Furthermore, the amendments would permit the Governor of each State to depart from the stated formula with respect to any particular high crime urban area if he found that the formula would create an imbalance in the distribution of law enforcement assistance funds in the State.

Mr. Chairman, over the last 2 years Congressman JAMES V. STANTON and I have written mayors and law enforcement officials in cities all across the country to ask whether they believed they were receiving an appropriate share of Federal law enforcement assistance funds. Even though many of them were reluctant to speak out, for obvious reasons, the replies we did receive fill 130 pages of fine print in the Judiciary Subcommittee record of hearings on this bill. Overwhelmingly, these mayors and city managers and police chiefs indicated that large metropolitan areas were being drastically shortchanged and the money was instead being broadcast over their States, with very little regard for the degree of crime in the various areas of the State. I wish time permitted me to read some of their comments. Those interested will find them on pages 736 through 865 of the subcommittee's printed hearing record.

Obviously, it is no accident that the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors this year specifi-

cally recommended major changes in the law along the lines of the amendments offered to the committee.

We must not tolerate a "pork barrel" approach by any State in distributing law enforcement assistance funds to local communities. The struggle against crime and violence and for criminal justice is too desperate, the funds too meager in proportion to the task, to allow the bulk of them to be sent anywhere except where the crime is or to allow them to be used in any but the most efficient way.

Mr. Chairman, believing my amendments which failed in committee would have provided much needed assurance that the law enforcement assistance funds would be used with maximum effectiveness, I had considered offering a version of them on the floor. However, because of their technical nature, they are ill-adapted for consideration except in committee. Since the other body has yet to act on this bill, there remains the possibility that such amendments will be considered there.

Accordingly, I ask only that the amendments be printed in the Record following these remarks, in order that all Members may have the opportunity of considering them in the event some such proposal should eventually come before the House again.

Let me add that, in the absence of such amendments, it becomes all the more important that the funding authorization in the bill not be extended to cover any period longer than the 2 years set forth in the bill. This period will put both the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the State planning agencies on notice that the Judiciary Committee will be performing a close oversight of their actions to assure that all funds appropriated under the bill are actually distributed to the areas of greatest need.

The amendments follow:

AMENDMENT (No. 1) TO H.R. 8152, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

Page 15, line 8, strike out "and".

Page 16, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: ";" and".

Page 16, immediately after line 8, insert the following:

"(13) provide that all cities above 100,000 population, all counties, and all other consenting units of general local government, but not less than a majority of all units of general local government, in each high crime urban area within such State shall participate in a regional planning unit which shall (A) assist in the development of the comprehensive State plan, (B) take receipts from the State planning agency of all Federal funds granted under this part for use in such high crime urban area, and (C) assist in coordinating all law enforcement and criminal justice efforts within such high crime urban area which are in whole or in part assisted by Federal funds under this title. A regional planning unit will qualify under this paragraph even if it represents units of general local government outside the high crime urban area or performs functions for a larger geographical area or that relate to activities other than law enforcement and criminal justice.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, if the chief executive of the State finds that any city with a population above 100,000 in any specific high crime

urban area is unable to reach a consensus with the other participants in the regional planning unit as to a plan for submission under subsection 303 (d), he/she may authorize such city to form a separate regional planning unit for purposes of this title, which shall take receipts from the State planning agency of that proportion of the Federal funds granted under this part for use in such high crime urban area that such city would receive if it were a separate high crime urban area.

AMENDMENT (No. 2) TO H.R. 8152, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

Page 17, immediately after line 14, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) No plan shall be approved unless there is made available in the form of an annual bloc grant under such plan to every regional planning unit which has been established under section 303(a) (13) for a high crime urban area in the State and which has submitted a plan to the State planning agency for the use of the funds made available under this subsection, that percent of the funds required to be made available to the units of general local government under section 303 (a) (2) which is computed as follows:

"(1) Compute the percentage of the population of the State represented by the population of such high crime urban area, according to the most recent available decennial census.

"(2) Add to the percentage so computed two times the percentage of all reported crime in the State represented by the greater of (A) all reported crime in such high crime urban area or (B) all reported crime in all cities with a population above 100,000 in such high crime urban area, as determined by the most recent uniform crime report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(3) Divide the sum obtained under paragraph (2) by three.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the State plan may vary from the foregoing formula with respect to any specific high crime urban area, if the chief executive of the State publicly declares that following such formula in such case would create an imbalance of law enforcement and criminal justice funds distribution in the State. Should the chief executive issue such a declaration, it shall be incumbent upon him/her working with the State Planning Agency, to otherwise assure that substantial funds made available to the State under this part are directed to the high crime urban area in the form of bloc grants as provided in section 303(a) (13). The State planning agency may also direct into a high crime urban area, in accordance with needs as determined by the State planning agency, funds available under this part, in addition to those that the high crime urban area would receive under the formula set forth in this subsection.

AMENDMENT (No. 3) TO H.R. 8152, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

Page 50, immediately after line 14, insert the following new subsection:

"(n) The term 'high crime urban area' means:

"(1) any city with a population above 100,000, together with any county having such a city or cities within its boundaries;

"(2) any city with a population above 100,000 which has jurisdiction over all normal county criminal justice functions; or

"(3) any county with a population above 350,000;

if the share of the total state reported crime within such city or county is equal to or greater than the share of the total state population.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA) having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, 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. 8152) to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1973, I requested, and was granted, official leave of absence due to illness in my family. As a result of my absence, I am recorded as not voting on rollcalls 194 and 195.

As a matter of record, I would like to state at this time that had I been present in the House Chamber on June 7, I would have voted "nay" on House Resolution 382, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 (rollcall 194); and "yea" on H.R. 7645, Department of State Authorization Act of 1973 (rollcall 195).

PRESIDENT NIXON'S TALK ON THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, last night the American people, with expectations high, were treated to a classical Nixon performance. It took the form of a lecture and lockerroom peptalk on the tragic state of our economy.

"Those who proposed actions that would lead inevitably to a permanent system of price and wage controls," were not, we were told, to lead us. We were also told that we would not, "put the American economy in a straitjacket." Further, we were told, "we are not going to control the boom in a way that would lead to a bust."

What then would we do? We would all do our part. Had not we been fortunate that ours was an economy, "by far the freest, strongest, and the most productive economy in the whole world." And then we were informed that we would have phase IV to deal with the problem of shortages brought on by increased demand, both here and abroad. These new phase IV controls, we are told, will control such forces.

We were not told a number of other things, however. The President did not tell us that phase III was a disaster, largely because of its conception and implementation from the top. He failed to inform his preempted audience that he ignored all warnings on ending phase II too soon and over the faults in phase III.

Such warnings came from all sides and from every economic literature in the Nation, with a handful of exceptions. He failed to claim credit for the consequences of his 6-month delay in imposing new controls, while America paid the major economic price for the inevitable consequences of his past actions.

He failed to make mention of the unwise grain deals with Russia at domestic expense in order for him to make short-lived political gains. Now higher prices for bread tell the sad tale, even if he did not choose to do so last night.

The same is true of higher milk, lumber, and oil and gas prices, as well as in a number of other strategic areas where consumers pay more because of preferential treatment by Government of a number of industries with heavy power concentrations.

Lettuce at 69 cents a head and hamburger at prices steak used to sell for tell their own story. Interest rates and housing costs tell the same tale.

Instead, last night the President pulled the same moth-eaten rabbit out of the same scruffy hat. He set up straw men and waved ghostly threats, mainly, of his own creation. But he never named names, informing us of our true foes.

Saddest of all, nothing he said reassures us that he better understands the economic problems and fundamental rules of economics than when he ordered an end to phase II. His on-the-job economic education and training continues at national expense.

As President he should be listened to, but such advice as he has need not necessarily be accepted as gospel. There must be better answers at hand for the average working person. Or better instructors in economics. Certainly locker-room exhortations and peptalks will not solve or alleviate any of our present self-inflicted difficulties.

BREZHNEV'S VISIT—WHAT COST TO AMERICAN SECURITY?

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, Leonid Brezhnev will be here in Washington, D.C., to meet with and probably to announce various agreements with President Nixon. Where has all the attention and debate been that should mark this occasion? It has been strangely absent.

Absent is the concern that should be given to this visit.

Absent are the questions that must be raised.

Absent is the concern over the deteriorating U.S. national security position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

The little discussion which has been taking place has largely been on the glories of détente. On how the Soviet Union allegedly is turning away from confrontation to negotiation, and on how it is turning to the West to negotiate agreements to lessen tensions. President Nixon, in his foreign policy report to the Congress, speaks of "a new era in international relations."

What is the new era of which the President speaks? What does it mean for the United States? What does it mean for our national security? What does it portend for the future?

First, let us determine what is new about the present era of United States-Soviet relations. Is it attributable to new internal policies in the Soviet Union? Perhaps, the Soviet Union is treating its own citizens better? Perhaps, there is actually an opening up of Soviet society?

Let us take a look at the treatment of Soviet Jews. This has received much attention in the West. Recently, there have been reports of the unofficial ending of the exit tax and a general loosening of restrictions on the Jews. However, less publicized reports speak of increasing repression since Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union.

In an earlier speech, I have discussed the testimony of Mr. Avraham Shifrin, a Russian Jew now residing in Israel. He points out that—

There are millions of prisoners in the concentration camps and prisons of the Soviet Union today; that the camps—far from having disappeared—number into the thousands; and that the conditions are just as bestial as they were in the days of Stalin.

Moiseev, a 20-year-old, was a Christian in the Soviet Army. He was placed in ice-boxes and in rubber suits into which air was pumped terribly compressing his chest. On July 17, 1972, his family was given him in a coffin and told he had died accidentally. The coffin was opened. Moiseev had been stabbed six times in the heart and had his skull fractured.

In Latvia, Fricis Menderes who is 84 years old and former Chairman of the Social-Democratic Party was sentenced to 5 years of imprisonment.

In August, September, and November, a number of Buddhists were arrested—including Donatus Butus, Aleksander Zelezov, Vladimir Montlevich, and Yuriy Lavrov. They were confined to a psychiatric hospital.

General Grigorenko protested against the "trials" of Sinyavsky and Daniel, of Vladimir Bukovsky, and Yuri Galanskov and Alexander Ginzburg. May 7, 1969, he was arrested and has spent more than 4 years since then in various KGB prisons and mental institutions.

Andrei Amalrik, the author of "Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984," was tried and found guilty in 1970 for "disseminating falsehoods derogatory to the Soviet state and social system." His 3-year term in a so-called labor camp or, more accurately, concentration camp was up May 21, 1973. He has not been released. Instead he is still being held and being investigated for new charges, under the same law, for which he was convicted in 1970. The only place he could have "disseminated falsehoods" since his arrest in 1969 is in that concentration camp where he has been a prisoner.

These and thousands of other examples conclusively show there is no loosening in the internal situation of the Soviet Union.

Perhaps then, the Soviet Union has changed in that it no longer seeks worldwide domination and the overthrow of the United States. Perhaps, this is where

the U.S. efforts at détente are being matched.

The Soviet Navy is building more ships and expanding its activities. Its Navy can now be found in all the oceans, the Mediterranean, Caribbean, and the Persian Gulf—to mention a few areas. Norman Polmar, the American editor of Jane's Fighting Ships, states:

Almost every year of the past decade has seen more Soviet ships at sea, farther from the Soviet homeland, and at sea for longer periods of time. In conjunction with this extension of blue-water operations has been the increased use of overseas ports and facilities, open-sea anchorages where Soviet ships cannot easily use foreign bases, and the development of the techniques as well as the equipment needed for deploying ships at sea (such as afloat support of ships and underway replenishment).

The Soviet Navy is obviously furthering Soviet goals at the expense of American interests throughout the world.

The Institute for the Study of Conflict, based in London has just issued a report which concludes that the total Soviet domination of Cuba gives the Soviet Union a conveniently located and increasingly useful base from which trade, educational propaganda and revolutionary movements can be promoted throughout South and Central America and the Caribbean. Additionally, the Institute points to the construction of a nuclear-submarine base at Cienfuegos, "the use of which greatly increases the effective capacity of the Soviet Navy in the Atlantic."

The Soviets realize the importance of oil to both the West and Japan. Their pressures have been increasing in the important Persian Gulf area.

In the Helsinki discussions on mutual force reductions—MBFR—the Soviets have shown that they are still trying to destroy NATO and the Western alliance by engaging in secret, bilateral talks with Germany and France. In the words of Walter Laqueur of the Institute of Contemporary History—

Soviet intentions vis-a-vis Western Europe are no secret. The Russians feel that the stalemate which has prevailed since 1949 is now out of date, and since the balance of power in Europe has changed in their favor, they hope gradually to achieve a much greater say in West European affairs.

What this means is simple. The Soviet Union is still attempting to gain control of Western Europe. Their goals have not changed.

Soviet military power is increasing. The Soviet presence throughout the world is increasing. Evidence of any Soviet turning from its expansion is slight, if not nonexistent.

The Economist of May 26, 1973, gives the following analysis:

West Germany has accepted the Oder-Neisse frontier and, for the foreseeable future, the division of Germany; east Germany is gaining international recognition; western grain (to say nothing of EEC butter) is already relieving Russia's food shortage; western finance and technology are coming along to ease its more general economic difficulties. And all this has been achieved without any Soviet concessions on any really crucial points. Russia's grip on eastern Europe, its huge military apparatus, and its defences

against penetration by disturbing ideas are still intact. And it is still entirely possible that the result of encouraging people to think that détente has already arrived will be a one-sided measure of disarmament by the west and therefore a shift in the whole balance of European power.

One of the major bases for this supposed détente is the Soviet need to buy Western agricultural products and, more importantly, technology. The Soviet grain deal, the sale of machinery, the building of the Kama River truck plant, all are examples of this Soviet need.

The benefits of the wheat deal to the American farmer, the consumer, or taxpayer are increasingly open to doubt. Estimates state the American taxpayer gave more than \$300 million of his tax dollars to subsidize the Soviet purchase. CBS News has stated the cost to American consumers has been another \$300 million in increased prices. The American farmer sold at low prices and the higher prices cut the subsidy available to a number of southwestern farmers.

Additionally, this whole deal was financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Department of Agriculture. The interest rate was 6 1/2 percent. This rate is less than that at which the U.S. Government can borrow money. American businessmen must borrow at much higher rates commercially.

The wheat sale was a good deal—for the Soviets. This deal has been one of the praised fruits of détente.

In SALT I, the United States agreed to 1,618 Soviet land-based ICBM's to our 1,054 and 62 Soviet Polaris-type submarines to our 44. This resulted in the "Jackson Amendment" to prohibit future concessions which would result in an even greater American weakness compared to the Soviet Union.

Now, my colleague, Congressman SPENCE, has given information that President Nixon may give more dangerous SALT concessions to Brezhnev during his visit here. These include limiting the U.S. multiple warhead missile programs—the Minuteman III, the Air Force's land-based ICBM, the Navy's Poseidon, and the not yet deployed Trident submarine-launched missile. What concessions, if any, that the Soviet Union may make are unknown.

Too often, the Soviet Union has proceeded on the assumption that what was theirs was theirs and what was ours was negotiable. Too often, American Presidents have allowed them to get away with this.

U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union is being built on the assumption that it is necessary to stabilize the Soviet Union and its leadership. By such stabilization, the hope is that Soviets will understand that their true interests lie in peace and good relations with other states.

Through trade, arms agreements, and other negotiations, the Nixon administration hopes to change the Soviet Union. Leonid Brezhnev and the Soviet Union, in turn, want and desperately need Western technology and help. They need credits in the billions of dollars for purchases and technology to exploit their resources.

The Soviets know that an advanced

technological industrial base is necessary for military strength. They are depending upon the West, and particularly the United States to help provide them with that base. Their economy continues to fail. Their military power continues to grow. Their goals have not changed.

In conclusion, I quote one who knows the Soviet Union and communism well:

The spirit of Munich has by no means retreated into the past . . . the spirit of Munich is dominant in the twentieth century. The intimidated civilized world has found nothing to oppose the onslaught of a suddenly resurgent fang-bearing barbarism, except concessions and smiles.

The words are those of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

The United States can no longer afford to misunderstand the Soviet menace. Dreams of a happier world if we only give the Soviet Union what they desire are foolishness. The issue is the continuing existence of free men in the United States and the world. Let us not further compromise our position, our integrity, and our freedom. If we do, the whole world loses.

A SAD ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I join with others of my colleagues in commemorating a sad anniversary. It is now 33 years since the Soviets invaded Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and seized them by force of arms.

The United States and other freedom-loving nations of the world stood by while this tragedy occurred. We can take comfort only in the fact that the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

Now we stand on the threshold of a new era of peace. We are beginning talks that promise to build a foundation for improved relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. But what of the Baltic States?

Lithuania fell under the yoke of Soviet dictatorship on June 15, 1940. Are we now to forget that act of infamy? Nay, it must never be acceded to by the Lithuanians themselves or by any of the freedom-loving people of the earth. It is a horrible injustice which must one day be put right.

Today I voice my continuing support for the just efforts of Lithuanians everywhere to reestablish their country as an independent state and to free their homeland from Russian control.

It is my view that any man who is dedicated to the principles of freedom and justice and informs himself of the manner in which the Soviet Union subjugated the Lithuanian people cannot help but be their ally in a persistent struggle to free them.

I am not surprised that Lithuanians consider themselves betrayed by the agreement entered into February 11, 1945, at Yalta by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin. There is

no question that the Yalta Agreement appeared to seal the fate of all of the nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

The Government of the United States had clearly closed its eyes to aggression by the Soviet Union after fighting a bloody war to cleanse the world of aggression by Nazi Germany and Japan.

Yet it is a fact of historic importance that the United States has never recognized the validity of the Russian occupation of the Baltic nations. And in this there is hope for Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians—and for the entire world. It means that the concept of freedom still lives—that it can never be extinguished by force of arms or the brutal suppression of a people. It means that there must come a time when the forces of freedom will rally to turn back the forces of darkness and oppression. Let us today look to the future and pledge that we will never rest until the Baltic States are once again free and independent.

FEDERAL ATTACK ON RISING RENTS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FORSYTHE), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, the rapidly rising cost of living is of concern to all of us. Wholesale prices soared at an annual rate of 24 percent last month. Retail prices have kept pace. We are experiencing the highest rate of inflation in 20 years.

In the coming weeks I will be addressing the question of soaring food costs, the price of shoes, and the spiralling cost of lumber which is having a significant impact on the price of new housing. Today, however, I would like to address the question of rising apartment rental fees.

Rent stabilization was born out of efforts to control rampant inflation in the rental housing industry. However, as phase 1 evolved into phase 2, I became concerned by the apparent fact that the benefits and burdens of the President's program were not being shared equally. Inflation in the rental housing industry was not being curbed, it was being institutionalized by the average transaction rule. Throughout the phase 2 period, I urged the adoption of a clear and consistent rent formula such as one that confines rent increases to a level commensurate with the landlord's fixed expenses. Unfortunately, my protestations fell on deaf ears.

With the lifting of even these controls, we have witnessed what can only be characterized as money grab by certain landlords. In recent weeks, numerous complaints from residents of my district has revealed recent rent increases ranging up to 40 percent. Increases of this magnitude are clearly above the level that can be tolerated by the average tenant.

When landlords were free to pass along the vast bulk, if not all of their fixed expenses under phase II, it is questionable whether these same landlords can now justify increases of the current magnitude. Many tenants now facing these large levies received one or more in-

creases under phase II. And I will not belabor the obvious and frequently tragic dilemma of Americans living on fixed incomes. What is happening to these individuals often amounts to nothing less than a confiscation of the recently approved rise in social security payments. Nor will I dwell on the situation of the worker who receives a rent increase of 10 to 40 percent on the same day that his employer is explaining to him the 5.5 percent wage guideline. Under the phase III and coming phase IV program, our goal must be the equality of sacrifice, not the sacrifice of equality.

I believe the President erred in not including rents in the present 60-day freeze. For an apartment dweller, rent is usually the largest item in the family budget. Too many landlords are insisting on pursuing an inflationary policy. The situation in many cities in the Northeast corridor encourages this situation as these cities have extremely concentrated populations and low apartment vacancy rates. In my district, many areas have vacancy rates well below the national average. During the past several weeks, I and a number of my colleagues have received complaints from individual tenants, and tenants associations cataloging large rent increases in San Francisco, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Seattle, Denver, Phoenix, Austin, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston.

While I do not have the resources to conduct a national survey I am disturbed by the extent of the problem and by the lack of recognition of the problem in the President's statement. While rent increases are not a serious problem in every population center, I am disturbed that the justification for the present inaction is analogous to efforts to explain to a drowning man that his problem is not a serious one because the average depth of the river in which he is drowning is only 6 inches. The President has the authority to assist our drowning tenants and I believe he was remiss in not using it.

I am not advocating national rent controls for we must not create inequities of our own by painting all landlords with one brush. Not all landlords are pursuing an inflationary policy. However, in those areas where we have extremely low apartment vacancy rates and soaring apartment rental fees, I believe serious consideration should be given to a system of local controls. This is a matter best resolved at the local level. However, where local authorities are unwilling or unable because of constitutional restrictions to afford necessary protection to tenants, I believe the Federal Government should during the next 60 days investigate the mechanism for providing that relief. Any mechanism that is tied to vacancy rates however, should not be tied to an amorphous national vacancy rate. The historic local vacancy average would be a better gage of the nature and extent of the problem.

I have today written the President urging that he freeze rents for 60 days and undertake a comprehensive study of the problem to insure that necessary relief is provided in those areas where the problem is severe.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot, indeed we must not, turn a deaf ear to the problems confronting America's tenants.

GENOCIDE DAY

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is the anniversary of one of the most tragic episodes in history, the deportation from their lands of the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians by the Soviet Russian military authorities.

May I remind the Members of this tragic episode, 32 years ago, on June 14, 1941, when the Soviet Union began to execute its policy of genocide in the Baltic nations. These three small republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, had been annexed to the huge Soviet Empire a year earlier. Tens of thousands of the Baltic people were killed and about a million were deported to Siberia and other areas.

During the following 4 years, the Baltic lands formed part of the battleground as the erstwhile allies, the National Socialists of Germany and the Communists of Russia, fought against each other. Those Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians who remained were terrorized by whichever of these vicious forces happened to be in the ascendancy. The final defeat and elimination of the Nazis left the Communists in undisputed and complete control.

While some of the Baltic peoples still reside in their ancient homelands, others have been replaced by Russians from other sections of the Soviet Union and still others have been scattered to other parts of the world. Many Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians have, during the past three decades, begun life anew in free America. As loyal and industrious citizens they have made important and lasting contributions to their adopted country.

In the fall of 1971, it was my privilege to serve at the United Nations as a member of the U.S. delegation. During the discussion of the subject of the right of peoples to self-determination, I raised the question of Soviet control over the Baltic States. May I briefly restate my points I made at that time:

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—represent a special case in point. They have been physically annexed by the Soviet Union and forcibly incorporated into the cluster of its "Socialist Republics." So far as the Communists are concerned, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have ceased to exist as separate entities entitled to their own national identity and independence. These views are not shared by the United States, nor by numerous other countries. To this day, the United States accords diplomatic recognition to the representatives of the last legitimate governments of the three Baltic States.

Large numbers of Baltic peoples were transferred to the Soviet interior after 1940. There are indications that as many as 60,000 Estonians and 25,000 Latvians, and probably more Lithuanians, were deported or killed during the first Soviet occupation of the Baltic States in 1940-41. The largest deportation occurred on the eve of the German

invasion. After the war several waves of deportations were conducted particularly from Lithuania, and chiefly in connection with the collectivization drives in the Baltic States.

Comparison of Soviet data on peasants in Latvia for the period from early 1947 to May 1949, shows that some 36,000 families or about 150,000 individuals were eliminated from the rolls during the period. Making allowance for migration to cities, it appears that over 100,000 Latvian peasants were deported to the interior. The figure for Lithuania may be assumed to be still higher. The Baltic peoples were evidently resettled in various regions of Siberia, as well as in the north.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of the House will keep in mind the legitimate aspirations of the Baltic peoples to independence and the right to again reside in their historic lands.

It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to recognize the right of the Baltic States to self-determination. I believe it is absolutely necessary for the policy of the United States to continue to be that of nonrecognition of the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. I make this pointed reference on the eve of the visit to the United States of the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev.

UNCERTAINTY BREEDS OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, most Members of this Chamber are quite familiar with the Institute on Comparative Political and Economic Systems at Georgetown University. Select students of this nationally renowned institute, chosen from over 90 universities and colleges across the country, hold coveted internships in our offices, and we are very proud to have them. The truly unique tripartite program of specialized instruction, experiential internship, and expert lectures in the Nation's Capitol is sponsored by the Charles Edison Memorial Youth Fund, headed by its president, George H. C. Lawrence of New York.

One of the institutions of higher learning participating in the program is the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Led by Dr. Benjamin Graves, president of U.A.H., the university recently invited the director of the institute, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is also a professor of economics at Georgetown, to deliver the commencement address. Titled "Uncertainty Breeds Opportunity," the address was given on May 27 and contains a number of vital perspectives posited in a global framework which I believe would profitably interest every thinking American, young and old alike, for the period of danger and opportunity ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I include Dr. Dobriansky's address at this point:

UNCERTAINTY BREEDS OPPORTUNITY

(Commencement address, University of Alabama, Huntsville, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

President Graves, Colleagues in Academia, Graduates of the Class of '73, their Parents, Spouses, and Friends, it is truly heartwarming

for me to be back at this forward-looking university, and I deem it a profound privilege to be given this honored opportunity to address you on this glorious occasion of your achievement and boundless promise. At the very outset let me state that by sheer experience, if anything else, I sympathetically share your immediate feelings and perhaps impatient anxiety regarding the typical commencement address, replete with high-sounding platitudes, endless exhortations, and a medley of advice and taboos, whether politically-slaned or otherwise, that border on a mini-lecture. Sit back and relax, for this will be short, concentrated, and hopefully in a common sense rapport directed at each one of you individually as concerns your personal uncertainties and outlook within the framework of the changing world you and I are tremendously fortunate to live in.

On different campuses several decades ago a number of us here sat in much the same setting as you do now, being conferred with our degrees and listening with varying attentiveness to the themes of the day. One cannot help but recall the theme of opportunity in the 30's when the heavy costs and ravages of the Great Depression engulfed many of us. The normal reaction was opportunity for what—to be unemployed? Soon thereafter the same theme was sounded by many a commencement speaker when World War II itself had already commenced. Opportunity for what—to be killed?

Yet, despite the skepticism and deep uncertainty that gripped our hearts and minds then, we were rationally compelled to allow for the realistic opportunities and demands that called for the non-recurrence ever of another Great Depression and for the prevention of another world war with all of its incalculable human costs. Each of us in his and her own way had to meaningfully relate these overriding demands and the inevitable opportunities generated by them to his and her existence and its potential fulfillment, involving such fundamental ingredients of productive and self-realizing life as basic values, knowledge, wisdom, and the will to translate each into concrete action and doing. Becoming involved, striving for peace, seeking justice and freedom were processes of expanding democratic existence long before us and will certainly continue far beyond you.

If cumulative human experience teaches anything, it undoubtedly teaches that uncertainty breeds opportunity. Amidst certain constants of objective reality and the human form, the world has always been in constant change, too. In our times the tempo of change has so increased that all too many become blind to the constants of being. Being and becoming, *stabilitas* and *mobilitas*, the one and the many are age-old philosophical problems that confront us in all their diverse ramifications as they had our forebears. The search for balances and harmony between the two in each set will inescapably be your search as educated men and women, a search for answers to the problems of being yourself, knowing yourself, and being able to live with yourself in a changing world not unlike that of the 14th century. Change means uncertainty, but uncertainty in turn breeds opportunity. *Dum Vivimus Vivamus*—"While We Live, Let Us Live"—but how?

THE SHIFTING GLOBAL PATTERN

The personalist answer to this question you will find only in your ceaseless reconciliations within the being of yourself, your soul/conscience and your body, and between yourself and your immediate and seemingly remote forms of community, extending from the family unit, through the Nation, and outward to the global environment of mankind itself. Uncertainty, the coefficient of life's contingency, cloaks each of these spheres, but resident within each is the

wonderment of indefinite opportunity, more so today than ever before. On the broadest level, what might seem remote to you—as Vietnam several years ago seemed to most of our countrymen—may impinge upon your life far more than events in your more immediate community. Thus for yourself and your loved ones, in our age of the contracting world community, of the old consuming problem of war and peace, there can be no rational escape from your spiritual and physical involvement in the uncertainties, the opportunities, and the fortunes and tragedies of the world community.

In all of its multiple spheres, the global pattern is a steadily shifting one, a promising one, and a very challenging one. In its external and internal dimensions, even with points of fixity and constancy, this sweeping change is witnessed in space exploration, oceanography, communications and transportation, economics and politics, not to mention numerous other spheres of human activity. Here, in Huntsville, it would be foolhardy for me to emphasize and elaborate on the past and certainly future uncertainties and opportunities of space exploration. The very symbol of this truth stands skyward here, and despite transient, short-run fluctuations in ways of resource allocation, inputs and outputs, our national penetration of space remains open-end. So with the opportunities in oceanography, with all the imaginable goods and bads that this development can bring, the creative talents and adventure of man have scarcely tapped the potentialities of this field of endeavor.

Periods of thoughtful contemplation and quiet reflection, so abundant and rich in medieval times of social *stabilitas*, have become increasingly scarce in our times of accelerated *mobilitas*. Yet when you can seize such precious moments and cast your disciplined reflections globally, not to say nationally and locally, you will find that most of the problems, frictions and warfare are human in origin and character. Vietnam, the Mideast, the Sino-Russian rivalry, the despotic totalitarianism in the Soviet Union, the uncertainties surrounding NATO and a host of other wide-ramifying problems can without an iota of simplism be reduced to the human denominator and all of its systemic arrangements. In your time these and other globally-studded problems—along with uncertainty and opportunity—will inevitably come closer home to you. Because if this is "the nuclear age," it is also an age of punctuated revolution in transportation and communications. Direct telephone calls to the Far East, short time travel across the oceans, the impending possibility of direct TV transmission into the sets of adversary states—these and more marvels of modern technology cannot but bind men and nations closer to each other, for better or for worse, but unquestionably with fruitful uncertainty and productive opportunities.

One does not have to be a Marxist by persuasion to appreciate these material formations and foundations for a more interdependent humanity. In fact, though it may not be popular in these days to observe this, the threads of America's *Manifest Destiny* are being woven in these formations for the good of mankind in terms of better living standards, extended longevity, improved medical and health care, and some measure of popular democratization and personal freedom. With a \$1.2 trillion G.N.P., we're still the strongest and most healthy national economic unit in the world, and though the control of inflation continues to be our foremost problem, our technology and know-how continue to be sought by all, including the Soviet Union and practically every state in the communist world. Creativity in technology, managerial know-how, skillful input-output planning, an inspired work ethic subject to change and improvement con-

stantly are the basic ingredients that have made our Nation the most powerful and free in the world, and are the very basic forces that can constructively contribute to the existence of the other segments of mankind. Coupled with all this is the remarkable fact that virtually every one of these segments is ancestrally represented in the composition of our population.

The brazen misuse of such terms as "American imperialism," "capitalist exploitation" and the like cannot obfuscate the material and cultural contributions of this destiny. Here, too, uncertainties prevail with balance of payments problems, recurring currency crises, international monetary reform, economic regionalism, the threat of trade warfare, and dangers in East-West trade, but again here, too, boundless opportunities prevail equally for our enterprising firms, labor, agriculture and capital. These many uncertainties are reflected almost daily in our stock markets, but opportunities are also sought and estimated by buyers who purchase from the more bearish among us. The relatively recent development of multinational corporations is in itself a tangible and material guarantor against any myopic resurgence of outdated isolationism and one of the many transmission belts for international economic interdependence and integration. "Go West, young man" was heard in the yesteryear of the pioneering development of our economy; "Go about the world young man and woman" is the fitting expression for you in this pioneering development of the free world economy.

PEOPLES ARE THE FIRST ASSET

Whether in the economic, political, cultural and other spheres of our expansive activity, let us always bear in mind that the first asset is peoples, our contacts with them, our knowledge and appreciative understanding of them, and our harmonious relations with them. This is prerequisite to all else if the bonds and cement of prolific interdependence are to be durable. In the process of our own cosmopolitan development, for much of the non-communist world the old "ugly American" is a thing of the past. But one is somewhat uncertain, though the opportunity is great, about the possible resurgence of American ugliness in contacts with the peoples which have been called the captive nations in the communist world, from the Danube to the Pacific. Here, too, despite the uncertainties, the opportunity for thriving knowledge, restructured conceptions, and an understanding quintessential to world peace and eventual freedom is the most challenging and engaging.

Aside from its political aspects, as denoted by such terms as "mutual accommodation," "detente," "coexistence" and others in the President's recent state of the world message to Congress, it is generally agreed that what has been defined as "a period of negotiation, not confrontation" is in essence a dynamic and changing one of the confrontation of negotiation. The aim of the thrust made is "to create a vested interest in mutual restraint," and its motivation is to realize a freer flow of men, women, goods and ideas between the two political worlds. Whether this will be possible in the scope hoped for, only the future will tell.

Objectively, it should be noted, however, that long before current concepts of "power multipolarity" and "interdependency" emerged, Moscow itself was advocating for its own purposes and objectives such things as "peaceful coexistence," liberalized trade, cultural exchanges, an all-European security conference, reduction of forces in Europe, and forms of disarmament and arms restriction. In a real sense, then, there is nothing new in any of this except the dynamic, pragmatic push for negotiations on these and less important matters, challenging Moscow,

and to some extent Peiping, to prove by action where their words are.

Regardless of our doubts and uncertainties about this course of action—and they may be many—objectively it cannot be doubted that the approach is fraught with the opportunity of overcoming any ugliness in our knowledge and contacts with the numerous nations and peoples that exist both in the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Republic of China. The first asset of real, human opportunity cannot be too strongly emphasized. When one hears or reads, even in the highest places of our government and other institutions, about "250 million Russians" in the Soviet Union, he cannot but wonder about our past processes of formal education. The enormous opportunity of greater access permitted by Moscow would be for you and others to know and learn not only about the Russian nation but also about the many non-Russian nations and peoples who constitute actually close to 50% of the USSR population, but really more. Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Azerbaijanis, Turkestani and others would make up your new vocabulary whether in trade, government or general cultural activity, and inevitably in the larger interests of world peace and broadened freedom, your understanding of their condition, aspirations, and hopes would be deepened. It makes no sense to deal in other assets when the first asset of peoples is least understood.

In opening our relations with mainland China the very same opportunity may be given to know in cultural and economic terms not only the roughly 670 million Chinese but also about 60 million Manchus, Mongolians, East Turkestanis, Tibetans and others in this additional multinational state. In advancing and pushing toward these new frontiers of popular American knowledge and understanding, your contributions could not but have a salutary impact on the need for growing interdependency among nations and in the primary interests of our own national security. The multinational states of the Soviet Union and Red China have for too long remained as closed societies, and we have really nothing to lose and everything to gain in our attempts to pry open these societies so that the great opportunity of exchange and contact can be broadened with the numerous nations and peoples within them.

Of course, in these dynamic and changeful approaches prudent realism demands that while we pursue these fundamental opportunities amidst rampant uncertainty, at all times we must keep our guard up and our defensive strength intact. Just to pose one problem to you in the form of a question. On the matter of expanding trade with the Soviet Union, estimated to rise to a level of about \$2 billion in the next three years, the price for Moscow's acquisition of much-needed grains and technology has been our honorable ground withdrawal from Vietnam. The question is how tall a price will we be caused to pay as Moscow, our chief adversary, bolsters its sagging economy at little cost to its continued military build-up, which today is the largest in the world, and to all sorts of intrigues and entanglements in diverse portions of the Free World? Again you are faced with considerable uncertainty but with equal opportunity.

THE FULL CIRCUIT

Not too long ago we heard much of the generation gap. There are many ways this phrase can be interpreted, but there is surely no gap as concerns the fundamental continuity of basic problems and issues, uncertainties and opportunities, that faces both you and me. The Great Depression and World War II highlighted the period before the chronological gap; the fight against inflation, the inverse of deflation and depre-

sion, and the outbreak of another and more tragic world war highlighted it after and now, but the fundamental continuity remains almost in the nature of a full circuit.

At our Institute on Comparative Political and Economic Systems in Georgetown University it has been a rewarding experience to maintain in part-summer residence selected students from this university. What they have been exposed to is partially what I have endeavored to convey today, with obvious stress on comparative systems and the peoples they embrace. Education by contrast, correcting and appreciating our own by analyzing others, is the main spirit of the institute. By further exposing these students in internships in Congress, executive agencies, and capital-based institutions, the criteria that it is not only what you gain in knowledge but more so how to use it and that a substantial difference exists between knowledge and wisdom are also underscored. The Charles Edison Memorial Youth Fund, which supports this institute, is confident that the supplementary role it plays in supporting your students and others contributes to the cultivation of young men and women for constructive leadership in our Nation. We are proud to have them.

To you graduates of the 1973 Class, and of course to your spouses, I extend my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for your most successful careers and happy lifetimes according to the values your consciences dictate. And because continuity of a filial nature made this possible, I warmly congratulate also your parents for their basic contributions to this achievement. For they have experienced and know, as indeed you will, that uncertainty does breed opportunity. God Speed to you all.

DISASTER PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the present Disaster Relief Act provides funds for the repair of damaged property through loans from the Small Business Administration and the Farmers Home Administration.

There are, however, many people who would prefer to use the funds which they obtain from these two administrations to prevent future damage from winds and water instead of simple restoration. Repairing the damage will not prevent further disaster.

Many times the cost of prevention is less than restoration. It makes a great deal of sense to me that if a property owner wishes to prevent future losses rather than restore present damage he ought to be allowed to do so.

For this reason, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to permit the proceeds of loans to be used to construct protective measures for the prevention of future damage. The administrator of the appropriate agency, SBA or FHA, would determine whether or not the damage is of the type that could be repeated.

In addition, the administrator would determine whether all or part of the loan funds could be used for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this amendment would not only allow a property owner to prevent future tragedy, but would necessarily reduce future Federal expenditures as well. By preventing the damage

from recurring, future reliance on Federal disaster assistance would be reduced thus freeing the funds for other purposes.

I urge speedy consideration of this proposal and solicit the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

FOOD STAMPS CAUSE JOB ABSENTEEISM IN MUSKINGUM COUNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, since the food stamp program was permanently established in 1964 its scope has expanded at an incredible rate. In 1965 the program cost \$35 million and covered 632,000 recipients. Today we are spending \$2.2 billion and 12½ million people are participating. Over the years criticism has been leveled at the program because its loose administration has contributed to abuses and violations, especially with respect to eligibility determinations.

Some progress is being made toward the implementation of quality control, but we have to better guarantee that only the needy are served by the program. The intent of the program is to improve the nutrition levels of low-income families. If the program is not oriented to those truly in need, it will provide those who can help themselves with a strong disincentive for self-sufficiency and productivity, and may thereby jeopardize the program for those who are needy.

A good example of this potential impact is contained in an article by Mr. Robert Wolf which recently appeared in the Zanesville, Ohio, Times Recorder. The newspaper survey describes a disturbing effect food stamps are having on employment attendance in Muskingum County, Ohio. I wish to bring the article to the House's attention:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM HERE A CAUSE OF HIGH JOB ABSENTEEISM

(By Robert Wolf)

The food stamp program in Muskingum County is apparently contributing to the highest rate of absenteeism at area industries in recorded history.

This is among a number of conclusions reached after an extensive month-long survey of area industries conducted by The Times Recorder. The survey provided evidence that able-bodied men in the Zanesville area have apparently artificially swelled the rolls of residents legitimately receiving food stamps by calling in sick to area industries (up to 25 per cent of the time) in order to keep their earnings sufficiently low to make them eligible for food stamps.

Business leaders reported that they have only recently become aware of a pattern in the absentee rate for some men; that is, some men are apparently calling in sick virtually the same number of days each month and are consistently refusing time and one-half overtime, at least in some instances, industry leaders are convinced, due to the worker's fear of becoming ineligible for food stamp benefits.

A president of one area manufacturing company reported that he knew of eight employees in his firm who were engaged in such behavior and suspected at least six more. He further cited a number of instances where

these employees approached him with such comments, as "after all, why should I work in all this dirt, when I can just relax and get food stamp benefits?"

Another president reported that he was fairly certain that between 10 and 15 of his employees were abusing the food stamp program and reported incidents of being laughed at when asking employees to stop such behavior.

Still a third industrialist reported that his absentee rate had reached "alarming proportions," at least in part due to the desire to obtain food stamp benefits. This corporate executive, as well as others throughout the area, indicated that strong remedial action had to be taken before there was any further impact on corporate productivity.

A number of executives did say that due to the high rate of absenteeism they were already cutting back on the number of orders and jobs they were accepting and in some cases had allowed their inventories to fall dangerously low in anticipation of further problems.

None of the industry leaders, however, was willing to be quoted directly, for fear of employing job reactions.

The food stamp program began in Zanesville on March 1, 1967. During its first year of operation, 5,806 food stamp cards were issued. In 1972, 24,122 cards were issued, an increase of almost five-fold, and over \$1.1 million was paid out in the food stamp program last year.

The amount that a family in this state receives in bonus food stamps is determined by the family's gross income, minus a household size factor, cost of utilities, and medical expenses. Once this figure is obtained, 30 per cent of it is calculated to go for shelter expenses. If shelter expenses exceed 30 per cent of the figure, then everything in excess of the 30 per cent amount is further deducted from the adjusted income figure.

Thus, for a family of five, the final adjusted income figure must not exceed \$440 a month. If the figure falls below this, then the family is entitled to receive a certain amount of bonus food stamps, allotted in varying amounts depending on how far below the \$440 figure the family falls.

Under the food stamp program, an individual or family must pay a certain amount in order to receive the bonus food stamps. Thus, if this hypothetical family of five had a final adjusted monthly income of \$400, \$40 below the maximum allowable, it would receive food stamps worth \$132 for every \$102 it paid.

However, it is the method by which the local welfare agency, under state direction, determines the gross monthly wage, which has enraged some area businessmen. Under the present system, all any person has to show the welfare bureau is the stub from his check, indicating his earnings for the month. Although the stub says how many hours the employee did work that month, it nowhere indicates how many hours he should have worked or if he had worked a full month and the normally highly desirable overtime which most employees are able to obtain.

Welfare department officials have candidly admitted that no check of this second figure is required by state law or directive, and thus none is taken. Thus welfare officials say privately that although they believe such abuses are infrequent, they are indeed possible under the present system.

However, the TR study indicates that the abuses may be more extensive than welfare officials believe. Statistics obtained from those companies willing to provide data, indicates that at least 50 men and their families are likely involved in Muskingum County alone, and the true number is probably higher.

Projecting this number throughout the state, it is reasonable to assume that statewide such abuses reach into the thousands. Under present state welfare regulations, how-

ever, none of these abuses is detectable, nor are they technically illegal.

Although many of the men reportedly abusing the food stamp program are low paid, generally unskilled employees, receiving the \$1.60 an hour minimum wage or thereabouts, some of these abusing the program were reported to be skilled men in a wide range of industries, receiving between \$3 and \$4 an hour. In a few instances the men were reported to be earning over \$4 an hour.

Curiously, despite all the expressed concern about these abuses, few industry leaders have made a serious attempt to correct the situation by either firing those employees who they believe are involved or by supplying the names of the employees to the local welfare agency.

One of the company presidents explained the rationale for this behavior this way: "None of the company presidents in this area are, or wish to become martyrs. We know that once we start pointing fingers at people and start singling people out we are opening ourselves up to a situation which we are not prepared to deal with. You might say, that until someone else comes in and clears up this situation our motto will be 'discretion is the better part of valor.'"

AGRICULTURAL EXPORT CONTROLS

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

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would require potential exporters of essential agricultural commodities to obtain licenses from the Secretary of Commerce. The present inflationary spiral makes the passage of this legislation of utmost importance and urgency.

In recent weeks we have witnessed an acute shortage in the domestic supply of essential feed grains, particularly soybeans and soybean meal. The result has been runaway prices of these commodities in the marketplace, and continually higher prices for food products. We can no longer continue to export grains at our present rate—30 percent higher than last year. The continued export of these commodities is seriously diminishing our domestic supplies. Speculation in the commodities market in the sale of futures contracts runs rampant. Grain prices have soared to their highest level in years, as have food prices.

In a June 2 editorial, the Washington Post made this point quite clear:

Foreign sales have drawn down our customary feed and grain stocks drastically. The current bidding appears to reflect a frantic scramble among traders who fear that we may actually run out of some commodities before the new harvest is coming in. But the harvests are not necessarily going to help much. In the case of wheat the summer harvest has already begun, and it looks as though it will be a record. Still the price keeps rising, and the futures markets show that the professional brokers expect it to stay at present levels right through next spring.

The panic in the grain markets is partly owed to the curious fact that no one knows, from day to day, what part of current American stocks of future harvest have already been sold for export. The trading companies operate in a tradition of great secrecy. It may well turn out, in time, that some of the wild bidding of recent days was based on rumors of foreign purchases that are un-

founded. Conversely, if the traders are in the process of selling abroad more than the country can prudently afford, the government and the public need to know about it before the final commitments rather than afterward.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is a need for export control regulation. This fact has been recognized by President Nixon. In his statement last night announcing the price freeze, the President said he will seek new authority from Congress to curtail exports, particularly of grains and other feeds and foods, in instances in which he determines that foreign demand is driving up U.S. prices.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced today is designed to provide the needed authority and a workable mechanism to curtail agricultural exports when such action is deemed to be in the national interest.

To this end, my legislation, which has been 2 months in preparation, requires potential exporters of agricultural commodities to obtain a license from the Secretary of Commerce. In the application for this license, the potential exporter would have to provide a full description of the kind and amount of the commodity involved and the time period over which he proposes to export it. Upon receiving such an application, the Secretary of Commerce would transmit it to the Secretary of Agriculture, who would analyze the current condition of the domestic economy as it relates to this product. Specifically, he would be required to determine the impact that exporting the stipulated quantity of the commodity would have on the economy. He would also have to consider the effect it would have on the domestic price and supply of the commodity in question.

Within 20 days of receipt of this application, the Secretary of Agriculture would submit a detailed report to the Secretary of Commerce containing this economic analysis, and a recommendation as to whether the license should be granted. Not later than 10 days after receiving such a report, the Secretary of Commerce would be required either to grant or deny the license. If the license were denied, the individual could not export the commodity.

Mr. Speaker, such licensing requirements, together with the issuance of a Federal impact statement describing the probable effects on the economy of proposed exports, would keep a watchful eye on the domestic supply of essential agricultural commodities. The passage of this legislation is essential if we are to bring equitable stability to the farmer and agricultural producer, as well as fair food prices to the consumer.

ESSAY ON FLAG DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I received a very thoughtful letter from a constituent of mine who made available to me his essay

on the flag and explained to me why he wrote it.

I could spend considerable time detailing for you the history of his essay but the letter written to me by Mr. Edward G. Fries of Hensley, Ark., speaks for itself and I would like to include it and the essay written by Mr. Fries in the RECORD at this point:

This was written by me aboard the Liberty Ship on April 12, 1945, after a Japanese suicide Kamakazi tried to sink the S.S. *Walter Colton* in Buckner Bay, Okinawa. It came over and strafed our ship, shooting three holes through our Flag; one shell cut the lanyard and I saw our Flag falling. I ran over and retrieved it and folded it up. Our Gun Crew shot the plane into the deep six.

I was given a Combat Bar Citation by the U.S. Maritime Commission. This was after the third plane we shot down.

Somebody came in and asked me for a rag to wipe oil and grease from their hand as he pointed to the Flag and said, "That is only just a piece of cloth." That made me angry, so I sat down and wrote this essay.

MR. EDWARD G. FRIES.

HENSLEY, ARK.

IT'S JUST A PIECE OF CLOTH—I AM THE FLAG

Yes! That is all it is, just a Piece of Cloth. But when a little puff of breeze comes along, it stirs, and comes to life and flutters and snaps in the wind, all Red, White and Blue! It is then, you realize that there is no other Piece of Cloth could be quite like it.

When you stop to really think about it, then you really realize that you have your whole life wrapped up in it, the time you spend with your family, the meals you eat, the kind of things your boys and girls learn at school. The strange and wonderful thoughts you get in Church on Sundays.

And those Stars in it, make you feel just as free as the stars in the wide deep of night. Did you ever see the myriad of stars on a clear dark night, far out at sea? And those broad Red Stripes. They are "Bars of Blood to any would be dictator, who would try to change our way of life".

Just a Piece of Cloth that is all it is, but until you make it real you must put your whole soul and life into it, to give it a true meaning, only then it becomes a symbol of Liberty and Freedom and Decency and Fair Dealing for every one.

Yes, it is just a Piece of Cloth, but to make it real, we must breath life into it, and watch it flutter in the empyrean sunshine of freedom, then fill your lungs with clean-air, stand erect and salute it, as it passes by.

Only then, we make it stand for everything we believe in and respect. Only then we will refuse to live without it. For many brave men have died for it, for their God and country.

[© 1973 by E. G. Fries]

CHILD ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this session a bill entitled the "National Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1973" (H.R. 5914). This legislation climaxes 5 years of work in the field of child abuse and neglect and represents a complete revision and updating of the measure I introduced during my first term in Congress.

The National Child Abuse Prevention Act, which now has the support of 40

Members of this body, offers to the States \$60 million in grants over a period of 3 years. Any State wishing to qualify for a portion of these funds must submit to the Secretary of HEW a comprehensive plan for child abuse treatment and prevention which includes:

Adequate reporting laws—either on the books or pending in the legislature—which meet the standards specified in this bill;

Programs designed to train professionals in the appropriate techniques of child abuse treatment and prevention;

Public education projects which would serve to inform citizens of the high incidence of child abuse and neglect as well as indicating the procedures for reporting suspected cases of maltreatment to the appropriate social service and law enforcement officials;

The establishment of a central registry to coordinate on a statewide level all information relating to convictions and other court actions within that jurisdiction.

The bill also creates a National Child Abuse Data Bank within HEW. This central agency will receive and evaluate confidential reports from every State in the Nation, with a view toward determining the actual incidence of abuse and neglect throughout the country and those trends in treatment and prevention which would serve as a rational basis for developing program standards and criteria in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently received certain studies and analyses in the area of child abuse legislation from one of this country's foremost experts in the field—Dr. Ray E. Helfer. I would like to submit for my colleagues' attention a position paper prepared by Dr. Helfer in March of this year.

I feel that this document will make a significant contribution to the current debate on how we can provide adequate treatment and care for the innocent victims of child maltreatment, and what means we can devise to prevent the spread of this regrettable practice.

The document follows:

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

(By Ray E. Helfer, M.D., Associate Professor Department of Human Development Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.)

The experience and research of the last ten years brought forth an in-depth understanding of the causes of child abuse and neglect. This, in turn, has led to the development of therapeutic models which have been shown to be both effective and efficient. At the present time, however, only a small fraction of the 50,000-60,000 children who are abused and neglected annually in the United States have access to a family oriented treatment program which have been shown to be successful.

Taking into consideration that the number of reports of suspected child abuse increases by 20-30% annually (some cities have noted a much greater rise than this), the next ten years will bring forth, unless some changes are made in the accessibility of effective prevention and treatment programs, the following minimum estimates:

1.5 million cases of suspected child abuse and neglect, 50,000 deaths, 300,000 permanently injured children (most of whom will be brain damaged), 1 million potential parents who will rear their children in the same manner in which they were reared.

MAJOR PROBLEM

The single, most important problem that must be resolved within the next decade is:

"To bring our present-day knowledge of the cause, prevention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect to the masses".

The current system of providing services to the abused child and his family can never be successful. The masses will not be helped because:

1. A single disciplinary program (i.e. a Department of Social Services) cannot resolve a multi-disciplinary problem.

Social Service workers around the country are expected (indeed often forced) to make legal, medical and psychiatric decisions for which they are not trained; to act as law enforcement officers and judges; and to provide long-term treatment for which they have no time.

2. Most, if not all, of the services provided by the Departments of Social Service are after-the-fact services.

A recent survey of 50 Protective Service workers from various parts of this country indicated that less than 20% worked in departments where the development of preventive programs and services were possible.

3. Protective Service programs are not state administered, rather they are run by autonomous or semi-autonomous county units.

Even with the utmost cooperation from all the disciplines within a given community, a minimum of two years is required to develop a coordinated multi-disciplinary child abuse and neglect program. If the three medical schools in Michigan were to make available a pediatrician to spend one-third of his time as a consultant to the 86 counties in the state, it would require 15 years to develop a coordinated child abuse and neglect program in every county. Considering that the half-life of Protective Service workers is a year and a half and three years for Protective Service supervisors, in addition to a change in directors of Social Services, judges, law enforcement officers and prosecuting attorneys each three to four years, a state-wide program for child abuse and neglect can never be accomplished under a system which requires the rediscovering of the wheel in each separate county unit.

COMPONENTS FOR A SUCCESSFUL CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT SERVICE PROGRAM

A successful child abuse/neglect service program must have the following:

1. State administered using federal guidelines.

Regional and city programs are more than likely to be necessary and feasible as long as they are directly responsible to an overall state program.

2. Multi-disciplinary in make up.

Since states do not have, under their present structure, multi-disciplinary departments, the child abuse/neglect programs will probably require a restructuring of the present vertical single-disciplinary departments in order to develop some type of horizontal multi-disciplinary units.

3. A two-way, state-wide registry for all cases which will be part of a national registry system and make use of a national reporting document.

4. Contain three distinct, but interrelated, segments which are as follows:

a. A diagnostic and evaluation unit. (This is an expansion and augmentation of our currently operating Protective Service system.)

This diagnostic and evaluation unit must have two distinct roles, i.e. early recognition program and acute care program. The various disciplines which make up the unit would be required to make recommendations to a panel consisting of a social worker, lawyer, and physician (which is the expansion of the present social service arm of the probate

or juvenile court). This panel would be required to review each case, make a determination about disposition, which may or may not incorporate the courts, but must incorporate a long-term treatment and follow-up plan.

b. An educational and training unit. (This is an expansion of the present community educational programs, community colleges, local universities, etc., and should be an arm of the National Training Center in Denver.)

This educational and training unit must have at least three ongoing programs which would be short-term training for workers in any of the disciplines; involved family rearing and child development courses for parents and general public relations for the overall program.

c. Long-term treatment development unit. (This is an expanded role of present state and private services currently available in almost all areas.)

This long-term treatment development unit would be required to coordinate in a consortium of multiple therapeutic programs, such as parents aides, day care, crisis nurseries, therapeutic foster homes, Parents Anonymous, group therapy, etc. This group would develop and help initiate but not be expected to operate these multiple programs since this would be the responsibility of the individual group or agency involved.

5. A state reporting law which must contain the following components:

a. A requirement to report all suspected cases of abuse and neglect.

b. A clear, nationally accepted, definition of abuse and neglect.

c. Define who is required to report.

d. Require that the report be made both by phone and in writing.

e. Define penalties for not reporting.

f. Protect the individual reporting from libel suits.

g. Provide for a state registry which is part of the national system and uses a standardized reporting form.

h. Require photographs and/or movies to be taken of all suspected cases.

i. Define one state-administered, multi-disciplinary program which is responsible for receiving and acting upon each report.

j. Define the steps taken by this program after receiving the report.

k. Provide for immediate removal privilege on a 24-hour basis in case of emergency.

l. Require legal representation for all, including the state's program, the parents, and the child.

m. State and federal funds for implementing the program.

7. A self-assessment and evaluation program which is carried out on ongoing basis throughout the state.

Penalties must be imposed upon those regions or communities not complying with minimal standards established by the state program under the federal guidelines.

AMBASSADOR SCALI AND THE RHODESIAN CHROME AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, our new Ambassador to the United Nations, John Scali, is demonstrating a very constructive attitude regarding the responsibility of the United States, as a member of the United Nations, to adhere to sanctions voted by the Security Council. He knows that when the United Nations Participation Act came into force in 1945, our country committed itself to live faithfully by the Charter of the United

Nations, and to accept decisions of the Security Council in certain specified situations. The same is true of every other member of the United Nations. But in the case of the United States and other permanent members of the Security Council, the veto power made certain that we would not be bound to do something that we felt seriously jeopardized our own interests or the world interest as we view it.

Congress enacted the U.N. Participation Act by a considerable majority, and the President of the United States was thereby obligated to carry out the provisions of that act as mandated by Congress. When President Johnson ordered U.S. compliance with Security Council sanctions against the minority regime of Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia, his action was entirely consistent with the provisions of the U.N. Participation Act. Moreover, the sanctions program had been supported by U.S. representatives of the United Nations who cooperated closely with our ally, the United Kingdom, in achieving agreement on sanctions in the Security Council.

Sanctions against Southern Rhodesia were viewed by the U.S. Government as the best feasible means to bring about a peaceful change toward majority rule in that British colony. Our policymakers saw nothing inimical to U.S. interests in the sanctions program, but rather, that such a program would be consistent with the longstanding U.S. policy of progress in international relations through non-violence.

The Nixon administration, upon assuming office in 1969, adopted as its own the previous administration's policy of supporting sanctions, but for reasons still not made clear, did not see fit to defend that policy when it was challenged in Congress in 1971. We know the results of the administration's acquiescence—the Rhodesian Chrome Amendment to the Defense Procurement Act of 1971 which allows importation of strategic materials such as chrome and nickel from Southern Rhodesia in violation of U.N. sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not the sanctions program is working effectively, one thing is crystal clear: the United States is in open violation of a treaty obligation it accepted, with congressional concurrence, in the U.N. Participation Act. This is the point Ambassador Scali made last week in a public speech in New York. He simply pointed out that the Security Council decision on Rhodesian sanctions "is legally binding on the United States," and that the Rhodesian Chrome Amendment "placed the United States in open violation of international law." For the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. to ignore these two facts would be a dereliction of his responsibility as our representative. Indeed, he must not only state and defend the position of the United States at the United Nations, but also call to the attention of our Government and people the legal and moral responsibilities of this country as a member of the United Nations.

The question is not whether the U.N. can "dictate" what laws the U.S. Congress can or cannot pass, but rather whether the United States is going to live

up to its international treaty obligations; that is, whether or not our country is going to recognize international law as a basis for world order. If Congress or the administration is to take the attitude that, as a matter of course, we can go back on our word, given solemnly in international treaties, then there can hardly be a better guarantee for international chaos in place of the peaceful and prosperous order we all favor.

I quote two paragraphs from Ambassador Scali's New York speech in which he deals with the problem of U.S. violation of U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia:

I have respectfully invited the Congress of the United States to reconsider the amendment to the Defense Appropriation Act which two years ago placed the United States in open violation of international law. At that time the Congress voted legislation making it impossible for the Executive Branch to prevent imports of chrome and other strategic commodities from Rhodesia as required by the Security Council, a decision which the United States voted and which is legally binding on the United States.

The evidence is mounting that this amendment not only damages America's image and reputation as a law-abiding nation, but that it has net economic disadvantages as well. The United Nations Association has itself made public studies suggesting that the amendment's repeal would be advantageous from the point of view of our economic health, of increasing employment, and of the national security. I would urge you, leaders in American business and labor, to acquaint yourselves with this issue and to address it.

In asking Congress to reconsider the Rhodesian chrome amendment. Ambassador Scali is making a commendable initiative in constructive leadership entirely commensurate with the responsibilities of his position. All who favor world peace through law should be encouraged by his forthrightness—a quality for which he is widely noted. I urge all Members of Congress to reflect upon what the Ambassador has said in light of the large body of new evidence that the Rhodesian chrome amendment not only places our country in violation of international law but contributes nothing to our national security and is damaging to our economic health.

NIXONOMICS

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, one again, Richard Nixon has had to go before the American people and admit the failure of his economic policies. His claim "You never had it so good" will not convince the people of this country who suffer from the ever shrinking dollar as they watch prices soar out of sight.

Last month we had the largest increase in the cost of living in 15 years, led by those raw agricultural products that Mr. Nixon still refuses to control. Couple this with no controls on rents, interests or dividends and we will find the American consumer worse off now than when Mr. Nixon started on his economic misadventures 22 months ago.

The fact is that the President cannot be trusted with discretion in handling the economy, and Congress should act at once to exercise its own authority in this area.

THE UNIFORMED SERVICES SPECIAL PAY ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the all-volunteer concept in the U.S. armed services has presented the military with some novel problems and difficulties, including the maintenance of an adequate supply of competent health professionals. It is vital that in our desire to move from the draft to the volunteer army we do not neglect the demands for a decent military health care delivery system in this country.

Today, I have introduced, along with six of my colleagues, a bill that will insure the maintenance of the high quality of health care that the military has grown to expect. This bill, The Uniformed Services Special Pay Act of 1973, faces the problem of obtaining the requisite specialized manpower. The Army and, consequently, the other branches of the services have been relying solely on the so-called doctors' draft to furnish health personnel as needed. The Department of Defense has recognized that there will be difficulties in maintaining health personnel for the military. To surmount these difficulties, DOD has recommended an extension of the special pay provisions for 2 years.

My bill goes beyond the DOD extension; it revises and extends special pay and bonus payments until 1977. These considerations affect critical specialty areas—physicians, dentists, optometrists and veterinarians—serving all three branches of the service. The recently released study done by the Brookings Institution for the Senate Committee on Armed Services expects that a manpower problem could develop in the area of health professionals. The study calls the supply of such personnel "traditionally" one of the most difficult problems confronting the services—even under draft conditions, and the draft has been terminated.

We must consider the health professional supply on two accounts. Comprehensive high-quality health care must be one of the benefits available to the all-volunteer military services. On the other hand, health professionals must realize enough inducements of one type or another to compensate for the differences in pay in comparison with the private practitioner. Allowances in special pay and bonuses do alleviate the differences to some extent and must be continued to insure the continued service of present personnel, as well as recruitment of new health personnel.

Almost daily we in Congress must consider one aspect of health care or another. Naturally the armed services are involved and concerned in this aspect of their well-being. Surely we cannot afford to skimp in this vital area.

In relying on the volunteer concept, it is hoped that all involved, including the health care professionals, will be highly motivated in serving in the armed services and will be career-oriented. Other factors will be influential in winning health professionals to the armed services—aspects such as the ability to practice at their highest level of training. We cannot attack those problems in this particular bill. But special pay, coupled with bonus pay, will be a significant first step in securing and retaining competent physicians, dentists, optometrists, and veterinarians, all of whom have contributed greatly to the Armed Forces health program and are a crucial factor in providing a comprehensive health plan for the all-volunteer concept.

A divisive inequity would develop should special pay not be enacted. Those health personnel already serving in the Armed Forces would continue to receive special pay. New, incoming health personnel would not—for the same skills, the same educational background, the same performance.

As the all-volunteer armed services becomes a reality, we must do everything to insure its success. As a part of that effort, we are obligated to extend these special pay and bonus considerations for physicians, dentists, optometrists, and veterinarians. These critical health professionals must be encouraged to enlist and to remain in the services. The health care of the armed services is of vital and essential concern to this Nation and all measures to support this program must be implemented.

ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the increasingly serious national problem which has been given the name of the "energy crisis." The darkened hallways and garages of our own office buildings early this week served as a faint reminder for us of the inconveniences, and even hardships, being faced by the American public at large. The fuel oil shortage of last winter, with children being kept home from school because of dark and unheated classrooms, has now been replaced by the summer gasoline shortage, with our citizens reliving the gas rationing days of World War II.

Now it is beginning to become apparent that the American citizen is going to be asked to sustain a heavy increase in his cost of living as a result of this situation. In a recent decision, the Federal Power Commission authorized some producers of natural gas to increase their prices by 73 percent; this represents an estimated rate of return for those companies of 27.5 percent. The Commission has under consideration a new national pricing policy which gives every indication of imposing a similar increase in the price of natural gas on a nationwide basis.

Part of the justification for this, of course, has been the contention that

there exists a great scarcity in our natural gas reserves, and that higher prices must be allowed in order to allow for increased exploration costs to find new reserves. And yet, the Federal Power Commission has not tied the 73-percent price increase to any agreement by the producers to undertake intensified exploration. On the contrary, two of the three companies authorized to increase their prices specifically refused to commit themselves to reinvestment of their increased profits in future exploration and development.

As if this in itself was not sufficient to raise serious questions as to the legitimacy of increasing the cost of living, we have recently become aware that the available reserves of natural gas may have been seriously understated. The Federal Trade Commission and its staff is to be commended for their efforts to find out the true state of affairs. Unfortunately, the inquiry of the Commission has been delayed by the failure of some gas producers to honor the Agency's subpoenas which sought to obtain substantiation for the scarcity of natural gas which the industry has assured us exists. A few days ago, the Justice Department went to court to enforce the FTC's subpoenas, and we may hope that in the coming months a clearer picture of our available reserves of natural gas will begin to emerge.

In recent days we have also heard charges that attempts were made by somebody at the Federal Power Commission to destroy data which the Agency had obtained from the gas producers and which could shed a great deal of light on the present situation. I do not wish to prejudge the facts in that particular situation, Mr. Speaker, but I think that it is time that we in the Congress have done with the regulatory agencies—set up as arms of this Congress—withholding information from the Congress, the collective representative of the public with whose business these agencies are entrusted. But that is a larger issue which we are working on in our Investigations Subcommittee at the present time.

In the meantime, we are faced with the prospect of an increase in the price of natural gas which, based on the Federal Power Commission's recent action in the so-called Belco case, may almost double the wellhead price. Unless some action is taken, this price increase will be accomplished before present inquiries into the existence of a legitimate natural gas scarcity have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for a moratorium. We need an appropriate breathing spell to enable the true facts to be examined. I am, therefore, introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of this Congress that prior to January 1974 it would not be in the public interest for the Federal Power Commission to permit increases in the price of natural gas above the administratively determined area rate ceilings in effect on June 1, 1973. This will still permit the producing companies to realize a return of approximately 15 percent, and will give the American people some hope that their cost of living will not

be arbitrarily increased before all the relevant facts are known.

FORMER AMBASSADOR GALBRAITH ADDRESSES GRADUATES

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, former Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics at Harvard University, has delivered an excellent address at the University of Maryland at Baltimore Commencement in Baltimore on June 1, 1973, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

Commencement season has come, and all across this green and lovely land a terrible thing is happening. Orators by the hundred are talking about Watergate. All are delving for the deeper meaning of this event. There has been no speechmaking like it since Teapot Dome. And in the innocent and blessed days of Harding, Coolidge and Albert Bacon Fall there was no oratory like it then. Already it has caused an unprecedented series of tornadoes in Arkansas and six inches of rain in one small town in South Carolina. The worst effects may be still to come.

Some of this oratory comes from political larcenists who have not yet been caught. Some is by amateurs of the political art who were never tested by the requisite temptation. That is my situation. Some is by deeply pious men, fraudulent of heart but lucid of speech and imposing of mien, whose crime is in drawing morals that are based on no detectable moral insight.

Among the few who will be silent this year, I read alas, is the Reverend Billy Graham. Not since Richelieu, perhaps not since Friar Tuck has so saintly a man had such access to secular leadership. He prayed, counselled, enjoined, and look what they went and did. So next week the Reverend Mr. Graham is launching a major crusade—in Korea. Clearly this is not his season in the United States.

On Watergate I will spare you. Or, almost, for I have two thoughts. It is plain now, that in this country, we have a ruthless capacity for coming to terms with power. It operated on F.D.R. in 1937 when he sought to enlarge the Court just after he carried all states but two against Alf Landon. It operated against Lyndon Johnson, again in the wake of a landslide, when he launched our arrogant adventure in Vietnam. Now it has operated against Richard Nixon whose unlicensed aggression was here at home, he being a man who has always been more troubled by domestic hobgoblins than those of foreign origin. And, as with Johnson, the response to power has operated with double force against the pikemen and the housecarls. Let us not deplore this process.

But let us allow it to function without sadism. I would not plead for leniency for those who try to escape punishment by perjury or by silence or by perfervid appeals to national security or who, in the elegant language of the higher Washington bureaucracy, try to "gut it out." Nor can one ask compassion for Cabinet officers who are untroubled by transactions that can only be made in hundred dollar bills or—one thinks of the former Attorney General—never, when in office, showed the slightest trace of compassion themselves. But let us not believe that the life of everyone associated with this remarkable business must be destroyed. Men are, indeed, caught in webs that are not of their own making. For a long time in Washington, too long no doubt, men have stood at attention when talking to the White House on the telephone. The deterrent effect of the

present events, which is what we want, will be great. Henceforth the first men hired in any election campaign will be the accountants. In any future campaign anyone who suggests behavior inappropriate to an election in the Epworth League will be put off the plane, quite possibly at a high altitude.

Meanwhile let us begin to spare some thought for problems with which, whatever happens to the Waterbuggers, we need desperately to concern ourselves.

The most urgent of these is economics. This is a time of appalling economic mismanagement. We have heard much in these last months of failed burglars; we have heard far too little of failed economists. And Mr. Nixon's economists, upright scholars though they are, are the same kind of underachievers. They began the year with a moderately well designed system of controls; it had reduced substantially the rate of inflation. Because the policy was working the Administration economists decided that it should be abandoned. The logic of this will long be pondered, as often happens with actions devoid of logic of any kind. People reacted rationally to the weakening of the controls; they concluded that their dollars would soon be worth less and proceeded to spend them at an unprecedented rate. In consequence inflation is again at a record rate; if there are signs of abatement, they are only in the speeches of Mr. Shultz and Mr. Stein. Business expansion is also at a rate that cannot be sustained. Business profits are also rising exorbitantly. So are executive salaries. Unions, however, are being asked to ask their members to exercise restraint.

Inflation remains an unfair and damaging thing. Not everyone's income keeps pace with rising living costs. The result is a heavy and arbitrary tax on those who can least afford it. And the longer inflation continues the harder it is to arrest it—the harder it will be, specifically, to persuade the unions that a serious effort will be made to restrain prices and living costs and accord fair treatment to profits and the salaries of the brass. And the harder it will be also to slow down the expansion without producing a serious slump. With economics as with alcohol the excesses of one period must be paid for in the travail of the next. I earlier mentioned the Nineteen Twenties. This is the worst period of economic mismanagement since Calvin Coolidge and with the difference that the sainted son of the Green Mountains did not try.

The primary blame lies with the Administration. But the economics profession has also a good deal for which to answer. In the last thirty years the nation has spent in prodigal fashion for economic research and education. Nearly all of this outlay has been devoted to winning an understanding of how the economy should be managed. The present mismanagement shows how little this outlay has accomplished. We should expect something better after all these years and all this effort, even from an intellectually retarded Administration. There is a parallel in medicine. It would not be possible for doctors to escape responsibility for a major outbreak of yaws, beriberi or athlete's foot merely because it occurred under the Nixon Administration.

One reason the Administration loosened the controls is that economic pedagogy has not yet accepted controls. We have a heavy vested—and commercial—interest in the accepted wisdom of the textbooks. Unfortunately, where strong unions that (as in housing) set the prices for weak firms or where they negotiate with strong corporations that have the power to pass the costs of settlements along to the public, the orthodox monetary and fiscal policies, however comfortable, no longer suffice. They do not suffice because the corporations and the unions have wounded, irretrievably, the market through which they work. And no priesthood, however refined its incantations, can resur-

rect that market. There is, I may say, no market priesthood higher than that possessed by Mr. Nixon.

A sensible policy requires a prompt return to firm controls. Needed also is a responsible fiscal policy. Three years ago the President, in a historic declaration, announced his conversion to the economics of John Maynard Keynes. It was not a radical step; Lord Keynes had been safely dead for more than twenty years. The President's apostasy, the economic counterpart of the pilgrimage to Peking, occurred at about the moment that Keynes had become obsolete. And now, alas, we have learned that it was only a fifty percent conversion—an arrested movement toward modernization that, in some respects, was worse than none at all.

The President showed himself willing to reduce taxes to expand output and employment. That, indubitably, is half the Keynesian prescription. But only half. The other half requires willingness, when occasion arises, to increase taxes to dampen inflation. Here the President's conversion is incomplete. Where inflation is the problem, one hears not of tax increases, only of the need to cut civilian spending.

By all available evidence we need a tax increase now. It should be on the upper or free-spending brackets in the personal income tax—perhaps beginning at \$15,000 or \$20,000. We need it, also, both for reasons of restraint and reasons of equity, on corporate profits. The special credit on business investment should also be repealed. We should not be subsidizing a level of investment that cannot be sustained—however much Wilbur Mills may disagree. And the excise tax on automobiles should, of course, be restored. Economic management is bad in the aggregate. It is also bad in detail. No detail is more bizarre than the runaway boom in automobile production at a time when there is no clear certainty that, for the goliaths we build, there will be enough gas.

For the sake of technical completeness one must also urge control and some tightening of lending for business investment and consumer purchases. This—monetary policy—is, however, the most uncertain of all the instruments of economic control. That is why it sustains such avid and quasi-mystical discussion. And it is also the most inequitable of remedies. It falls with especial weight on those businesses that, by their nature, depend on borrowed money. And, in a broad sense, it favors the rich man in relation to the poor, for, it can be established logically, that the man who lends money tends usually to have more of it than the man to whom he lends.

Any action to arrest inflation involves risk of recession—although, if combined with effective controls, the risk can be considerably reduced. As noted, there is always a penalty for allowing things to get out of hand. A recession, in turn, means that men will be out of work, and, as Coolidge, who keeps recurring in this narrative, thoughtfully observed, when men are out of work, unemployment results. The proper action is not to continue inflation and risk an even greater bust; rather it is to have ready an adequate program of public service jobs that can be directed specifically to the communities affected. Such a program, sufficient in scale and energetically pursued, is an essential supplement to effective overall or macroeconomic management. We need it, indeed, for the unemployment we now have.

There is a certain charm in the whole Watergate affair—and undeniably, also, in talking about it. As compared with the hideous crises of recent years, there is no bombing, no mines, no death, no great waste of public funds and only the gentlemanly theft for which the SEC, not the police, are called in. I refuse to think that we were in danger of fascism, or even much repressed.

The burglars we have seen on television, had they invaded our privacy, would almost certainly have got the wrong house. The political trials showed bad intention but they all failed—and a considerable number of people, most recently my friend Dan Ellsberg, acquired in consequence a voice and influence that would not otherwise have been possible. Encouraged by their experience—so I trust—more people are now voicing more outrageous ideas with less fear than ever before in my lifetime. The actors that Watergate has brought before our eyes are especially splendid—one rejoices in the not three but four M's—Mitchell, Mitchell, McCord and Magruder. What a fine public relations firm that will one day be! All of us who have had any past association with the Democratic Party are enchanted at seeing John Connally called from deep in the heart of the fiscal thickets of Texas to become the symbol of moral rejuvenation and fiscal purity in the White House, available one day a week. With all other compassionate people I have sympathy for the President and hope he will be found guiltless. But even in his troubles there are grounds for satisfaction—a silver lining, a hopeful thought. How much better it is that so guiltless and trusting a man—one so indifferent to his subordinates' behavior, to what is going on around him—should be President of the United States and not the Director of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving.

So it was painful for me to have to talk about economics—as it was painful for you to have to listen. But I would draw your attention, as also that of the President were it available, to a recent Gallup poll. It showed that far more people are aroused about living costs than by the revelations at the Watergate. And given the bungling of economic policy and its consequences this sense of priority is sound. Thus my plea for renewed attention to economics. Incompetent as opposed to well conducted burglary has much to command it. But we cannot have an economic policy that suggests that odd managerial skills of Mr. E. Howard Hunt.

POSSESSION OF HOLY CROWN OF ST. STEPHEN

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join several of my colleagues in offering a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Government retain protective possession of the Holy Crown of St. Stephen, symbol of Hungarian sovereignty. I am most appreciative of my colleague, Mr. HOGAN, of Maryland, for initiating discussion on this topic, an area in which I am deeply interested.

It somewhat surprises me that this subject must even come up, since 1945 the United States has held this sacred symbol in trust until such time as Hungary was again a free and democratic nation. To return this emblem would violate the trust and thwart the hopes of millions of Hungarian nationals as well as Americans of Hungarian descent who yearn for their homeland to be free once again.

Mr. Speaker, every year the Members of this body commemorate and protest the enslavement of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain through a vehicle known as Captive Nations Week. This week of speeches is the one effort taken by an arm of the U.S. Government which

voices support and hope for the people of Eastern Europe and their desire to break the chains of Soviet oppression. And so, Mr. Speaker, while I am shocked that we must even debate this topic of the return of the Holy Crown of St. Stephen, I welcome it as a golden opportunity for the Congress to go beyond a mere vocalization of support. We have before us the opportunity to really demonstrate that we do care about the destiny of several million human beings.

The President of the United States has made a valiant effort to strengthen and mend the ties between our country and the nations of the Communist bloc. Most of us commend his moves in this direction, ones that surely represent steps toward understanding and peace. But the Congress of the United States must go on record to notify the President that as valuable as peace and understanding between nations is, breaking the spirit of people who envision freedom for their children is too high a price to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 250.

WILLIAM C. SULLIVAN'S REMARKS CONCERNING THE LATE J. EDGAR HOOVER

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I joined several of my colleagues in strong criticism of remarks attributed to former FBI agent, William C. Sullivan, as it related to the late J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Sullivan has communicated with me about this and in all fairness and in the interest of accuracy I am submitting a copy of his letter for the RECORD.

JUNE 12, 1972.

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEVINE: In the recent past, there have been attributed to me in the press, some remarks which do not at all accurately reflect my evaluation of the late J. Edgar Hoover. What I do think of Mr. Hoover is as follows:

First, I worked for this man thirty years in a number of different capacities. It was thoroughly enjoyable and I know of no finer group of people in this Nation than the employees of the FBI with whom I was associated continuously for three decades.

Second, the quality of these people gives one an excellent insight into Mr. Hoover. He had set the highest of standards for himself and, therefore, his recruitment programs resulted in the hiring of the kind of men and women who reflected his own values, principles and ideals.

Third, under Mr. Hoover's leadership, the FBI as we all know it, became highly respected throughout the Nation. He gave to this organization the best of his mind, his heart and his spirit. We who worked under him benefited from this greatly.

Fourth, Mr. Hoover was a man with a sense of mission in life and dedicated to the preservation of our Nation. He did not spare himself, and when I last saw him in 1971 he was still vigorous, thinking sharply and just as interested in maintaining his high standards of conduct as when he was young. We did have some major policy differences. These were official differences and did not detract from the high regard in which I held this

man for so many years. His superior ability, industry, intelligence and personality set him apart from most men. Many of us in the Bureau used to say, "We will not soon see his kind again." I believe this to be true. The record he established will stand the test of time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. SULLIVAN.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON INFLATION

(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, the strong actions taken by the President to fight inflation will be welcomed by consumers, and his appeal for cooperation from the Congress should be promptly heeded. In view of the President's announced intention to ask for legislation to implement his economic program, I place in the RECORD at this point the text of President Nixon's address to the Nation last night and, in addition, the Executive order he issued yesterday, and a brief fact sheet issued by the White House summarizing the present controls and price freeze:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE NATION'S ECONOMY ON NATIONWIDE RADIO AND TELEVISION

THE OVAL OFFICE

Good evening.

I want to talk to you tonight about some strong actions that I have ordered today with regard to the American economy—actions which will be important to you in terms of the wages you earn and the prices you pay.

But first, since we have been hearing so much about what is wrong with our economy over the past few months, let us look at some of the things that are right about the American economy. We can be proud that the American economy is by far the freest, the strongest, and the most productive economy in the world. It gives us the highest standard of living in the world. We are in the middle of one of the biggest, strongest booms in our history. More Americans have jobs today than ever before. The average worker is earning more today than ever before. Your income buys more today than ever before.

In August, 1971, I announced the New Economic Policy. Since then, the Nation's output has increased by a phenomenal 11½-percent—a more rapid growth than in any comparable period in the last 21 years. Four and a half million new civilian jobs have been created and that is more than in any comparable period in our whole history. At the same time, real per capita disposable income—that means what you have left to spend after taxes and after inflation—has risen by 7½ percent in that period. This means that, in terms of what your money will actually buy, in the past year and a half your annual income has increased by the equivalent of four weeks' pay. Now, when we consider these facts, we can see that in terms of jobs, of income, of growth, we are enjoying one of the best periods in our history.

We have every reason to be optimistic about the future. But there is one great problem that rightly concerns every one of us and that is, as you know, rising prices, and especially rising food prices. By the end of last year, we had brought the rate of inflation in the United States down to three and four-tenths percent. That gives us the best record in 1972 of any industrial coun-

try in the world. But now prices are going up at unacceptably high rates.

The greatest part of this increase is due to rising food prices. This has been caused in large measure by increased demand at home and abroad, by crop failures abroad and as many people in various areas of the country know, by some of the worst weather for crops and livestock that we have ever experienced. But whatever the reasons, every American family is confronted with a real and pressing problem of higher prices. And I have decided that the time has come to take strong and effective action to deal with that problem.

Effective immediately, therefore, I am ordering a freeze on prices. This freeze will hold prices at levels no higher than those charged during the first eight days of June. It will cover all prices paid by consumers. The only prices not covered will be those of unprocessed agricultural products at the farm levels, and rents.

Wages, interest and dividends will remain under their present control systems during the freeze. Now, the reason I decided not to freeze wages is that the wage settlements reached under the rules of Phase III have not been a significant cause of the increase in prices. And as long as wage settlements continue to be responsible and non-inflationary, a wage freeze will not be imposed.

The freeze will last for a maximum of 60 days. This time will be used to develop and put into place a new and more effective system of controls which will follow the freeze. This new Phase IV of controls will be designed to contain the forces that have sent prices so rapidly upward in the past few months. It will involve tighter standards, more mandatory compliance procedures than under Phase III. It will recognize the need for wages and prices to be treated consistently with one another.

In addition to food prices, I have received reports from various parts of the country of many instances of sharp increases in the price of gasoline. And therefore, I have specifically directed the Cost of Living Council to develop new Phase IV measures that will stabilize both the prices at the retail level of food and the price of gasoline at your service station.

In announcing these actions, there is one point I want to emphasize to every one of you listening tonight. The Phase IV that follows the freeze will not be designed to get us permanently into a controlled economy. On the contrary, it will be designed as a better way to get us out of a controlled economy, to return as quickly as possible to the free market system.

We are not going to put the American economy into a straitjacket. We are not going to control the boom in a way that would lead to abuse. We are not going to follow the advice of those who have proposed actions that would lead inevitably to a permanent system of price and wage controls, and also rationing.

Such actions would bring good headlines tomorrow, and bad headaches six months from now for every American family in terms of rationing, black markets, and eventually a recession that would mean more unemployment.

It is your prosperity that is at stake. It is your job that is at stake.

The actions I have directed today are designed to deal with the rise in the cost of living without jeopardizing your prosperity or your job.

Because the key to curbing food prices lies in increasing supplies, I am not freezing the price of unprocessed agricultural products at the farm level. This would reduce supplies instead of increasing them. It would eventually result in even higher prices for the foods you buy at the supermarket.

Beginning in 1972, we embarked on a com-

prehensive new program for increasing food supplies. Among many other measures, this has included opening up 40 million more acres for crop production. In the months ahead, as these new crops are harvested, they will help hold prices down. But unfortunately this is not yet helping in terms of the prices you pay at the supermarket today or the prices you will be paying tomorrow.

One of the major reasons for the rise in food prices at home is that there is now an unprecedented demand abroad for the products of America's farms. Over the long run, increased food exports will be a vital factor in raising farm income, in improving our balance of payments, in supporting America's position of leadership in the world. In the short term, however, when we have shortages and sharply rising prices of food here at home, I have made this basic decision: In allocating the products of America's farms between markets abroad and those in the United States, we must put the American consumer first.

Therefore, I have decided that a new system for export controls on food products is needed—a system designed to hold the price of animal feedstuffs and other grains in the American market to levels that will make it possible to produce meat and eggs and milk at prices you can afford.

I shall ask the Congress, on an urgent basis, to give me the new and more flexible authority needed to impose such a system. In exercising such authority, this will be my policy: We shall keep the export commitments we have made as a nation. We shall also consult with other countries to seek their cooperation in resolving the worldwide problem of rising food prices. But we will not let foreign sales price meat and eggs off the American table.

I have also taken another action today to stop the rise in the cost of living. I have ordered the Internal Revenue Service to begin immediately a thoroughgoing audit of the books of companies that have raised their prices more than 1½ percent above the January ceiling.

The purpose of the audit will be to find out whether these increases were justified by rising costs. If they were not, the prices will be rolled back.

The battle against inflation is everybody's business. I have told you what the Administration will do. There is also a vital role for the Congress, as I explained to the Congressional leaders just a few moments ago.

The most important single thing the Congress can do in holding down the cost of living is to hold down the cost of government. For my part, I shall continue to veto spending bills that we cannot afford, no matter how noble sounding their names may be. If these budget-busters become law, the money would come out of your pocket—in higher prices, higher taxes, or both.

There are several specific recommendations I have already made to the Congress that will be important in holding down prices in the future. I again urge quick action on all of these proposals.

Congress should give the President authority to reduce tariffs in selected cases in order to increase supplies of scarce goods and thereby hold down their prices. This action will help on such scarce items as meat, plywood and zinc. And in particular, the tariff we now have on imported meat should be removed.

Congress should provide authority to dispose of more surplus commodities now held in Government stockpiles.

Congress should let us go ahead quickly with the Alaska pipeline so that we can combat the shortage of oil and gasoline we otherwise will have. I will also soon send to the Congress a major new set of proposals on energy, spelling out new actions I believe are necessary to help us meet our energy

needs and thereby lessen pressures on fuel prices.

In its consideration of new farm legislation, it is vital that the Congress put high production ahead of high prices, so that farm prosperity will not be at the cost of higher prices for the consumer. If the Congress sends me a farm bill, or any other bill, that I consider inflationary, I shall veto that bill.

Beyond what the Administration can do, beyond what the Congress can do, there is a great deal you can do. The next 60 days can decide the question of whether we shall have a continuing inflation that leads to a recession or whether we deal responsibly with our present problems and so go forward with a vigorous prosperity and a swift return to a free market.

You can help, by giving your Senators and Congressmen your support when they make the difficult decisions to hold back on unnecessary Government spending.

You can help, by saying no to those who would impose a permanent system of controls on this great, productive economy of ours which is the wonder of the world.

Let there be no mistake: If our economy is to remain dynamic, we must never slip into the temptation of imagining that in the long run, controls can substitute for a free economy or permit us to escape the need for discipline in fiscal and monetary policy. We must not let controls become a narcotic—we must not become addicted.

There are all sorts of seemingly simple gimmicks that would give the appearance or offer the promise of controlling inflation, but that would carry a dangerous risk of bringing on a recession, and that would not be effective in controlling inflation. Rigid, permanent controls always look better on paper than they do in practice.

We must never go down that road which would lead us to economic disaster.

We have a great deal to be thankful for as Americans tonight. We are the best-clothed, best-fed, best-housed people in the world; we are the envy of every nation in that respect. This year, for the first time in 12 years, we are at peace in Vietnam and our courageous prisoners of war have returned to their homes. This year, for the first time in a generation, no American is being drafted into the Armed Forces. This year, we find our prospects brighter than at any time in the modern era for a lasting peace and for the abundant prosperity such a peace can make possible.

Next Monday, I will meet at the summit here in Washington with General Secretary Brezhnev of the Soviet Union. Based on the months of preparatory work that has been done for this meeting, and based on the extensive consultation and correspondence we have had, much of it quite recently, I can confidently predict tonight that out of our meetings will come major new progress toward reducing both the burden of arms and the danger of war; and toward a better and more rewarding relationship between the world's two most powerful nations.

Today in America, we have a magnificent opportunity. We hold the future—our future—in our hands. By standing together, by working together, by joining in bold yet sensible policies to meet our temporary problems without sacrificing our lasting strengths, we can achieve what America has not had since President Eisenhower was in this office: full prosperity without war and without inflation. This is a great goal, and working together, we can and will achieve that goal.

Thank you and good evening.

EXECUTIVE ORDER: FURTHER PROVIDING FOR THE STABILIZATION OF THE ECONOMY

On January 11, 1973 I issued Executive Order 11695 which provided for establish-

ment of Phase III of the Economic Stabilization Program. On April 30, 1973 the Congress enacted, and I signed into law, amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 which extended for one year, until April 30, 1974, the legislative authority for carrying out the Economic Stabilization Program.

During Phase III, labor and management have contributed to our stabilization efforts through responsible collective bargaining. The American people look to labor and management to continue their constructive and cooperative contributions. Price behavior under Phase III has not been satisfactory, however. I have therefore determined to impose a comprehensive freeze for a maximum period of 60 days on the prices of all commodities and services offered for sale except the prices charged for raw agricultural products. I have determined that this action is necessary to stabilize the economy, reduce inflation, minimize unemployment, improve the Nation's competitive position in world trade and protect the purchasing power of the dollar, all in the context of sound fiscal management and effective monetary policies.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, particularly the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Effective 9:00 p.m., e.s.t., June 13, 1973, no seller may charge to any class of purchaser and no purchaser may pay a price for any commodity or service which exceeds the freeze price charged for the same or a similar commodity or service in transactions with the same class of purchaser during the freeze base period. This order shall be effective for a maximum period of 60 days from the date hereof, until 11:59 p.m., e.s.t., August 12, 1973. It is not unlawful to charge or pay a price less than the freeze price and lower prices are encouraged.

SEC. 2. Each seller shall prepare a list of freeze prices for all commodities and services which he sells and shall maintain a copy of that list available for public inspection, during normal business hours, at each place of business where such commodities or services are offered for sale. In addition, the calculations and supporting data upon which the list is based shall be maintained by the seller at the location where the pricing decisions reflected on the list are ordinarily made and shall be made available on request to representatives of the Economic Stabilization Program.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this order shall not extend to the prices charged for raw agricultural products. The prices of processed agricultural products, however, are subject to the provisions of this order. For those agricultural products which are sold for ultimate consumption in their original unprocessed form, this provision applies after the first sale.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this order do not extend to (a) wages and salaries, which continue to be subject to the program established pursuant to Executive Order 11695; (b) interest and dividends, which continue to be subject to the program established by the Committee on Interest and Dividends and (c) rents which continue to be subject to controls only to the limited extent provided in Executive Order 11695.

SEC. 5. The Cost of Living Council shall develop and recommend to the President policies, mechanisms and procedures to achieve and maintain stability of prices and costs in a growing economy after the expiration of this freeze. To this end, it shall consult with representatives of agriculture, industry, labor, consumers and the public.

SEC. 6(a). Executive Order 11695 continues to remain in full force and effect and the authority conferred by and pursuant to this order shall be in addition to the authority conferred by or pursuant to Executive Order

11695 including authority to grant exceptions and exemptions under appropriate standards issued pursuant to regulations.

(b) All powers and duties delegated to the Chairman of the Cost of Living Council by Executive Order 11695 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of that order are hereby delegated to the Chairman of the Cost of Living Council for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this order.

SEC. 7. Whoever willfully violates this order or any order or regulation continued or issued under authority of this order shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 for each violation. Whoever violates this order or any order or regulation continued or issued under authority of this order shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than \$2,500 for each such violation.

SEC. 8. For purposes of this Executive Order, the following definitions apply:

"Freeze price" means the highest price at or above which at least 10 percent of the commodities or services concerned were priced by the seller in transactions with the class of purchaser concerned during the freeze base period. In computing the freeze price, a seller may not exclude any temporary special sale, deal or allowance in effect during the freeze base period.

"Class of purchaser" means all those purchasers to whom a seller has charged a comparable price for comparable commodities or services during the freeze base period pursuant to customary price differentials between those purchasers and other purchasers.

"Freeze base period" means

(a) the period June 1 to June 8, 1973; or
(b) in the case of a seller who had no transactions during that period, the nearest preceding seven-day period in which he had a transaction.

"Transaction" means an arms length sale between unrelated persons and is considered to occur at the time of shipment in the case of commodities and the time of performance in the case of services.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 1973.

**ECONOMIC PROGRAM FACT SHEET
FREEZE PERIOD CONTROLS**

1. A ceiling is placed on prices at a level not to exceed the base period level: the highest price at which substantial transactions occurred in the period June 1-8.

2. Unprocessed agricultural products at the farm level are exempt.

3. Wages are not frozen but remain under the Phase III control system. We recognize that the exclusion of wages from the freeze is possible only if the freeze is short.

4. Rents are not covered.

5. Interest and dividends remain under the jurisdiction of CIO on a voluntary basis.

6. The freeze is to be a maximum of 60 days duration.

7. A profit sweep will be conducted during the freeze and prices will be reduced to levels permitted by existing Phase III rules where they are found to be above these levels. These reduced prices will be the maximum permitted during the freeze.

8. The freeze will be administered by the COLC with increased assistance from IRS.

LICENSING OF AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

1. All exporters must notify the Secretary of Commerce by June 20 of orders for export of grains, soybeans and products thereof on their books as of this date (June 13, 1973).

2. Weekly thereafter exporters must notify the Secretary of Commerce of export orders for above commodities received after this date.

3. Steps will be taken to reduce Government-supported exports of foods.

4. Congress is asked to amend the Economic Stabilization Act to authorize the

President to limit exports where necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act, under conditions less restrictive than in the Export Administration Act.

5. The export control authority will be used if necessary to restrain exports sufficiently to bring domestic prices of feed down to levels consistent with the present prices of meats and other animal products.

THE POST-FREEZE CONTROLS PROGRAM

1. The purpose of the post-freeze program (Phase IV) is to yield lower rates of inflation than we had during Phase III. One purpose of the freeze is to give time for consultation and for the development of a more effective, temporary, system of controls.

2. Information obtained from the reports to be received on the first quarter's operations under Phase III will be helpful in judging the points of adequacy or deficiency in the Phase III system.

3. Phase IV will require more prenotifications, tighter standards, a wider spread of mandatory controls, and a larger administrative staff than we had with Phase III.

4. The Cost of Living Council will develop regulations for food prices in Phase IV which in conjunction with actions on exports will stabilize the retail price of food.

5. The Cost of Living Council will develop regulations to stabilize the retail price of gasoline.

6. Phase IV will recognize the need for consistent treatment of wages and prices.

7. Every effort will be made to provide more specific information on the nature of the Phase IV system in about 30 days.

8. It is a primary objective of the Administration to manage Phase IV and other aspects of economic policy so as to permit early termination of controls.

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to present the results of my 11th annual public opinion poll conducted over the last several months in the 10th Congressional District of North Carolina. This questionnaire was distributed to every household in the district, and I am pleased to say that the response this year

was enthusiastic; nearly 14,000 of my constituents responded to the poll—an increase of more than 1,500 over my survey of 1972.

Ranging from economic issues to amnesty and Presidential prerogatives, this year's poll consisted of 12 questions and was designed to cover subjects foremost in the minds of the American public and the Congress. Each questionnaire provided for a separate response from both husband and wife, as there is sometimes a difference of opinion within families.

Question 6, concerning a mandatory death penalty for certain specific Federal crimes, that is, kidnapping, assassination, and skyjacking—elicited the most decisive response. The affirmative reply was overwhelming: 88.6 percent of the men polled and 85.8 percent of the women, favored a mandatory death penalty for the perpetrators of serious Federal crimes involving murder or endangering human life. It is clear to me that my constituents in the 10th District consider these crimes to be quite serious and want such criminals to be dealt with accordingly.

Several other questions drew an almost equally resounding response. Questions 2, 3, and 4 concerned themselves with foreign policy. Almost 3 out of every 4 of my constituents responding to the poll favored a requirement of congressional approval for the commitment of American troops abroad for any period exceeding 30 days. Even more decisive was the response to the question of aid to North Vietnam and amnesty for draft evaders: 76.4 percent of the men and 78.8 percent of the women respondents opposed a foreign aid program for the reconstruction of Indochina, including North Vietnam. Similarly, both men and women, 79.6 percent and 75.6 percent, respectively, opposed amnesty for those who left the country to evade the draft.

In contrast to the decisive reaction elicited by these issues, the question of Presidential power to withhold congressionally appropriated moneys—No. 10—

drew the least decisive response. In addition to being the least decisively answered question in the poll, it also proved to be the only question upon which the men and women respondents differed. Slightly over half of the men—51.1 percent—felt that the President should have the power to withhold funds appropriated by Congress. Nearly the same percentage of women—52.1 percent—felt that the President should not have this power.

I found that the questions evoking the most decisive reactions also drew the greatest numerical response. The question concerning aid to Indochina, for example, elicited a total of 7,314 opinions, giving it the greatest numerical response from the men. In turn, the question drawing the greatest number of responses from the women dealt with amnesty; 6,759 women voiced an opinion on this issue.

Set against the high return given to what might be called the "gut" issues; for example, amnesty, the death penalty, aid to North Vietnam—questions 12 and 7 elicited the smallest number of responses. Question 12, on whether or not a news reporter should have the right to refuse to reveal a news source to a court or grand jury in a criminal case, was replied to the least number of times by the men—6,469. The women gave the lowest numerical response—6,384—to question 7, which dealt with revenue sharing. Perhaps this smaller response to questions of this sort indicates a lesser understanding of the issues.

Another interesting inclination indicated by my constituents' responses was that husbands and wives tend to hold basically the same views on the issues. Despite this tendency to agree, however, there was, naturally, always a degree of overall difference in the percentages.

The views indicated in this poll have proved quite informative and helpful to me, as have the polls of the previous 10 years, and I would like to thank my constituents in the 10th District for their time and interest in responding.

The detailed results of the poll are as follows:

	His		Hers				His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No			Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a phaseout of farm controls and farm subsidy programs?	75.6	24.4	73.1	26.9			64.1	31.9	65.1	34.9
2. Should congressional approval be required for the commitment of U.S. troops abroad for more than 30 days?	72.4	27.6	74.7	25.3			64.9	35.1	67.8	32.2
3. Do you favor U.S. participation with other nations in a foreign aid program for the reconstruction of Indochina, including North Vietnam?	23.6	76.4	21.2	78.8			56.1	43.9	57.9	42.1
4. Would you favor amnesty for those who left the country to evade the draft, with the requirement that they participate in some alternative Government service?	20.4	79.6	24.4	75.6			51.1	48.9	47.9	52.1
5. Would you favor a national no-fault automobile insurance plan instead of continuing State options to enact such plans?	69.7	30.3	69.1	30.9			63.4	36.6	65.3	34.7
6. Would you favor a mandatory death penalty for certain specific Federal crimes such as kidnapping, assassination, and skyjacking?	88.6	11.4	85.8	14.2			42.3	57.7	48.2	51.8
7. Should Federal revenue-sharing funds replace Federal-aid programs such as housing, hospital construction, and water and sewer assistance?										
8. Would you favor a return to mandatory wage and price controls?										
9. Should the States be allowed to use some moneys from the Federal highway trust fund (gasoline taxes) to finance mass transit systems?										
10. Should the President have the power to withhold moneys that have been appropriated by Congress?										
11. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage to \$2 per hour effective Jan. 1, 1974, and to \$2.20 per hour effective Jan. 1, 1975?										
12. Do you believe a news reporter should have the right to refuse to reveal a news source to a court or grand jury in a criminal case?										

DEATH OF CONGRESSWOMAN MARGARET HECKLER'S FATHER

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the House the death of the beloved father of my colleague from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

The Congresswoman's father—John O'Shaughnessy—passed away in his sleep last evening at the age of 86.

I take this opportunity to explain Mrs. HECKLER's absence from Congress today. I am sure all of us extend our deepest sympathies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the Flag Day ceremonies conducted today in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.

MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for the period from June 18, until June 30, 1973, on account of official business.

Mr. LANDGREBE, for June 18, 19, 20, on account of he will be in Germany visiting military installations.

Mrs. BURKE of California (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), for today through Monday June 18, on account of official business.

Mr. DANIELSON (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), from 5 p.m. today and June 15, on account of family illness.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. CONTE) for the remainder of this week, on account of the death of her father.

Mr. MAILLARD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 15, account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), from 4:30 today and June 15, on account of official business.

Mr. SYMMS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from 4 p.m. today and balance of week, 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. SPENCE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORSYTHE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALSH, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEELE, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BIAGGI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, on June 15.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, on June 15.

Mr. FAUNTRY, for 5 minutes, on June 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN to revise and extend his remarks and insert a newspaper article.

Mr. SEIBERLING to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter on the Law Enforcement Assistance Act extension.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SPENCE), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUNT in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. STEELE in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOLT.

Mr. FROELICH.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. MILLER in four instances.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mr. DENNIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATTEN in three instances.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. COTTER.

Mr. OBEY in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. KOCH in three instances.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri.

Mr. MCFALL.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. FULTON in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1747. An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 with respect to authorizations of appropriations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4682. An act to provide for the immediate disposal of certain abaca and sisal cordage fiber now held in the national stockpile.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 15, 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:

1031. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 12, 1943, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department's working capital fund, without reimbursement, and to capitalize in the fund at fair and reasonable values, such equipment and other assets as he may determine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1032. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting the texts of International Labor Recommendations No. 136, concerning special youth employment and training schemes for development purposes, and No. 138, concerning seafarers' welfare at sea and in port (H. Doc. No. 93-114); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1033. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restructuring of the rail system in the Northeast, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1034. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting corrected copies of the previously submitted draft "Northeast Railroad Restructuring Act of 1973" and sectional analysis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1035. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to improve the program of payments for Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance and the program of grants to States for aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1036. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 (H. Doc. No. 93-115); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1037. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on some problems in contracting for federally assisted child-care service; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 8510. A bill to

authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 5157. A bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to extend its geographical coverage to contracts performed on Canton Island; (Rept. No. 93-279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 8662. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DORN: Committee on Veterans' Administration. H.R. 3733. A bill to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to assume control of overseas war memorials erected by private persons and non-Federal and foreign agencies and to demolish such war memorials in certain instances; (Rept. No. 93-281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STRATTON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8537. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to make permanent certain provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. STRATTON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1717. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy retired, to the grade of admiral on the retired list; (Rept. No. 93-283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, Ms. CHISHOLM, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 8674. A bill to facilitate the completion of the New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENITEZ (for himself, Mr. PIKE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. DE LUGO):

H.R. 8675. A bill to authorize the appropriation of such funds as may be necessary to effectuate the transfer of all naval weapons range activities from the island of Culebra to the islands of Desecheo and Monito not later than July 1, 1975; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 8676. A bill to repeal the filled cheese regulatory provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 8677. A bill to guarantee the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively which safeguards the public interest and promotes the free and unobstructed flow of commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 8678. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 8679. A bill relating to the dutiable status of fresh, chilled, or frozen cattle meat and fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs) and beef prepared in air-tight containers and beef prepared whether fresh chilled or frozen and lamb or mutton prepared or preserved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8680. A bill to repeal the statutory authority to impose quotas on certain imported meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FROELICH:

H.R. 8681. A bill to provide that respect for an individual's right not to participate in abortions contrary to that individual's conscience be a requirement for hospital eligibility for Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8682. A bill to exercise the power of the Congress to enforce the 14th amendment by defining certain 14th amendment rights, and to limit the jurisdiction of certain Federal courts with respect to certain cases involving the validity of State laws concerning abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8683. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit medicaid payments for abortions except in cases of medical necessity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 8684. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to permit certain veterans up to 15 months of educational assistance for the purpose of pursuing retraining or refresher courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 8685. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HOLT:

H.R. 8686. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for civil service retirement purposes service as an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. DELLMUS, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 8687. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 8688. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide the States with maximum flexibility in their programs of social services under the public assistance titles of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 8689. A bill to amend title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (Pub-

lic Law 85-699) for the purpose of creating industrial mortgage insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8690. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 8691. A bill to provide Federal assistance for programs of consumers' nutritional education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 8692. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials; to the Committee on Government Operation.

H.R. 8693. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations governing the humane treatment of animals transported in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 8694. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 8695. A bill to amend section 1903 of the Social Security Act to remove limits on payments for skilled nursing homes and intermediate care facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 8696. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to impose certain restrictions upon the exportation of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8697. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt private vessels and aircraft entering or departing from the United States at night or on Sunday or a holiday from provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 8698. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to achieve certain reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 8699. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve employers of 50 or less employees from the requirement of paying or depositing certain employment taxes more often than once each quarter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 8701. A bill to authorize financial assistance for service, employment, and redevelopment (SER) centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 8702. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sex or marital status against individuals seeking credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 8703. A bill to amend chapter 17, title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital care and medical services abroad to an alien, who was never an American citizen for any service-connected disability incurred while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8704. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide more effectively for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

bilingual proceedings in certain district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 8705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 8706. A bill to assure to all first offenders the restoration of their Federal civil rights after the completion of their sentence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 8707. A bill to establish in the State of Florida the Egmont Key National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8708. 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. STARK (for himself, Mr. MAILLARD, and Mr. BURTON).

H.R. 8709. A bill to authorize the striking

of medals in commemoration in the 100th anniversary of the cable car in San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REES, and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 8710. A bill to provide reduced retirement benefits for Members of Congress who remain in office after attaining 70 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 8711. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to permit the proceeds of certain loans to be used to construct protective measures for the prevention of future damage; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 617. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the Congress to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. MACDONALD):

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the price of natural gas should not be permitted to be increased prior to January 1974, in certain

June 14, 1973

cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

250. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to highway safety; to the Committee on Public Works.

251. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the capital gains treatment of timber; 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. CARTER:

H.R. 8712. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy retired, to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8713. A bill for the relief of Renoru Nishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESERVE AND GUARD SHORTAGES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 14, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if our Nation is to survive in a peacetime environment, we must maintain a strong Reserve and Guard.

The fact that such an accomplishment will not be easy is illustrated by a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Reserve, Guard Enlistments Lagging." This article points out that shortages in the Guard and Reserve presently total some 50,000 personnel. In my view, these shortages will grow during the approaching fiscal year.

Mr. President, this article, by Dana Adams Schmidt, deserves the attention of the Congress and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 9, 1973]

AVOID-THE-DRAFT INCENTIVE GONE—RESERVE, GUARD ENLISTMENTS LAGGING

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. National Guard and reserves are uncomfortably short on manpower—despite efforts to replace their lost attraction as a draft alternative.

A report issued recently by the manpower division of the Pentagon stated that the shortages in the guard and reserve have stabilized at about 50,000 men. Their statutory strength is 976,559. It anticipated slightly larger losses in the final quarter of fiscal '73

and greater losses in fiscal 1974 unless recruitment is intensified.

NO ONE WAITING

For many years the guard and reserves had waiting lists of men who wanted to join to avoid the draft. Seventy percent of their recruits were draft motivated. Now they have to work to win recruits.

J. M. Roche, former chairman of the board of General Motors Corporation, who for the past year served as chairman of the National Committee for Employers' Support of the National Guard and Reserves, has announced that 50 state governors and nearly 13,000 employers have signed statements supporting the guard and reserves. These employers account for more than 25 million employees or about 31 percent of the total U.S. work force.

But in spite of everything he and his executive committee of 20 leaders of labor and industry could do "to improve the environment" for the guard and the reserves, he said, "unfortunately this has not been reflected in manning increases. A year ago our strengths were below mandated levels, they are still below and the projections for the balance of this fiscal year are that strength will be even lower."

Mr. Roche reported with pride that he recently won statements of support from George Meany of the AFL-CIO and Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen as well as Mayor Walter E. Washington of the District of Columbia.

A report prepared for the Senate Committee on Armed Services by Martin Binkin and John D. Johnston of the Brookings Institution has pointed out that the guard and the reserves would have made a much poorer showing during the fiscal year just ending had it not been for two government programs.

PROGRAMS THAT HELPED

First, Army personnel were permitted an early discharge if they agreed to serve in an Army Reserve unit for one year.

Second, a policy was established permitting selective-service registrants who already had

been ordered to report for induction to enlist instead in the selected reserve.

The Brookings Institution suggested that the guard and reserve might resort to a number of devices to increase the number of recruits before they turned to payment of special bonuses.

The Uniformed Special Pay Act of 1973 would authorize enlistment bonuses up to \$1,100 for six years for individuals with no prior military experience or \$2,200 for re-enlistments. It is estimated that these payments would cost \$85 million in fiscal 1974, \$107 million for fiscal 1975 and \$139 million in fiscal '76.

OPTIONS OPEN

Instead, the study recommends that recruiting officers seek more women, non-whites, and more individuals scoring in the lower mental groups.

It suggested that the guard and reserves also devote more attention to re-enlisting men who have dropped out of the armed services because they can be used without additional training or costs.

In addition, they urged that a study be made to determine if the existing aim of maintaining the guard and reserve at 30 percent of total strength of the armed services could not be lowered.

In the opinion of the Brookings report some categories of reservists could be eliminated.

ON-BOARD STATUS

The following is a table showing the authorized strengths and status of the various reserve units:

Reserve components	Authorized strength fiscal year 1973	Shortage or surplus
Army National Guard	402,300	15,600(—)
Army Reserves	261,300	26,100(—)
Naval Reserves	129,000	2,800(+)
Marine Corps Reserves	45,000	5,900(—)
Air National Guard	87,600	2,400(+)
Air Force Reserve	51,300	6,700(—)