

question about the merits. What is the strategy that he wants us to accomplish?

Mr. HARTKE. I will be glad to explain it to the Senator from Rhode Island. No. 1, the chairman of the Finance Committee wants to bring up the renegotiation bill, which expires June 30.

Mr. PASTORE. I heard him. I would like to hear from you.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes; if the Senator will permit me, I will explain what I want to do.

I am in favor of the renegotiation bill being extended if we can have an agreement not to attach the social security amendments which he proposes to attach to that bill tonight. If they are not to be attached to that bill, we can proceed with that legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. Where would they be attached? I understand they were repudiated by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HARTKE. They were what?

Mr. PASTORE. The conference report was repudiated by the House, was it not?

Mr. HARTKE. If the Senator from Rhode Island is aware of why the House repudiated the conference report, I wish he would tell me.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know.

Mr. HARTKE. I do not know, either. I have my ideas, but I do know that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is not in any hurry, either, and neither he nor I are in a hurry, if you want to know the truth.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not care who is in a hurry. I wonder exactly what the Senator is campaigning for here tonight. What does the Senator from Indiana want us to do?

Mr. HARTKE. I want to proceed with the business in an orderly fashion.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, what is that?

Mr. HARTKE. To go ahead with the renegotiation bill on its merits, with the understanding that there will not be this attempt to do an end run to get around and put the social security amendments for 35 million Americans on a bill which

is certain to be vetoed. That is what the chairman of the Finance Committee is asking us to do, to take these amendments and put them on a bill he himself has told us the President will veto. Is that not a nice set of dishes?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator's argument is that if it goes on the debt limit bill, it will not be vetoed?

Mr. HARTKE. I will guarantee the Senator that then the burden is on the President to go ahead and answer the 35 million people, is on him but not on us; but we know in advance tonight that if we put these amendments on this bill, we are asking for a veto, according to the word of the chairman of the Finance Committee that it will be vetoed, and then we take our chances on overriding that veto.

I say if we want to make sure that the President provides for those 35 million Americans the benefits of social security which we provided in the Senate, let us put it on a bill which puts the burden on him instead of on us.

Mr. PASTORE. But no matter who assumes the burden, as I understand the argument made by the Senator from Louisiana, the President has already indicated that he will veto these bills in any event, and his idea is that it would be easier to override the veto if we put them on the renegotiation bill rather than the debt limit bill, because there are so many people who are against raising the debt limit anyway, and for that reason they would vote to sustain the President's veto, whereas if we had a clear chance with the renegotiation bill, the meat of the nut would actually be these amendments we are talking about, and they would be more amicable toward overriding the President's veto.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. HARTKE. I understand what the Senator from Rhode Island says. I suppose if you really believe you want to get these beneficiaries of social security and the aged, blind, and disabled the money we voted on the Senate floor, the best

chance of doing it is to keep it on the debt limit bill.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the Senator's idea. The Senator from Louisiana disagrees with that, and that is the question we have to decide.

Mr. HARTKE. If you want to continue this tomorrow morning, it is all right with me.

Mr. PASTORE. What time tomorrow morning, 8:30?

Mr. HARTKE. I did not say we would vote tomorrow morning. I said take this measure up tomorrow that is what I meant to say.

Mr. PASTORE. I think it is rather unfair, at 11 o'clock at night, to insist, "I either get my way or nothing is going to happen." I think the Senator ought to have an opportunity to argue his point, and I think the Senator has argued his point. He is now arguing about the merits, and there is no question about the merits. The Senator ought to understand that it is 11 o'clock at night; let us see what the will of the Senate might be.

Mr. HARTKE. I would be glad, Mr. President, to adjourn and go home now. I will be glad to yield for that purpose, if I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will my friend indicate how much longer he intends to talk, if he talks longer tonight?

Mr. HARTKE. As long as I can hold out.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Will the Senator yield to me to make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10:59 p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 30, 1973, at 9 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 29, 1973

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Behold, God is Mighty, He is mighty in strength and wisdom.—Job 36: 5.

O Thou Supreme Architect of the universe and the Father of all persons, in whose circle of love we live and move and have our being, keep us close to Thee through the hours of this day that strengthened by Thy spirit, guided by Thy wisdom, and filled with Thy peace we may work the ways of Thy will doing justly, loving mercy, and living humbly with Thee.

As we face the Fourth of July when we commemorate our great day of independence, we call to mind the great men whose creative faith and courageous stand made liberty a grand and glorious reality. May we here highly resolve

to keep this spirit alive in our world and work for the time when all nations shall be free and all people enjoy the fruits of a just, righteous, and honorable peace.

In the spirit of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

H.R. 7670. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1974 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

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

H.R. 8152. An act 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;

H.R. 8510. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8619. An act making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection programs for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1808. An act to apportion funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and to authorize funds in accordance with title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8152) entitled "An act 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," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8619) entitled "An act making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McGEE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. FONG, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 11. An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River Basin compact, Arkansas-Oklahoma;

S. 1776. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended;

S. 1794. An act to amend section 308 of title 44, United States Code, relating to the disbursing officer, deputy disbursing officer, and certifying officers and employees of the Government Printing Office;

S. 1795. An act to authorize the Public Printer to adopt an official Government Printing Office seal, and to designate employees to administer oaths;

S. 1802. An act relating to certain authority of the Joint Committee on Printing;

S. 1884. An act to permit national banks to invest in agricultural credit corporations;

S. 1904. An act to amend the act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for members of the police force of the Library of Congress;

S. 1945. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, so as to authorize certain grapefruit marketing orders which provide for an assessment against handlers for the purpose of financing a marketing promotion program to also provide for a credit against such assessment in the case of handlers who expend directly for marketing promotion;

S. 1972. An act to further amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948;

S. 2016. An act to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes; and

S. 2079. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. 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. 312]

Andrews, N.C.	Fuqua	Reid
Ashbrook	Gibbons	Robison, N.Y.
Ashley	Gray	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Griffiths	Ryan
Bell	Gubser	Sandman
Biaggi	Hansen, Wash.	Sisk
Blatnik	Hébert	Staggers
Breaux	Hollifield	Stratton
Burke, Calif.	Jarman	Symington
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	McCormack	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	McKinney	Thornton
Dellums	Matsunaga	Tieman
Dent	Mitchell, Md.	Waggonner
Derwinski	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitehurst
Esch	Nedzi	Wilson, Bob
Fisher	Pepper	Wright
Frey	Rees	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 479 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 479

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 6, rule XXI to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9055) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 5, rule XXI are hereby waived. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the following amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 307 of the bill H.R. 9055.

"Sec. 307. None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act or heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over, or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces."

Mr. BOLLING. 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, I should like to explain this rule very clearly so that the Members will understand exactly what is in it and what will be possible after it has been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to avoid any discussion on our side of anything except the rule. I have refused to yield time to a number of Members who would like to discuss the issue. The Committee on

Rules tried extremely hard to provide a rule that was absolutely fair to all the Members of the House and all of the groups in the House who have expressed their position in this matter, and I should appreciate if it were possible for those who are interested to hear what I have to say.

First of all, we waived the provisions of clause 6. That is the 3-day rule, and unless that were waived, obviously this matter could not come up today.

We also waived the provisions of clauses 2 and 5. Clause 2 deals rather broadly with the question of authorizations. Clause 5 deals with the question of transfer and reappropriation, and before the waiver on clause 5 was included, it was determined that that had no effect on the issue which is really before the House.

The Committee on Appropriations added section 307 which is an effort to achieve a compromise over the issue which concerns the Members.

Those who have supported the amendments variously called Addabbo, Long, and Eagleton felt very strongly that they should have an opportunity since this compromise language, which was not germane to the bill under normal circumstances, was to be included. They have a straight opportunity to vote on that which they preferred. I will call it the Eagleton amendment. The Rules Committee provides that opportunity.

That is as accurate and precise a description of the rule as I can give you. If there are questions I would be glad to try to answer them. If there are no questions, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to find out whether under the rule that is reported out by the Rules Committee, and I think it is a good rule, the language of the Eagleton amendment is open to an amendment to that amendment, or whether it poses a straight up and down vote on the substitute as authorized by the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman repeat that so I can be sure of it?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I wanted to find out whether in the authorization of the rule it is specifically provided, because it repeats the language of the Eagleton amendment, whether this allows someone to offer an amendment to that amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) or whether this keeps us to a straight up and down vote on the Flynt offer?

Mr. BOLLING. The substitute language could be amended. An amendment to the substitute language could be offered.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. One more question. Could any type of amendment

be offered or would we be held to amendments which did not change the whole import of the language?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from Missouri cannot foresee all possibilities. I can only answer that the normal rules of the House with respect to germaneness and so forth would prevail with respect to any amendments or the propriety of any amendments or to the ability of any Member to offer an amendment. That would be a ruling made by the officer in the chair. I cannot go beyond that.

Mr. LATTA. I would like to say I concur with the statement just made by the gentleman from Missouri about the rule. We spell the amendment out on page 2 of the rule and certainly the House could not change the amendment in such a form that it would not reflect what the Rules Committee has reported.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. YATES. After the rule is adopted by the House, will the bill itself be subject to any amendments?

Mr. LATTA. This is an open rule. If the Members want to change the bill the House passed previously they would have the opportunity to do so. I might point out, as the gentleman from Texas will mention in general debate, with one other exception dealing with the transfer of funds, this is the identical bill which was previously passed by the House. If I am not correct, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON). But I see he is shaking his head affirmatively, so I must be correct.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do think this is important. Under the rule proposed here could an amendment be offered to the Flynt language which would reinstate the Whitten amendment with, say, a somewhat different date, maybe August 14 or August 1 or something of that sort?

Or, would this be so different from the intent of the rules committee in providing for a vote on the Eagleton amendment that it would be ruled out of order?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is a parliamentary question which will be answered by the Chair when we get into general debate.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that this is an open rule? Do I further understand that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) intends to offer the Eagleton amendment as a substitute which we had voted on in the last few days?

I understand from conversations which I have had at the Chair that it would be in order then to offer amendments to the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, and if any of

those amendments were passed, it would be an amendment to that substitute.

If that substitute passes, there can be no more amendments and the vote will be up or down on that issue. Thus, if I am correct, then, Mr. Speaker, if the substitute is passed, then there will be a vote on that up or down, and there can be no amendment beyond that point, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will answer that this is a matter for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Chair is not able at this time to take over the responsibility of making parliamentary rulings from the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker is absolutely correct. This is something that can be taken up in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Rules Committee has provided an adequate rule to accommodate the different positions on this issue. We cannot in the Rules Committee set forth every possible amendment which could be offered to this legislation.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I intend to phrase that question in the committee and have the ruling on it.

I think I understand what will be the procedure, and I will also say to the House that if the substitute is not passed, I think a motion will be made then to amend the committee amendment.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I might say, as far as my own position in the Committee on Rules is concerned, I sought to save the House the task of plowing this same ground again and voted against this rule permitting the offering of the same amendment which caused the veto of this bill. This question has been before the House many, many times. We have stated our individual positions as a matter of record. The President has vetoed the language which is proposed to be again inserted by this amendment. We were 35 votes short of the number required to override the veto. The votes are not available to override another veto.

I do not think that we want to take this course again and send the same identical legislation downtown for a certain veto. I think we should realize it is time to compromise. We have a very serious situation on our hands. On Saturday night this Government will be without operating funds. Hundreds of thousands of people working for the Federal Government will deserve to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is too serious a matter to do something foolhardy, and I think it would be foolhardy on the part of the House to adopt the same language and send it to the White House for a certain veto. What would be accomplished by such an action?

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I respect his position. My position, I think, has been the same as his for a long time. I have never voted for any kind of amendment which would handcuff the President in his dealings with the situation in Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, however, the House has made certain plans for next week. Now, we are simply kowtowing to a veto, or being asked to, and I intend from here on out to vote for every amendment which will cut off the war in Asia which is offered on any bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is absolutely absurd for us to be here dancing a jig while the President is vacationing out in San Clemente.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is not a question of whether or not we are for or against continuing bombing in Cambodia. It is a matter of facing reality. I think we are reasonable individuals, and I think we all can count. When this issue was before us on the question of overriding the veto, the yeas were 241 and the nays were 173. The veto was sustained.

We were 35 votes short of the two-thirds necessary to pass it over the veto of the President.

My colleagues, we might as well face reality. The votes are not available to pass this bill over a veto, so compromise we must. The bill must become law and time is running out.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the bill H.R. 9055, which the House will soon have before it, all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter. I make that request, Mr. Speaker, in order that all Members may know they may insert their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. 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. MAHON. 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. 9055) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 9055, with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) will be recognized for one-half hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is refreshing to feel the atmosphere of serenity and calmness that pervades the House of Representatives today.

Not long ago, upon invitation, I went to the Kennedy Center and listened to a production by British actors of Shakespeare's "Midsummer Night's Dream." The actors spoke with such a British accent that I was not able to understand all they were saying. I did catch a line which was:

What fools these mortals be.

Well, I am sure that William Shakespeare was not speaking of the House of Representatives, and certainly not of the other body. I have great respect for our institution, very great pride in the House of Representatives.

It is the genius of our system of government that we are always able to resolve our differences.

Yes, once we did have a war between the States, but otherwise we have been able to resolve our differences for almost 200 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope, and I earnestly believe, that today we will resolve the matters involved in this bill. Indeed, we must. We have no other alternative. And so I come to reason with you about this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill must be passed; it is our responsibility to pass it. It provides urgently needed funds for the current fiscal year which ends tomorrow night.

Mr. Chairman, maybe we could get along at this time without the \$40 million in the bill for claims and judgments on which interest is running; maybe we could get along at this time without the \$26 million for workmen's compensation benefits; maybe we could get along at this time without the \$61 million for firefighting costs, and maybe even the \$87 million for retired military pay could be postponed. Maybe we could put off appropriating the money for defaults on the student loan insurance fund and break faith with the lenders. But it would be bad indeed to decline to give the States the \$614 million in the bill for grants to States for public assistance.

Failure of this bill would really bring

vital programs to a grinding halt and bring condemnation and the contempt of the people upon the Congress.

Then there is \$748 million for emergency flood relief for many areas of the Nation. This involves SBA disaster loans. The SBA has not been able to fund new loan applications since May 25. There are perhaps \$175 million in loan applications pending at SBA and more will be coming in as accurate damage assessments can be made. There have been disasters in 29 States and the Government cannot respond with the assistance that is needed at this critical time.

There is also the matter of pay increases which we have promised by legislation for several million Federal workers. There is in this bill \$891 million for pay costs for this final year.

So, of course, if we are to act responsibly, we must pass this bill, and we need to pass it before Saturday night.

Now, as has been stated, the amount of money appropriated in this bill is just the same as the conference agreement on H.R. 7447 when it was passed by the House earlier this week.

Yes, we did delete some transfer authority for defense because there was some controversy and we wanted to eliminate any controversy we could.

Mr. Chairman, I will urge that we not adopt any amendments to the bill and thereby bring on a lot of additional controversy. We have fought out these amendments heretofore. In five conference meetings with the Senate we finally settled on the bill, and what we have here is the conference version of the bill. So if we do not amend the bill with respect to the funds, then we come down to the question of what to do about the amendment involving combat activity in and over Cambodia and Laos.

Mr. Chairman, we have been up and down this hill before. We will have to compromise. There is nothing disgraceful about compromise. It is a necessary and honorable procedure, and without it we could not operate our system of government. We do not have a dictatorship, so we cannot permit any member of either branch to be a dictator.

Therefore, we must compromise our differences.

I have never, heretofore, supported a definite cutoff date applicable to Southeast Asia until this week.

But, along with others, I have to compromise, and so today in this bill, which bears my name, for the first time I am supporting a bill reported out of committee with an ironclad, ironfisted cutoff. After August 15, the President can use no funds in this bill or heretofore appropriated for combat activity in Cambodia or Laos.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to proceed if I might.

So this measure seems to me to be something that I can reluctantly agree to, because we do have to have a compromise. The date of August 15 does not seem too unacceptable since compromise is required.

So here we are. There will be those who say "Well, the President has been a bit arrogant; the President has vetoed the bill." Well, the Constitution gives the President the right to veto a bill. And the Constitution also gives the Congress the right to override it. However, rightly or wrongly, the Congress did not override it. Now that the Congress did not override the veto, what do we do? Shall we just vote on the same bill that was vetoed before and go up that hill again? In my opinion, it would make us look childish, and in my view it would be unrealistic to undertake to do the same thing that we did before.

If we are going to make our system work, we have to provide a different arrangement. We have provided for a different arrangement here. In the final pages of the committee bill we have this language:

None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia or Laos . . .

Of course, I must say there should not be any reference to Cambodia or the war in Southeast Asia in this bill. There are no funds in the bill for combat activities in Cambodia or Laos. But we have been forced to consider it. I regret that we have to consider it but this is necessary in view of previous actions. It says:

None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia or Laos or off the shores of Cambodia or Laos by United States forces—

Funds in this bill will not be used that way, anyway. It is surplus language. But if that pleases people, that is good. We say then, and here is a definite, unequivocal cutoff—

and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose.

That language seems to be something that everyone could accept, some with great enthusiasm and others with reluctance, in order to solve this problem and take care of these emergency needs involving \$3.3 billion and millions of U.S. citizens.

I just think regardless of how I or you voted previously we can say, "Well, I voted my feelings previously, but we now have come to an impasse and having come to that impasse and it being urgent that we provide funds to pay the Federal workers and make flood loans and all of the other needs, I felt I had to adjust to changed circumstances, even though reluctantly, and support a different approach."

As I understand it, now the White House and the administration are willing reluctantly to go along. The White House does not support any of this language, but as a matter of compromise they will.

So here we have compromise by the administration, and a compromise by those in the House who entertain different views. So we can reach a settlement,

and that seems to be the way to approach this matter.

There will be those who will raise their voices and pound the table and say that this represents an abject surrender. How ridiculous, how indefensible such a statement. It is not an abject surrender to fix a definite cutoff date for the bombing and to try to work out a way to serve the best interests of the Nation and to provide this \$3.3 billion which is urgently needed. It is not abject surrender to try to make our system of government work.

I hope we will not hear those words in the debate this afternoon.

So Mr. Chairman, I believe I have covered the case.

Let me suggest, if the Members wish to have a quick understanding of what this bill does, it is set forth in four pages in the report perhaps better than I have stated the matter in the remarks which I have made.

So, let us reason together and make our system work. Stiff-necked people have not been responsible for the progress this Nation has made in the past and stiff-necked people must not lead us into error today or for the future.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on the bill today will be centered around the Cambodian issue. The question of the amounts of money in the bill was settled by action of the conferees on H.R. 7447, the original second supplemental, and by adoption by the House and Senate of the conference report. But for the information of Members and others, I shall make brief reference to totals in the bill.

All the appropriated amounts are identical to what was provided in H.R. 7447 as sent to the President. The changes made in the bill before us today do not affect the appropriation totals. The bill totals \$3,362,845,279, which is \$244,260,225 below the budget estimates. The new bill is \$336,394,000 under the Senate-passed version of H.R. 7447.

The bill before us today is \$507 million above the total contained in the original bill when it passed the House. The Senate did consider additional budget estimates of more than \$444 million which were not before the House. These new estimates were nearly all for expenses associated with recent flood disasters.

The RECORD of June 25, 1973, beginning on page 21164, contains a statement as to the principal features of the conference agreement on H.R. 7447. Since the appropriated amounts are identical to those contained in the pending measure, the statement accurately reflects the bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I have made reference to the report which accompanies this bill. It is relatively short and, under leave to revise and extend my remarks and insert extraneous material, I offer for printing in the RECORD the text of the report which includes a summary by chapter of the amounts in the bill compared to the budget estimates:

[H. Rept. No. 93-350]

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1973

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The President on June 27 vetoed the bill H.R. 7447, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1973. The bill provided additional funds for a large number of departments and agencies of Government. The great majority of the funds in the bill were for programs which were totally or virtually uncontrollable at this late date in the fiscal year. The President stated in his veto message that he was returning the bill because of his grave concern that the enactment into law of the so-called "Cambodia rider" contained in the bill would cripple or destroy the chances for an effective negotiated settlement in Cambodia.

The House of Representatives on June 27 voted 241 to 173 to override the veto, but this fell short of the necessary two-thirds voting in the affirmative required by the Constitution to override a Presidential veto. Accordingly, the message and the bill were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

In his message the President emphasized that the provisions in the bill, other than the "Cambodia rider," contain a number of appropriations that are essential to continuity of governmental operations. He stated that it is critical that these appropriations be enacted immediately.

About 84 percent of the \$3,362,845,279 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1973 as passed the Congress is for programs that are uncontrollable at this point in time. They are required for fiscal year 1973 accounts and include:

- \$891,604,000 for pay costs.
- \$747,748,000 for emergency flood and disaster relief programs.
- \$614,066,000 for grants to States for public assistance.
- \$190,900,000 for payment to the Civil Service Retirement fund.
- \$87,000,000 for retired military pay.
- \$60,963,000 for fire fighting costs.
- \$26,300,000 for Federal workmen's compensation benefits.
- \$39,308,029 for various claims and judgments against the government including Vietnam prisoner of war claims.
- \$32,700,000 for military mail privileges and postal costs.

Another 7 percent of the funds in the bill, the sum of \$243,510,000, is for higher education items.

The Committee has considered the vetoed bill and recommends deletion of certain language originally contained therein relevant to Cambodia and Laos. However, it recommends new language prohibiting the use of any of the funds in this Act to support directly or indirectly combat activities by U.S. forces in, over or off the shores of Cambodia or Laos, and, after August 15, 1973, prohibiting the use of other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act for such purpose.

Specifically, the Committee recommends that the language be stricken from Title I, Chapter II, Department of Defense—Military which read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

"None of the funds herein appropriated to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or from off

the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces.

"Section 735 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1973, is amended by deleting '\$750,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$825,000,000': *Provided*, That on and after the date of enactment of H.R. 7447 of the 93rd Congress (a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes), no funds may be transferred under the authority of section 735 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1973, to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces."

Similarly, the Committee recommends that the language be stricken as contained in Section 305 of Title III, General Provisions of the bill as passed by the Congress which read as follows:

"Sec. 305. None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act or heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces."

The Committee recommends a new section, Section 307, to Title III, General Provisions, to contain the following language:

"Sec. 307. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia or Laos or off the shores of Cambodia or Laos by United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose."

The first part of this new section is identical to the language contained in the Continuing Resolution as passed by the House on June 26, 1973. For all practical purposes, this portion of the section is inoperative in the current version of the bill because the Committee is advised that none of the funds included in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1973, are applicable directly or indirectly to any combat activities by U.S. forces. Monies in the bill for the Department of Defense are solely for Military and civilian pay, military retired pay, mail and postal costs, and medical scholarships. As indicated above, the language providing an additional \$75,000,000 in transfer authority to the Department of Defense has been stricken in its entirety from the bill.

The remaining portion of Section 307, "... and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose," is self explanatory. The Committee believes that this language, which prohibits after August 15, 1973, the expenditure of other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act to support combat activities by U.S. forces in Cambodia or Laos, is a reasonable compromise under the circumstances, and can be supported by a majority of the House.

The new bill submitted by the Committee otherwise contains the identical sums and provisions for the various items of the several departments and agencies as the bill vetoed by the President. Recognizing that an acceptable solution must be found for the disposition of the many items of critical importance for the fiscal year which ends this Saturday night, the Committee determined this to be the most reasonable and responsible course to follow.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The following table compares, on a chapter summary basis, the budget requests considered and the amounts recommended in the bill.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
SUMMARY

Chapter No.	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates	Chapter No.	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS				VIII	Legislative branch.....	\$20,502,250	\$20,597,250 +\$95,000
I	Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection.....	\$47,100,000	\$59,387,000 +\$12,287,000	IX	Public Works.....	85,200,000	103,350,000 +18,150,000
II	Defense.....	253,848,225	165,026,000 -88,822,225	X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	523,594,000	541,598,000 +18,004,000
III	District of Columbia.....	8,500,000	8,500,000	XI	Transportation.....	49,646,000	43,883,000 -5,763,000
IV	Foreign Operations.....	738,000	700,000 -38,000	XII	Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.....	315,667,000	309,527,000 -6,140,000
V	Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, and Veterans.....		20,000,000 +20,000,000	XIII	Claims and Judgments.....	23,108,029	23,108,029
VI	Interior and related agencies.....	96,498,000	67,281,000 -29,217,000		Total, title I.....	2,588,116,504	2,471,241,279 -116,875,225
VII	Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare.....	1,163,715,000	1,116,784,000 -46,931,000		Title II, pay costs.....	1,018,989,000	891,604,000 -127,385,000
					Grand total, titles I and II.....	3,607,105,504	3,362,845,279 -244,260,225

¹ Includes \$444,225,070 in budget estimates not considered by the House.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I will try to state as the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations has stated a view that I think is sound in this national emergency that we face.

Anyone familiar with my remarks and my voting record for the last 5 or 6 years on this issue would know very, very well that I would never write the language of this appropriation bill, section 307. That I would never support this language unless I was convinced that that language was the only solution out of a very serious dilemma that we face in this country. We face it in the House right now. The other body will face it shortly and the President will face it when this legislation gets to him.

My record is clear from the very beginning. I have time after time after time opposed any cutoff date, period. I have resisted many efforts by Members on the other side of the aisle and some on this side of the aisle who have repeatedly over a span of years sought to get the Congress to approve amendments that would limit the authority of the President to conduct military operations in Southeast Asia. I have never challenged the motives of anybody who felt differently than I. I have sought to vigorously set forth my own views and I have tried to convince individual Members on both sides of the aisle to adjust their views with mine.

But we have a different situation today. It seems to me that we should now, at this critical juncture, accept the language in this appropriation bill, section 307. This is not my language. This is not the language of the people who have felt totally different than myself. It is a compromise that in my judgment reasonable people can accept as we face a very critical problem in the United States.

With those introductory remarks, I should like to state as clearly and as unequivocally as I can information that may be of some help and assistance to those individuals who are undecided how they are going to vote.

I have communicated directly with the spokesman at the White House last night and again today, and I am au-

thorized to say the following: No. 1, the President will definitely accept and sign a bill that contains the language in section 307. No. 2—If military action is required in Southeast Asia after August 15, the President will ask congressional authority and will abide by the decision that is made by the House and the Senate, the Congress of the United States.

Let me add a third point. The third point is just as clear as the other two. The President will definitely veto any legislation that contains any restriction sooner than August 15. It is August 15. No earlier date.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman is saying, then, that the President will, if more time is needed, ask Congress around August 15 for more time?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me phrase it this way.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I got that impression from what the gentleman has said.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think what the gentleman has said is a reiteration of what I have said.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the President wants to take any military action in Southeast Asia after August 15, he will come back to the Congress and request that authority.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. He will ask for more time?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. He will ask for authority to pursue any military operation.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Right, which is to ask for more time; is that not what it is?

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

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

Mr. GIAIMO. I do not want to get into any disagreement here. I have the highest respect and regard for the gentleman from Michigan's word and have for many years, but I am very nervous about the question of assurances from spokesmen in the White House. Let me say this: I understand that just as of an hour or so ago in the other body there are meetings taking place between the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Secre-

tary of State, wherein they have been discussing this question of trying to work out a compromise solution to the Southeast Asia problem, and my latest understanding is that although there is an indication on the part of the Secretary of State, and a willingness to work out some modus operandi in this matter, the fact of the matter is that as of the present time, I understand, we cannot and have not received any absolute assurances such as the gentleman just stated.

This does create a problem here, because we are being asked to compromise, and we are all compromisers in this Government, but there is no offer of compromise from the other side excepting an open-ended ticket.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Because I suspected, and properly so, that there would be a discussion on the floor of the House at this time. I went back this morning and got a reconfirmation of the information that I had last night late, after we finished yesterday's deliberations.

Mr. GIAIMO. Can the gentleman tell us from whom?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be frank with the gentleman; I did not talk with the President, but I am talking of people who have told me they have talked with the President.

Let me just reiterate what I said. I happen to believe the sources, and I will add, if it means anything to my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut—I know it will not mean anything to some people, but I trust that it will make some impact on the gentleman from Connecticut.

What I am saying on behalf of the President I will stick by, which means that I will not come in the well of the floor of this House and ask for any extension beyond August 15 if there is not a Presidential request for congressional authority. I will make that firm commitment here on the floor of the House.

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

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman means by his statement. Of course I would take the gentleman's statement any time, any place, anywhere. The only thing that disturbs me, I say to the gentleman from Michigan, is that the information I have is that the Secretary of State has apparently indicated this morning that although they will try to work something

out they have not committed themselves to any firm position as to time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me just say that I believe my sources. I have reconfirmed them. I have given my personal word. And I might add a postscript. I hope this is not misunderstood. I do not think that any further extension could be achieved on the floor of the House if I and some others did not try to get it, so whether it is a sufficient word or not I think the White House has to understand that they are not going to get it unless they come back, ask for it and get congressional authority.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's second point of the three he made is a very important one. I would just like to clarify that and make sure we all have an understanding of it. As I understand what the gentleman said, if the President believes that military activity is necessary in Southeast Asia—and that would include Cambodia, Laos and North and South Vietnam—after August 15, that he will come back and request such authority from the Congress. That means to me he is affirming the constitutional principle that the authority is here in the Congress for such operations at least in that section of the world. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am not going to get into a constitutional discussion. We had some of that earlier this week. I suspect we will have that discussion after the recess when we consider again the war powers bill.

There is, I concede, some debate and difference on that issue. All I can say is that in this instance under these circumstances I have the word of the White House. I have gotten reconfirmation of it. As a practical matter I am sure that is what will happen if there is any need and necessity for such authority after August 15.

Mr. DU PONT. If the gentleman will yield further I think that is a very important point to consider in our deliberations, the fact that we have that kind of agreement from the President of the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that under this bill which would authorize bombing to be continued up to August 15 the White House is committed when this bill is enacted and signed into law that all bombing would cease on August 15, that all military activity in and over Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam would cease unless the President came back to the Congress and asked for and obtained authority to commence military activity?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. And we are going to

be in recess from August 3 until September 5, so there is a period of some 3 weeks that we could be assured that there would be no combat activity in or over Indochina unless Congress is reconvened and gives its approval?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That would be my understanding.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. And the gentleman in the well, the minority leader, will lead us in the effort to obtain that commitment from the White House or do we have that?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman repeat that again? I want to be very frank.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Does the distinguished minority leader have this commitment from the White House, from the President that the bombing ceases August 15?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do not have the answer to his precise question as he phrases it but as I interpret what they have said it would include a "Yes" answer to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, from my own position, I do not know how I will vote on these matters, which to me can be perhaps the greatest constitutional question since the Civil War, but how I vote will depend on whether or not the White House is willing to make that commitment precisely. I think we have time to obtain that commitment between now and the time this vote will occur.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be very frank with the gentleman from California. I am not going back and ask the precise question the way the gentleman phrased it. I do not think we have to have it as the gentleman necessarily phrases it. I have it in a way that I think covers any and all contingencies, including the way the gentleman from California phrased it.

I have no feeling that there is any difference in the way he phrased it and the way I sought to explain it. Therefore, I think we have to have faith in the gentleman from California, myself and others, that the situation is covered.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I understand the reason for setting the time at August 15 was so that we can negotiate further. What leads the gentleman from Michigan to believe that there has been any change on the part of the parties involved in the negotiations which would enable us to get the idea that they will not wait until August 15, if we do set the date? That is the argument that has always been used against setting a date.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I agree, and I understand it, but I am also told that there has been and there is now and there will continue to be active negotiations involving Cambodia at a very high level. The anticipation is that there is some reason for optimism. In my judgment, the White House apparently is willing or believes that between now and August 15 there is reason for a settlement at the negotiating table.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, is this not the same thing that was told to us in early May, which is some 50 days ago, as to the fact that we were going to be able to conclude negotiations with these high sources or high authorities? I support the Flynt amendment to cease the bombing upon the enactment of this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right, but we started negotiations with the North Vietnamese back in 1968. We did not make much progress, but the effort has been continuous. We finally solved the problem by getting a peace agreement in January of this year. I have to rely on the people who have been involved in those negotiations. I am informed that they have some reason for optimism, and I am going to believe it.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about how successful the negotiations may be. Successful or unsuccessful, we provide and make provision in this bill for a cutoff of combat activity in Cambodia and Laos. It is not dependent upon any successful negotiations concerning the Cambodia question.

This is the first time that the members of the Appropriations Committee have joined together, in submitting a bill to fix a cutoff date. If the combat activity continues beyond that date, it will be in defiance of the express statutes of the land.

Therefore, it seems to me a pretty clear situation. I, for one, propose to stand by the provision which we have before us, and I believe that the Members of the House would feel likewise, that there are no escape hatches. It is just a matter that it is over so far as combat activity by U.S. forces in or over Cambodia or Laos is concerned after August 15. That is the answer. Of course, with respect to North and South Vietnam, we have specific obligations under the January cease-fire agreement and they must be adhered to.

I certainly have received assurances from people such as Mel Laird, although I have not talked to the President, but these assurances have been unequivocal. However, it does not make any difference whether we have assurances or not in taking this action.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure I heard the gentleman's answer to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT). This includes, this agreement, South Vietnam.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It includes Southeast Asia, and South Vietnam is in Southeast Asia.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So in fact it is more total in its all inclusiveness than previous statements.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes. Southeast Asia has a broader context than

just North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So it is really more inclusive than the coverage in previous times.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is my understanding.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. If the mechanics work out, and we recess on August 6, and something does occur, so that the President feels he must use additional military force beyond that date, will it be, in all likelihood—I know there can be no guarantee—submitted prior to our recess?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. No. 1: I hope the negotiations will have resolved the problem, the one remaining problem, a government in Cambodia, before that date. If that has not been resolved by August 6 I believe the President will have to go to August 15 and stop military operations in Southeast Asia. If something comes up which justified, in his opinion, the consideration by the Congress of further military activity in that area, I believe he would have to ask the Congress to reconvene and consider his proposal.

I do not look down the road and anticipate that, but as I understand the commitment that is what it means.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

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

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

Mr. HEINZ. I thank the minority leader.

I believe the minority leader made a very good point on the statement he made earlier about the inclusion of North and South Vietnam in the prohibition we are talking about with respect to Southeast Asia after August 15. Would the gentleman in the well support an amendment to the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations that would make explicit in the bill the inclusion of North and South Vietnam?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do not believe it is necessary. I do not believe it is essential.

Mr. HEINZ. Why would the gentleman contend it would not be necessary?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the first place, I have the word of the White House. I have made my own commitment that it includes Southeast Asia. If we start enumerating North and South Vietnam then we have to define Southeast Asia, and may have to redefine our obligations under the January cease-fire agreement.

Mr. HEINZ. The gentleman would not oppose such an amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am going to stick by the language in the bill, with the assurances that have been made.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. In regard to the statement made just a few moments ago by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) based on information he believed to be correct, let me inform the House that the Secretary of State has not been over to the Senate today. No such conversation took place.

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

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I believe we have made considerable progress in our conflict of will with the White House with respect to the termination of the war in Southeast Asia. We can all take heart today that at least we know the war is going to be ended come the middle of August.

What we are still concerned about, of course, is the fact that between now and August 15 we are going to be dropping, with 100-plane raids, per day, on the order of 180,000 250-pound bombs in an effort to kill about 100 to 150 alleged Communists, 90 percent of whom are indigenous Cambodians.

What I cannot quite understand is why it is necessary for the President to pledge to grind the operations to a halt in the domestic affairs of the United States in order to accomplish that particular Cambodian objective and to risk the loss of further additional dead American flyers, who undoubtedly will die over the next month and a half, and further missing in action, all for a nebulous agreement which may be forthcoming, when we have just had additional protocols executed and put in effect.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me respond in two respects. Unless we get a settlement in Cambodia, a government, and a cease-fire, we are in effect abandoning any verification of MIA's. This is the only way we are going to get any verification of MIA's.

No. 2, as was indicated earlier, I have always voted against any cutoff. The gentleman from time to time, if I recall his record accurately, has voted consistently to impose a prospective cutoff. So by voting for August 15 on this occasion and authorizing certain military activity between June 29 and August 15, he is not doing anything differently than he has done in the past by voting for a prospective cutoff date of 60 or 90 days.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me get the comment from the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN), first, because what the gentleman from Alabama says may relate to what the gentleman from Connecticut wishes to discuss.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, one of the top assistants of the Secretary of State has just indicated to me that the Secretary did testify yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and did make some remarks concerning there being no agreement at that time, at 2 p.m. yesterday afternoon, to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. However, he has not had further conversation today on this subject with anyone, and the State Department says that what the minority leader said in the well of the House at this hour is the way it is, that there is agreement which is firm and there is no question about it, and they by no means wish to confuse or challenge that. What was quoted earlier concerning there being no agreement is what the Secre-

tary said prior to the word the minority leader received from the White House last night or this morning.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the minority leader yield?

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

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

The gentleman knows that I do not want to misstate or deceive anyone in this Chamber, and certainly not the gentleman from Michigan. What I said or what I should have said is that Senators JAVITS and FULBRIGHT had a meeting this morning, but the meeting with the Secretary of State took place last night, as the gentleman said. But as of this morning, when they did have a meeting, there was an announcement made by Senators JAVITS and FULBRIGHT that as of the present time, about 11 a.m., there had still been no meeting with the Secretary of State.

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN). Then I will yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I will simply underline that what the minority leader has promised in the name of the President is the same as the State Department's understanding of the President's position and that the agreement is firm and clear.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I will now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

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

I am one Member who thinks that a considerable amount of progress has been made and that we should give full and intelligent consideration to the fact this is in effect a real compromise. I bring this suggestion to the committee: That in striking the language that previously existed, and in particular looking at the general provisions in section 735, I notice that the language previously was to the effect that no money shall be transferred after a particular date; that was in the other language. But in the language now being recommended by the committee, it puts in, both as to the money in this bill and as to the money heretofore appropriated, the language that after the date of August 15 no money shall be expended.

Now, I trust I am correct in this, and I wish that the chairman of the committee would correct me if I am wrong, because to me this is a very important point. I am particularly concerned that there be a tandem relationship between the money to be expended and the activities that are going on.

Mr. Chairman, am I right now in my understanding that by putting this language in, in relation to expenditures, we can be assured that the flow of money and the stoppage of activity are coincidental as of August 15?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAHON. I would say you are precisely correct.

Mr. HANNA. To me this is a very important aspect of this compromise, and I believe, precisely as the gentleman in the well does, that it does not make any difference what the President assures. If this Congress makes the law clear, then the President is bound by it. The only way he could change this is to veto this law. I would take it from the statement of the gentleman in the well that if he vetoes this one, we will override his veto by a very substantial margin.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCloskey).

Mr. McCLOSKEY. As I understand the gentleman in the well, it is that the language of section 307 in the committee bill is intended to include Southeast Asia, North and South Vietnam as well as Cambodia and Laos.

I would like to ask this question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who will head our conferees, if we may have the understanding that if we vote for section 307 as it is included here, out of the conference will come the language that includes Cambodia, Laos, and North and South Vietnam, if the leader of our conferees will commit himself to that position.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. While the chairman is discussing a matter with a colleague, let me make a suggestion. I have clearly indicated my interpretation of what the White House understands to be the situation. I do not think we ought to amend this bill today, because I have concern about our peace agreement obligations, but if the other body adds North and South Vietnam in this context, I would have no hesitancy about having the House accept that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes, and the time of the gentleman (Mr. CEDERBERG) has expired. The gentleman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MAHON. As I have committed all of my time on this side, I can yield only 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have yielded an awful lot of time to an awful lot of people, and I would like to have 1 minute.

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I would just like to make this statement: We have tried and failed to get the two-thirds majority necessary to write into the law of the United States that this conflict will be ended on a date certain. If the President will sign existing 307 in this law, for the first time we will have reestablished the constitutional power of the Congress to prevent any further conflict. Since we cannot get the two-thirds majority to write it into the law today, I am prepared to vote for 307 if it comes out of the committee in order to reestablish the Constitution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I hope that the bill is approved as it is being presented.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I did have some time and it is gone, but I think it was for a very worthy purpose. I think that the compromise spirit is here, and I only hope it will prevail, because it is essential for the best interests of keeping this Government operative.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, this past Monday, the House of Representatives by a vote of 235 to 172 prohibited the use of any funds contained in the second supplemental appropriations bill, or any previous appropriations bill, for combat operations in, over, or off the shores of Cambodia and Laos.

Our vote on Monday was a logical extension of the position which this body assumed on May 10 when by a vote of 224 to 172 we prohibited the use of any funds contained in the second supplemental appropriations bill for combat activities in Laos and Cambodia.

The majority of the Members of this House have on two occasions in the past month explicitly voted to end America's combat role in Indochina.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the will of the majority of this Congress has been thwarted by a Presidential veto, sustained by one-third of the Members of this body. The issue before us today is twofold: Is it the will of this Congress to end the bombing of Indochina? And shall the will of Congress be determined by a simple majority of our Members, or shall we be dictated to by a minority of one-third?

As I have continually stated in the past, I am hard pressed to find any justification for the continued bombing of Cambodia either on strategic or legal grounds. If nothing else, the last 10 years have proven that peace in Asia will not be achieved by massive American bombing. The authority which a past Congress vested in the Presidency through the Gulf of Tonkin resolution is not the policy of the 93d Congress. We have clearly broken with the past.

For the first time since the Congress surrendered its constitutional powers to the executive branch almost a decade ago, we have the opportunity to reassert the right of Congress to decide when American men will go to war. If we accept section 307 of this bill, American combat involvement in Indochina will cease once and for all on August 15. If the President should wish to continue the war in Indochina he will have to petition the Congress to do so. Under the provisions of section 307, the decision to maintain American combat involvement in Cambodia and Laos will be decided by a simple majority of the House, not one-third.

Therefore, today I will join with those who have voted against this war since their very arrival in Congress in voting for section 307 of the supplemental ap-

propriations bill. In so doing, I do not for one moment condone our bombing Cambodia. To me, the overriding issue is that in the acceptance of section 307 and in the President's signing that section, we are receiving from the executive branch of the Government the first agreement in over 10 years and the first acknowledgment since World War II that the President of the United States may not put American military men, forces, or money into action without the approval of Congress.

With the addition of the Case-Church amendment this morning, the provisions of section 307 now include not only Cambodia and Laos but South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and Thailand as well. The President's signature on this bill is, in fact, his endorsement of a Southeast Asia War Powers Act. He is very clearly stating that it will be the law of the United States that there be no activities in Southeast Asia without the approval of both Houses. And that approval he will not get.

So, we find ourselves pledged to an end of the bombing in Southeast Asia, yet put in the incredible moral dilemma of having to authorize this bombing until August 15. If the Addabbo amendment, which I had voted for, had passed, bombing still would have continued for 15 or 20 days. It is very small consolation that we have achieved what we have by having to authorize bombing for another 20 days. But I think the overriding issue was, and still is, the fact that we recognize the constitutional power of the legislative branch to control the military adventures of the United States. For that reason, with reluctance but with a firm conviction that the issue is far bigger than 20 more days of bombing, I will join my colleagues in our decision to close the war off on the 15th. We do this with the strong feeling that the constitutional and legislative strength of this bill will give us the renewal of the power this House threw away almost a decade ago.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have served on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, and certainly since 1967, when I spoke to the annual convention of the National Reserve Officers Association—and 200,000 copies of the speech went out all over the country—calling for an end to the war in Southeast Asia, I have done everything that I knew to bring the war to a conclusion.

We are at a place where at long last we can have the end in sight. I say that so that you may know there has not been anyone on this floor more active in trying to bring the fighting and combat to a satisfactory conclusion.

We have a nation with three equal and coordinate branches of government. As I have said many times, there must be a comity of understanding between those three branches of the Government or else our Government fails.

Despite the efforts of everyone here, despite the deep feelings of all of us who are in this House, if we do not accept section 307 as follows, there will be no time limit, nor other limit on the bombing in Cambodia and Laos, and there

will be no end to this fighting. Unless we are able to pass this bill and get it signed, our efforts have been futile.

The Flynt amendment would simply be repetition of the provisions we had when the bill passed before. It was vetoed then, and if the amendment is adopted today, it will once again be vetoed. We did not have the votes to override the veto before, and we do not have the votes to override a veto this time. Therefore a vote for the Flynt amendment is a vote for another Presidential veto, when on the other hand, we are presenting you with an opportunity to enact into law a provision which will once and for all place a time limitation on the duration of the bombing in Cambodia and Laos.

Mr. Chairman, the language of the bill which I wrote in the committee is an attempt to be practical and bring to a halt the war in Indochina at the earliest possible date. The section is as follows:

None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia or Laos or off the shores of Cambodia or Laos by the United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any Act may be expended for such purpose.

Now if we accept this language with the assurance given here to the effect that the President will sign this bill, then we will have a limit on the bombing. We have none now.

I would have liked to have had the bombing stopped last month, even back in 1967 and before, but we found we could not. As long as the present stalemate exists we will have no limit.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that there is only one vote to be cast. I trust that vote will support the committee section 307.

I believe that I have tried everything that any one person could, long before 1967 and up to date, to bring this unfortunate war to an end, and now, finally, we have in front of us a chance to bring this fighting to halt.

If we turn down this opportunity to end the existing stalemate, then we will not have accomplished a thing. We cannot afford such a course.

I, therefore, ask the Members to stand by the committee and by this statement, where we know we will have solved the problem.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I did not have time to speak on my own time, but I just wish to say that I believe that everyone in this House knows what my position has been in this matter, and that I have supported President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Nixon in these matters. But now I think that we have arrived at this point where we now are, and I will accept this language.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, I will abide by this language.

I wish to thank the minority leader,

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for his assurances in this matter because my actions will be guided by those assurances.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say to all of the Members, let us vote for the one opportunity we have to set a deadline, which is in the committee bill as we bring it to the Members. Again, I urge you not to vote for the Flynt amendment which is exactly the same language that resulted in a veto before, for it will cause a veto again; and the stalemate over the bombing will continue without limit. For what it is worth I believe the Senate will follow us.

The points I make here even outweigh the urgent needs for the financing in this bill which our report lists as follows:

\$891,604,000 for pay costs.

\$747,748,000 for emergency flood and disaster relief programs.

\$614,066,000 for grants to States for public assistance.

\$190,900,000 for payment to the Civil Service Retirement fund.

\$87,000,000 for retired military pay.

\$60,963,000 for fire fighting costs.

\$26,300,000 for Federal workmen's compensation benefits.

\$39,308,029 for various claims and judgments against the Government including Vietnam prisoner of war claims.

\$32,700,000 for military mail privileges and postal costs.

Another 7 percent of the funds in the bill, the sum of \$243,510,000, is for higher education items.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, on May 10 I offered an amendment to this bill when it came before us originally to strike \$450 million of transfer authority. The Members supported that amendment. When I offered that amendment to the Members I offered it to them on this basis. It seemed like a very simple request by the Department of Defense to transfer from one account to another funds, and they admitted in their hearings that the funds would be used for bombing.

I told the Members at that time that the Air Force, the Department of Defense, did not need the money. They needed the stamp of approval of this House to conduct an illegal operation in Cambodia and Laos. We told the President and the Department of Defense that we want no part of that war; it is a new war. The Department of Defense trying to get that transfer authority compromised all the way down to \$75 million; from \$450 million to \$75 million.

Today in the bill before us there is not one dollar request for transfer authority, which only proved the fact that they did not need the dollars; they wanted the stamp of approval, a new Gulf of Tonkin resolution to continue a new war in Cambodia and Laos.

Today we have a new bill before us, and all those who spoke vehemently against my amendment on the transfer authority question stated what would happen—our armies, our navies would stand down if we did not give them this transfer authority—suddenly say, we

are going along. They do not need this transfer authority, but we are going to give you a different compromise. Even if we do not like it, we are going to step all the way back. We are going to give you some nebulous assurance of August 15.

If the President wanted to give us that message, he could have teletyped a message to this House telling us "August 15." We do not have that message before this House. We have commitments, and I believe the gentlemen who have given us those commitments, but we do not have a Presidential commitment. What we do have before us this afternoon is a request to continue bombing until August 15, to give the support, the stamp of approval, of this Congress. What they could not get through transfer authority, they are now trying to get through a subterfuge of August 15, a stamp of approval for an illegal war in Cambodia and in Laos.

They say to the Members, "If you want to enjoy a week's vacation back home, let the Department of Defense continue to bomb, to expend millions of dollars, and expend American lives until August 15."

Mr. Chairman, we are legislating on an appropriation bill. The rule granted today says this House this afternoon has the right to legislate on an appropriation bill. The Members are being asked to legislate a war until August 15.

If the continuing resolution is signed, the bill that we passed, cutting off immediate funds for any bombing, and this bill passes with the August 15 date, the Members will have legislated that the Defense Department can continue to bomb beyond July 1. If the Members give August 15 in this bill as the cutoff date, they will have legislated continued bombing to August 15. If the Members are against the war, if they do not believe in this illegal action, then they must support the amendment that we have this afternoon offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNN).

If the Members are for the war and they want to justify the war, then vote for this bill as it appears before us.

Mr. Chairman, all of us here know the issue in front of us. It is, in part, whether or not the Congress will concur in the bombing activities now underway in Cambodia. It is also partly a matter of whether the Congress will stand up for the position it has already taken several times in the last few days, or whether it will submit to the will of the Executive. I remain convinced the House will again vote to ban any further bombing. For my part, I am willing to remain here as long as it takes to convince the President the Congress means what it says.

I think that our actions on previous issues are responsible for our being here today. We in the Congress have for years always submitted to the President, no matter who sat in the President's chair. That, I believe, is no longer the case. It is doubtful that few people fully realize the change that has come over the House of Representatives. Perhaps those who realize it least serve here in this Chamber. There are a determined number of people in the House who will not back down, who will not cave in to the Presi-

dent and who are willing to go eyeball to eyeball with him.

To that point let it be clearly understood that we are willing to remain here as long as is necessary, to undergo countless vetoes to get the message across to the Executive. On this issue, we will not be bowed. We do not do this to haggle. We do not do this to simply spar with the President of the United States. The issue, once more, is quite clear. Our intention is to stop the bombing. We seek nothing more. We will accept nothing less. The Congress in exercising its constitutional rights must do as it sees fit; the President may respond as he desires.

By voting to end the bombing, the Congress is saying that dropping bombs is not a good way to negotiate. The lives of American airmen are not to be used as fodder for negotiated settlements. Disputes within the boundaries of other nations must be resolved, and the United States may be a party to the negotiations if it so desires, but the Congress will not allow U.S. military intervention without its express approval. We are saying to the President that he has his rights and the Congress has its rights, and that the dispatching of U.S. military men to battle is a constitutional right of the Congress and not an extension of the President's right to negotiate.

We in this Chamber have all listened to the conventional wisdom of some of our leaders who urge that we drop this subject for now and take it up again at a more convenient time. There is nothing convenient about war. There is nothing convenient about the dropping of bombs. Under any rule of reason the dropping of bombs is an act of aggression and it is our Nation, our bombers and our countrymen who are doing this by direction of the President of the United States.

These acts are done in the name of negotiating: How or why I do not pretend to understand. How in the name of everything sacred can we Members of Congress go blithely off on a summer holiday without putting and end to this? Our national security is not threatened by the Cambodian belligerents. Our nationals in that nation ought to be neutrals and free from involvement in the fighting. If they are not, they certainly ought to be removed. So what we are left with is bombing as a ploy for international negotiations. I find it hard to comprehend how the bomb that explodes in a Cambodian village strikes a blow for peace in the world.

I do not see how we can fail to adopt an amendment to end this military activity in Cambodia. I think it is time that our Nation turn off the motors of war. I would hope an end to the fighting in Cambodia could be found. I would like peace in that nation as much as the President of the United States. But the way to help others seek peace is not to declare war on them. We serve no surge for peace by bombing in Cambodia. More likely, we in our continued bombing serve as a catalyst for continued violence and death.

I urge those who have voted to end the bombing before to do so again. And again, if necessary. We can end this

bombing if we stand firm. We can, and I believe that we shall.

Mr. MAHON. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York said, we are legislating here today by the authority of the Rules Committee, and we are legislating, make no mistake about it, because whether the date is August 15 or June 30 or July 15, we are in effect by this legislation sanctioning bombing and sanctioning a war.

Here we are at this moment where the entire economic and domestic affairs of the United States could well be tied up tomorrow night in order that the United States, the most powerful Nation in the world with the most powerful Air Force can continue to bomb helpless peasants running around in Cambodia from one hideout to the other. Is there no morality left in our hearts in this Nation? Doesn't anyone worry about this at all?

Now we are told that we have assurances. I will take the assurance of the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, as I have said, at any time. He is a most trustworthy man and one of the most able legislators and public servants I have ever had the privilege to serve with, and I believe him when he says he would come in after August 15 and insist on the commitment he has made today against further bombing and combat activities.

But think of our problem today. Think of where we are. The whole country is coming to a halt. There is one person who by a simple press statement today could clarify this matter, and yet we hear nothing but silence from the one man who could clear it: The President of the United States.

He has spokesmen, but he himself remains silent.

The other body has met this morning. They finished at 11 o'clock. They are going back into session at 2 o'clock in the Foreign Relations Committee. The announcement from the Senators from both parties is to the effect that as of 11 o'clock there is no agreement. There is no agreement.

So we are asked to violate our constitutional duties to see to it that the President acts with the consent and will of Congress in matters of war and we are expected to concede—my chairman does not like the words "abject surrender" but, Mr. Chairman, this is abject surrender on the part of the House of Representatives.

Let us hear a word from the President of the United States. With one statement, once and for all, he can settle this controversy which has been raging for 10 long years.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the President of the United States does not speak to the minority leader of the House of Representatives. I would have thought that on a matter as important as this the minority leader would have been able to speak directly to

the President of the United States rather than to some unnamed spokesman. Perhaps I am being unduly suspicious but I am not willing to accept the word of some unnamed spokesman that certain things will happen on August 15.

The President of the United States has already indicated that he is allergic to agreeing upon any kind of a fixed date, to end the war. He has stated his opposition to that kind of approach. In 1971 when the so-called Mansfield amendment was passed by both Houses of the Congress and came before the President for signature, the President imperiously stated he would pay no attention to the declaration by Congress that the President should fix a date for ending the war in Vietnam.

This is what the President of the United States wrote in his message vetoing the bill:

Section 601 expresses a judgment about the manner in which the American involvement in the war should be ended. However, it is without binding force or effect, and it does not reflect my judgment about the way in which the war should be brought to a conclusion. My signing of the bill that contains this section, therefore, will not change the policies I have pursued and that I shall continue to pursue toward this end.

Mr. Chairman, shall we now accept the word of some unnamed spokesman which is directly contrary to the statement of the President of the United States in writing? I would not be willing to accept the word of some member of the White House hierarchy as to the views of the President. Much too frequently such statements have later been repudiated as not correctly expressing the President's ideas.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the distinguished minority leader is asking us to accept the word, necessarily, of an unnamed White House spokesman as much as he is asking us to recognize his word as a man of honor and integrity, who is praised on both sides of the aisle. I ask that we accept his word that the President would have to come back to the Congress for authority to continue combat activity after August 15.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman overlooks the fact that the minority leader does not have the power to stop the war. That is the point that is involved, not the honor or the word of the minority leader. The question is still where does the President stand?

Let the President state his views to the Congress. He has paid little attention to the legislative branch on this question heretofore. I cannot accept this so-called compromise at this time because it grants authority—congressional authority—to the President to continue his combat actions in Cambodia. I will not vote to give him that authority.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is not a contest over whose word will be accepted. The committee bill would write into the law of the land that all bombing in and over Cambodia, and all

combat activities, will cease by August 15. That will be the law of the land if the committee position is upheld.

We do not ask for the assurances of anyone with respect to our actions here. We are writing into law for the first time an unequivocal cutoff date. Therefore, I am constrained to believe that the Members of the House realize the bill must be passed, and that a compromise is necessary. I hope no amendments will be offered or adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I just finished talking with the President himself for approximately 10 minutes, and he assured me personally that everything I said on the floor of the House is a commitment by him.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H.R. 9055, the supplemental appropriations bill, although I do not believe the limitation upon military activity in Southeast Asia to be in the national interest.

I have previously been recorded on this issue many times. On each such occasion, I have resisted such limiting language. No new facts have been presented which cause me to reverse my position.

It is true, of course, that special circumstances exist with respect to this bill. It appropriates funds which are urgently needed. The war issue is largely extraneous to the bulk of the funds appropriated. The bill—because of its “must” character—has been selected as a vehicle to raise once again the war issue. These special circumstances have given the Congress and the President an opportunity to play pressure politics on an issue of far reaching international significance.

I shall not repeat arguments which I have made heretofore and which I believe remain valid. My view remains that the United States, in the name of peace has an important role to play in Southeast Asia.

Given the necessity of the bill's passage however, some compromise is required to move both the Congress and the President from their inflexible and contrary positions. The bill represents a compromise. I do not like its limiting language, but I shall support the bill as a matter of legislative necessity.

My vote should not be understood, however, as reflecting a change in my view that our policy of resistance to aggression is and has been correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, many in this Chamber have consistently opposed setting any date for cutoffs or withdrawals of military action. We believe that to be a poor tactic when dealing with an adversary of any kind and especially a military adversary.

However, Mr. Chairman, I sense a feeling of understanding and willingness to cooperate and compromise here in the U.S. Congress today. I sense a strong desire on the part of many in the Congress who have strong differences to reach an agreement in the best interest of our country. I sense a strong feeling on the

part of the President to reach an accord with the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, as one Member of Congress who has consistently opposed the tactic of announcing military intentions in advance, I am willing to modify that position here today and join in the effort for accord and vote for this bill which sets August 15, 1973, as a final cutoff for U.S. military activities in or over Southeast Asia.

I join with the President and my colleagues in the prayer that real peace will finally settle upon the people of Southeast Asia.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the President has been finally forced by Congress to set a date to end the war in Indochina. But his argument that we permit him to continue his 100-plane-a-day bombing assaults on Cambodia and Laos until August 15 in order “to assure the success of peace negotiations” is a strange departure from the ritual arguments against a date certain in the past.

Always before the President has argued that setting a date certain would hamper negotiations. Now, he maintains such an action would assist negotiations. It is true that arguments supporting this ugly war over the years have had an “Alice in Wonderland” tone to them but this latest reversal seems beyond comprehension.

The issue is simple. The people want this war over. They want it over today—not August 15.

The President does not understand that. He never has. Does the Congress understand it? It never has to date.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the antibombing program included in the supplemental appropriations bill because it will assure continued operation of the Government and end the bombing in Southeast Asia.

The new language enlarges upon that passed earlier in the week by the House in that its prohibition on bombing extends beyond Cambodia and Laos to all of Southeast Asia. A date certain for the end of all military operations is included. Even more significantly, the President and the Congress have established a working relationship whereby he will have to seek specific congressional authorization to undertake any military operations in Southeast Asia after August 15. Finally, the establishment of this agreement between the President and the Congress will assure the availability of funding which is needed to honor Federal commitments for a wide variety of important Government programs.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) asks us to set a date for the ending of the bombing of Cambodia, August 15, 1973. He tells us that President Nixon wants this date set. That the President has agreed to stop the bombing on that date if Congress will agree and will go ahead and pass these appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the setting of this date of August 15, 1973, as the date to stop bombing would be an immoral act by Congress. It would be the

licensing by Congress of a 6-week bombing holocaust on a small, defenseless country. It would be Congress saying to the President, “Bomb them into dust for 45 days. Use up all the bombs you have. Send every airplane you have.”

No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the route to take. We want the bombing stopped—and now—not next week, not August 15. Please, no new blood on our hands.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee, by a vote 10 to 5 on yesterday reported out the rule we had under consideration. The chairman and other members of the Appropriation Committee and other colleagues testified, pro and con, concerning the proper rule to submit for your consideration under the unfortunate circumstances now existing in our almost 10-year war headache in Southeast Asia.

I wish to repeat rather briefly comments I made to the Rules Committee yesterday regarding what I believe is the sworn duty of every Member of Congress. That admonition was to support the Constitution of the United States and the desires of the vast majority of the American people and the Congress—to immediately terminate this unfortunate war 10,000 miles away, which has already cost the American people over \$150 billion, over 45,000 American boys dead, and over 350,000 casualties. As the years pass, generations in the future will be pointing to this epoch of our Government's international “blunder” in Southeast Asia as the most startling mistake that has been committed by our Nation in history—either domestic or international.

When you are voting this afternoon, your mind should reflect back and give some very strong consideration to what the people back home are thinking about. The deplorable veto which the President made last week in his effort to continue bombing and killing the people in this unfortunate and defenseless nation of Cambodia without any consultation with the Congress. The decision was no doubt made by the President through the advice of the military brass hats who have been urging the continuance of this Southeast Asia debacle over the last 4 or 5 years.

I do hope that the minds of our colleagues today will reflect back to the fall of 1968 when our President was campaigning over the Nation assuring the people that he had a plan—and in some speeches he called it a secret plan—to terminate and end the war in Vietnam. Millions throughout the Nation believed him. In his closing speech, immediately previous to the election of 1968, he devoted most of the message that if they wanted this war terminated without delay they should vote for him in that election approximately 4½ years ago.

After the 1969 Inauguration, many months passed before there was even a remote effort to carry out the main plank in his platform in that close election he won in 1968. His assurances which he gave to the people of his plan for peace—and immediate peace—was the No. 1 reason that he was elected in 1968 for a 4-year period as President and Commander

in Chief of the Armed Forces. The people listened to promises and waited in vain for about 3 years and 7 months when the President sensed that he must again resort to the Vietnam issue for victory. Last October 1972 the newspapers, TV, and radio were almost daily filled with the great peace propaganda that Mr. Kissinger was making with conferences in Southeast Asia, Europe, and Washington. The American people today have not forgotten that on the shadow of election eve, Mr. Kissinger and the President, on the news media, television, radio, announced the great event of peace with honor in our time that had taken place—sealed, signed and delivered in Paris.

Millions throughout the Nation today are now convinced that they witnessed a replay last October of the same assurances of world peace—an issue on which President Nixon won the election in 1968. On election day 1972 the people went to the polls and in their enthusiasm and happiness of a signed and finally-won international peace. The President won "4 more years" by a handsome majority.

The American people have been aroused by the President's continued neglect to terminate the war in Cambodia and the great majority of the Congress and the Senate have voted this week to immediately terminate that unfortunate epoch in world history today. Now—not August 1 or August 15—but now. Many lives will be sacrificed, both civilian and military, between now and August 15. This Congress today should not reject the authority and power given to it by the Constitution of the United States when it said that "only the Congress can declare war." We are now in approximately the tenth year of an undeclared war. Let us follow the majority of the thoughts of the majority of the 206 million Americans instead of one individual, President Nixon.

If on this day the Congress follows the Constitutional law of this country and votes to uphold and stand by the bill we enacted to terminate this war, which was vetoed by the President, you will realize that the people of your district, with but few exceptions, will congratulate you and ratify your statesmanship and your decision to stop the criminal and unlawful bombing in Cambodia.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. FLYNN). My reasons are the same as those I advanced on May 10—H.R. 3570.

Just for practice I will restate them. Twenty-four hours after we cease to apply military pressure on any part of Indochina, the oceanic tide of its ancient culture will close over our presence; it will obliterate any arrangements we might be pleased to call permanent. It will dissolve pledges and relationships as soon as the ink dries on the documents which purpose to guarantee them. That being so, what is to be gained by providing further leverage in the form of bombing authority to bring today's North Vietnamese and Cambodian leaders to the conference table? Who among us can even name the leaders of South Vietnam whose signatures would have been essential to similar arrangements

since 1963? Yet we dare not assume the leadership of a totalitarian state is more dependable because it is more durable.

They will sign what it pleases them to sign, and history will release them from that pledge when it suits them. In that light any massive series of raids at great cost merely to secure a diplomatic gesture has to be viewed as foolish. It is foolish because it secures the form, not the substance of accommodation. If America truly insisted on the substance, which is to say "a generation of peace" as we understand the term, America might back the bombing indefinitely. But America does not insist upon it. America knows better.

We know we lack both the wisdom and the power to effect tranquility in a part of the world we understand so little. We know also that 45 more days of raids can cost more POW's and MIA's. Experience tells us we will consider their plight a justification for extending the deadline. So we see no advantages stemming from the bombing which outweigh the disadvantages. And if the President sees them, he has yet to explain them. Only 2 weeks ago Dr. Kissinger appeared at a briefing before some 200 Members of this body. He said that the latest agreements with the North Vietnamese were facilitated by the realization on the part of Hanoi that, "no military solution was possible." I then asked him a most natural question, "in that event what factors justify the continued bombing of Cambodia?" "Cambodia," he replied, "is different." We did not get to pursue the distinction, but up to that moment every initiative in Cambodia was defended with respect to its impact on the struggle in Vietnam. Now, suddenly, it is different. Yet if it is unrelated to the military solution which Hanoi no longer wants in Vietnam, to what situation is it related?

Former Defense Secretary Richardson once justified the bombing as essential to preserve an independent regime in Phnom Penh. Cold is the spine that does not get chills from that rationale. After 10 years, 50,000 lives, and \$150 billion have slipped away maintaining independent regimes in Cambodia's neighboring territories, we have learned that no regime we have guaranteed either independent or durable.

No, it is clear, the only safe thing to do, the only rational thing to do, the only right thing to do is simply to agree that no military solution is possible and act accordingly—at once.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the atmosphere on the House floor today reminds me in some respects of the atmosphere that prevailed when the Tonkin Gulf resolution was passed in August 1964.

Emotions were high. The prestige of the Presidency and therefore of the United States were thought to be at stake. Little attention was given to the precise effect of the language under consideration. The resolution at that time was interpreted to the personal satisfaction of each Member. Certainly, in voting for it, I did not believe it constituted a conveyance of extensive war powers to the President. I have regretted that vote ever since.

Today the situation is similar, with some new added factors. Almost all Members have holiday plans and are eager to effect a compromise to avoid staying in Washington for the July 4 week.

This was probably the most persuasive factor in causing the House to change positions overnight.

The prestige of the Presidency is at stake for reasons that did not exist in 1964.

Many Members were gratified to learn that the President would accept an August 15 cutoff and, further, that he would ask for congressional authority if military measures in Southeast Asia are deemed necessary after August 15.

These assurances are cited as concessions sufficient to justify approval of the compromise. To me, while gratifying and helpful, they do not justify the compromise.

Many Members see the compromise as a way to end the war in Cambodia. It can also be argued that it is a 45-day Tonkin Gulf resolution, because clearly it establishes congressional sanction for acts of war in Cambodia, Laos and both Vietnams for that period of time.

In saying that, I do not wish to leave the impression that I think the President will use this sanction to undertake military measures beyond those he would otherwise press. I am proud of the President's exceptional record of foreign policy, and in particular his success in extricating our ground forces and POW's from Vietnam.

Nevertheless the war powers ascribed to the Congress by the Constitution are very precious and precise. They should not be exercised to approve acts of war, except on the basis of thorough justification. The Congress should guard these powers very jealously.

In my view, the President has not made a sufficient case for acts of war in Cambodia. For that reason, I will not support this resolution, because, to me, it contains a conveyance of warmaking authority for a 45-day period.

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9055, the second supplemental appropriations bill, which absolutely limits the amount of time funds may be spent in support of military activities in Cambodia and Laos until August 15, 1973.

I am pleased to see that the President has reacted to the votes this past week which sought to curtail the hostilities in Cambodia and Laos. He has recognized the important role that Congress must have in determining how and where military activity may take place. When the President signs this bill he will show that he is willing to write into the laws of the country a new definition of war powers. No President has ever signed a similar piece of legislation. Moreover, the President has promised to bring any action concerning any military activity in Cambodia and Laos before August 15 to the attention of Congress for approval, thus confirming his commitment to the concept of war powers.

The inclusion of this language in the appropriations legislation at this time is heartening to those of us who, like my-

self, have sponsored war power bills. We are seeking to reaffirm the doctrine of separation of powers and to give the legislative branch a voice in determining the nature and extent of future hostilities anywhere in the world. The importance of this critical decision on the part of the President should not be overlooked, nor should the opportunity to incorporate it into our public laws be bypassed. I believe that a vote in favor of the delegation of power to Congress to control declarations of war far outweighs any purist views which would deal only with our immediate military entanglements.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote "present" on the passage of this bill. I voted against the Flynt amendment and the proposed amendment to it would have widened the prohibitions on actions by the U.S. Government via the device of bans on particular kinds of spending of appropriated moneys. I feel very strongly that these excursions by this body into areas of power and jurisdiction allocated to another branch of the Government are dangerous and unwise.

This is particularly true as, in this instance, they would seek to terminate hostilities of long standing by legislative fiat, irrespective of the consequences. Sometimes I wonder when this body will, by a rider, seek to repeal the law of gravity.

In the Far East President Nixon finally has brought a measure of peace. All that remains is to end the hostilities in Cambodia on a basis that is stable. The President has done a magnificent job to quiet the other areas involved. He has gained the return of the war prisoners and otherwise headed the entire episode, now over a decade old, to conclusion.

Congressional incursion into this area in the past has been of absolutely no benefit. We are told by returned POW's that they only served to lengthen the war and its miseries. But here, once more, Congress wants to dabble into the matter. In this case, by means of the August 15 expenditure deadline, it appears to me to be no more than slow poison which will paralyze and by that date kill off any reasonable chance the President has garnered to stop the hostilities on a stable basis. All the opposition has to do to render us powerless to impose a fair and permanent settlement is to wait it out a few weeks.

In short, I view the exercise as one which possibly shuts off one war at the certain price of a wide-open ticket to another one. To me, that is an extremely bad bargain.

Therefore, I cannot vote for this measure which contains the August 15 cutoff. Nor can I vote against the necessary appropriations rightfully included in the second supplemental. Those are my reasons for the vote of "present" which I will shortly be casting.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the conference report and the August 15 cessation of U.S. military activity in Indochina.

Earlier this week, I voted in support of an immediate termination of the Cambodian bombing and when that bill

was vetoed, I voted to override the veto. The effort to override fell short by 35 votes. In this second attempt to create an immediate cutoff, it is clear that we are engaged in a futile effort.

The President has announced that anything less than an August 15 cutoff will be vetoed. There is no evidence that we have the 35 votes that we lacked before.

What we do know is that we need this bill and the many others that must pass between now and the end of the fiscal year if we want to keep this Government and country operating. If we continue to play this game of political brinkmanship with the executive branch we are going to put this country in an economic and administrative straitjacket of terrible consequences.

College students will go without loans which we, the Congress, have promised. Federal employees, public safety officers, and veterans will go without pay or retirement benefits. Many necessary and important programs in the field of human services will evaporate.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, I accept this compromise cutoff date with reluctance. If I could have my way we would be out of Cambodia today. I went on the record to that effect earlier.

However, I am realistic enough to realize that we cannot achieve that. Furthermore, I realize that the very success of our democratic form of government is founded upon the principle of compromise. We have a compromise that is workable and honorable. It will end the war.

This conference report, for the first time ever, sets a date certain for the end of our military engagement in Indochina. We have the commitment of the President that he will accept this cutoff. We have the word of the White House that no military activity will be ordered by the President after that date without the express approval of Congress.

Knowing this, Mr. Chairman, and realizing further that since the 10th of May this House has consistently opposed any efforts to prolong our engagement in Cambodia, there can be no doubt that we stand today on the verge of ending this war once and for all.

We should not let this opportunity slip through our fingers by stubbornly insisting upon an immediate termination. We do not have the votes to do that. We do have the votes to end the war by August 15 and I urge that the House do just that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, and that the remainder of the bill be open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to permit debate

on amendments relating to the Cambodian situation to continue for a reasonable period of time without an effort to cut off such debate?

Mr. MAHON. Well, of course, we have had some debate in connection with the so-called Southeast Asia amendment, and we will have further debate. There will be no disposition to be arbitrary or unreasonable in restricting debate.

Of course, we could debate it until midnight. I am sure the gentleman has in mind some reasonable accommodation.

Mr. MOSS. Well, I use the term, "reasonable," advisedly.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I address the same question to the gentleman from Texas.

If there is assurance that there will be a reasonable opportunity for debate—and I underline the word "reasonable"—then I certainly will not object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, have I served in the U.S. Congress for 39 years and established a reputation for being otherwise than fair?

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request. The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROSENTHAL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill may be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ADDABBO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment, from this point on.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EVANS
OF COLORADO

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The portion of the bill to which the amendment relates is as follows:

SEC. 307. None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia or Laos or off the shores of Cambodia or Laos by United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVANS of Colorado: On page 57 of the bill, line 23, strike

the word "or" between the words "Cambodia" and "Laos", and insert a comma in lieu thereof; and after the word "Laos" on line 23 insert a comma and add the following: "North Vietnam and South Vietnam".

And on line 24, strike the word "or" between the words "Cambodia" and "Laos" and insert a comma in lieu thereof and after the word "Laos" on said line 23 insert a comma and add the following: "North Vietnam and South Vietnam".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I do not mind saying that both in the Appropriations Committee yesterday and since, when we considered the bill that was to be brought to the House today, I had a great deal of difficulty in making up my mind what I was going to do.

In the committee, it seemed to me that we had no other choice, that a veto had not been overridden and therefore it was up to the House to offer something different to the President. Then I began to think, "Well, we have other issues at stake here; we have a continuing resolution with tougher limitations on it; we have a debt ceiling bill which has different limitations on it." I began to feel, in the absence of any indication from the White House or the President himself as to what the position of the President would be, that probably the best course of action would be to send back to the White House exactly the same bill he vetoed with the message hopefully being that a strong majority of the House and Senate believe we should cut off all our military activities in Southeast Asia.

I have listened with great interest to these proceedings in the House this afternoon. I have been most impressed, I must say, with the assurances that have been brought to us by the distinguished minority leader, first of all on his personal word, which I was inclined to take, and then, after the challenge of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut and Illinois regarding, not the word of the distinguished minority leader, but the word of the people upon whom the minority leader in the White House was relying, I was then considerably impressed with the fact that the minority leader came back to the Committee of the Whole a few minutes ago with the assurances that he had just spoken personally with the President, and that the President had personally assured the minority leader that the remarks he had just made on the floor of the House were correct, and reflected the commitment of the President, and that if for any reason the President wanted to become involved in military activities in Southeast Asia after August 15, that before doing so he would come back to the Congress and ask for authority from the Congress to take such action.

On the strength of those assurances the amendment which I offer would merely add North Vietnam and South Vietnam to the provisions of section 307.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will support my amendment.

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

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, although the point of order has been reserved, I would not want to reserve a point of order because I think we are operating here in a spirit of compromise. I can understand the position of the gentleman from Colorado, and in that spirit of compromise I did not raise a point of order, but of course that is the prerogative of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman from Texas would join in this overwhelming spirit of compromise. For my part, I would be willing to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very deeply the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) whether the gentleman desires to press his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MAHON. I do, Mr. Chairman; I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

The language of the amendment goes to funds beyond the scope of the bill, and is therefore legislation on an appropriation bill. The language of the amendment prohibits the use of funds heretofore appropriated under any other act for activities in or over North or South Vietnam.

The rule protects a proposed legislative provision which would prohibit the use of funds heretofore appropriated for activities in or over Cambodia or Laos. The rule does not protect additional legislation such as that proposed in the amendment.

As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I feel it is my responsibility to try to protect the bill. I have no strong feeling about the matter, I just feel that the language is subject to a point of order, and it is incumbent upon me to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that in considering a bill which extends limitations in Laos and Cambodia that it would certainly be in order to extend those limitations to other portions of Southeast Asia, which is the sole purpose of my amendment.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I can understand very clearly, and I think, as a member of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS) can understand the position of the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) in raising his point of order.

I want to make my own position clear because it might be helpful in this area,

and that is that we are operating, as I said before, in a spirit of compromise.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I think I understand the feelings of the Chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) the feelings of the gentleman for responsibility for this bill as he has expressed himself. However, it does seem to me that it ought to be tempered with the consideration of the importance of this legislation as the gentleman has so eloquently described it in his opening remarks, and to approach, as the gentleman did, the Committee on Rules when the gentleman knew that there were problems of the type that should be met on a temperate basis.

I am sure that were he aware early on that this was before the Committee on Rules, that he would probably have been constrained to ask for a waiver of the point of order, and it is now within his power to use that same kind of discretion. I believe that what the gentleman is suggesting is going to increase the assurances and the confidence of this House in precisely what we are doing on a measure that is a little larger than the bill that we are considering, and I should hope that we could find some way in which to accommodate ourselves to the amendment of the gentleman and not be hung up on the technicality of a point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements and assurances that have been made on both sides of the aisle, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the 5 minutes. I am neither for nor against the amendment. Whatever provision is made, whatever action is taken, the result of it is that we will be for the first time authorizing hostilities in Southeast Asia if we pass any provision of this type permitting hostilities for any period of time.

The point is not whether we do it with respect to Cambodia or Laos or Vietnam. We have not, since the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, authorized the President to engage in hostilities beyond his constitutional authority since that time—unless we do it today.

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. What does the gentleman think we have been voting for when we have voted for appropriations that have financed our military effort over there for each of the last 10 years?

Mr. ECKHARDT. Simply to pass an appropriation or authorization generally for some money for the military is not to declare war. We are asked today to authorize for a period of time the exercise of the war power by the President of the United States. Only Congress can do it, and this will demonstrate the first time we have done it.

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

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the gentleman's amendment has much wisdom if one wants to compromise here today. For example, there is a possibility of a compromise going to August 15 and including North and South Vietnam. That seems to me a more realistic approach to compromise than merely extending the date to August 15. That is why I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I think it is incorrect to say that the House, by adopting the committee recommendation today, is placing its approval upon bombing in Cambodia or Laos. People can still have their views. The bill language does not say whether there is any authority or not. We do not say there is any. We just say there shall be no bombing in Cambodia and Laos after August 15. It does not say, "we favor or recommend bombing prior to August 15."

Mr. ECKHARDT. If the gentleman will yield back to me, I think it is the simplest logic to say that if we say we will not bomb after a particular date, it will mean that we are authorizing bombing until that date.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. I support the amendment to include North and South Vietnam in the restriction placed upon the President. The gentleman in his statement said something to the effect that this amendment would be a question of war powers of the President. I recall, however, that just recently the gentleman issued a statement to all the Members, opposing the war powers bill, which I support.

Mr. ECKHARDT. For the same reason: I do not think we should authorize any power on the part of the President to engage in hostilities except by congressional action.

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

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. I think we ought to understand something else. The bill that the President said to the minority leader he would accept is not the bill we would have if the gentleman from Colorado's amendment is in there, and it would take the President, as well as the minority leader, completely off the hook, if it were adopted.

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, the argument has been raised repeatedly that we are by some method or some means either authorizing or condoning the bombing of Cambodia and Southeast Asia. May I say nothing could be further from the fact.

The Congress passed a prohibition. The action was vetoed. We did not have

the votes to override the veto. We do not have them now. Thus we offer you the earliest date for a cutoff in an attempt to get the bill signed into law by the President.

Further, if we read this bill from top to bottom and forward and backward, we will not find any place where it authorizes the President to bomb. Personally, I hope there will not be a single bomb dropped anywhere. I would like to see it stop tomorrow. But we tried that, and lost. We offer you the best course possible but nowhere authorize bombing. We are not approving anything. We are just being realistic and saying, right or wrong, combat must stop on or before August 15. The bill has to be passed and signed to do us any good. Again we are not authorizing approval or condoning any bombing. We are being realistic and putting in a date that we can sell. Wishful thinking will not help.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There is no bombing going on to my knowledge at the present time in North and South Vietnam. I think this confuses the issue. We just heard from the distinguished minority leader that he had been on the telephone with the President of the United States. I assume that I am correct when I say that the conversation referred to bombing in Cambodia, and I would ask the gentleman from Michigan if that was not what the tenor of the discussion was.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman rephrase his question, please?

Mr. GIAIMO. Is it not so that the gentleman's discussion with the President of the United States referred to bombing in Cambodia and Laos? We now have a new factor in here, a commitment from the gentleman and from the President that there will be no bombing in North and South Vietnam.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If I recall accurately what I said, which I got reaffirmation upon as far as the U.S. President is concerned, it is that after August 15 there would be no combat activity which I take to include bombing in Cambodia or otherwise in Southeast Asia. That is what I think I said and that is my understanding from the President.

Mr. GIAIMO. My understanding was that we were talking at the time about Cambodia and Laos. We are now introducing North and South Vietnam which is a subject of great controversy in the other body at the present time between the administration and those who are trying to work out a solution to this, and I understand that there is administration opposition to the inclusion of North and South Vietnam.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am not commenting on any such opposition. I am simply stating what I believe, that the commitment I have made is broad in that the bombing in Cambodia is a part of that overall.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may ask a question of the minority leader?

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

Mr. YATES. May I ask the minority leader to tell the House what the subject of his conversation was and what the commitment of the President was?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I came back and said in a few sentences, which I will try to repeat as accurately as I can remember them, that I told the President of the statement I had made on the floor of the House, summarizing it as best I could in approximately 10 minutes, where I had taken 30 minutes on the floor on the same subject. I asked him if I had his authority to reaffirm those commitments, and the President said "Yes."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I take it the statement the gentleman made on the floor of the House, and which will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is a commitment of the President of the United States, is that right?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To the best of my knowledge and personal contact with him.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time the unanimous consent request was made will be recognized for three-quarters of a minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, as far as I personally am concerned, I have no strong feelings about this amendment. If the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is opposed to this amendment and those over on the other side of the aisle are opposed to it, in the spirit of compromise, I shall be glad to be against the amendment. It is all right with me.

This is the first time I have ever had a chance to compromise with the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Illinois, so let us vote the amendment down. That is fine.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I just heard my name mentioned.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman was opposed to this amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to vote for the amendment to be offered by Mr. FLYNT for the immediate cutoff, but I cannot understand why anybody, who favors stopping the war in Indochina, should be opposed to the amendment offered by Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

This amendment represents a broadening of the language offered by the committee. The committee compromise, I think, is likely to carry even though a number of Members will continue to support the Flynt position. If the committee position does prevail, then surely it is much better if the language includes North and South Vietnam as well as

Cambodia and Laos. This will also bring it into conformity with the assurance we received today from the minority leader.

Therefore, I urge the Members to support the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado, and then, if they will, to vote for the Flynt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado and I hope the House will do likewise.

He has expanded the language to make clear that it is the intent of Congress and the law of the land, should this bill pass, that no further military action shall take place in any of Southeast Asia without the President getting prior approval of the Congress. There are purists in the House who see this bill as violative of a principle of both morality and constitutionality.

Whereas I do not quarrel with those determined to see in this bill an accommodation and a compromise, which at this point in time is important to the country and to this House, let me remind the Members that I, with them, know what has gone on in terms of military activity in Southeast Asia and I have consistently opposed it for a considerable period of time. I know what is going on in terms of military activities and I do not approve of it.

I see in this bill before us a real opportunity to express my support for a law which will terminate what is going on. In no way do I intend a negative pregnant by this action which would cancel out all of my previously expressed opposition.

By having made the best of attempts in terms of precisely what now is the alternative and having seen that vetoed and having faced the inability to override the veto, I am anxious to get on the books a law which clearly establishes the requirement for the President to come to the Congress for any substantial extension of the activities which are currently underway and which I so vehemently oppose, just as strongly morally as any in the House and strongly legalistically as any in the House.

Finally, with this bill passed and behind us I believe we can get on with very important substantive bills yet to be faced some of which will continue to address themselves to the constitutional and moral issues. Others which are absolutely necessitated in terms of the continuing ability of our country to operate effectively both as to domestic and international questions. It is, I believe, at this time important to demonstrate to our people and to the world that this democracy can still function.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will pass this amendment and this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, we have the word of the President, as I understand it, and that of the minority leader that the date of August 15 applies all over Southeast Asia. I have always understood that North and South Vietnam were included in Southeast Asia. I cannot quite see what this amendment is all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say as clearly as I can that so far as I am concerned, in going along with section 307, there is no express or implied approval of any bombing prior to that date. I find any argument on the other side by anybody who has been at any stage of the game talking about an early pullout from Vietnam surprisingly inconsistent. By saying this is the outer cutoff date we certainly do not approve anything before that date. Anybody who ever before said we ought to be out of Vietnam by a certain time cannot be said to have approved being in Vietnam until that time. They did not mean that. Equally so by setting here a cutoff date for bombing we do not mean that we approve bombing until that date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY).

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Chairman, I see no problem in accepting the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS). To me, it is clearly within the spirit of compromise on both sides. It is implementation of the offer of the President, extended to us this morning in the House by the distinguished minority leader Mr. Ford. The extension of the August 15 cutoff date to include all of Southeast Asia, and that adds North and South Vietnam to Laos and Cambodia, strengthens the bill, and spells out the agreement. The President will, understand, sign the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I see no validity in the argument which has been raised that this amendment on the bill specifically authorizes any military activity in Southeast Asia. Nor do I see that this touches on the issue of the constitutional powers of the President or of the Congress. It is simply a negotiated compromise of a thorny issue, and I congratulate all parties for their thoughtful consideration.

I urge acceptance of the amendment provided a point of order is not passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP).

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I speak to my friends on this side for just a moment. Two things worried me for many years on Vietnam. No. 1 was, would any President, not just President Nixon, agree to cut it off? No. 2 was, when?

It seems to me we have the personal assurances of the minority leader that the President has personally spoken to him in agreement that he shall cease military activities in Southeast Asia by August 15.

That satisfies me. I have been wondering if we ever could get such an assurance. Having that assurance, I do not see how any of us who in the past have voted to cut off military action in 60 days,

or 120 days, can now be concerned and sensitive about 45 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ).

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS). The amendment would include North and South Vietnam in the committee prohibition against American involvement in hostile military activity in Cambodia or Laos after August 15, 1973, without the advance and express approval of the Congress.

In adding North and South Vietnam to the prohibition, we are materially and substantively reducing the likelihood that this Nation will ever again reinvolve itself any further in the type of tragic conflict that we have seen in Indochina for over a decade.

As I think is clear from my colloquy a few moments ago with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), adoption of this amendment would be consistent with the expressed intent of the President—as stated by the minority leader—that the United States will not engage in hostilities, directly or indirectly, in any part of Indochina. As I understand the President's position, this means he will sign into law a complete prohibition on this Nation's military role in Indochina, with the prohibition becoming effective in just over 45 days.

If the Evans amendment is accepted, we will then have an even more important vote. We will vote on whether to substitute instead an immediate prohibition of the support of military activities, including bombing, in or over Laos and Cambodia. A vote against this amendment to be offered by Mr. FLYNT, is identical to voting against the better-known "Eagleton Amendment."

I have given this vote a great deal of serious thought.

Five times this week I have voted for an immediate halt to the bombing in Laos and Cambodia. On Monday I twice supported the so-called "Eagleton Amendment" to H.R. 7447, the original supplemental appropriation bill. This includes my voting against the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON). As is now history, the "Mahon Amendment," which postponed the bombing prohibition until September 1, 1973, was defeated on a tie vote, 204 for to 204 against and 1 present. Each of the 204 of us who voted against the Mahon amendment may truthfully consider each of our votes the "deciding vote".

Again on Tuesday, during consideration of the continuing appropriations bill, House Joint Resolution 636, I voted three times to maintain the principle of an immediate bombing halt in Laos and Cambodia. Had I been present for the vote on Wednesday, I would have voted to

override the President's veto of H.R. 7447, the supplemental appropriations bill we first considered on Monday.

But at this moment, we are confronted with a different and more difficult question.

It is clear that it is the will of the Congress, as evidenced by the five House votes I referred to earlier, that U.S. military activities in Laos and Cambodia cease forthwith. On the other hand, the constitutionally required two-thirds majority of both the House and Senate to override a presidential veto does not exist, as signified by Wednesday's vote. In effect, we are at a legislative impasse that might be broken in one of two ways.

The first is for the House to seek a way of resolving the impasse by taking a different road to achieve its objective.

The second possibility the permutations and outcome of which are unclear, is confrontation. This would be achieved by continued congressional insistence on an immediate halt to military action in Laos and Cambodia, followed by Presidential vetoes. I can imagine the continuation of this scenario at least through July 15, at which point it is possible, although not certain, that a Government financial crisis would force capitulation of the President.

It is argued that any change in the House position is a compromise, and that any compromise implies congressional sanction of an unauthorized and unconstitutional activity, namely, the continued bombing of Cambodia.

Certainly, the bombing of Cambodia is unauthorized; it is based on no treaty commitment to Cambodia, and therefore is not a constitutional exercise of the power of the President, even in the role of Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. But it is not true that any action this House may take today necessarily sanctions or implies even remotely the sanction of any bombing of Cambodia at any time. In fact, the legislative history established this week in both the House and Senate establishes beyond any doubt whatsoever that the Congress does not, I repeat not, sanction any such actions.

I prefer to believe instead that there exists the opportunity for the House to determine at this moment in time, a comprehensive policy for not only ending our military actions in Cambodia, but also for preventing any future unwanted reinvolved of any kind in any part of South or North Vietnam, as well as Cambodia or Laos. Not only can we establish such a policy, but based on the previous discussion here with the minority leader, we can expect the policy to be signed by the President, giving it the full force of the law of the land.

It is particularly important to recognize that this establishes, with certainty, a precedent of incalculable value. It would establish the principle that the President—this President or any President—must come to the Congress for advance authorization before committing this Nation to a conflict that is occasioned by anything except an act of war against the United States.

In the longer view, this may well be a precedent that we should establish here today without further delay.

It troubles me, however, that in establishing this precedent, that the unauthorized bombing of Cambodia might continue even one extra day. And it is possible by taking this action that the costly and deadly air attacks in Cambodia and Laos could result in being prolonged.

I have thought about this possibility over and over during the course of today's debate, and I believe that the actual effect of rejecting the amendment to be offered by Mr. FLYNT in favor of the alternative I have spoken to would in fact be otherwise. I say this for these reasons.

Regardless of what date certain we set today, whether immediate or 45 days from now, the inescapable fact is that we will have set a definite, certain date for the termination of our military involvement. This immediately removes, in every case, that incentive or "pressure" that the administration contends it needs to negotiate an agreement with the parties in Cambodia. This being the case, the effect of bombing on the negotiations is negligible, if any, as months and months of previous bombing have not accomplished an agreement to date. It follows necessarily that the current secret Cambodian negotiations will be concluded independently of whether the bombing continues any longer. It is my belief that those negotiations will be concluded within the next 10 days, and in any event before July 15, which is the earliest the Congress, by brute force, could terminate the bombing. It is therefore inconceivable to me that there is any logic to the bombing continuing beyond the next few days. I do concede that logic has rarely appeared to prevail in our seemingly endless involvement in Indochina. But for once, I think the logic of the situation is absolutely clear to all, including the Pentagon and others, that more bombing can only be a wasteful, unsupportable and possibly counter-productive act.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have concluded after considerable soul searching that the benefits to our Nation and posterity by establishing in law today the principle of congressional prerogative in determining so fundamental a question as that of war or peace outweigh the risks associated with the other course.

Accordingly, should the Evans amendment prevail, which I believe it should and will, I will vote to oppose the amendment offered by Mr. FLYNT.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, in this brief time I should just like to take note of the fact that the Congress has indeed already expressed itself that it would like the bombing and war actions to stop now, not 45 days from now.

I believe we ought to at least have a fraction of a second to speak for those people who are bound to be killed in the next 45 days. I do not mean just Cambodians and Laotians, but Americans as well.

We should point out that no grant of war power now exists. Our bombing policy is illegal and inhuman. What we are

being asked to create today is a grant of war power for 45 days.

We are being told that we must give belated congressional approval to the bombing and killing. The President is saying in effect "if you will withdraw your objection to my bombing—and help me bomb for 45 more days—then I will stop." We are told that we must join the lawbreaking and killing in order to finally stop it. It is a shameful suggestion—Executive blackmail.

I would hope we would not surrender. I believe we ought to stand firm and insist that the bombing stop now. We have no right to take the lives of those that will be killed by American military efforts during the next 45 days. I implore my colleagues—let us stop the killing now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

(By unanimous consent, Ms. ABZUG yielded her time to Mr. GIAIMO).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of compromise I also will change my mind and support the amendment, but I should like to read a press release clipping that just came off the wire, that says:

Other war critics, including Sens. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., and Frank Church, D-Idaho, were said to be agreeable to the Aug. 15 date—but only if it applies to all of Indochina, the two Vietnams as well as Laos and Cambodia.

The White House reportedly was willing to accept Aug. 15—but only for Laos and Cambodia—leaving its hands free for any possible future U.S. military action in North and South Vietnam.

So I am not quite sure where the House and the other body stand at the moment, vis-a-vis each other.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the report of the conversations between the minority side and the President and the assurances of the minority leader, I will not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLYNT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLYNT: Page 57, line 21, Strike out all of section 307 and insert a new section 307, as follows:

Sec. 307. None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act or heretofore appropriated under any other act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by the U.S. forces.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment pursuant to the rule which brings this second supplemental appropriation to the floor of the House today. I offer it in continuing good faith because the Members of the House of Representatives have the right to decide by

their vote whether they want this war to stop now or to continue for 45 more days.

Mr. Chairman, to adopt section 307 as it appears in the bill will amount to ratifying everything that has gone on in Southeast Asia during the past 9 years and would amount to an unlimited declaration of war from now until August 15, 1973. A declaration of war against whom? Against whom are we continuing to fight in Cambodia and Laos and for what purpose?

Mr. Chairman, the bombing that is going on in Southeast Asia today is undoubtedly as intensive as it has ever been at any time during the entire period of this tragic military involvement by U.S. forces on the peninsula of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, if it is wrong to continue this war after August 15, it is wrong to continue it 1 hour beyond today.

I recognize that certain statements have been made by the distinguished minority leader here today, whose word, of course, I always respect and accept without hesitation or reluctance. If we are to accept this so-called compromise, make no mistake about it, the language of section 307 in the bill is no compromise at all. It is an admission that previous efforts to stop this tragic war have been a mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment will be adopted. If the other body sees fit to put in the language of section 307, then we could come back to conference perhaps within a matter of hours and resolve this thing once and for all. I hope that the House will stand by the position which it has consistently taken since May 10. This bill passed the House on May 10 of this year, and it was stalled in conference for 2 to 3 weeks before it was ever brought back to the House of Representatives for vote on a conference report. When the conference report was brought back in disagreement, the House rejected a motion which was almost identical to the one which is contained in section 307 today.

The House spoke very clearly then and subsequently spoke even more clearly, when the veto message came back, by a vote of 241 to 173, and the House position was again affirmed.

The language of my amendment would have been offered on May 10, 1973, when we first had this bill before us, but it was clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore would have been ruled out of order. Today we have this language before us made specifically in order by the rule which brings this appropriation bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the House will recognize section 307 as what it is; it is by no means a compromise in the true sense of the word but, rather, it is a surrender by the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government at a time when the people of the United States would stand behind the legislative branch of the Government if it adopts my amendment here today.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

He is correct; to adopt this amendment is to give sanction to a war for an interim period of six long and bloody and costly weeks. We have not previously given that approval. We have done many foolish things in this body. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution is a monument to the foolishness of the House of Representatives and of the other body making up the Congress of the United States. But at this moment we ought to, if it calls for giving up the break for the 4th of July, if it calls for a Saturday session or a Monday session or a Tuesday session, still we ought to say to the President on this point, "Mr. President, we will not surrender to you."

Mr. Chairman, we are the House of Representatives. We here speak for the people and we here have accountability to the people. The people by every device have shown how very repugnant to them is the continuation of this war even for 1 additional day. We should not permit it.

It is not the first time that the President and the Congress have disagreed. I recall one time where we took a bill back to President Eisenhower in almost identical form three times. Twice it was vetoed and the third time it was signed into law.

This is a time when we should consider carefully the veto message and then send back our strong and our loud voice, "Mr. President, we do not concur."

The mere fact of the inability to override and in effect the unwillingness of the overwhelming majority to subscribe to a doctrine of minority government whereby the support of one-third only of one House is given and the President himself overrides the will of the vast majority of the American people continues to contribute to the instability of the dollar around the globe and continues to destroy the credibility of this Nation and continues to drain its resources at a time when the great Committee on Appropriations is grappling with some of the most monumental fiscal problems ever confronted. During these 6 weeks we can drop another \$36 million.

How tiny an amount that seems in context with the military program. How large it seems in context with human-oriented programs.

I think this House ought to examine its conscience. It ought to be firm in its convictions. It ought to be willing to stay here until hell freezes over to prevent a continuation of all senseless slaughter of people. We will accomplish not one thing by their destruction.

I recall vividly in October of last year when the word leaked out that we had peace. I recall the days that went on and on and on, until December, waiting for the signing of an agreement by Dr. Kissinger. And I recall now, on the third protocol, how elusive that peace has become, that absolute peace.

But I do know that we here today have the power to terminate this senseless war, this war we are not committed to win, nor have we been committed to win for many years. Let us stop it now.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are victims today of a draw play. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) says the President says that the war will end on August 15. I was always told by my daddy never to trust verbal agreements, because there are so many different ways of fudging on them, you know, no matter how honest and decent the people are.

Remember, furthermore, that men are going to die between now and August 15, and Congress is going to be asked today to authorize that, however implicitly.

You say it is not an authorization, but supposing you, as a father, said to your daughter, "Your allowance will be cut off if you have improper relations with that young man after August 15." Would not she be able to interpret this as some kind of sanction of her misbehavior between now and then?

The gentleman from Mississippi says that if this bill does not pass the war will go on. But, remember, the House has passed a continuing resolution, which the Senate is almost certain to take, and under the terms of which, whether it passes or not, no money can be spent.

We have been told a lot about the need for the funds in the second supplemental. We were told we absolutely had to have the money. My office just this morning contacted Miss O'Hanian, Deputy Chief Disbursing Officer of the Treasury, who has told me that not a single agency has called to say that it has no funds to pay operating expenses as a result of the veto of the second supplemental. So we were told one thing 6 weeks ago and it has never come to pass.

Mr. Brazier, the Deputy Assistant Secretary to the Comptroller, had said in early May that if the Department of Defense did not receive transfer authority in the second supplemental the DOD would have to "Stand down forces, make major reductions in scheduled training, freeze personnel enlistments and promotions." However, today when my office called Mr. Brazier's office, the Special Assistant was unable to say that a single one of these "drastic actions" had been taken.

What kind of credibility is this? We are being asked to authorize a war to continue for 45 days when we do not even know what the war is all about. We are fighting the little Communist with our left arm; we are helping the big Communist with our right arm, feeding them, giving them grain and technical help, and we are embracing—or at least the President is—the top Communist with both arms. For this kind of a war we are asking young men to risk giving up the only lives they are ever going to live. I support this move of the gentleman from Georgia to end this bombing now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flynt amendment. I should like to tell the Members a little story about another alleged understanding with the White House back in 1964. In 1964 when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was before the Senate, Senator NELSON of Wisconsin, was going to offer an amendment to make clear that no language in that Tonkin resolution would imply that we could

send large numbers of men and arms to Vietnam. Later he withdrew that amendment and voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, because of good faith assurances which he received from Senator FULBRIGHT, who was the spokesman for the administration on the floor at that time that the amendment was not needed, and that it was the position of the administration that the language of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in no way implied that the Congress would be endorsing the use of large numbers of troops in Vietnam. Those assurances were given in good faith by Senator FULBRIGHT.

What we are being asked to do here today is to buy a second so-called understanding with the White House, which is not in writing. There is no way that I would accept any agreement with the White House on this issue, be that man a Democrat or Republican, unless that message was in writing in a message which was sent directly to this House and signed by the President.

It has been suggested by the chairman of this committee that there is a time for compromise and that the true statesmen are the people who know when to compromise. I would suggest to the Members that true statesmen also know when to stand, and this is a time to stand. This is not a time to state for the first time that we will give the President authority to bomb in Cambodia.

I urge the Members' support of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time to let my friends on the other side of the Chamber in on a secret. They won. They have won. This is not a measure which extends the war. There is a war going on right now. This is a measure which says that the war is going to be over. You won. Would you rather keep fighting than win? Why in the world would anybody not accept this amendment? Look at what you won. Not only are we not going to take any military action over Laos and Cambodia after August 15, but not over North or South Vietnam either.

In my opinion, the President has gone the whole way to agree with the Congress of the United States after August 15. Actually, of course, we are being asked to take the word of the President of the United States on two things. One is that he actually means this—and I have every reason to believe that he does—and also that there is a good reason why we should not end the bombing today, which would end on August 15.

Mr. Chairman, the track record of the President is pretty good insofar as negotiations on wars are concerned.

I would like to point out to the Members again that we had 548,000 people fighting in Southeast Asia not too long ago. I would like to point out to the Members again that there is no war that involves Americans in North or South Vietnam today. I would like to point out to the Members again also that there are negotiations to end the war in Cambodia and hopefully to establish a government in that country which is capable of maintaining the peace. You gentlemen have

won, so there is not any reason why we should not proceed to a vote on the amendment and a vote on the bill, send it to the other body and get on with it.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman I intend to oppose the present amendment and support the bill as brought to the floor with section 307, to end the bombing.

Mr. Chairman, in this hour of constitutional crisis, and of a very real confrontation between the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government, there is presented in the second supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 9055) an opportunity to resolve the differences between the President and the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am committed to a position to end the bombing and other combat activities by American forces in Southeast Asia. This measure—as now presented—contains a firm and unequivocal assurance that all of such American combat activities will be ended on or before August 15. In addition, we have a commitment from the President of the United States that no combat activities will be undertaken in Laos or Cambodia after that date without express authority of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion section 307 of the pending bill, coupled with the assurances given by the President, provide a constructive and rational resolution of the dilemma in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. Chairman, it is my further position that enactment of this legislation will enable us to meet our obligations—as set forth in the numerous categories covered in this crucial appropriations bill. Accordingly, enactment of this measure as well as the continuing resolution which provides the funds for other Federal activities and obligations—is essential to the orderly conduct of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, by voting today on H.R. 9055 in the form as presented to the House, we can meet our constitutional responsibilities with respect to the fiscal management of our Government—and also to prohibit the use of American combat forces—at an early date in a continuing military conflict to which the people of our Nation are strongly opposed.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, just in a spirit of levity, we have been discussing this for several weeks. I see many Members here standing for recognition. I was going to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and other amendments should end by August 15, but I will withhold that.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has said we have won, but all we have won is "no other funds heretofore appropriated." We have not gone as far as "any funds which will be in a continuing resolution which goes beyond the end of July."

Mr. RHODES. I think my friend, the gentleman from New York, knows full well when this formula is established that the same formula will be used in the continuing resolution and on the debt limit, too.

Mr. ADDABBO. I would ask the gentleman, if he is a conferee will he support this language in the continuing resolution?

Mr. RHODES. I give the gentleman my word, if I am a conferee I will.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, do we understand the commitment of the President of the United States is to August 15 no matter what the legislation says?

Mr. RHODES. I was not asked to say anything about what the President of the United States said.

Mr. YATES. That is what the gentleman just answered.

Mr. RHODES. No. The gentleman asked me what I would do as a conferee and I told him.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Arizona and others in opposition to the Flynt amendment, as now pending.

I suspect it will be said, in some quarters, that my present position on the Flynt amendment—when taken together with my present intention to vote for the expanded antibombing language as now contained in section 307 of the bill, represents a shift in my previously expressed opposition to further combat operations by U.S. forces in Southeast Asia, as evidenced by both my past votes and statements.

There are some who will see my decisions, today, in that light—but I would urge them to first carefully consider the drastically and, indeed, dramatically changed situation that pertains here in this Chamber this afternoon.

Before addressing myself further to that situation, I would like to make mention of the fact that—until an hour or so ago—it had been my firm intention to attempt to help us arrive at a viable and reasonable compromise of the differences that divide President and Congress on this issue by offering an amendment to section 307 of the committee bill which would have changed the effective date of the bombing prohibition from August 15, 1973, to August 1, 1973. Although the remarks I had prepared in support of such an amendment do not now pertain, since I do not now intend to offer such an amendment, those remarks do help explain my reasoning on this whole, complex problem facing us as of this morning and, thus, further help explain my subsequent decisions this afternoon.

I would have begun those remarks by attempting to describe the situation facing us—as I saw it—in these words:

Mr. Chairman—my colleagues—from nearly every vantage point these are dark days for

this Nation; and it is fair to state we stand at this moment on the brink of its worst serious Constitutional crisis since the days immediately preceding the outbreak of our Civil War.

Those words still certainly apply—although it is now my hope that, in light of the action we prepare to take here in a few moments, that constitutional crisis may now be averted. In any event—since, for the moment, whether or not such proves to be the case still depends on action to follow in the other body—after saying I was primarily directing my intended remarks at those of you who voted, as I did, against Chairman MAHON's motion on Monday to defer until September 1 the effect of the antibombing language inserted in the first version of this supplemental appropriation bill, I intended to make these further observations:

Although I agree with those others who have argued that the pending Continuing Resolution is probably the best vehicle on which to fight out this issue, this is still the issue that divides us—and further divides the Congress from the President—and there can be no doubt that whatever action we take on this issue, now, will set the pattern for its disposition on both that Continuing Resolution, when it comes back to us, and on such other vehicles as may be affected.

Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly painting ourselves into separate corners on this issue—with few brush strokes remaining on either side. On one hand, we have the Majority Leader in the other body vowing to attach an immediate bombing ban to every bill coming before him until, as he puts it, "... the will of the people prevails." On the other hand, we have a beleaguered but determined President clinging to his position that any bombing ban could "cripple or destroy" his diplomatic efforts to achieve a cease-fire between contending forces in Cambodia. The final element in the equation that spells out 'deadlock,' is the existence in this body of a dedicated one-third-plus-one—or more—bloc of votes sufficient to sustain any and all Presidential vetoes of measures containing bombing bans unacceptable to the President.

Finally, after having thus attempting to describe the seriousness of the stalemate we were walking into, I intended to use these words to detail our options and our attitude toward them:

Our options have dwindled down to two. We—President and Congress, that is—can continue on our present courses until we bring, and not many days off now, the whole structure of our Federal government crashing down upon us. Or, we can work together—and I stress together—to fashion a viable and reasonable compromise of our differences on this issue in order to avoid such a national disaster.

This Republic has withstood a good deal of battering in the past but one has to wonder—given our present situation—if it could withstand the additional kind of burden some of us seem prepared to load upon it.

It is all well and good to thunder our challenges down Pennsylvania Avenue about the "will of the people" or to declare that we are standing on "principle" in that, to provide the President with any additional time, would be to "condone the bombing," and I suspect those kinds of speeches are far more fun to deliver than this, which I trust will be accepted as a plea for reason.

Mr. Chairman, I then intended to end that "plea for reason"—and argument in support of my intended amendment—by saying further that I was heartened by the new willingness on the part of the

President to compromise with us, as evidenced by his spokesmen's advance of a 45-day deferral date as opposed to the earlier 60-day one, and I was prepared to urge that Congress must now be equally willing to compromise.

Then, it would have been my argument that, on any issue as deeply divisive as this one—and on which competing points of view were so badly polarized—I felt it necessary that the contestants meet each other half way. In support of that point of view, I would have said:

The President wants—and, by his lights, needs—time. He has now indicated that some forty-five days will suffice. It is unclear what is so magical about forty-five days, so I think it has to be asked—particularly in view of the more-difficult situation in the other body—if thirty days would not equally suffice.

Hence, I offer this amendment to defer the effect of the anti-bombing language now presented to us until after August 1, 1973, in lieu of August 15, 1973. I urge its careful consideration, for I believe it is the best way out of our dilemma one can possibly hope for from whatever point of view. And, if it is adopted in this body, I would further urge that we here and now commit ourselves to hold to such date in whatever negotiations may subsequently ensue regarding the same with the other body.

My final intended remarks would have closed with a plea to "let us have done with arguments over who is 'right' and who is 'wrong' on this issue," and with the further argument that "the paramount need—the overriding issue—is now that of insuring the continuity of the Government in and for this Nation."

In any event, Mr. Chairman, the revelations by the minority leader earlier this afternoon of the new disposition on the part of the President to consider what clearly appears to be "the will of the people" on the question of further U.S. combat operations in Southeast Asia; of his disposition to accept that will, even if only after a further period of not to exceed 45 days of such operations; and—most importantly—of his disposition to move us back closer to constitutional government in that he has agreed, through the minority leader, not to renew military operations of any kind in Southeast Asia after August 15 without first consulting with Congress, all represent substantial concessions on the part of the President of a nature sufficient to encourage me to accept that as a "trade-off" against the additional 15 days of possible bombing raids in Cambodia that I am prepared to give him.

I have already been asked by the news media: "Does that now mean that I 'condone' such bombing?" To that question, my answer has been, "No"—in further explanation of which I have sought to point out that such bombing is now going on; that, despite my past and, especially, my recent votes designed to end it, those votes—given the situation I earlier described—have not been, and apparently will not be, enough.

I long ago learned, here, that as wiser heads than mine have noted, "Politics is the art of the possible." Put another way, the older I get the more clearly I understand the fact that life, itself, is a succession of "tradeoffs"—of compromise, in one fashion or another, not with one's basic principles but of a sort designed to

achieve one's basic purposes. Nowhere does that lesson become clearer than here, in the Halls of Congress.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I tend to believe that today is, after its own fashion, destined to be a historic day. We have here reached, I believe, at long last, our final, and determinative, votes on the issue of the war in Southeast Asia—an issue that has for so long divided and polarized public attitudes in this Nation, and for so long exacerbated relations as between President and Congress, and equally for so long restricted our common and collective ability to concentrate on other, more important issues upon the wise resolution of which more clearly rests the future of this Nation and its citizens.

I further think—and am most happy to express the thought—that today marks the specific end of the war in Southeast Asia for the people of the United States; and, in reflection, it seems to matter less that its actual ending has been possibly put off for some 45 days, yet, than that the necessity to end it has finally been accepted by all concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us now put behind us—finally—the scars and traumas of this long and difficult decade and set our faces, hopefully, toward a new and better day.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in support of the Flynt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would not buy an automobile or a radio without seeing a written warranty. I do not propose to buy a war in that way.

What is going to happen if the Flynt amendment fails? We shall then have ratified 45 more days of bombing. What are the consequences of that?

Consequence No. 1. I would expect that the President would continue, renew, and perhaps even intensify the bombing, in its full destruction and violence.

Consequence No. 2. The people against whom this bombing is ostensibly directed, the Communists of one sort or another, are in the tradition of soldiers who know that if they can only hold out for 45 days they have got it made, and they are going to make a retrograde movement to the rear, to Laos or North Vietnam or wherever they can find a hole, so they do not get hurt.

Consequence No. 3. The old men and the women and the children of Cambodia who cannot make that retrograde movement to the rear are going to find themselves killed and maimed and wounded as in the past.

I am perfectly willing to be here on the Fourth of July if that is the price of not continuing the bombing.

I usually make a Fourth of July speech at home which has a great deal of talk about "We hold these truths to be self-evident" and about "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." I think both can be perfectly relevant here on the floor next Wednesday, if that is the way it is going to be. We can link them up with the principle of stopping the bombing now.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Members of this body are anxious to proceed to a vote on the issue. However, I feel it incumbent upon myself to announce my position, because I assured the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) when we came into the Chamber earlier this afternoon, that I was prepared to support his amendment, as indeed I did on yesterday in the Rules Committee when I was among those who voted for a rule that would make it in order to give him an opportunity to offer that amendment.

However, I feel that after listening to the assurances of the distinguished minority leader in which, after personally consulting with the President of the United States, that he has given us what I think is a very fundamental and historic shift in the attitude of the President on the question of the role of Congress in ending hostilities in Southeast Asia. The assurance that the President will come back to this body—to this Congress on or after that date set forth in section 307 to seek any further authorization that might be needed to carry out hostilities, impels me to the judgment that I am warranted this afternoon in doing what I said I would not earlier do. That is, to support this compromise as contained in section 307 of the bill before us and as worked out by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy decision for me to make, believe me. It is a matter over which I have agonized in recent days for many hours, because of the conviction to which I have come that on constitutional grounds, once the agreement of January 27 was reached, once the prisoners were sent home and our troops were withdrawn, that there was in fact no constitutional basis for the President to continue hostilities in Southeast Asia.

However, I feel that in the longer view of history that I must take in this Chamber this afternoon, we have now succeeded in convincing the President of the United States, the administration, that it will be necessary for them, 45 days hence, to come before the Congress and get that advance authorization before any hostilities are continued. I think that is a concession. I think that is the kind of substantive change in policy that can convince me that I ought to compromise in this matter. I do not sanction the bombing of Cambodia. However, I know of no quicker and more effective way of finally terminating those hostilities than to establish this cutoff date.

I would also agree with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) that more is involved than simply the funds that are carried in this particular bill. If the principle for which the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. MAHON) has argued is adopted, that the August 15 compromise be accepted, then I understand that the conferees on the debt ceiling bill are willing to go back to conference and try to import that same principle of compromise into that bill. That is a bill we do need. We may be able to get along without the funds in this

supplemental appropriations bill. However, on the 30th of June the present temporary debt ceiling expires. I understand every week the Treasury has to issue at least \$4.2 billion worth of 90- and 180-day bills to refinance the debt of this Government. We simply then, I think, would be faced with an intolerable situation. After June 30, 1973 if we cannot separate this controversy over the war in Cambodia from the clear necessity of getting a bill passed that will extend the debt ceiling.

Mr. Chairman, much as I am opposed to the war in Cambodia and Southeast Asia, I believe that for all of these reasons and because I think those of us who voted to override the Presidential veto of this bill the other day were successful in some measure in bringing about a change in attitude and proclaiming a willingness to compromise and a willingness by the administration to concede that this Congress must affirmatively act, before further hostilities in Southeast Asia are undertaken, I am going to be willing this afternoon to vote for section 307 and support the committee on the bill.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there is no way that this amendment can get through the other body. The other body is not going to capitulate on a debt ceiling or anything else.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I was told a few minutes ago that the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, was among those who were leading an effort in that body to try to secure acceptance of the August 15 compromise.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we have the word from the majority leader of the other body that there is no way they will capitulate for even 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to make the effort. I would simply repeat in closing that I think the effort has to be made. Those of us who have with great difficulty taken a position in opposition to our own President now have some assurance that we can look forward to the situation with greater hope that the powers and prerogatives of this Congress with respect to the warmaking power will be supported.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLYNT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered By Mr. GROSS To The Amendment Offered By Mr. FLYNT: Strike out "in, over or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos", and insert "in, over or from any other sovereign state".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would make the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Georgia read as follows:

None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act or heretofore appropriated under any other act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or from any other sovereign state by United States Forces.

I offer this amendment to give the Members of the House the opportunity to go all the way and not just piecemeal. There is a dangerous situation in the Middle East that could erupt at any time. I simply think that any legislation here today in the nature of that offered by the gentleman from Georgia should be made to cover possible contingencies in addition to Laos and Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 57, noes 346, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

AYES—57

Baker	Hays	Moss
Bennett	Hechler, W. Va.	Parris
Clawson, Del.	Helstoski	Poage
Cleveland	Hungate	Rarick
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Conlan	Johnson, Colo.	Rousselot
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Okla.	St Germain
Dickinson	Kastenmeier	Saylor
Fascell	Kazen	Skubitz
Findley	Ketchum	Snyder
Forsythe	Leggett	Steed
Froehlich	Long, Md.	Sullivan
Gibbons	McClory	Symms
Ginn	Mathis, Ga.	Taylor, Mo.
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	Towell, Nev.
Gross	Mazzoli	Wampler
Gubser	Miller	Young, Fla.
Guyer	Montgomery	Zablocki
Hanrahan	Mosher	Zwach

NOES—346

Abdnor	Brinkley	Cohen
Abzug	Brooks	Collier
Adams	Broomfield	Collins, Ill.
Addabbo	Brotzman	Conable
Alexander	Brown, Calif.	Conte
Anderson	Brown, Mich.	Conyers
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Corman
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, N.C.	Cotter
Andrews, N.C.	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
Andrews, N. Dak.	Buchanan	Crane
Annunzio	Burgener	Cronin
Archer	Burke, Calif.	Culver
Arends	Burke, Fla.	Daniel, Dan
Armstrong	Burke, Mass.	Daniel, Robert
Aspin	Burleson, Tex.	W. Jr.
Bafalis	Burlison, Mo.	Daniels
Barrett	Burton	Dominick V.
Beard	Butler	Davis, Ga.
Bergland	Byron	Davis, S.C.
Bevill	Camp	de la Garza
Blaggi	Carey, N.Y.	Delaney
Biester	Carney, Ohio	Dellenback
Bingham	Carter	Dellums
Blackburn	Casey, Tex.	Denholm
Boggs	Cederberg	Dennis
Boland	Chamberlain	Devine
Bolling	Chappell	Diggs
Bowen	Chisholm	Dingell
Brademas	Clancy	Donohue
Brasco	Clausen	Dorn
Bray	Don H.	Downing
Breckinridge	Clay	Drinan
	Cochran	Dulski

du Pont	McCollister	Rosenthal
Eckhardt	McCormack	Rostenkowski
Edwards, Ala.	McDade	Roush
Edwards, Calif.	McEwen	Roy
Eilberg	McFall	Roybal
Erlenborn	McKay	Runnels
Esch	McKinney	Ruppe
Eshleman	McSpadden	Ruth
Evans, Colo.	Macdonald	Sarasin
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Sarbanes
Fish	Madigan	Satterfield
Flood	Mahon	Scherle
Flowers	Mailliard	Schneebell
Flynt	Mallary	Schroeder
Foley	Mann	Sebelius
Ford, Gerald R.	Maraziti	Seiberling
Ford,	Martin, Nebr.	Shipley
William D.	Martin, N.C.	Shoup
Fountain	Mathias, Calif.	Shriver
Fraser	Mayne	Shuster
Frelinghuysen	Meeds	Sikes
Frenzel	Meicher	Sisk
Frey	Metcalfe	Slack
Fulton	Mezvinsky	Smith, Iowa
Gaydos	Michel	Smith, N.Y.
Gettys	Milford	Spence
Glaimo	Mills, Ark.	Stanton
Gilman	Minish	J. William
Goldwater	Mink	Stanton
Goodling	Minshall, Ohio	James V.
Grasso	Mitchell, Md.	Stark
Green, Pa.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steele
Grover	Mizell	Steelman
Gude	Moakley	Steiger, Ariz.
Gunter	Mollohan	Steiger, Wis.
Haley	Moorhead,	Stephens
Hamilton	Calif.	Stokes
Hammer-	Moorhead, Pa.	Stratton
schmidt	Morgan	Stubblefield
Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	Stuckey
Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.	Studds
Hansen, Idaho	Myers	Symington
Harrington	Natcher	Talcott
Harsha	Nedzi	Taylor, N.C.
Harvey	Nelsen	Teague, Calif.
Hastings	Nichols	Thomson, Wis.
Hawkins	Nix	Thone
Heckler, Mass.	Obey	Thornton
Heinz	O'Brien	Treen
Henderson	O'Hara	Udall
Hicks	O'Neill	Ullman
Hillis	Owens	Van Deerlin
Hinshaw	Passman	Vander Jagt
Hogan	Patten	Vanik
Hollifield	Pepper	Veysey
Holt	Perkins	Vigorito
Holtzman	Pettis	Waggonner
Horton	Peyser	Waldie
Hosmer	Pickle	Walsh
Howard	Pike	Ware
Huber	Podell	Whalen
Hudnut	Powell, Ohio	White
Hutchinson	Preyer	Whitehurst
Ichord	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Jarman	Price, Tex.	Widnall
Johnson, Pa.	Pritchard	Wiggins
Jones, N.C.	Quile	Williams
Jones, Tenn.	Quillen	Wilson
Jordan	Railsback	Charles H.,
Karh	Randall	Calif.
Keating	Rangel	Wilson,
Kemp	Rees	Charles, Tex.
King	Regula	Winn
Kluczynski	Reid	Wolf
Koch	Reuss	Wright
Kuykendall	Rhodes	Wyder
Kyros	Rinaldo	Wyllie
Landgrebe	Roberts	Wyman
Landrum	Robinson, Va.	Yates
Latta	Robison, N.Y.	Yatron
Lehman	Rodino	Young, Alaska
Lent	Roe	Young, Ga.
Litton	Rogers	Young, Ill.
Long, La.	Roncallo, Wyo.	Young, S.C.
Lott	Roncallo, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Lujan	Rooney, Pa.	Zion
McCloskey	Rose	

NOT VOTING—30

Ashbrook	Duncan	Patman
Ashley	Fisher	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Fuqua	Ryan
Bell	Gray	Sandman
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Staggers
Breaux	Griffiths	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Hébert	Tiernan
Dent	Hunt	Wilson, Bob
Derwinski	Jones, Ala.	Wyatt

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) raised a question which I think is entitled to an answer.

In 1968 one of the worst of many horrors of this war took place at a time when the Congress and most of the people in the country did not even know of its occurrence.

I am referring to the terrible happenings at a place called Mylai. When I read about it in the magazines and newspapers, I tried to recall what I was doing in March of 1968 at the time that terrible tragedy occurred. I realized that I spent that week skiing with my family, out at Vail, Colo. It has haunted me ever since that at a time when death and destruction were being rained down on a small country and on innocent people, and even though I had publicly protested the war, I was out enjoying myself and not doing everything in my power to stop it.

Today we know what is happening in Cambodia. Not one American has ever been subjected to a raid by strategic bombers dropping bombs from 50,000 feet. If they had, and if Members of this House had been subjected to that, they might have a different feeling about civilians being subjected to unseen terror from the skies.

I cannot go home and enjoy the Fourth of July recess having voted to continue the rain of death and destruction, the immoral rain, since there is no meaningful justification for it, for 1 more hour. That is the reason why I cannot vote for this so-called compromise, which is, in fact, no compromise at all.

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flynt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 2 days ago I became a certified "enemy" of the White House.

Messages and telegrams of congratulations have poured into my office.

Friends and foes have told me that my re-election on November 5, 1974—16 months from next Tuesday—is now assured.

Only 18 members of the House of Representatives have been certified as "enemies" of the White House. Consistent with its racist policies in other areas of its activities the White House has two lists of Members of the House—one white and one black.

I was pleased to note that the White House regularly updates this list of its "enemies."

Although I cannot guarantee any of my colleagues that they will be placed on the enemy list if they vote to terminate the bombing in Cambodia today I can guarantee them that if they vote for the President's policy, they run the risk of being placed on another list, as yet unrevealed of "friends" of the White House.

Woe to the Member of Congress who is unlucky enough to turn up on the list of the "friends" of the White House!

I feel fairly certain that if any Mem-

ber of the House changed his position today and voted to allow the President 6 more weeks of bombing in Cambodia he would have a very good chance indeed of having his name added to the list of "friends" of the White House.

I am opposed to 6 more weeks of bombing. I am opposed to 6 more days of bombing. I am opposed to 6 more hours of bombing. I am opposed to 6 more minutes or 6 more seconds of bombing.

The monstrous proposition offered to us by the Appropriations Committee is not a "compromise." It is a request for a license to bomb for 45 more days in exchange for some promise that the White House will not veto this bill.

I hope that all friends and enemies of the White House will reject this sordid and gross proposition.

If you are interested in being re-elected 14 months from next Tuesday I urge you to aspire by your vote today to get your name on the list of the "enemies" of the White House!

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Flynt amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:45 o'clock.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was recognized before the chairman got to his feet. Will this limitation come out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole always protects the right of the chairman of the committee which brings in the bill being considered on the floor. The Chair did not see the chairman when he looked at the gentleman prior to recognizing the chairman. The Chair was protecting the chairman's right to be helpful to the Committee of the Whole in discussing this bill.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I am not complaining but I am just wondering whether the limitation is going to affect my 5 minutes or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago I voted here against an amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, in spite of the fact that in many respects I sympathized with the gentleman and sympathized with his amendment. If I had been free in my thinking to merely follow my inclinations, I might well have gone along with the gentleman, but I voted "no" because it seemed to me that, regardless of how I might feel in my heart, it was really not responsible to determine long-range, worldwide policy for this Government on an amendment offered on the spur of the moment to an appropriation measure. I do not really think it is responsible to do that on even such a provision as section 307 to this appropriation bill, and yet I am supporting section 307 in the committee's bill today.

On a number of occasions I have taken the well and expressed the point of view

that we should not determine national policy that way, and a great many times I have said we should not have a cutoff date because it did not make sense, because we are just telling the other side they should keep going until then, and then they are home free.

Yet today I am supporting that position. Why? Because I think I can see reality. The American people are tired of bombing in Cambodia. I am tired of bombing in Cambodia. Everybody is tired of bombing in Cambodia. It goes against our grain; it lies heavy on our conscience. And we have reached that point in this situation; but there are some folks over here, apparently, who cannot see reality yet.

As the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) said, they have won, and they do not seem to care. Why, the same people who are supporting the Flynt amendment talked here for years about setting a cutoff date, and now we are setting a cutoff date and they are voting against it. That is exactly what is happening here this afternoon, these Members are willing to jeopardize everything accomplished to date in Vietnam. They will not let the President have 6 weeks to perfect the peace. The Members here probably remember the old story about the farmer and his mule. The farmer used to take a 2 by 4 and hit the mule over the head right between the eyes. When they asked him why, he said the only reason he did it was to get the mule's attention.

I recognize reality in this situation and I am for the committee bill and I am against this Flynt amendment; and I just hope my friends over here, some of them, will recognize it too and not act like the mule.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:50 p.m.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered will be recognized for approximately 1 minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ADDABBO yielded his time to Ms. ABZUG.)

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, this is the only body which has the power to use the appropriation process to determine whether there should be war. This is, if we accede to this "compromise," the first time we are approving the war in Cambodia. Instead of just using the appropriation power totally and cleanly to stop the war, we are ceding a larger power, the power to declare war, which belongs only to the House of Representatives and not to the President.

By giving this August 15 date, we are giving power for war to the President. This is a power he does not have under the Constitution. It is a power that the people do not want him to have. It is a power that he will use to kill many innocent people.

I believe that all of the discussion which has taken place here on the floor

is really quite irrelevant. Representations have been made about what the President may have said, about what some officials of the State Department may have said, and yet we in the House have had only one message from the President, and that was the veto message earlier this week on the Eagleton amendment which is the only written, direct word that the President has given us on the question of how he feels about this war. He has suggested that he believes that it would be "tragic" if congressional action were to undo the efforts that he has made to continue this war in Cambodia.

This compromise has a very interesting aspect, and that is that it would run out on August 15, right in the middle of our summer recess. You will all recall that congressional recesses are Mr. Nixon's favorite time for precipitous action, as any possible counteraction of a unified nature is impossible until we reconvene. For example, the illegal and inhuman bombing of North Vietnam last fall took place during the hiatus between the 2d session of the 92d Congress and the 1st session of the 93d.

A look back into history provides some interesting suggestions as to Mr. Nixon's next move. In 1964, we had the Gulf of Tonkin incident, in which two U.S. warships were allegedly attacked off the coast of North Vietnam. This allegation later turned out to be false, but it provided the pretext for the longest, most costly war in our history, a war utterly without justification.

In 1939, Polish troops allegedly crossed the German-Polish border to attack a German radio station. This allegation also turned out to be false, but it provided the pretext for Adolf Hitler's invasion of Poland and the beginning of World War II.

I am not an alarmist by nature, but I am alarmed by what I see proposed here today. I fully expect to hear, at some point between now and August 15, some claim of provocation reminiscent of the Gulf of Tonkin incident or the Polish border incident.

I urge you not to fall into this trap. I urge you to stand firm against this trickery and to agree to the Flynt amendment, for those who do not heed the past are condemned to repeat it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flynt amendment and ask the Members to think with me about what section 307 of the Appropriation bill does. Whether or not a Member is for the war, they understand the argument against setting a date certain, because by doing so we lose our bargaining power. The other side knows we have to withdraw. Therefore, I think if we are continuing the war to better our bargaining position, section 307 with its August 15, 1973 cutoff makes no sense.

What reason could we have to bomb Cambodia for 6 more weeks? The only reason I see is to strengthen the Lon Nol regime.

Remember him? He is the Cambodian leader who wanted to bomb rabbits because he thought they had explosives strapped to their stomachs. He is the Cambodian leader whose wizards sug-

gested we sprinkle magic poofle dust to protect Phnom Penh.

Do we think we can strengthen this regime by spending more money and lives?

If we wish to strengthen the Lon Nol regime we should send him psychiatrists, not bombs. There are no positive facts whatsoever for extending this conflict any further. The war is illegal, immoral, and any further expenditures fruitless and senseless.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I have not spoken on this issue, not because I am not concerned about it but perhaps I am too deeply concerned about it.

I should like for the Members to listen to me for a moment, just for a moment. I know they have been listening for 4 or 5 days.

How many individual Members in this House have ever in their experience been in an air raid where their lives were involved? How many have been in that kind of a circumstance in their lives?

How glib it is for all of us, or many of us, to speak and say how terrible it is, or for those on the other side, in part, who would come back and dare to say, "We need more time to kill. I am neither hawk nor dove, but I am not a duck."

I say to the Members: Think a minute about letting those bombs rain on your heads.

I stand in this well with a 3½-year combat infantry record, when I was so scared, and I am not ashamed to say it on the floor of the House, until my teeth chattered.

Just one more half second, if I may. As we waited to cross the Rhine we had to shovel away the dung of those people who fought, who were so afraid.

Think about what it means to individual life.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HUDNUT).

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. HUDNUT, COLLIER, RUTH, and SARASIN yielded their time to Mr. ARENDS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to appeal to the Members of the House this afternoon, now that we have almost reached the end of debate as to what we are going to do. Let us do it emphatically, with an overwhelming vote on the compromise.

I say this for one simple reason. What this House now does will have great impact on the gentleman on the other side of the Capitol, and will be important as to whether or not we are going to finish the legislative program scheduled for this week.

Let me repeat, I would hope that all of us would do our best to give support to this agreed-upon compromise, not to make me happy or to make many others happy, but being responsible we all have to compromise on occasion. The longer one serves here, the more this becomes a fact of life.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flynt amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill.

The House of Representatives has only recently gone on record in support of an immediate cutoff of funds for the ongoing Indochina war. It would be most unfortunate for the House to step back from this position today and accept an extension until August 15, 1973, an additional 45 days of bombing.

Many of us were not in Congress when the United States first began its slide into the Vietnam quagmire. Others who were here did not understand that by their cooperation they were leading this Nation into the most wasteful, futile, self-destructive war in its history. Today, however, we do not wear blinders. Today, the wool cannot be pulled over our eyes as it was when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was passed.

Mr. Chairman, the debates over the Indochina war that have been conducted in this Chamber over the past decade have nearly exhausted the topic, just as our people are exhausted and fed up with the war itself. Today, in this Nation we have a multitude of domestic reasons to deter us from further military adventures. We have long since honored whatever commitment we had in Indochina. Let us not pretend that a 45-day extension of the bombing will accomplish what a major U.S. effort over the last decade did not.

To postpone the ending of the bombing and other military activities in Southeast Asia is simply going to mean the loss of more innocent lives in that ravaged land as well as the lives of more American pilots.

Make no mistake, the achievement of a final and true peace is ultimately dependent on the leaders and citizens of the nations of Indochina not on whether American bombers rain death and destruction for an additional 30, 45, 60, or any other number of days.

We have come a long way since those naive Gulf of Tonkin days. Let us not take a step backward. I urge my colleagues to support the Flynt amendment and all other similar amendments which might come before the House in the next days and weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It cannot be read at this moment because we have limited time.

This amendment to the Flynt amendment would provide that upon the enactment of this bill it shall be illegal to be in combat operations in these areas.

The reason why I have brought this amendment up is because we are doing this thing very inartfully. We have the power in the Congress to end these hostilities by clearly enacting a piece of legislation saying it shall be illegal to continue them. We have not seen fit to do that. We should do that. We can do that on this piece of legislation, if allowed.

There are two issues involved in this matter. One is the conflict of decision

between the President and the Congress. The Constitution is very clear on that. The Constitution clearly says it is the Congress which is to determine whether we are to fight a war or not, not the President.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of the issues involved. The other issue is whether we, in fact, should be in this war. Personally, as I stand before the Members at this moment, I favor the Flynt amendment, being of the opinion that we should opt in favor of ending this war right now, the sooner the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FROELICH).

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, this week we have been snarled in a real constitutional crisis. Congress, by majority vote, has determined to end bombing in Cambodia. The President, by veto sustained in this body, has determined to continue the bombing. The legislative-executive confrontation has deadlocked. Checks and balances have created the ultimate governmental impasse.

In this crisis, the alternative to compromise is chaos. Unless the two branches each give up something our governmental processes will cease. Payrolls will not be met; social security checks will not be mailed; interest will not be paid.

My position in this matter is one of complete dedication to ending the bombing, which I believe has no legal or constitutional basis anymore. In addition, I have voted since I first entered this body for the withdrawal of our forces, the cutting off of funds for Vietnamese military actions and for ending the bombing. It is most difficult for me to alter my position in any way that might prolong the bombing.

Nevertheless, however strong my feelings against the bombing, I believe that some reasonable compromise must be made. The President, through the minority leader, has offered an attractive compromise. In effect he offers a Southeast Asia War Powers Act including a passive congressional veto on any military activity there. That surely gives us something we could not get ourselves legislatively.

In addition, we are offering a time certain for termination of the bombing.

If we do not accept this compromise and our position prevails, we can only anticipate continued bombing with pipeline funds, and a chaos in, and breakdown of, our Government. In this crisis situation I believe the compromise is the only alternative which offers anything but chaos. I therefore intend to vote for the committee bill on the basis of the compromise presented for the President by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION).

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I cannot help but notice the compassion being felt for

the lives of the Communists in Southeast Asia. I would like to say something about the free people of the countries of Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, it is possible that as a result of our action today, millions of people may be slaughtered because they do not want to live under godless communism. The people of Cambodia, Thailand, and perhaps all of Southeast Asia could fall under the cancer of communism.

By depriving the free people of those lands, the assistance we have traditionally given to those about to be enslaved, we could well be responsible for that result.

Mr. Chairman, a true demagogue, recognizing that possibility, would vote "no" on this measure today. Then he could later take the floor, beat his breast in righteous indignation, and loudly proclaim innocence of this infamous activity.

I do not intend to take that action. Those of us who are concerned about the growth of communism are making a much greater compromise by our vote today, even without this amendment, than the ultraliberal leftwing extremists who have done so much to discourage our fighting men and have brought so much aid, comfort, and encouragement to the Communists.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING yielded his time to Mr. WILLIAMS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, back in the time of the 1930's I watched legislative groups like this over most of the world do their best to appease the Axis countries. That appeasement resulted in my spending over 3 years in the service, and it resulted in the deaths of over 22 million people.

When I came here in January of 1967, the Gulf of Tonkin resolution had already been passed. The Members of this House were condoning the sending into South Vietnam of over 540,000 troops. Our casualties were high; our deaths of American young men were running between 200 and 300 per week.

Mr. Chairman, now we have accomplished 95 percent of what we have to accomplish. We have gotten our troops home, we have gotten most of our POW's and our MIA's home, and when we are about 5 percent away from a true type of peace settlement, it is just wrong to yank the rug out from under this country and cave in so that we can have more of the same in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

I say reluctant opposition because I have supported every amendment and every bill to bring about the termination

of our military involvement in Southeast Asia including the identical amendment to this bill when it was before the House originally and in support of the motion to override the veto.

Although a majority of the House favored overriding the veto by a vote of 241 to 173, we failed by some 35 votes to achieve the two-thirds majority necessary to override the veto.

If we adopt this amendment the Congress will march up the same hill and after a veto march down the same hill again and we will be no nearer an end to our military involvement in Southeast Asia.

I recognize that on technical grounds section 307 might be construed to give some legitimacy to our military operations in Cambodia. This I do not like, but I am more concerned that, for the first time, the Congress can take effective action which will reassert the congressional constitutional power to terminate military actions by the executive.

At times the unattainable ideal must give way to the practical solution.

Today we face such an alternative.

Based on the assurances by the minority leader that the President would not veto the bill containing the present section 307 and that the President would feel compelled to seek congressional approval before engaging in any military operations in Southeast Asia after August 15, 1973, I support the committee compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I had not really intended to speak on this issue which has been discussed so many, many hours in this Chamber in the last several years. However, after listening to the reasons as given by many this afternoon for voting against the committee bill and voting for this amendment or some other restricting amendment, I am led to ask a few questions. This is not the time nor the way to attack the President.

The decision here should not be a political one. It is not a way to vent your feelings against the President, whom you blame for many things. Surely this issue of ending this war in the right way rises above your political motives this afternoon.

I think it is a tragedy when you read the RECORD tomorrow and you see the reason some have put as to why they are going to vote for this amendment. An attack on the President once again. It will not sound very good.

We want to end this war, but we want to do it in the right way. Just today Cambodia announced that if they did not have this assistance they would surely go Communist and many thousands of people will lose their lives.

Yes, as the gentleman from New Jersey said, war is bad, but war goes both ways, and we have an opportunity here to end it in the right way. I believe most will want to cast their vote, not politically, but for what is best for a lasting world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today in unmitigated euphoria over the argument as to whether or not we will finally terminate the Vietnam war either this month or next month. I revel in this posture and hope that we can get this war over with however this vote goes in the quickest possible manner.

It was said some years ago that this war would just slide away, and that is apparently how it will happen. The folks who have supported this war all along will claim their little victory for the next 30 days, but I want to tell the President this: We will keep book on him if we work out any kind of a compromise and for every man lost in the next month, for every man missing in action, for every bomb dropped, for every peasant killed, and for every agreement not executed, we will hold him personally responsible and accountable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PASSMAN yielded his time to Mr. SIKES.)

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, before we allow ourselves to be carried away by the spirit of confrontation, let us just remember that the Flynt amendment is the same as the language which was vetoed. The House does not have the votes to override.

The administration has yielded to a very great degree in an attempt to achieve accord with the Congress on the issue of Southeast Asia. The Senate will probably accept the committee language. If the House does not accept the committee language, there will be another veto, and we will be back here tomorrow and next week. The fact that we may not adjourn tonight is not of importance. But it is important that civilian and military personnel cannot legally be paid after tomorrow if this bill is not enacted. You will get yours; can you explain to the people back home why they cannot get theirs. This bill affects a great many people. It provides needed funds for almost every department and agency of Government. That includes a lot of people who need their money. It includes the very important college student aid program, retired military pay, funds for payment to the civil service retirement fund, and claims and judgments against the Government which have not been paid. There are many such claims. Typical are the moving companies which move household goods of military personnel and dependents. These claims and accounts are for your constituents. The money to pay them is in this bill.

The President has yielded a great deal. We can afford to yield a little, and that is all the House is being asked to do. The Nation's financial house is in disorder. We can take an important step today toward restoring a degree of order to this situation. I am not happy about the solution which is offered to the problem of Indochina, but I recognize the necessity of resolving the impasse which has developed and I shall support the committee proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY yielded his time to Mr. GIAIMO.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flynt amendment.

If your people back home ask you why they are not getting the moneys that were appropriated by the Congress of the United States, the answer is very simple.

Ask them to call President Nixon and ask him because he is the one who vetoed the bill. Congress provided the funds for all of the needs that were in the supplemental bill.

It is very important, in view of the commitments that were made here today by the President of the United States, that we remind the President that the House and the Senate overwhelmingly voted to stop the bombing in Cambodia. It is only because of those actions, those heroic actions by the Congress in the past weeks that we now are able to get word finally from the President that he only wants another 45 days. You will recall we passed this bill originally on May 10, and they said then that they only needed a couple more weeks. They have had 50 days, and absolutely nothing has happened so far to end the bombing.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us demonstrate a resounding will on the part of the Congress to stop the bombing and, more important than that, regardless of all the verbiage and all of the arguments, the fact remains that if we go along with the language of the committee bill this Congress is authorizing hostilities and combat activities, something which the Congress has gone on record as saying it does not want to do.

I ask a resounding vote in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Flynt amendment which would strike the "August 15, 1973" date from the Appropriation Committee's antibombing proviso and call an immediate halt to the war.

The basis for the opposition to the Flynt amendment is the assurance from the distinguished minority leader that after the August 15 cutoff date the President will come to the Congress to seek authorization for continued bombing in Indochina. With all due respect to the minority leader, I think such an assurance is wholly illusory.

For we have received no assurance about what the President will do if Congress refuses to give the President further bombing authority after August 15. If he is consistent with his past actions, he will not abide by the will of the Congress, but merely continue the bombing in the same illegal way he is now carrying it out—without prior congressional approval.

Secondly, we are not told what the President's actions will be if Congress passes another rider after August 15

preventing the President from carrying out his ruthless activities in Cambodia. Will he be bound by the will of a majority of the Congress or will he insist that Congressional sentiment be manifested in a two-thirds vote. If he vetoes any further cutoff legislation and insists on a two-thirds vote, then we will be in the same situation after August 15 that we are in today.

On the other hand, if the President's reassurances indicate that after August 15 he will in fact abide by a majority decision to end the war in Cambodia, then why can not he abide by our will today? I cannot believe that another 6 weeks of this senseless bombing is going to achieve any positive results or that the congressional majority will be wiser after August 15 than it was today.

We were told in May that the administration only needed a few more weeks to straighten out the Cambodia situation. Yet, we are bombing that country more intensely today than ever before.

It is clear that the President does not need 6 additional weeks for this war any more than he needed the "transfer" authority he sought back in May. And if we vote to allow him to continue the bombing, we are doing nothing more than putting our imprimatur on the blood which he is spilling in Cambodia.

Let us remember what continued bombing for another 6-week period will mean. Think about the American servicemen who are flying continuous and grueling nonstop missions from Guam and Thailand. Do you think that they want to risk their lives for this useless war? I have personally heard stories from flyers who have joined in my lawsuit and their relatives outlining their frustration over participating in this futile effort. Think also what this continued bombing will mean to the American public.

They are being asked to make a sacrifice of \$4,000,000 a day for another 45 days—which means a wasted expense of \$180,000,000. How can we deplete our resources so foolishly when our domestic programs are so desperately underfunded? How can we continue to tell our constituents that we have no money for better housing or social security increases or health care because we are destroying villages and people in Cambodia?

Finally, we must remember what this brutal bombing policy is doing to the people of Cambodia. Think about the terror we are forcing upon them merely to prop up a corrupt regime that could not survive for 2 hours on its own.

We are not asked by the President for a mere compromise on a simple piece of legislation. We are asked to compromise our ethical values, the lives of our fighting men, and our precious resources. We are being blackmailed on the one hand and offered meaningless promises on the other.

And at a time when the American public is looking to Congress for leadership we cannot capitulate to the President over a bankrupt and immoral policy.

(By unanimous consent, Miss HOLTZMAN yielded her remaining time to Mr. ADDABBO).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO).

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members who have asked for August 15 that I wonder how many of them on August 15 would not give the President further authority? By that time maybe 1,000 of our young men will have been taken prisoner or killed over Cambodia between now and August 15.

That is a possibility we are voting for when we do not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this because I was standing, and several people can testify to that, and my name was not on the list, and that is a possibility that can happen when many people are standing and the Clerk can overlook them.

But, Mr. Chairman, I feel motivated to say something about this, because I had voted against the cutting off of bombing. I voted to keep from restricting the President. I voted with the President every single time that this has been before the House. As I said earlier, I have changed my position, and I would not be taking the well of the House now except that I have heard some very peculiar statements here that I thought somebody ought to talk about.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania talked about what the Congress did in World War II. I agree with the gentleman that the Congress did make it possible to appease Hitler. But then somebody else on that side got up and said this is not the time to oppose the President.

Well, in the name of God, when a list comes out that fills a whole sheet of a newspaper of people that they are going to get down at the White House—and I do not say the President knew about it—I say this is the time to oppose the President.

I was talking to a Hungarian doctor yesterday. He said:

When I read this list in the paper a chill went up my back because, when the storm troopers marched into Hungary they had lists like that, and my name was one of them. And I got out just ahead of them with my life.

And I say to you on my left you can boo and you can do what you like, but when those two Nazis, Haldeman and Ehrlichman, have lists like the Nazis who supported Hitler did, then it is time somebody called a halt. And I am going to vote to cut the war off today, this afternoon, now.

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

Mr. HAYS. If I have any time left I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I understand the gentleman from Ohio has his own list.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I have not got a list, but if I did have I might put you on it.

I voted for Mr. Gross' amendment because it made a lot of sense. If we are going to cut off the war in Cambodia and Laos, why not cut it off everywhere? I do not know what the President promised Mr. Ford. I am willing to take Mr. Ford's word. He has never broken his word to me. But I can tell the gentleman from Michigan this: As late as this morning the White House was trying to get me—how do I know it was the White House; it was a voice on the telephone that said it was—to go to the conference on the State Department appropriation at 3 o'clock and get the Case-Church amendment revised, which I was trying to do for them, so that it did not include North and South Vietnam.

Do I understand that it is all right if we include them now? Is that what I understood the gentleman to say?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I can only repeat what I said earlier, that my interpretation is Southeast Asia, and that includes North and South Vietnam.

Mr. HAYS. Then I am going to conference and accept the Senate version on North, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia—what have you—because I cannot follow the gyrations of the people downtown. I was trying to help. I really felt maybe we ought to keep our options open in North and South Vietnam. They talk about negotiating a peace in Cambodia. If it is as full of holes as the peace Dr. Kissinger negotiated in North and South Vietnam, maybe we ought to keep our options open. I just do not know, because that negotiated peace, on which there was a lot of propaganda, turned out to be no peace at all.

If the Members are going to say it was not our fault, I will agree with them ahead of time.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my understanding that on yesterday there was the lowest level of any incidents in North or South Vietnam, three in number. That is a tremendous achievement, and I regret that the gentleman downgrades or degrades the settlement that has been achieved.

Mr. HAYS. I am not downgrading or degrading anything, but there have been several thousand people killed since that so-called peace was announced. It is just a little bit like the epitaph on the tombstone up in Vermont. It says this:

Here lies the body of Jonathan Ray who died maintaining his right of way. He was right, dead right, as he rolled along, but he's just as dead as if he'd been wrong.

The people who have died in Vietnam since the "peace" are just as dead as if the war were still going on.

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) which would immediately terminate funding of combat activities in, over or from off the shores of Laos or Cambodia, either directly or indirectly and in support of the committee's recommendation to give the Pres-

ident of the United States until August 15 to conduct negotiations with the strength and flexibility of response that he desires backing him up, after which date funding of such hostilities would cease.

These are hard decisions for us to make. They involve much soul-searching. And in making them, reasonable and sincere men will differ.

We have heard it asked here this afternoon, "How would you like it if American bombs were raining down on your head from 50,000 feet up in the sky?" As if to imply that the United States is deliberately and diabolically indulging in arson and murder of Cambodians. Might we not also ask: How do we suppose the Cambodians like having 40,000 incursions inspired and supplied by Hanoi pouring across their borders from North Vietnam? How do we like the prospects of Cambodia and Laos falling under Communist sway? How do we like standing by while a weaker neighbor is ground under the boot of the tyrant?

I say we cannot sit by and let this happen. To bring a halt at this time to U.S. air operations over there would remove Communist incentive to negotiate, dim prospects of our diplomacy arranging a cease-fire, compromise the current tactical situation in Cambodia, undermine the chances of establishing a stable new broadened government in Phnom Penh, subject the civilian population of that city to extreme hardship with the potential closure of road and water routes by enemy actions, and ultimately probably clear the road for a Communist insurgent government in Cambodia that would be subservient to Hanoi, and thus jeopardize the entire Indochina peace.

The administration has asked that we give them a little time to work through the negotiation process, and we have the word of the distinguished minority leader that the administration has agreed to the August 15 date. It does not seem to me to be unreasonable to agree to wait that long, and considering the success that the President has had in dealing with the Communist world, in winding down the war in Vietnam, in achieving a détente with Russia and China, and in bringing some measure of stability to Indochina. I think we should vote this afternoon, not to tie his hands, but to give him the strength and flexibility he needs to conclude the efforts in which his administration is engaged to achieve a peaceful settlement in Southeast Asia by August 15, 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think the debate has been ample, and I think everyone is familiar with the issue before us. I rise in opposition to the preferential motion. I ask that the Flynt amendment be voted down and that we then have the opportunity to approve the amendment provided in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The preferential motion was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLYNT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT to the amendment offered by Mr. FLYNT: At the end of the Flynt Amendment strike the period and insert a semicolon and the words "and from the date of the enactment of this law it shall be illegal for anyone to participate in, or order, any such activities."

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the limitation having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Legislation on an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the point of order comes too late. Since all time for debate under the limitation had expired, the Chair had put the question. The Chair had recognized the chairman of the Appropriations Committee only for the purpose of ascertaining that fact.

Does the gentleman from Florida wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have not thoroughly researched this point of order but I believe the amendment modifies the language which is before us today in a very realistic way. As has been pointed out by attorneys in the Department of Defense, the mere cutting off of funds does not end the war. This is just a frank statement of law which will be upheld by the President because it makes it illegal to continue the war, which we should have done a long time ago instead of approaching it by the funding method.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman. I have a statement as to the point of order.

The amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROOKS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) was protected by the rule. An amendment to that amendment which would add language making an act illegal would be in effect legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 236, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]

AYES—169

Abzug	Gialmo	Owens
Adams	Gibbons	Patten
Addabbo	Ginn	Pepper
Alexander	Gonzalez	Perkins
Anderson, Calif.	Grasso	Pickle
Andrews, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Pike
Annunzio	Gude	Podell
Aspin	Gunter	Preyer
Barrett	Hamilton	Price, Ill.
Bennett	Harrington	Pritchard
Bergland	Hawkins	Randall
Bingham	Hays	Rangel
Boggs	Hechler, W. Va.	Rees
Boland	Heckler, Mass.	Reid
Bolling	Helstoski	Reuss
Brademas	Henderson	Riegle
Brasco	Hicks	Rodino
Brooks	Holtzman	Roe
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Roncalio, Wyo.
Burke, Calif.	Hungate	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Rose
Burlison, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Rosenthal
Burton	Jordan	Rostenkowski
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Roush
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Roy
Chisholm	Kluczynski	Roybal
Clay	Koch	Runnels
Cohen	Kyros	St Germain
Collins, Ill.	Landrum	Sarbanes
Conte	Leggett	Schroeder
Conyers	Lehman	Seiberling
Corman	Litton	Shipley
Cotter	Long, La.	Shoup
Cronin	Long, Md.	Stanton, James V.
Culver	McCormack	Stark
Daniels	Macdonald	Steele
Dominick V.	Madden	Stokes
Dellums	Matsunaga	Studds
Denholm	Mazzoli	Sullivan
Diggs	Meeds	Symington
Dingell	Melcher	Thone
Donohue	Metcalfe	Udall
Drinan	Mezvinsky	Ullman
Dulski	Miller	Vanik
du Pont	Mills, Ark.	Vigorito
Eckhardt	Minish	Waldie
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Whalen
Eilberg	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson,
Esch	Moakley	Charles H., Calif.
Fascell	Morgan	Wilson,
Findley	Mosher	Charles, Tex.
Flynt	Moss	Wolf
Ford,	Murphy, Ill.	Yates
William D.	Natcher	Yatron
Fountain	Nedzi	Young, Ga.
Fraser	Nix	Zwachs
Fulton	O'Byrne	
Gaydos	O'Hara	
	O'Neill	

NOES—236

Abdnor	Butler	Delaney
Anderson, Ill.	Byron	Dellenback
Andrews, N. Dak.	Camp	Dennis
Archer	Carter	Devine
Arends	Casey, Tex.	Dickinson
Armstrong	Cederberg	Dorn
Bafalis	Chamberlain	Downing
Baker	Chappell	Duncan
Beard	Clancy	Edwards, Ala.
Bevill	Clausen,	Erlenborn
Biaggi	Don H.	Eshleman
Blester	Clawson, Del.	Evans, Colo.
Blackburn	Cleveland	Evins, Tenn.
Bowen	Cochran	Fish
Bray	Collier	Flood
Breckinridge	Collins, Tex.	Flowers
Brinkley	Conable	Foley
Broomfield	Conlan	Ford, Gerald R.
Brotzman	Coughlin	Forsythe
Brown, Mich.	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Brown, Ohio	Daniel, Dan	Frenzel
Broyhill, N.C.	Daniel, Robert	Frey
Broyhill, Va.	W. Jr.	Freelich
Buchanan	Davis, Ga.	Gettys
Burgener	Davis, S.C.	Gilman
Burleson, Tex.	Davis, Wis.	Goldwater
	de la Garza	Goodling

Gross	Mallory	Sikes
Grover	Mann	Sisk
Gubser	Maraziti	Skubitz
Guyer	Martin, Nebr.	Slack
Haley	Martin, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Hammer-	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
schmidt	Mathis, Ga.	Snyder
Hanley	Mayne	Spence
Hanna	Michel	Staggers
Hanrahan	Milford	Stanton,
Hansen, Idaho	Minshall, Ohio	J. William
Harsha	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steed
Harvey	Mizell	Steelman
Hastings	Mollohan	Steiger, Ariz.
Heinz	Montgomery	Steiger, Wis.
Hillis	Moorhead,	Stephens
Hinshaw	Call.	Stratton
Hogan	Moorhead, Pa.	Stubblefield
Hollfield	Murphy, N.Y.	Stuckey
Holt	Myers	Symms
Horton	Nelsen	Talcott
Hosmer	Nichols	Taylor, Mo.
Huber	O'Brien	Taylor, N.C.
Hudnut	Parris	Teague, Calif.
Hutchinson	Passman	Thomson, Wis.
Ichord	Patman	Thornton
Jarman	Pettis	Towell, Nev.
Johnson, Pa.	Peyster	Treen
Jones, N.C.	Poage	Van Deerlin
Jones, Okla.	Powell, Ohio	Vander Jagt
Jones, Tenn.	Price, Tex.	Veysey
Kazen	Quile	Waggonner
Keating	Quillen	Walsh
Kemp	Railsback	Wampler
Ketchum	Rarick	Ware
King	Regula	White
Kuykendall	Rhodes	Whitehurst
Landgrebe	Rinaldo	Whitten
Latta	Roberts	Widnall
Lent	Robinson, Va.	Wiggins
Lott	Robison, N.Y.	Williams
Lujan	Rogers	Winn
McClory	Roncallo, N.Y.	Wright
McCloskey	Rousselot	Wydler
McCollister	Ruppe	Wylie
McDade	Ruth	Wyman
McEwen	Sarasin	Young, Alaska
McFall	Satterfield	Young, Fla.
McKay	Saylor	Young, Ill.
McKinney	Scherle	Young, S.C.
McSpadden	Schneebell	Young, Tex.
Madigan	Sebelius	Zablocki
Mahon	Shriver	Zion
Mailliard	Shuster	

NOT VOTING—28

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Rooney, N.Y.
Ashley	Fisher	Ryan
Badillo	Fuqua	Sandman
Bell	Gray	Teague, Tex.
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	Thompson, N.J.
Breaux	Grimiths	Tierman
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Wilson, Bob
Clark	Hebert	Wyatt
Danielson	Hunt	
Dent	Jones, Ala.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's understanding in withdrawing his motion.

I had said earlier in the debate that it was my intention at that time to consider offering an amendment at this point in the debate. I was going to submit the date of August 1 instead of August 15.

Mr. Chairman, to me that would have given us a common ground. One side would have given up 30 days; the other side, the President, would have given up 30 days. It has the added factor that the Congress would be in session on August 1 and not in recess. I think, with 15 days fewer, it would have the advantage of stopping the bombing more quickly and saving lives.

I do not think at this particular point it would serve any successful purpose to offer the amendment because we now

can all see the handwriting on the wall. I still think it is something the conference might find a common ground on to help work out a final compromise. For that reason I will not offer the amendment. I think the House has worked its will and a clear and definite understanding has been reached between the House and the President. I will now join with others in final passage in voting for the committee bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, 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. 9055) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 278, nays 124, present 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

YEAS—278

Abdnor	Brown, Mich.	Daniel, Robert
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	W., Jr.
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Ga.
Andrews,	Broyhill, Va.	Davis, S.C.
N. Dak.	Buchanan	Davis, Wis.
Annunzio	Burgener	de la Garza
Archer	Burleson, Tex.	Delaney
Arends	Burlison, Mo.	Dellenback
Armstrong	Butler	Dennis
Bafalis	Byron	Devine
Baker	Camp	Dickinson
Barrett	Carter	Dorn
Beard	Casey, Tex.	Downing
Bergland	Cederberg	Dulski
Bevill	Chamberlain	Duncan
Biaggi	Chappell	du Pont
Blester	Clancy	Edwards, Ala.
Bingham	Clausen,	Elberg
Blackburn	Don H.	Erlenborn
Boggs	Clauston, Del	Esch
Bolling	Cleveland	Eshleman
Bowen	Cochran	Evans, Colo.
Bray	Collier	Evins, Tenn.
Breckinridge	Collins, Tex.	Fish
Brinkley	Conable	Flood
Brooks	Conlan	Flowers
Broomfield	Coughlin	Flynt
Brotzman	Cronin	Ford, Gerald R.
Brown, Calif.	Daniel, Dan	Forsythe

Fountain	McKay	Saylor
Fraser	McKinney	Scherle
Frelinghuysen	McSpadden	Schneebell
Frenzel	Madden	Sebelius
Frey	Madigan	Shipley
Fulton	Mahon	Shriver
Gaydos	Mailliard	Shuster
Gettys	Mallory	Sikes
Gilman	Mann	Sisk
Ginn	Maraziti	Skubitz
Goldwater	Martin, Nebr.	Slack
Goodling	Martin, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Gray	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Grover	Mayne	Snyder
Gubser	Mazzoli	Staggers
Guyer	Michel	Stanton,
Haley	Milford	J. William
Hamilton	Miller	Steed
Hammer-	Mills, Ark.	Steele
schmidt	Minshall, Ohio	Steelman
Hanley	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Hanna	Mizell	Stephens
Hanrahan	Mollohan	Stratton
Hansen, Idaho	Montgomery	Stubblefield
Harsha	Moorhead,	Stuckey
Harvey	Calif.	Talcott
Hastings	Moorhead, Pa.	Taylor, Mo.
Hays	Morgan	Taylor, N.C.
Heinz	Mosher	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Murphy, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Hillis	Murphy, N.Y.	Thone
Hinshaw	Myers	Thornton
Hogan	Nelsen	Towell, Nev.
Hollfield	Nichols	Treen
Holt	Nix	Udall
Horton	O'Brien	Van Deerlin
Huber	Parris	Vander Jagt
Hudnut	Passman	Veysey
Hutchinson	Patman	Waggonner
Ichord	Patten	Walsh
Jarman	Perkins	Wampler
Johnson, Pa.	Pettis	Ware
Jones, N.C.	Pickle	White
Jones, Okla.	Poage	Whitehurst
Jones, Tenn.	Powell, Ohio	Whitten
Jordan	Preyer	Widnall
Kazen	Price, Ill.	Wiggins
Keating	Price, Tex.	Williams
Kemp	Quile	Wilson,
Ketchum	Quillen	Charles H.,
King	Railsback	Calif.
Kluczyński	Regula	Winn
Kuykendall	Rhodes	Wright
Landgrebe	Rinaldo	Wydler
Landrum	Roberts	Wylie
Latta	Robinson, Va.	Wyman
Leggett	Robison, N.Y.	Yatron
Lent	Rogers	Young, Alaska
Long, La.	Roncallo, N.Y.	Young, Fla.
Lott	Rooney, Pa.	Young, Ill.
Lujan	Rostenkowski	Young, S.C.
McClory	Roush	Young, Tex.
McCloskey	Roy	Zablocki
McCollister	Ruppe	Zion
McDade	Ruth	Zwach
McEwen	Sarasin	
McFall	Satterfield	

NAYS—124

Abzug	Donohue	Lehman
Adams	Drinan	Litton
Addabbo	Eckhardt	Long, Md.
Anderson,	Edwards, Calif.	McCormack
Calif.	Fascell	Macdonald
Andrews, N.C.	Findley	Mathis, Ga.
Aspin	Ford,	Matsumaga
Bennett	William D.	Meeds
Boland	Froehlich	Meicher
Brademas	Gialmo	Metcalfe
Brasco	Gibbons	Mezvisky
Burke, Calif.	Gonzalez	Minish
Burke, Mass.	Grasso	Mink
Burton	Green, Pa.	Mitchell, Md.
Carey, N.Y.	Gross	Moakley
Carney, Ohio	Gude	Moss
Chisholm	Gunter	Natcher
Clay	Harrington	Nedzi
Cohen	Hawkins	Obey
Collins, Ill.	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara
Conte	Heckler, Mass.	O'Neill
Conyers	Helstoski	Owens
Corman	Hicks	Pepper
Cotter	Holtzman	Pike
Crane	Howard	Podell
Culver	Hungate	Pritchard
Daniels,	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Dominick V.	Johnson, Colo.	Rangel
Dellums	Kath	Rarick
Denholm	Kastenmeier	Rees
Diggs	Koch	Reid
Dingell	Kyros	Reuss

Rlegle	Schroeder	Symington
Rodino	Seiberling	Symms
Roe	Shoup	Ullman
Roncalio, Wyo.	Spence	Vanik
Rose	Stanton	Vigorito
Rosenthal	James V.	Waldie
Roussetot	Stark	Whalen
Roybal	Steiger, Ariz.	Willson
Runnels	Stokes	Charles, Tex.
St Germain	Studds	Wolff
Sarbanes	Sullivan	Yates

PRESENT—2

Hosmer	Young, Ga.
--------	------------

NOT VOTING—29

Ashbrook	Derwinski	Peyser
Ashley	Fisher	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Foley	Ryan
Bell	Fuqua	Sandman
Blatnik	Green, Ore.	Teague, Tex.
Breaux	Griffiths	Thompson, N.J.
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Tierman
Clark	Hébert	Wilson, Bob
Danielson	Hunt	Wyatt
Dent	Jones, Ala.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. Badillo against.
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Tierman against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Danielson against.
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Bell against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Jones of Alabama.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Burke of Florida.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Sandman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT AND HOUSE BACK IN AGREEMENT

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and so include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, now with the passage of the committee bill and the overwhelming defeat of the Flynt amendment, the House and the President are back in agreement. The tender of compromise by the President is gratefully accepted by me.

The confrontation, so-called confrontation, is no longer between the President and the Congress, but if there be a confrontation it is between this House and the other body.

I trust that both Houses of the Congress can now act in a responsible and rational manner and promptly effect a compromise in the spirit of deliberation for which the Congress is renowned and in the national interest which must be paramount to all personal, provincial, or party considerations.

When so many are absorbed in the confrontation, alleged confrontation, between the President and the Congress, I trust the Congress will not permit the Government of our Nation to be obstructed or ground to a halt by a con-

frontation between the two Houses of this Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOURCE RECYCLING AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced today the Resource Recycling and Conservation Act of 1973 and was joined by 13 of my colleagues. This bill is identical to S. 1593 introduced by my senior colleague in the other body, Senator FRANK E. MOSS on April 16, 1973.

At this time of serious concern over the energy crisis, it is important that we solve environmental problems in a way to avoid the supposedly collision course set by those who call for relaxing environmental controls in order to develop energy reserves and the equally dedicated environmentalists who claim that energy development can, and should, proceed in an environmentally sound way. This bill is an attempt to solve the short-term problem of rapidly increasing volumes of solid waste while recognizing the long-term problem of dwindling energy reserves. The bill I have submitted anticipates the energy demand that is represented by continued consumption of virgin materials for product manufacture and provides a combination of incentives and disincentives to convert the reliance on virgin materials to a greater use of recycled materials. By so doing, the savings in energy otherwise required to extract virgin materials, is made available for other purposes.

The legislation has the support of the National Association of Secondary Materials Industries and has drawn the interest of many responsible environmentalists across the country.

I hope that hearings by the appropriate committee of the House can be scheduled at an early date.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 469 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 469

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8916) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI are hereby waived.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is the rule waiving points of order on clause 2, rule XXI, which has to do with matters which are not authorized, and some other matters.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this is the last rule the Rules Committee will report out without a detailed listing of the points of order that would be involved, so that all members will be able to see them. It is one of three rules that the Rules Committee issued earlier this week under pressure of time involved in trying to secure action on a variety of appropriation bills this week.

Before that was done, after colloquy in the Chamber—in fact, several colloquies—it was made clear that the Rules Committee agreed to be specific in granting waivers hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy on this particular rule.

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering House Resolution 469, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 8916, the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974. The rule waives all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. Clause 2 prohibits both unauthorized appropriations and legislation on an appropriation bill. This waiver was requested because there are a number of items in the bill which have not as yet been enacted into law. These items are found:

On page 2-13, Department of State.

On page 20, lines 12-13, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

On page 25, lines 21-25 through page 26, lines 1-7, United States Travel Service.

On page 27, lines 21-26, under National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

On page 28, lines 12-24, all of page 29, and page 30, lines 1-17, under Maritime Administration.

On page 42, lines 13-16, International Radio Broadcasting.

On page 46, lines 12-25, all of pages 47, 48, 49, and 50, lines 1 and 2, United States Information Agency.

The committee report notes several limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill:

On page 11, in connection with American Sections, International Commissions.

On page 17, in connection with the FBI.

On pages 23 and 24, in connection with periodic censuses and programs.

On page 27, in connection with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

On page 28, in connection with science and technology.

On pages 28 and 29, in connection with Maritime Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to appropriate a total of \$4,150,143,000 of new obligational authority for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce,

and the Federal Judiciary, and 14 related agencies.

I urge the adoption of this rule in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 8916.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the joy of that one open rule we had in the last, I believe, several weeks, on yesterday afternoon was short lived, was it not?

Mr. LATTA. Yes. As the gentleman from Missouri has mentioned, we hope that this is the last one.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman hopes this is the last one?

Mr. LATTA. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. The last one for how long?

Mr. LATTA. I cannot say.

Mr. GROSS. Until tomorrow?

Mr. LATTA. Hopefully.

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

Mr. BOLLING. 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. SLACK. 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. 8916) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK).

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. 8916, with Mr. VANIK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK).

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this afternoon we submit for the consideration of the House the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Com-

merce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, we have sorely missed the able leadership of our distinguished chairman, JOHN ROONEY, who became chairman of this subcommittee some 25 years ago. I understand he is on the road to recovery, and we sincerely hope that he will be back with us in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this bill started March 5 and were completed on May 10.

They are contained in four volumes with more than 4,000 pages of printed material.

Since there are some 100 items, I shall summarize the committee's actions, after which I shall be pleased to respond to any questions.

Mr. Chairman, the total amount recommended in the accompanying bill in new obligatory authority is \$4,150,143,000, which is a reduction of \$84,937,000 in the total amount of the budget estimates. The amount allowed is a decrease of \$2,628,950,850 below the total appropriated for the current fiscal year—including funds contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1973.

The decrease below the total appropriation for the current year is attributable in large part to the fact that a total of \$1,855,000,000 was appropriated in fiscal year 1973 for the disaster loan fund of the Small Business Administration, for which no additional funds have been requested as yet for the fiscal year 1974.

In addition to the new obligatory authority, there is also included in the bill a total of \$221,515 million to liquidate contract authorizations. This amount is \$10.5 million below the appropriation for this purpose for the current fiscal year.

The action of the committee as set forth in the bill will reduce expenditures projected for fiscal year 1974 by approximately \$54 million.

The budget estimates for the Department of State for fiscal year 1974 total \$609,050,000. The committee has included in the accompanying bill \$595,571,000, which is a reduction of \$13,479,000 in the total amount of the budget estimates and is an increase of \$3,385,350 over the total appropriated for fiscal year 1973.

Under the general heading of "Administration of Foreign Affairs" a total of \$314,908,000 is recommended.

For "International Organizations and Conferences" the sum of \$213,812,000 is provided.

The recommendation for "International Commissions" is \$12,551,000.

A total of \$54,300,000 is provided for "Educational Exchange."

Moving along to the Department of Justice, the budget estimates for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1974 totaled \$1,836,349,000.

The committee recommends \$1,808,112,000, which is an increase of \$30,034,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year for this Department and a decrease of \$28,237,000 in the budget request.

The committee has again approved the full amount of the budget estimate;

namely, \$13,019,000 to provide for necessary expenses for the effective enforcement of antitrust laws.

The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate; namely, \$366,506,000, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This will provide for a staff of 19,360 full-year employees, consisting of 8,496 agents and 11,134 clerks.

For the Immigration and Naturalization Service a total of \$139,698,000, the full amount of the budget estimate, is recommended.

Mr. Chairman, the bill contains a total of \$164,571,000 in three appropriations for our Federal prison system. The committee has included in the bill the sum of \$866 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 as amended, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is charged with the responsibility for assisting State and local governments in reducing crime and improving the quality of the criminal justice system.

The committee once again, Mr. Chairman, recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, \$77.4 million for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, which is an increase of \$2,747,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Moving along to the Department of Commerce, the budget estimates considered by the committee for the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1974 total \$973,546,000 in new budget authority, plus \$221,515,000 for liquidation of contract authorization. The committee recommends the full amount requested for liquidation of contract authorization and \$961,804,000 in new budget authority. This is a decrease of \$650,270,500 from the total appropriated for the fiscal year 1973 and is \$11,742,000 less than the total requests considered for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Chairman, the budget as presented to the Congress included a request of \$20 million in order to phaseout the economic development assistance programs. The committee has passed over this request without prejudice, pending the receipt of budget amendments to implement recently passed legislation which extends the economic development assistance programs for another year.

However, Mr. Chairman, the committee has provided for the EDA and the regional commissions in the continuing resolution which permits them to be continued at the current rate.

The budget requests of the judiciary are submitted to the Congress without revision by the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

The total amount of the estimates for the fiscal year 1974 as prepared and presented by the judicial branch is \$205,529,000. The committee recommends a total of \$199,561,000, which is a reduction of \$5.968 million below the total request, or an increase of \$5,918,400 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, we shall now concern ourselves briefly with the 14 related agencies carried in this bill. A total of

\$585,095,000 is included in the accompanying bill for the 14 different agencies funded under this title.

The committee recommends \$3,800,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission. This is the full amount of the budget estimate.

The sum of \$6,935,000, the amount of the budget estimate, is included in the bill for arms control and disarmament activities.

The bill includes \$5,566,000 to cover the necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights. The amount allowed is an increase of \$618,000 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$40 million is included in the bill for the necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Op-

portunity Commission. The amount allowed is an increase of \$8 million over the appropriation for fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, a total of \$248,123,000 is included in the bill in three separate appropriation items for the Small Business Administration.

A total of \$219,422,000 is included in the bill in the five separate appropriation items for the U.S. Information Agency. This is an increase of \$9,754,000 over the fiscal year 1973 appropriation and is a decrease of \$12,432,000 in the total of the budget estimates for this agency.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the budget estimates for fiscal year 1974 and the appropriations for fiscal year 1973.

Department or agency (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (enacted to date) ¹ (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (3)	Bill compared to—		
			New budget (obligational) authority recommended in bill (4)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973 (5)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974 (6)
Department of State.....	\$587,185,650	\$609,050,000	\$595,571,000	+\$8,385,350	-\$13,479,000
Department of Justice.....	1,778,078,000	1,836,349,000	1,808,112,000	+30,034,000	-28,237,000
Department of Commerce.....	1,612,074,500	973,546,000	961,804,000	-650,270,500	-11,742,000
The Judiciary.....	193,642,600	205,529,000	199,561,000	+5,918,400	-5,968,000
Related agencies.....	2,608,113,100	610,606,000	585,095,000	-2,023,018,100	-25,511,000
Total.....	6,779,093,850	4,235,080,000	4,150,143,000	-2,628,950,850	-84,937,000

¹ Includes amounts in 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1973, as agreed to in conference.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in closing that the members of this subcommittee, in the absence of our chairman, have shared equally in the work of this committee, and in my judgment they have taken a practical and realistic approach to the some 100 items contained in this bill. On this basis and for that reason, we submit our recommendations for the consideration of the Members.

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

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Members that the time that will be taken on this bill is going to be quite short, because I do not believe that there is very much controversy in it. I recommend that all of the Members read the report, because I think they will find in the report that it is the consensus of this subcommittee that our job is to provide adequately for all of the agencies over which we have jurisdiction, and to do nothing more than to provide adequately.

Now, the Members will also find, as they look into this report, that in most areas there are reductions in the budget requests.

I can also say that we are in close liaison and have good working relations with the various agencies in this bill. We do not let them hoodwink us in any way, but our staff, I think, is as fine a staff as there is on the Hill. They know where all of the bodies are buried, and we do our very best to be sure we do provide adequately.

I understand when we do get under the 5-minute rule there will be a few amendments offered, which is perfectly proper and as it should be. From the amendments I have seen, I think the committee action has been justified, and

we will, of course, at that time have plenty of opportunity to have discussions as to the reasons why we made these decisions.

We have had a busy afternoon, and I have nothing more to say on this bill.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill of widespread application involving three of the major departments of Government—State, Justice, and Commerce plus the judiciary and such varied and important activities as the U.S. Information Agency, the Small Business Administration, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and many others.

I congratulate in particular the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK), who because of the illness of our distinguished and beloved colleague, JOHN ROONEY, has been serving as acting chairman. Mr. ROONEY has the best wishes of this body for an early and complete recovery. It is difficult to be thrust suddenly into a post as varied and demanding as this one, but Mr. SLACK has discharged his responsibilities with ability and distinction. The subcommittee is one which works well together and enjoys the benefit of an able staff and I feel that the result now before you is creditable.

It will be noted that under the Department of State are funds for international organizations and commissions. The cost of these activities which includes the United Nations is steadily increasing. Two years ago at the insistence of Congress and notably of this commit-

tee we finally were able to bring about a reduction in the U.S. share of U.N. and related costs. We were committed to pay 31 percent, a ridiculous figure, because the U.N. simply has not been worth that much to the United States and there have been serious doubts about its value to the rest of the world. To make the matter worse we did not stop at paying 31 percent. We picked up by loans and grants the deficiencies in U.N. funds which were caused when other nations refused to pay the much smaller amounts they were committed to. All in all our share has been running nearer 40 percent than the agreed 31 percent. Escalated costs which are carried in this bill are still calculated on the old basis. We do not get the benefit of the new lower 25-percent rate until the end of the calendar year. By that time the operating cost of the U.N. and related agencies will have increased to the point the taxpayer will not have realized any significant savings.

There is a point to this discussion. It is now time to begin new efforts to cut further our commitments to the U.N. I would hope we could have the leadership from the administration and that of the legislative committees of Congress to accomplish this but I am not optimistic. There seems to be an abysmal lack of interest in saving U.S. dollars where the U.N. and its subsidiaries are concerned. Again, I repeat, it makes no sense for the United States to be paying our share and that of a lot of other people simply to belong to a debating society which votes against our interests more than it votes with us.

I recognize and respect the leadership of Secretary Rogers in the Department of State. I feel that he has done a good job. I know that he has tried. He has worked under difficult circumstances both from within and from without. It seems difficult for the U.S. State Department to face up to the challenge of coexistence with other world powers. Their foreign offices constantly seek to promote the aims of their countries including business and industry objectives. The Russians are the most realistic of the lot, but other nations by pressing vigorously for their country's own interests, enjoy a high degree of success in these important objectives.

I hear more criticism directed at the U.S. State Department for failure to cooperate with and assist American businessmen and industrialists abroad than for any other cause. It almost seems that our representatives are afraid to do more than hand out little brochures which describe in general terms the country to which they are assigned. America is a big and powerful nation. It does not throw its weight around; it gives it away. Somewhere in between there should be a more effective way for the State Department to represent the United States in the escalating conflict for economic survival among the nations of the world.

Two of the better agencies of Government are the Small Business Administration and the Economic Development Agency. Both of these have served a useful purpose. They deserve the support of

Congress. Their work has been of great value in many areas.

There has been a conflict within the authorizing committee over U.S. Information Agency. I find it difficult to comprehend this. Where there are weaknesses there should be corrective steps but this should not be at the expense of the organization itself. It is very important that we tell the story of America to the rest of the world. We can be certain the Communists are doing so hour after hour after hour, and they have no inhibitions about the way they tell their side of the story. We should do more, not less, in spreading the word about the United States of America to the rest of the world.

This brings me down to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The facts will show that this agency has mushroomed. They cannot fill the vacancies they have but they constantly want more jobs assigned. Any businessman will tell you this is a nuisance agency which harrasses and hampers business more than it helps to bring about equal employment opportunity. I am convinced that it would be a better agency if it had half the personnel it now has rather than if it were increased as this bill proposes to do. If there should be a confrontation on the floor on this bill I intend to spell out the details about its deficiencies and there are many.

The Department of Justice, of course, includes the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Historically we have funded the FBI for approximately the amount of money requested because we had confidence in the Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and we knew the essentiality of the organization to our country. I call your attention to the fact we have reached nearly \$1 billion in funding for LEAA. This may be too much money. Law enforcement and crime control are now magic words and they can be used to secure virtually any amount of money whether or not it accomplishes the purpose. Of course, we want crime control. The best way is to apprehend and convict criminals. Court rulings have made it almost impossible to convict those who are apprehended. I support funds for law enforcement but I caution that we may be getting close to the stage of boondoggling in this very important field just because there may be more money available than is required.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he desires to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, discussion of this bill is not going to be the same as it has been in years past when the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) was present.

I regret, as do other Members of the House, his illness and his inability to be here this afternoon.

It was always a pleasure to do business with the gentleman.

That leads me to the first question. How about the representation allowance for the State Department? Is that in good shape? Is there an increase or a decrease in what the gentleman from

New York (Mr. ROONEY) was pleased to call the "tools of the trade"?

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

Mr. GROSS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will find that there is a slight increase due to increased costs.

Mr. GROSS. A slight increase?

Mr. CEDERBERG. A slight increase.

Mr. GROSS. Due to increased costs?

Mr. CEDERBERG. The price of lemonade has gone up, and also there is a devaluation of the dollar cost that has to be taken into consideration.

But I think that the gentleman will find that over the years the total increase in the cost of representation has been substantially the same. So now it was felt, about time, we thought, that we increased it just a little bit.

Also, when you consider that the price of corn in Iowa has been going up consistently that has an effect also, because when the price of corn goes up there is an effect on the other product used in "the tools of the trade."

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to talk to Kentucky about that. Iowa grows the corn. It does not convert it for the use of those who get Federal funds for representation allowances.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that we did allow them an increase of \$132,000. But at the same time we reduced their request by \$138,000 because we do believe in moderation in this item. However, food and labor costs have gone up, as the gentleman from Iowa well knows. Even the price of Coca-Cola has gone up. We held the line for 9 years, of course, without an increase. Some things just are not much good if they get watered down too much.

On the other hand, we do not object if they have to add just a bit of ice.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman recommending a slight watering down of the State Department?

Mr. SLACK. I think some things can be watered down a bit.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we find this curse of devaluation all over the place. This Government devalues the dollar by 10 percent, and as a consequence every dollar we spend overseas is increased, to take care of that short fall, but 10 percent. Yet we do not get any such help here at home. Our dollars are devaluated, too, but the citizens of this country get no such relief. Let us hope that there will not be another devaluation to cause a further outpouring of our dollars.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say that that would not come under the Committee on Appropriations; that would come under another committee. The gentleman is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the chickens are coming home to roost in this appropriation bill just as it is in others regard-

less of what committee approved the devaluation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I assume that part of the increase in the representation allowance is due to the devaluation of the dollar, and its failure to buy quite as much of the good things of life for the Pooh-Bahs who live or travel overseas, and the Members of Congress who visit them. I have never traveled that course, but I assume Members of Congress are provided the good things of life when they go overseas.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, I am quite sure that they do. However, having traveled as a member of the Subcommittee on the State Department, I must say that I think we have a responsibility to travel just as I think the gentleman from Iowa, being on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, should be traveling a little more than from Washington to Iowa. I believe it would be helpful to the gentleman. I would be glad some time to accompany the gentleman on one of these trips. I think it would be most helpful to both of us to see the tremendous job that is being done by our employees overseas. We have some of the finest people employed in the State Department in the embassies that I have visited. They are most dedicated.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, for being so solicitous of my welfare.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I want to say that I think we can expect a further devaluation. The day before yesterday they applied export controls and indicated they might apply them in the future. That is the most severe strain upon the dollar we have had. So I do not believe you can expect anything but a further devaluation as long as we have the policy of export controls.

Mr. GROSS. If my colleague from Iowa is correct, then I hope Congress will slash our contributions to take care of the shortfall in the dollar to various international organizations, some of which are of highly questionable value. And if we are going to do this with respect to everything we do overseas or become involved in, then I think we should make some provision for the people of this country to take care of the shortfall in their dollars. After all, they pay the bills.

This bill, as I understand it, calls for expenditures of approximately \$4 billion in the next fiscal year. I also understand that is slightly below the budget request. But I wonder if this will stand up. Only a few minutes ago we passed a \$3 billion deficiency appropriation bill, which some Members are pleased to call supplemental appropriations. Except in the case of a national emergency there is no acceptable reason for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. It does not make any sense to cut this bill or any other below the budget request and then turn right around a few months later and lard it up again through a supple-

mental bill. I hope that will not be the case in any appropriation bills as we embark upon the 1974 fiscal year. I hope those who get this money will stay within the limits set forth here and I hope the committee will see to it that they do.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I share the gentleman's concern, and I agree with him. I am unhappy with supplementals. However, there are some facts of life we have to face. If there is a pay raise that takes place, the employees have to be paid, and Congress usually is involved in the action that makes this pay raise necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Supposing we just say that there will be no pay raises.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Then the gentleman will take a long step toward that. I might say in all respect to the agencies involved in this bill, we have required that they absorb a tremendous amount of the pay raise fund, and they have done a very, very respectable job in that regard, but usually the need for supplementals is the result of congressional action; it is not something that an agency does.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I see that a movement is under foot to raise the pay of Members of Congress and that a bill is to be initiated, according to the morning newspaper, by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to engineer another increase for Members of Congress.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman from Iowa will have an opportunity to become a bit more disturbed this evening when the debt ceiling bill is brought before the House with nearly a score of Senate amendments all nongermane that will cost about \$1,800,000,000. At that time a good part, perhaps, of what he is saying here would be far more apropos when that bill comes before us for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that we ought to accept this or any other appropriation measure because of the debt ceiling bill. I listened attentively to the gentleman, and I will have my feet braced when that bill comes tomorrow. I did not have a chance to read all of the hearings on this bill so let me ask if the committee doubled the salaries, as requested, of certain persons employed by the Justices of the Supreme Court? Does anyone know whether the salaries were more than doubled from \$16,000 a year to \$34,000 for law clerks employed by the Supreme Court?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Will the gentleman please restate his question?

Mr. GROSS. In the hearings I note that the Supreme Court asked for an increase for three law clerks from the present \$16,000 to \$34,000 a year.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think the bill may be somewhat misleading because what the Court proposed to do is to upgrade the positions and not employ the same kind of law clerks with the same qualifications they previously had. Instead of having someone just out of law college who will come on one year at a time, they want to secure some more seasoned lawyers who have had an opportunity to practice and who will be there on a more permanent basis.

Mr. GROSS. I am not trying to compare anything. I am trying to find out if in this bill we are being asked to approve the increase in pay of three law clerks from \$16,000 a year to \$34,000.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I understand. My point is we really did not do that. What we did was to go from three law clerks to a really different classification of personnel.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the contributions to international organizations, including the United Nations, that is, I believe, \$202 million a year. What percentage of that total are we contributing, including the United Nations?

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as of January 1 next it will be 25 percent.

Mr. GROSS. And as of now?

Mr. SLACK. It is varying depending on which organization but I would say it is an average of about 30 percent.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the appropriation has been cut to 25 percent beginning as of January 1 of next year.

Mr. SLACK. That is correct, and since they are on a calendar year basis we anticipate there will be a reduction when this bill is brought up next year of some \$26 million.

Mr. GROSS. Our total contribution to the U.N. Tower of Babel is \$63.9 million, which I believe is the figure in the bill. That compares with the Russian debt to the United Nations of about \$105 million; also Brazil owes the U.N. about \$1.7 million; Czechoslovakia owes \$5.6 million; France owes \$22.2 million; Hungary owes \$3 million; Poland owes \$6.4 million; South Africa and Spain owe \$2 million each; and Mexico is behind in its contribution by \$1.4 million.

Yet we continue to pay right through the nose although we have a Federal debt of some \$457 billion. We continue to pay right through the nose to these international organizations.

There is also the "cultural exchange" which gets a total of \$47.8 million out of the till of the United States, or an increase of \$2.55 million over last year. The total foreign country contributions to this international junketing society amounts to \$2,816,782 as compared to our \$47.8 million.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the reductions that have been made in this bill below the budget stand up, and that we will not get a supplemental appropriation bill later this year or early next year putting back all of the money and more of the alleged savings.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ought to have been reduced far more than it has been and I will vote against its passage.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, first let me say, along with the other members of the committee, that I deeply regret the illness and absence of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY). This is the first time during my service in the Congress that this bill has not been presented to the House by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleague from Florida (Mr. SIKES) and others, in expressing in the very highest terms, the admiration which I have for the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK) who as acting chairman of this subcommittee, has conducted the hearings, the markup and the presentation of this bill to the House with dispatch and with thoroughness.

During the hearings which the gentleman from West Virginia has conducted in his capacity as acting chairman of this subcommittee, I believe that he has done as thorough and commendable a job as I have ever known to be done in any subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I believe that I speak for every member of the subcommittee when I say that we express our gratitude and appreciation to him for the many, many long hours which he has put into the conduct of these hearings, the markup and the preparation for the presentation of this bill to the House today.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that as a general rule we, while not readily reaching an agreement, that the members of this subcommittee do reach agreement when this bill is presented to the floor of the House. Quite frankly, there are some major changes which I would have made if I had been allowed to write this bill by myself. On the other hand, I think that the bill would have been larger in dollar volume than it is if some of the suggestions which I made at the time of the markup had not been accepted by the other members of the subcommittee.

By and large, I think that the committee has done a good job. We have reduced the budget estimates substantially. The increases that we have made over the 1973 appropriations bill have been almost insignificant in the amounts and in the percentage of the increases in this bill as compared with the corresponding appropriations bill for fiscal 1973. I commend the reading of the bill and the report to all members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, while I do not claim that this final result of this bill is by any means perfect, we on the committee feel that we have done a very creditable job in bringing to the floor of the House the bill which we have today, H.R. 8916. Although, as I said earlier, there were some additional cuts from the budget estimates I would have made, and did suggest in subcommittee to be made. Although some of my suggestions for reduc-

tions and further reductions were accepted, others were not, and as often happens, this is a case of give and take.

Mr. Chairman, on the whole, I think that this is a sound bill, a bill which will reflect credit on the acting chairman of this subcommittee who reported it to the House. I urge its passage.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question for clarification.

The report shows a reduction of \$3 million due to the Tijuana River flood control project, the agreement not having been properly reached. There is some concern that this reduction will cut into the funds for the lower Rio Grande flood control. Is my understanding correct that that is not the intention of the committee?

Mr. SLACK. That is not the intention, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be paid annually (in lieu of the annual payment provided under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1973), as a payment to the Republic of Panama in accordance with article I of the Treaty of 1955 (6 U.S.T. 2275), \$2,328,200: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of S. 929 or similar legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, would some member of the committee be kind enough to tell me the reason for this qualification in the following language:

This appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of S. 929 or similar legislation.

Mr. SLACK. This is a permanent appropriation which requires authorization in order to be raised.

Mr. GROSS. A permanent appropriation that cannot be raised. Is this the regular payment to the canal?

Mr. SLACK. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If that is true, then why the reference to S. 929? Or is this in the nature of an ex gratia payment due to devaluation of the dollar?

Mr. SLACK. According to the treaty, the dollar amount of the annuity must be changed whenever there is a change in the relationship of the U.S. dollar to gold.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is contingent on the passage of legislation dealing with the par value of the dollar. That must be the case.

I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the President of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with, and for the official use of, the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions, such exchange to be subject to cancellation if dissemination is made outside the receiving departments or related agencies; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including purchase for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year not to exceed one thousand and forty-three (for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire of aircraft as temporarily needed in specific criminal investigations; firearms and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph; payment of rewards; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$366,506,000.

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia: Page 17, line 14, after the word "employee" add a new paragraph as follows: "None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation may be used for investigating political activities not involving the commission of crimes under the laws of the United States."

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK) who has ably presented this bill on the floor, and I wish to commend his colleagues on the committee as well.

I believe that this amendment which I have offered is self-explanatory, because of recent and highly publicized developments which have in many instances turned our free Nation toward what approaches a "police state." All too often we have seen the Federal Bureau of Investigation go far beyond the scope of investigating activities involving the commission of crimes under the laws of the United States. I believe that this limitation on the appropriation bill would prevent the investigation of purely political activities which are not in any way associated with the commission of Federal crimes. I deplore and condemn the politically inspired actions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which have occurred under Mr. Gray, who in

many instances made the FBI a political tool of the White House. It is high time we clean out and prohibit this type of un-American activity which subverts our American political system.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have the very highest regard for my distinguished friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, and I know that he means well in this amendment. I can see the value of such an amendment if it could be accepted on its face.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that this amendment could in effect negate much of the work of the entire Federal Bureau of Investigation. They are charged with the investigation of subversive activities, the activities of communism and other isms which seek to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Now, those could be interpreted as political activities; although their obvious intent is to subvert and overthrow the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman, how are we to exclude such investigations in the administration of this amendment?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, that the portion of my amendment which clearly states, "not involving the commission of crimes under the laws of the United States," would certainly cover those activities which the gentleman mentioned, if indeed they involved the commission of crimes. I just want to stop the FBI from running all over the lot and subverting the American political system. We can do without that type of activity, and we ought to restore the FBI to its traditional role of investigating the commission of Federal crimes—which are plentiful enough to keep this organization busy on its central mission.

Certainly, the gentleman would concede that overthrow of the Government of the United States would be the commission of a crime under Federal law.

Mr. SIKES. If my distinguished friend from West Virginia will yield, it depends a great deal on how crime is interpreted in this country. Nowadays newspapers which publish secret papers get prizes for it and the people who steal the papers for the newspapers are called heroes. When I first came here they were called traitors. So it is a little hard to understand where the amendment would apply and how the definition of crime would come into the picture. Again I fear it could be broad enough to cripple the work of the FBI.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. May I also add that the definition under lines 18 through the end of page 16 and on line 17 very clearly fund the Federal Bureau of Investigation to carry out those necessary activities for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States or the acquisition, collection, clas-

sification, and preservation of identification and other records, and so forth down through the detail included in those duties for which salaries and expenses are furnished in the section on pages 16 and 17. Certainly there is ample authority so the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation would not be crippled or in any way diverted from its basic mission by my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am sure the gentleman means well, but I think by the all-inclusive language that he precluded preemployment investigations which are required by several laws of the United States prior to the employment of Federal employees.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would certainly hope, I advise my friend from Iowa, that preemployment investigations would not include political investigations of the individuals being employed.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Have you read the questions on the form? The questions on the form are reiterations of the requirements in the authorizing law. It requires them to ask questions which could include just that.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would certainly hope that political activities which have no relationship to the commission of crimes would not be a prerequisite for employment. Also, I was once interviewed by an FBI agent engaged in a preemployment inquiry, and the FBI agent asked whether it was indeed true that the applicant had voted for Franklin Delano Roosevelt every time he ran. That is the type of investigation to which my amendment refers. For that reason my amendment does indeed, I would advise my good friend from Iowa, ban and proscribe a preemployment political investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I do not think it makes any difference whatsoever whether an applicant for any Federal civil service job should be a Republican or a Democrat. For the life of me I cannot understand what business the FBI has in looking into a person's political beliefs, when that does not involve the commission of a crime against the United States. It is for that reason I would hope my amendment would also proscribe that type of question, investigation or purely political inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I believe your amendment goes far beyond that.

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

As we understand the gentleman's amendment, I think it goes far beyond what he intends.

Let me point out further this is not the place, in an appropriation bill, to handle a matter of this kind. This ought to be decided by the Committee on the Judiciary after adequate and clear hearings so that you can have a clear definition of what political activities mean, and the scope of these activities.

Further, the amendment says commission of crimes under the laws of the United States. Well, the FBI works in co-

operation with States and they have State laws, and they work with local governments that have their own particular types of laws.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. My colleague from Georgia reminds me that independent agencies are limited in the number of members from one political party; so they are required to ask these people what their political party affiliations are.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not consider this. If the gentleman wants to pursue it, he ought to take it up with the Committee on the Judiciary and have them hold proper hearings on the matter.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I think the gentleman has raised an extremely valid point.

Last year during the election campaign in the neighboring district to my congressional district, it was brought out that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was conducting investigations of every single candidate for Congress of the United States and had done so far years, as a matter of routine.

And when it was brought out and there was widespread public criticism for it, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation announced the FBI would discontinue this practice. I hope they have discontinued it. But it seems to me that is just one example of overreaching and misuse of power to investigate for reasons that have nothing to do with the commission of crimes. I think that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) has performed a real service by raising this issue.

It does seem to me that perhaps this amendment could be tightened up a little bit by bringing out that it should cover investigations whose primary focus is on political activities and not those where an investigation is being conducted for another purpose that is legitimate and where, as a minor and incidental feature, they inquire as to whether the person being investigated has taken part in certain types of activities.

I wonder if the gentleman from West Virginia would consider that kind of an amendment to his amendment?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur with the gentleman from Ohio that the focus could be sharpened. Of course, this language is the language upon which the amendment will be voted unless the gentleman from Ohio has additional language that he is prepared to send to the desk prior to the vote. I believe that we should stick to the original language because it is very clear from the original language that it points to political activities which are related to the commission of Federal crimes. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) for his perceptive comments.

It is very obvious that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been forced to

go far afield from its central mission, in order to investigate the political enemies of the administration. I might add that the morale of the once-proud FBI sank to a new low because of the political activities its personnel have been forced to investigate. I do not wish to circumscribe the legitimate investigations necessary for the prosecution of crimes, but merely to stop these senseless invasions of our domestic political system in the false name of "national security."

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. Chairman, in the last few days the new Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was confirmed by a vote of 96 to 0 in the other body.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has done a good job, and I for one have explicit faith and confidence in the work that they have done. I am perfectly willing for them to continue doing the good work that they are authorized to do under present law. Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. SLACK. Certainly, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I might say that under the new head of the FBI, Mr. Clarence Kelley, who spent the first 3 months of his professional career in my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., we can hopefully look forward to a better administration of the Federal Bureau of Investigation than we have had in recent years. I would certainly hope that the legislative history of this discussion would be forcefully called to the attention of the new administration in such a way that past evils may be corrected, and we can avoid some of the investigation of purely political domestic activities that have absolutely no connection with the commission of crime.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT REGULATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order 11387, January 1, 1968, \$2,600,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a couple of questions, the first bearing on the item just read, "Foreign direct investment regulation," this being authorized by an Executive order in the amount of \$2,600,000. What is this all about?

Mr. SLACK. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLACK. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Executive order

is based on authority contained in 12 U.S.C. 95(a).

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but what is the money being expended for?

Mr. SLACK. The primary purpose of the program is to regulate foreign direct investment of U.S. persons in order to strengthen the balance-of-payments position of the United States. This is the purpose of the program.

Mr. GROSS. We are relying here again on an Executive order as the authorization for this?

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

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. I think I can add a little light on this subject, because as legal counsel for a large corporation with a lot of activities, I had to live with these Executive orders and regulations for years. The Executive order was issued by President Johnson and created a whole elaborate structure of regulations controlling the extent to which American corporations can invest American dollars abroad. It always struck me as incongruous that it was based on the state of emergency that was declared way back in the 1940's and, on the strength of that, the Executive order was issued in the late 1960's. As a result, we have had tremendous proliferation of controls over foreign investments.

I am not saying they are not needed, but it does seem to me a perfect example of why we ought to take another good look into this whole business of continuing to operate under a declaration of emergency that was issued back in the forties as a basis for all this kind of thing, without any sanction of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I hope it will be authorized by law, if it is going to be continued, rather than by an Executive order. I am absolutely and utterly opposed to Executive orders being used as lawful authorizations.

Mr. SEIBERLING. There is a whole looseleaf service 2 feet thick of regulations and decisions all based on this little Executive order, which in turn is based on a declaration of emergency back in 1940.

Mr. GROSS. Now that I have the floor and a little time remaining, I should like to ask a question concerning an item that is upcoming. "U.S. Travel Service, Salaries and Expenses," to be given \$9 million, and a \$3,500 representation allowance. What is expected to be accomplished by this \$9 million? What has been accomplished for the expenditures in the past with respect to U.S. Travel Service?

I assume this is tourism.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. The figure the gentleman stated is the same amount that was appropriated for the current fiscal year. I will go further and state that apparently the authorizing committee of the Senate believe it is a good program, because it has authorized \$30 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased that the committee has not approved \$30 million.

I note the Secretary of Commerce has a representation allowance of \$1,500, but whoever directs this U.S. Travel Service has a representation allowance of \$3,500. I cannot help but wonder who is getting the short end of the stick with respect to these entertainment and liquor funds.

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

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I would say to the gentleman the \$3,500 figure he mentioned a moment ago is for all the U.S. travel offices overseas, the entire operation abroad.

Mr. GROSS. How many of those do we have with a total expenditure of \$9 million? I will not pursue the question. I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Mr. SLACK. We are in the process of closing some, I will say to the gentleman. I think six offices will remain in operation in fiscal year 1974.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I do this for the purpose of pursuing briefly the matter that my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, has been discussing. Is it not true that since this service was established the disparity in dollar expenditures between the American tourist going abroad and the foreign tourist coming to this country has increased each year?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if the question is disparity, the reason for the disparity is that the number of U.S. citizens going abroad is increasing at a far faster pace than for the foreigners coming here. We are having a larger number of foreign visitors come to the United States, and a good deal of it is the result of this promotion by the U.S. Travel Service, and they are having a great deal of success in getting some of the professional organizations in some of the foreign countries to hold some of their conventions here, as some of our professional organizations such as the doctors and the lawyers and the American Bar go over there for instance to London and other places. So we cannot blame the disparity on the U.S. Travel Service. As a matter of fact, if it were not for the travel service I would say the disparity would be greater.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose for the establishment of this Travel Service was to correct this disparity. It was because congressional concerns for our balance-of-payments problem prompted it. I recall distinctly, as I trust most of the Members do, that at that time President Eisenhower even sought to impose some restrictions on foreign travel. As a matter of fact, if there is a justification for the Federal Government to go into the travel and tourist business notwithstanding the fact that most commercial operators do a pretty good job of it, then we ought to determine whether or not it warrants continuing. If, in fact, in the period of time that it has been in operation we have had a growing outflow over income in tourism and consequently in our bal-

ance of payments problem, perhaps some reevaluation ought to be made.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The disparity would be worse if it were not for this Service.

Mr. COLLIER. What the gentleman is saying is that the patient is still sick but he would be even sicker if it were not for this Service.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If we can get the American people to stay home the disparity will be less. If the gentleman can arrange that, that would be fine.

Mr. COLLIER. That would require a new agency which I am not about to recommend. I am questioning the need for the one we already have.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this body when it passed Public Law 92-544 on October 25, 1972, was clearly to limit spending of taxpayers' money to finance the United Nations and its related agencies. The law, clamping a 25-percent ceiling on all our contributions to the U.N. except those specifically exempted, was a congressional response to a growing public resentment of the excessive, lopsided funding of the United Nations with American money.

Mr. Chairman, I request that appropriate portions of the law follow, so that our colleagues will have reference to the exact statute:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND
CONFERENCES
CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS
U.N., restriction

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, \$176,190,750: *Provided*, That after December 31, 1973, no appropriation is authorized and no payment shall be made to the United Nations or any affiliated agency in excess of 25 per centum of the total annual assessment of such organization except that this proviso shall not apply to the International Atomic Energy Agency and to the joint financing program of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

(Pub. L. 92-544, Title I, Sec. 101, Oct. 25, 1972, 86 Stat. 1110)

Legislative History

House Reports: No. 92-1065 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 92-1567 (Comm. of Conference).

Senate Report No. 92-821 (Comm. on Appropriations).

Congressional Record, Vol. 118 (1972):

May 17, 18, Oct. 12, considered and passed House.

June 15, Oct. 13, considered and passed Senate.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Vol. 8, No. 44: Oct. 28, Presidential statement.

No mention is made in the law of "voluntary" contribution. Yet, from the State Department bureaucrats we hear this term bantered about with reference to the Lodge Commission recommendation:

Each reduction in the U.S. share of the regular budget must be clearly marked by at least a corresponding increase in U.S. contributions to one or more of the voluntary budgets or funds in the U.N. system.

It is apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the State Department holds the recommendations of an appointed commission in

higher regard than the legal charge given them by this Congress. Rather than reducing their U.N. budget requests for next year, and winding down our participation in all U.N. related agencies, the Department has asked for an increase of \$16,929,250 to be paid primarily to five specialized agencies of the United Nations. This is a clear violation of the intent and spirit of the legislation passed by this body.

In recent years the "commitment" to the United Nations has been elevated to a position of greater importance than the commitment owed to the people of the United States. Every attempt at reducing the total amount lavished on the U.N. is met with cries of "upholding our international commitments." What about the commitment we have to the people of this country? Must they be forgotten while we court international favor?

Our so-called commitments to the international banking community sent our dollar into a devaluation nosedive in February, and reduced the buying power of the American consumer.

Our so-called commitments to provide the Soviet Union with grain to feed their livestock reduced the amount of grain for cattle in this country, and drove prices to all-time highs. As a result, we face not only higher food prices, but a serious meat shortage. These so-called commitments have contributed to the inflation crisis.

Mr. Chairman, our commitments are first and foremost to the taxpayers of this country, and any bill that comes before this House should place Americans first in spending priority. This bill does not.

I shall maintain my commitment to the people I represent, and cast our vote against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal Judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$81,278,000: *Provided*, That the salaries of secretaries to circuit and district judges shall not exceed the compensation established in chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, for General Schedule grade (GS) 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10, and that the salaries of law clerks to circuit and district judges shall not exceed the compensation established in chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, for General Schedule grade (GS) 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of step increases corresponding with those provided for by chapter 53 of title 5 of the United States Code, and of compensation paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by each of the circuit and district judges shall not exceed \$43,453 and \$33,377 per annum, respectively, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge of each district court having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$56,228

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RAILSBACK

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I and \$42,897 per annum, respectively. have amendments pertaining to pages 35 and 36 which are related. I ask unanimous consent that those amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendments offered by Mr. RAILSBACK: On page 35, at lines 13 and 14, strike '\$81,278,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$83,372,000'.

On page 36, line 23, strike '\$12,200,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$12,909,000'.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will count.

Forty-five 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. 316]

Abdnor	Fuqua	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Ashley	Griffiths	Powell, Ohio
Badillo	Gunter	Quile
Bell	Hansen, Wash.	Reld
Blackburn	Harrington	Rooney, N.Y.
Blatnik	Harsha	Roush
Breaux	Hébert	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Hollfield	Sandman
Burke, Fla.	Horton	Satterfield
Chisholm	Hunt	Steele
Clark	Jarman	Sullivan
Danielson	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Dent	Keating	Thompson, N.J.
Derwinski	King	Tiernan
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Veysey
Dingell	McSpadden	Vigorito
Evins, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.	Wiggins
Fish	Melcher	Wright
Fisher	Montgomery	Wyatt
Fraser	Nichols	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, 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. 8916, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 371 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this is an amendment on page 35 and page 36 of the bill which deals with the Federal judiciary budget request. What happened, quite simply, is that the judiciary requested 340 new probation officers with the necessary clerk supporting personnel. That request was cut in half, so that as a result of action taken by the Committee on Appropriations they have provided for 170 new probation officers instead of 340.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment reluctantly in the sense that I have only—and I mean this sincerely—the highest regard for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK) and also my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) but I offer it with the utmost sincerity.

Mr. Chairman, members of Subcommittee No. 3 had an opportunity, par-

ticularly last year, to investigate many prisons. We had the opportunity to have come before us at numerous hearings people who were expert in the field of corrections, including people with the administration and people outside of the administration. They made many recommendations to us.

But, time after time, expert witness after expert witness made the point that something is wrong in this country when we have a recidivism rate that indicates that 72 percent of our first-time youthful offenders who have gone to prison one time are going to be back in prison within a 5-year period. We know that, frankly, our entire criminal justice system could and should be indicted for that particular statistic alone.

One thing that has been successful is the various probation systems, including the probation subsidy system that is being used more extensively in California than any place else, but I think that these experiments have prompted our Federal judiciary to request more probationary personnel so that, instead of having a caseload of 105 cases per caseworker, we can reduce it down to what we hope will be a manageable number.

Even if my amendment should pass, the total amount of money involved is \$2.8 million, but even if that should pass, it would mean that we would still have a caseload per individual caseworker of about 81 cases per caseworker when we include their presentence report responsibility. We know that the probation caseload is expanding so that we can predict with a reasonable degree of accuracy that that caseload is even going to be higher than 81.

What the experts say is that a good figure per caseworker would be to have a caseload of about 35 cases per caseworker. I would only say that if we really want to do something about crime, if we want to do something about the rates of recidivism, this is the poorest place in the world to be cutting our budget.

With all due respect to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, this is the one item that I disagree with him on. I think that I have had some experience, and I think he is going to hear from some other people who have had some experience as far as the needs for rehabilitation are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal judiciary's budget estimate for salaries of supporting personnel was cut by the Appropriations Committee by \$4,048,000. My amendment would only restore that which is related to the Probation Service, \$2,803,000. The judiciary requested money for 340 new probation officers and 201 clerk stenographers. This request was cut in half and the bill before you would only provide for 170 probation officers and 100 clerk stenographers. I think we are making a serious mistake by such a cut.

The best information available clearly indicates that probation offers one of the most significant prospects for effective rehabilitation. It is also clear that the most important component of a successful probation system is trained manpower. The judiciary requested an additional 340 probation officers for the pur-

pose of effectively supervising people that were placed on probation. The committee saw fit to cut that request by 50 percent. Needless to say, this is a very sizable cut.

I believe that the Members of Congress should give serious thought to what has been done here. For fiscal year 1973, taking into account the fact that the probation officers also have to do presentencing reports, their caseload amounted to 105 cases per probation officer. In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice stated that a meaningful caseload for real supervision should be 35 cases per probation officer. Six years have gone by since that recommendation and we are nowhere near that figure.

Ladies and gentlemen of Congress, whom are we kidding? With that kind of caseload there is little, if any, real supervision. If you support my amendment we would be able to cut the caseload down to perhaps 81 cases per officer, if the caseload would remain constant, but I am sure it, too, will increase.

Who are we talking about when we speak of people on probation? During the period June 30, 1968, to January 1973, the number of persons under supervision increased from 36,799 to 51,529, an increase of 40 percent. The projection for fiscal year 1974 is 59,400 persons under supervision in probation. In 1968, 27 percent of the probation population was 24 years of age or younger when received for supervision. By January 1973 this proportion had increased to nearly 40 percent. The total number of persons in this age category increased from 9,891 to 19,987, an increase of 102 percent.

This is a very significant figure because it is the younger offender who is more active and aggressive—it is the younger offender who has the greater need for counseling and education. The increased concentration of youth in a caseload means increased demands on the probation service in order to meet the unique challenge of dealing with youthful offenders, because it is well known that the younger the offender the greater the risk that he will violate the condition of his release.

So, who are we talking about when we speak of the type of person involved in our probation system? The bulk of the time and energy spent by a probation office is spent on the young. Therefore, the \$2,803,000 which my amendment would restore to H.R. 8916 will further assist the probation service in concentrating its resources on the young offender, for he has the potential to become either tomorrow's law abiding citizen or tomorrow's costly liability caught in the revolving door of recidivism.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that a dollar spent on the rehabilitation of the younger offender is the best investment we can make, and I urge the Members to vote favorably for my amendment.

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a few questions. How many additional positions will the monetary figure that is in the gentleman's amendment provide?

Mr. RAILSBACK. This would provide for 170 probation officers and 101 additional supportive personnel. I think they are called clerk-stenographers.

Mr. WYMAN. So they are doubled, then?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Yes; but let me point out this is the judiciary's request.

Mr. WYMAN. I understood the gentleman to say that the caseload of each probation officer at the present time under the figure for personnel that has been put in by the committee would run something about 105, and if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it would be in the vicinity of 81?

Mr. RAILSBACK. The gentleman is correct, and this would include presentencing reports, which are part of a probation officer's job.

Mr. WYMAN. Is the gentleman familiar with what the testimony was with respect to what that caseload should be if they are to be really able to adequately handle the size of rehabilitation and proper sentencing?

Mr. RAILSBACK. If the gentleman will yield, in 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice said that a meaningful caseload for real supervision should be 35 cases per probation officer. Six years have gone by since that recommendation, and it has gone up to 105 per caseworker.

Mr. WYMAN. Has the testimony been, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois, that with a caseload of 81 there will still be an inadequacy in terms of a review of the family situation and background and all the facts that are necessary to provide adequately researched and documented individual records before the judges before sentencing?

Mr. RAILSBACK. I do not think there is any question about that. In other words, I agree with the gentleman that this is not an adequate provision.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, just to correct the record, this is not the administration's request. There is no administration request. This is a Judiciary Department request. It is not even subject to review by OMB.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I had my administrative assistant check this out because someone asked me that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is submitted by the Judiciary Department and it does not even go through the OMB.

Mr. RAILSBACK. That may be, and if I did characterize it incorrectly I am sorry.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, if we are to do anything about rehabilitation this is an important field in which there is increasing public interest and concern. I think the gentleman's amendment ought to be adopted. It is a good value for the money involved and will redound to the

public benefit by emphasizing those individual and personal backgrounds of persons in difficulty with the law so that justice can be tempered with compassion and understanding where justified.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

I compliment the gentleman from Illinois for the amendment he has offered and I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 50,000 individuals in this Nation currently under probationary supervision in the federal system. Through the efforts of varying correctional programs, the offender is reintegrated into his community, protected from the stultifying effects of confinement and hopefully insured against prejudicial treatment of their families. In addition, probationary efforts reduce the financial responsibility of the public to the correctional institution.

Approval of the gentleman's amendment to H.R. 8916 will help insure that valuable public services provided by probation agencies are not compromised by a lack of manpower. As the gentleman points out, recidivism is a revolving door. Each year, 60 percent of all adult felons are paroled, yet 35 to 40 percent of these individuals return to prison after a subsequent conviction.

Effective probation programs offer professionalism and expertise in the rehabilitation of offenders and help to decrease the rate of recidivism. Ineffective programs, however, plagued by inadequate staffing and disproportionate caseloads, do little to control recidivism. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967 reported as a desirable caseload average for juveniles and adult felons the level of 35. Yet, in 1965, fewer than 4 percent of the probation officers in the Nation were carrying caseloads of 40 or less. Today, the average caseload amounts to 105 cases per probation officer. The Commission concluded:

Whenever probation programs are subject to criticism, the oversized case load is usually identified as the obstacle to successful operation.

Recidivism is a problem which affects all of us. Young people caught in its "revolving door" can be given the necessary rehabilitative services only if a reasonable probation officer-offender ratio is established and maintained. Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we are truly serious about dealing with the alarming recidivist trend which has contributed to the growth in crimes which we are witnessing across the country, then we should give our wholehearted support to amendments of this nature.

Mr. Chairman, the Judiciary Subcommittee has had hearings on the entire subject of our probation and parole system and the testimony indicates that something is drastically wrong with our penal system as it stands. There is a problem of the "revolving door" and how we go about breaking that. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois about the economics involved, because certainly

a question is going to be raised about whether this is another example of an increase in spending and there is a question about the parole and probation activities and resulting cost savings to the taxpayer.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have a letter from Donald L. Chamlee, assistant chief of probation, dated June 27, 1973, which indicates a daily per capita cost of Federal supervision in the community for the fiscal year 1972 was \$1.05 a day or \$384.83 a year. The average 1972 per capita cost for confinement in the Federal Bureau of Prisons institutions was \$5,200 a year or \$14.25 a day.

This figure was calculated on salaries and expenses and operation costs and remodeling and does not include the cost of new construction or confining Federal prisoners in non-Federal institutions.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a system which allows or permits a ratio of 105 probationers to 1 probation officer or case worker is a system which is decidedly unfair and designed to fail.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I just want to say, referring back to my own personal experience for 1 year before I came to the Congress when I had the privilege of being a county judge with criminal justice responsibilities and a family court judge, fortunately I had an outstanding probation department which had been built up by my predecessor. They were all underpaid and overworked, but I found out by experience that the judicial system depends to a tremendous degree upon these dedicated people who do the presentencing examinations and investigations and who do the counseling and the supervision of people when they are on probation—and most of those on probation are young people. I think if we are ever going to reform our penal system and cut down the recidivism we see today, the place to start is with a good, strong probation department.

I would enthusiastically support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois even though I am usually on the side of cutting down expenditures.

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Illinois, what portion of the additional \$2,803,000 provided for in this amendment would go for the clerk-stenographers?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for the purposes of answering the question?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as I understood it, there was already \$2,803,000 additional money included by the com-

mittee. Now, the gentleman is putting in another \$2,803,000 with his amendment.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, here is the answer I have: 101 clerks, \$590,000. This figure is based on GS-5 salary rate at \$7,319 per year plus related benefits. Then, under the second part of the amendment we break the increases down for such things as equipment, security, investigations, communications, printing, other supplies; 101 clerks, \$106,000. Those two figures out of \$2.8 million.

Mr. MAYNE. Then, that would be approximately how much for clerks and stenographers and how much for the probation officers themselves?

Mr. RAILSBACK. The officers themselves would be allocated \$1,504,000. This is based on GS-9 salary, which is \$11,614, plus related benefits for 9 months.

As far as the increase on the other page which is for travel, it would be for 170 probation officers, \$603,000. There is a breakdown I could give the gentleman on how much travel, equipment, security investigations. The total figure is \$603,000.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I note that there would be 170 additional probation officers and 101 additional clerk-stenographers, or a ratio of about 10 stenographers to every 17 actual officers. Is this in line with ordinary experience in the Department of Justice for this kind of stenographic backup?

It seems a little high to me. Has the gentleman checked into this ratio at all?

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will let me check my records, I think I have an answer for him on that which I cannot put my finger on right now, where they do justify that figure. I do not have it right now.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me and say that as far as the case for additional probation officers is concerned, I think the gentleman from Illinois has made a strong presentation, but it does seem to me that 101 additional clerk-stenographers have not been shown to be necessary. I nevertheless intend to support the amendment because of the demonstrated need for more probation officers to handle the rising caseload of youthful probationers. It is in the national interest to facilitate their rehabilitation through adequate probation personnel.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, and despite the fact that I compliment the gentleman from West Virginia, the acting chairman of the subcommittee, on the work he and his committee have done, I must certainly side with the gentleman from Illinois in recommending the restoration of the full amount for probation officers.

As the subcommittee chairman from the Judiciary Committee on Corrections, nothing is plainer to us than the fact that it is much, much more effective; much less expensive to give young offenders the sort of supervision these officers would afford them, than to have them in an institution.

Indeed, if the future of these individ-

uals involved were not at stake, certainly the safety and security of society is, because we cannot expect a probation officer to maintain supervision over 100 or 105 cases and expect that we are going to have very much success in terms of the future of those individuals supervised, or the security of society, from crime as a result.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the other gentlemen who have risen here to address the Committee.

I think the members of the Committee know by this time that I am hardly one of the big spenders in the House.

One of the reasons why I am not is that oftentimes it seems to me we spend our money for the wrong things and in response to various types of public pressure where we rarely show much result for it. In other places, where a little money will do a lot of good, we do not get much public pressure and hence tend not to spend it. This is one of them.

I believe the significant thing about our short debate today is that those who have spoken in favor of the amendment are mostly people who know something about the subject. It is only simple truth that anybody whose lot has been cast in the courts to any extent, and particularly in the criminal courts to any extent, on either side of the table, if he has any feeling or any sense of the situation, knows that one place a little money might help would be in probation, particularly, and in parole, secondarily, rather than simply on building walls and that sort of thing.

The prison system is one place where we have a lot of room for reform, and I believe this is a modest step forward.

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

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, as a former member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee has already included in this bill 270 additional employees for the probation office, of which 170 are probation officers and 100 are clerk-stenographers.

Last year they received 252 new positions, of which 168 were probation officers.

The bill as now before us contains funds for 978 officers, which compares with 640 in 1972. Mr. Chairman, this represents an increase of over 50 percent in 2 years.

In the hearings before the committee on March 5 they told us that they had 36,327 on probation as of the last available date. That figure compared with 35,999 for 1972, which figures out to an in-

crease of only 328 cases, or less than 1 percent.

The charge has been made that this committee rubberstamps the FBI and that on the other hand we have neglected the court system. I want to state for the RECORD that the increase in supporting personnel for the U.S. courts has been higher percentagewise over the past 10 years than for the FBI, and a large number of other appropriations that are in this bill.

I should also like to point out to this committee that the judiciary budget is not touched at all by the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Chairman, there are more new jobs in this one appropriation alone for the judiciary than there are for the entire Department of State, or for that matter the Department of Justice. The same thing would hold true for the Department of Commerce.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the committee has treated the judiciary fairly. There is no way we can completely satisfy some of these judges, regardless of how much we provide for them. In my opinion, if these same judges would put some of the criminals in jail instead of on probation the country would be a lot better off.

I therefore ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. The distinguished gentleman and the committee feel, if we think back for a moment as to what he has stated, that we have provided personnel just as fast as they can be absorbed into the system and properly used. It would be a waste of the Government's money to add any more at this point.

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

Mr. SLACK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have to take a little issue with the statement about putting some of these people in jail instead of on probation.

Mr. Chairman, it is not that there are not people who ought to go to jail. I am no bleeding heart on that subject. But I would like to point out to my friend that most of the people put on probation are young people who are first offenders. That is where most of the probation is.

Mr. Chairman, we would be a long ways ahead in 9 cases out of 10 if we did not send those young people to jail.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that there are some people on the streets right here in the city of Washington on probation or parole who ought to be in jail. I think the record will show that there was one individual who raped five women, and that he is out walking the streets today.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate. Now, I am just as interested in probation problems as the gentlemen who serve on the Committee on the Judiciary.

The only difference is that we are charged with the responsibility of putting up the money, and we look into how it is being spent. We are giving them 170 new officers this year. When these hearings were held, looking on page 95, they had 67 vacancies out of the 160—some we gave them last year.

Mr. Chairman, I will admit that they are in the process of filling these vacancies, and we want them to fill them; we want them to fill them as wisely and with as competent people as they can. But I cannot see any reason to give them 340 when I am not confident that they can find 170 people who are competent to do the job.

This is what we want to have done, and we do not yield to anybody in our concern for adequate and proper probation. If the Members will look at the increases which have taken place year after year after year, they cannot help but come to the conclusion that we have been fair with these people and we have used the best kind of judgment possible in behalf of the people who are under probation, and taking into consideration the taxpayers as well.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend for yielding.

I want to point this out to him. It is something which I do not think any of us have pointed out before.

Mr. Chairman, based on the rate of growth of the last 4 years, we predict that by the end of fiscal year 1974, the officers will complete 33,400 presentence investigations and supervise 59,400 offenders.

Regardless of what we say about what we have done, the caseload is still 105 per caseworker, and it is going up. We know that that is grossly inadequate, according to every law enforcement officer in the country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is that we are giving them the necessary personnel to do the job, and I do not think we should go any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 164, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—220

Abzug	Blaggi	Burgener
Adams	Blester	Burke, Calif.
Addabbo	Bingham	Burton
Anderson,	Boggs	Butler
Calif.	Brademas	Carey, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Bray	Carney, Ohio
Arends	Breckinridge	Chisholm
Aspin	Brinkley	Clausen
Baker	Brown, Calif.	Don H.
Barrett	Brown, Mich.	Clay
Beard	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Bergland	Buchanan	Cohen

Collins, Ill.	Hutchinson	Riegle
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Rinaldo
Conyers	Johnson, Colo.	Robinson, Va.
Corman	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Coughlin	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Cronin	Jordan	Rogers
Culver	Karh	Roncallo, Wyo.
Daniel, Robert	Kastenmeier	Roncallo, N.Y.
W., Jr.	Kazen	Rose
Daniels,	Kemp	Rosenthal
Dominick V.	Koch	Roy
de la Garza	Kyros	Roybal
Dellenback	Landrum	Ruppe
Dellums	Leggett	Ruth
Denholm	Lehman	St Germain
Dennis	Lent	Sarasin
Dickinson	Litton	Sarbanes
Diggs	Lujan	Schneebell
Donohue	McClary	Schroeder
Downing	McCloskey	Seiberling
Drinan	McCollister	Shuster
du Pont	McCormack	Smith, N.Y.
Eckhardt	McKinney	Stanton,
Edwards, Ala.	Macdonald	J. William
Edwards, Calif.	Madigan	Stanton,
Ellberg	Mailliard	James V.
Erlenborn	Maraziti	Stark
Esch	Martin, N.C.	Steele
Eshleman	Mathias, Calif.	Steelman
Findley	Mathis, Ga.	Steiger, Wis.
Flowers	Matsunaga	Stokes
Foley	Mayne	Stuckey
Ford,	Mazzoli	Studds
William D.	Meeds	Symington
Forsythe	Melcher	Thone
Fraser	Metcalfe	Thornton
Frenzel	Mezvisinsky	Towell, Nev.
Frey	Michel	Udall
Fulton	Minish	Ullman
Gilman	Mink	Van Deerlin
Gonzalez	Mitchell, Md.	Vander Jagt
Grasso	Mizell	Vanik
Gray	Moakley	Waldie
Green, Pa.	Moorhead, Pa.	Walsh
Grover	Mosher	Wampler
Gude	Moss	Ware
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalen
Hanley	Nedzi	White
Hanna	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Hanrahan	Owens	Widnall
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	Wilson, Bob
Hastings	Pepper	Wilson,
Hawkins	Peyser	Charles H.,
Hechler, W. Va.	Pike	Calif.
Heinz	Podell	Wilson,
Helstoski	Preyer	Charles, Tex.
Hicks	Price, Tex.	Winn
Hillis	Pritchard	Wolff
Hogan	Railsback	Wyman
Holtzman	Randall	Yates
Horton	Rangel	Young, Alaska
Hosmer	Rees	Young, Fla.
Howard	Regula	Young, Ga.
Huber	Reid	Young, Ill.
Hudnut	Reuss	

NOES—164

Abdnor	Daniel, Dan	Jones, Okla.
Alexander	Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.
Andrews, N.C.	Davis, S.C.	Ketchum
Annunzio	Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski
Archer	Devine	Kuykendall
Armstrong	Dorn	Landgrebe
Bafalis	Dulski	Latta
Bennett	Duncan	Long, La.
Bevill	Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.
Boland	Flood	Lott
Bolling	Flynt	McDade
Bowen	Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen
Brasco	Fountain	McFall
Brooks	Frelinghuysen	McKay
Broomfield	Froehlich	Mahon
Brotzman	Gaydos	Mallory
Brown, Ohio	Gettys	Mann
Broyhill, Va.	Gialmo	Martin, Nebr.
Burke, Mass.	Gibbons	Milford
Burleson, Tex.	Ginn	Miller
Burlison, Mo.	Goldwater	Mills, Ark.
Byron	Goodling	Minshall, Ohio
Camp	Gross	Mitchell, N.Y.
Carter	Guyer	Mollohan
Casey, Tex.	Haley	Moorhead,
Cederberg	Hammer-	Calif.
Chamberlain	schmidt	Morgan
Chappell	Harsha	Murphy, Ill.
Clancy	Harvey	Myers
Clawson, Del	Hays	Natcher
Cochran	Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen
Collier	Henderson	Nichols
Collins, Tex.	Hinshaw	Nix
Conable	Hollifield	Obey
Conlan	Holt	O'Neill
Cotter	Ichord	Parris
Crane	Jarman	Passman

Patten	Shipley	Taylor, N.C.
Perkins	Shoup	Teague, Calif.
Pettis	Shriver	Thomson, Wis.
Pickle	Sikes	Treen
Poage	Sisk	Veysey
Fowell, Ohio	Skubitz	Vigorito
Price, Ill.	Slack	Waggonner
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Whitten
Rarick	Snyder	Williams
Rhodes	Spence	Wylder
Roberts	Staggers	Wylie
Robison, N.Y.	Steed	Yatron
Rooney, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.	Young, S.C.
Rostenkowski	Stephens	Young, Tex.
Runnels	Stratton	Zablocki
Satterfield	Stubblefield	Zion
Saylor	Symms	Zwach
Scherie	Talcott	
Sebelius	Taylor, Mo.	

NOT VOTING—49

Andrews,	Fascell	Madden
N. Dak.	Fish	Montgomery
Ashbrook	Fisher	O'Hara
Ashley	Fuqua	Quie
Badillo	Green, Oreg.	Rooney, N.Y.
Bell	Griffiths	Roush
Blackburn	Gubser	Rousselot
Blatnik	Gunter	Ryan
Breaux	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Burke, Fla.	Harrington	Sullivan
Clark	Hébert	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Hungate	Thompson, N.J.
Delaney	Hunt	Tiernan
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Wiggins
Derwinski	Keating	Wright
Dingell	King	Wyatt
Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden	

So the amendments were agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of directing some questions to any member of the subcommittee and particularly the chairman because these questions arise inasmuch as I find no explanation in the committee report.

On page 17—and I am not necessarily intending to offer any kind of amendment because I know we have passed that section and an amendment would not be in order, but nevertheless I think it is vital for us to have some explanation of some of the provisions under the Immigration and Naturalization Service, salaries and expenses. For example, in discussing the "payment of allowances—at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day—to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed," I wonder if we could have an explanation about the nature of the work performed and why the stipend of \$1 has been set and how much of this work on an average is being performed and under what circumstances?

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, we have had this in the bill for some 20 years and there has been no request to change it.

Mr. GONZALEZ. This has been in the substantive law before?

Mr. SLACK. It has been in this bill for a number of years.

Mr. GONZALEZ. This same section?

Mr. SLACK. Yes, it has.

Mr. GONZALEZ. What about on page 18 where we provide on lines 13 and 14 for "acquisition of land as sites for enforcement fence and construction incident to such fence"? That is obviously for the holding of aliens but is this a new authorization for acquisition of land for a concentration camp type of detention?

Mr. SLACK. I would say to the gentleman this is not a new authorization. This fence was constructed along the border many years ago.

Mr. GONZALEZ. There is nothing in this budget contemplated for additional construction of detention centers?

Mr. SLACK. The gentleman is correct. Mr. GONZALEZ. All right.

One more question. On lines 17 and 18 it says: "maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children."

Who could that refer to? We have a tremendous number here of illegal alien workers, but this says "alien enemies and their wives and dependent children." What alien enemies? We are winning them and dining them and toasting them nowadays, but this obviously has reference to some alien enemy. I just do not know why this is here at this time.

Mr. SLACK. This too, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, has been in the law, so far as I know, for a number of years.

Mr. GONZALEZ. It is so general.

Mr. SLACK. The authorization is contained in 8 U.S.C. 1185, which states:

(a) When the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President, or, as to aliens, whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more states, and the President shall find that the interest of the United States requires that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this section be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States.

This again has been in the bill for many years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that I take the well of the House in regard to bills from other committees. One of our subcommittees on Government operations, headed by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL), has been making a study of the immigration from other countries such as Canada in the north and Mexico in the south, of aliens coming into this country.

Mr. Chairman, we have studied the materials that Mr. RANDALL's committee has developed. In the last 10 years the number of these alien immigrants, who are committing a criminal act when they come into this country with either forged documents or no documents, has increased from 88,000 a year to over 560,000 in 1972.

In California alone, 200,000 illegally entering aliens, most of them from south of the border, were apprehended. Then, we are faced with a situation of taking care of these people, either feeding them, jailing them, hospitalizing them, or detaining them until they can be deported. If they agree voluntarily to be deported, then we put them in vans and take them down to Tijuana or Encinitas, and send them across the border.

If they will not go voluntarily, then they have to be arrested and put in jail and detained until there can be an administrative hearing. In the case of illegal aliens who have committed felonies

the Federal courts in Los Angeles will not take additional cases. They must be filed in San Diego.

When Members think of arresting 200,000 in 1 year, they can understand what I am talking about. Los Angeles County alone has incurred a cost of over a hundred million dollars annually to apprehend, take care of, feed, hospitalize and return these aliens to the border. We have cases where we have arrested the same alien six times within 1 year. We have just considered reorganization plan No. 2 which had to do with the immigration and naturalization service. This Presidential plan says we should reduce about 500 employees in the immigration service in the face of this flood of illegal aliens. We have reported from the House Government Operations Committee an amendment which will prevent the transfer of 900 employees from the Immigration and Naturalization Service to Customs. These aliens that come in across the border are taking the jobs of citizens, many of whom are out of work.

I see nothing wrong with building a fence down on the border. I hope they will put people on the border patrol who will walk up and down that fence, and fly over it with helicopters, to keep these people out of our country.

If they want to come in legitimately, I am all for that, but if they want to break the laws and come in illegally they should be apprehended and should be deported.

I say this to the shame of the Congress, that in the past 10 years there have been requests for close to 5,000 new people in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to do the job of guarding the borders and apprehending these people when they come in, and there have been only 992 allowed by congressional action. Less than 25 percent of the number requested by the Immigration and Naturalization Service have been allowed by the Appropriations Committee.

I believe it is time for us to look at this thing and look at it in reality. I do not blame the people who are trying to come across. The level of poverty in which they live south of the border is just terrible. There is no doubt about that. I cannot blame any one of these individuals for wanting to better his life.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—I should like to point out that we have passed that section of the bill. There is nothing we can do about it insofar as this legislation is concerned, and the hour is getting late.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I very seldom come to the well of the House, far less than the gentleman from Florida goes into the well, I might say. These remarks of mine were in-

spired by the questions of my friend from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ). I just wanted to express some of the facts that we have on this matter and say that I see nothing wrong in having border patrol forces adequate to take care of the exclusion of these illegally entering aliens who are coming in here at great expense to the taxpayers of the United States and are in many instances taking the jobs of American citizens who want to have those jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 403. None of the funds contained in this title shall be available for the salaries or expenses of deputy clerks in any office that has discontinued the taking of applications for passports subsequent to October 31, 1968, and has not resumed such service on a permanent basis.

This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1974".

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I seek clarification from the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia with respect to certain language in the bill.

On page 17, line 8 of the bill, there is language concerning the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There is an appropriation "not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character."

I should like to ask the gentleman whether any of these funds are intended to be used for the investigation of persons who have differing political viewpoints from the executive branch, or what exactly are these funds intended to be used for?

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

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. The funds provided to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature are used to make unusual emergency and confidential expenditures in criminal and security investigations where the name of the informant or the nature of the expenditure must be kept secret so as not to jeopardize the investigative operations. The personal safety of the recipient of the funds is the paramount consideration in situations of this type.

Mr. Chairman, in direct answer to the question posed by the gentleman, I would say that the answer is "No."

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) yield?

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the question which has been posed by the gentleman from New York. It ties in directly with the amendment which I submitted earlier stating that none of these funds could be utilized for investigation of political activities not involved in the commission of Federal crimes.

I certainly hope, although that amendment was defeated earlier, that we could receive support in this body for the adoption of similar or related language

by the authorizing committee. The FBI as we all know, has been forced through political pressure and otherwise to engage in domestic political investigations which go far beyond the suppression of crime. This is why I believe it is a very, very important point which the gentleman from New York has raised, even though she has referred to a very narrow phase of the activities funded by this bill.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

It is my understanding from what the chairman of the subcommittee has stated that in essence this language in the appropriation is not intended to fund investigations not connected with the investigation of Federal crimes; is that correct?

Mr. SLACK. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for arms control and disarmament activities authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2551 et seq.), \$6,935,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEIBERLING

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEIBERLING: Page 40, line 11, strike the figure "\$6,935,000" and insert in place thereof "\$10,000,000".

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, but I believe it is an important one. All it would do is bring the appropriation for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency up to the very modest level of last year's appropriation, namely, \$10 million.

That is "peanuts" compared to the amounts of money we have included in this bill and included in the proposed Defense Department budget.

Mr. Chairman, this would represent an increase of approximately \$3.1 million from the approximately \$6.9 million called for in the administration's budget for fiscal year 1974 and in the appropriation bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, it is incomprehensible that at the very moment when the administration was preparing to enter into the second round of strategic arms limitation talks with the Russians, it would choose to reduce the budget for the very agency that is charged by law with the preparation and management of the U.S. participation in all such international negotiations on arms control and disarmament.

It has been only a few days since the President and Mr. Brezhnev signed a joint statement declaring that both governments would move rapidly ahead to achieve significant new strategic arms limitation agreements. It is inconsistent, to say the least, to reduce the capabilities of the United States to negotiate on arms control at the very time that the administration is proclaiming its intention to reach effective new agreements.

It would seem that at this point in

time, when arms limitation is as crucial as at any time in our Nation's history, that the prestige and capacity of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be increased rather than decreased.

Mr. Chairman, the President himself has stated that this round of strategic arms limitation talks is of the utmost importance to continuing international detente, and yet, without the slightest hesitation, he has proposed a reduction so crippling that it will deny the Arms Control Agency the very tools necessary to accomplish its mission.

It is instructive in the context of spending priorities to note that an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency appropriation of \$10 million for fiscal year 1974, which is what my amendment authorizes, would only pay one-half the cost of a single F-14 aircraft.

Mr. DRINAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DRINAN. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and commend him for his initiative. I do hope we will go forward and have a record vote on this. It is most appropriate on this day when we have failed to stop war immediately that we at least see that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has the funding that they had last year.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman.

That is another interesting aspect of this. Savings from cutting the appropriation from \$10 million to \$6.9 million, which is what the bill without my amendment would do—the saving is less than the cost of 5 days of bombing in Cambodia at the current rate, which has been running \$600,000 a day on the average.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I will not yield at this time. I will in just a moment if you gentlemen will allow me to proceed.

It is almost ludicrous to compare the increase in the DOD proposed fiscal year 1974 budget just for research and development, an increase of \$562.7 million to the \$10 million that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was allocated last year and which I am asking us to appropriate again this year. Certainly we can agree that it is not only the right but it is the duty of the Congress to provide for a strong and effective Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Therefore I urge the committee to restore the full \$10 million funding for the Agency for 1974.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would like to say this: I am all for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. If there was one crying need we have in the world, it is to have disarmament. If it took \$100 million, I would be for it. But the simple facts are that the funds we have allocated to the Agency are sufficient. On page 582 of the RECORD you will find in

my colloquy with Mr. Farley, the Acting Director, I asked him the question is there enough funds and personnel to carry out the mission, and he said that there were enough funds to carry it out. I asked him as follows:

Mr. CEDERBERG. In your opinion, with the personnel you have and the funds available, you can carry out the mission assigned to you; is that correct?

Mr. FARLEY. We believe we will carry out our basic job, Mr. Cederberg.

That is what we want. Giving them an extra \$5 to \$10 million may make us feel better, but it does not do the job any better.

Mr. SEIBERLING. May I suggest one other thing to the gentleman from Michigan, whose opinion, of course, I respect very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. One of the troubles with this cut from last year's level is that it is part of an apparent effort to downgrade the role of the agency below that which has been designated by the Congress in the 1961 act, which says that it shall have the primary responsibility for negotiating a strategic arms limitation agreement.

The gentleman to whom you referred replaced the previous head of the agency, who conducted the first round of SALT talks. I doubt very much if he is free to express views contrary to the position of OMB on this budget.

I submit this amendment is a symbolic act which will back up the President in his declaration, with Chairman Brezhnev last week, that SALT II is the most important negotiation we have going in the international field. This is one way to back him up and give him moral support.

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

Mr. Chairman, this committee consistently has supported the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Year after year we have given the agency all the money they said they needed to do their job, and that is exactly what we have done this year. We gave them the full amount of the budget request. If they had any additional money, there would be no plans to spend it and no need to spend it. This would not be sound legislative procedure.

Let me quote from the record on page 577, part IV of the hearings, from the testimony of the acting chairman of the agency, Mr. Farley.

He said:

In order to carry out this desire for curtailing Federal expenditures and streamlining Federal programs, our Agency will sharply reduce external research, . . .

which probably is largely window dressing, anyway.

. . . streamline the utilization of personnel, but we will, . . .

Now listen to this:

. . . we are confident, be able to meet our negotiating and statutory responsibilities. Specifically, ACDA will generate budget

savings by (1) cutting the external research program in the amount of \$1.5 million (the largest area of reduction), (2) reducing some personnel, and (3) as mentioned above, through the consolidation of the two SALT sites into one.

Mr. Chairman, the agency is receiving the full amount of the budget request; every dime they asked for, every dime they showed a need for. We hope they do a good job. We will support them for whatever amount they really need. Our record is consistent. The amendment cannot be justified and should be defeated.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentlewoman. Mr. Chairman, there are some things that the Congress ought to do to indicate what its judgment is as to matters of priority. It strikes me that when we have an appropriation request for the agency that is supposed to negotiate the cuts in arms around the world so as to be able to put our money into things that are needed at home, and which are more productive for human needs, and when that proposed appropriation is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the proposed Defense Department research budget for next year, and less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent of the proposed military budget for next year, then something is wrong with our order of priorities. So this is one way to say to the world that we are giving some priority to arms control and arms limitation.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the thing I would like to ask the committee is whether they received any adverse testimony about this? All of the people who are seeking to reduce the military expenditures have severely criticized the arms control agency, and indications of this are everywhere. I am wondering if they made available a platform, or asked any witnesses from their home communities to come and tell what the arms control agency really should have if it is going to do its duty.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

The testimony that was read by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) indicates that this agency has been under a lot of pressure to reduce its requests in the budget. The events of last week proposing agreements in strategic arms limitation that we all want to take place expeditiously, warrant a greater investment in the kind of work for arms control that this agency has done for many years. If their budget were increased,

I believe agreements could come about more quickly. The expertise of this agency should be made more available to our negotiators in order to assist them in such agreements.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SEIBERLING) there were—ayes 23, noes 103.

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

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be made available for the collection and preparation of information which will not be available to Committees of Congress in the regular discharge of their duties.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarification on the legislative intent of this section, I should like to ask my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, to clarify the provisions in this section as to whether or not this provides for requiring the trade negotiators to answer the inquiries raised by Members of the U.S. Congress on the trade negotiations, and whether or not these answers will be forthcoming from these trade negotiators on the who, what, where, when, why, and how of what they are doing.

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, I would say that it is the intent of this committee that they respond forthwith to the inquiries of Members of Congress.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed \$1,552,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and not to exceed \$5,500,000 for the expenses of vocational training of prisoners, both amounts to be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and to be computed on an accrual basis and to be determined in accordance with the corporation's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Eckhardt: Add after line 9 on page 51 the following:

"Sec. 706. Any expenditure which is permitted to be made solely on the certificate of the head of a department of government because of the confidential or other special nature of the expenditure shall be subject to the scrutiny of the Comptroller General to determine the nature of the purpose of the expenditure and whether or not it is of such confidential or other special nature."

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the basis that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The rule provides that all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

Furthermore the language of the amendment is pertinent to several provisions of the bill. For instance, on page 17, where the Attorney General is permitted to expend moneys accounted for solely on his certificate, on lines 10 and 11; on page 17, line 24 and page 18, lines 1 and 2, where the Attorney General is entitled to expend money for confidential purposes solely on his certificate; and on page 20 where there is an authorization of approval by the Attorney General to be accounted for solely on his certificate; and pages 20 and 21.

This provision simply restricts such sole accounting authority of the Attorney General, it is germane to the provisions in the bill, and it provides a general limitation with respect to these items.

The point of order with respect to legislation on an appropriation bill is specifically waived by the rule.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may be heard.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment was not before the Rules Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VANIK). The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas imposes new duties, additional duties on Federal officials and is therefore legislation in violation of clause 2, Rule XXI. The rule which waives points of order applied only to the provisions of the bill and does not waive points of order against any amendments offered.

So the point of order is sustained.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 705. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of, or any remuneration whatever to

any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at or doing research at an institution of higher education who has engaged in conduct on or after August 1, 1969, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RARICK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rarick: Page 52, after line 16, insert a new section:

Sec. 706. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be expended to aid or assist in the reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam). Renumber the succeeding lines accordingly.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is self-explanatory. It is a prohibition to make sure that the funds passed by this House under this act are not to be used in aid or assistance in the reconstruction of North Vietnam. It is a good amendment. I urge its adoption.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RARICK), there were—ayes 31; noes 52.

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

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VANIK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8916) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the

engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 370, noes 11, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

YEAS—370

Abdnor	Corman	Hastings
Abzug	Cotter	Hawkins
Adams	Coughlin	Hays
Addabbo	Cronin	Hechler, W. Va.
Alexander	Culver	Heckler, Mass.
Anderson,	Daniel, Dan	Heinz
Calif.	Daniel, Robert	Helstoski
Anderson, Ill.	W. Jr.	Henderson
Andrews, N.C.	Daniels,	Hicks
Annunzio	Dominick V.	Hillis
Archer	Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw
Arends	Davis, S.C.	Hogan
Armstrong	Davis, Wis.	Holifield
Aspin	de la Garza	Holt
Bafalis	Dellenback	Holtzman
Baker	Dellums	Horton
Barrett	Denholm	Hosmer
Beard	Dennis	Howard
Bennett	Devine	Huber
Bergland	Dickinson	Hudnut
Bevill	Diggs	Hutchinson
Blagel	Dingell	Ichord
Blester	Donohue	Jarman
Bingham	Dorn	Johnson, Calif.
Boggs	Downing	Johnson, Colo.
Boland	Drinan	Johnson, Pa.
Bolling	Dulski	Jones, N.C.
Bowen	Duncan	Jones, Tenn.
Brademas	du Pont	Jordan
Brasco	Eckhardt	Karth
Bray	Edwards, Ala.	Kastenmeier
Breckinridge	Edwards, Calif.	Kazen
Brinkley	Eilberg	Kemp
Brooks	Erlenborn	Ketchum
Broomfield	Esch	Kluczynski
Brotzman	Eshleman	Koch
Brown, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Kuykendall
Brown, Mich.	Findley	Kyros
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Landrum
Broyhill, N.C.	Flynt	Latta
Broyhill, Va.	Foley	Leggett
Buchanan	Ford, Gerald R.	Lehman
Burgener	Forsythe	Lent
Burke, Calif.	Fountain	Litton
Burke, Mass.	Fraser	Long, La.
Burleson, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.
Burlison, Mo.	Frenzel	Lott
Burton	Frey	Lujan
Butler	Froehlich	McClary
Byron	Fulton	McCloskey
Camp	Gaydos	McCollister
Carey, N.Y.	Gettys	McCormack
Carney, Ohio	Gialmo	McDade
Carter	Gibbons	McEwen
Casey, Tex.	Gillman	McFall
Cederberg	Ginn	McKay
Chamberlain	Goldwater	McKinney
Chappell	Goodling	Macdonald
Chisholm	Grasso	Madigan
Clancy	Gray	Mahon
Clausen,	Green, Pa.	Mailliard
Don H.	Grover	Mallory
Clawson, Del	Gude	Mann
Clay	Guyer	Maraziti
Cleveland	Hamilton	Martin, Nebr.
Cochran	Hammer-	Martin, N.C.
Cohen	schmidt	Mathias, Calif.
Collier	Hanley	Matsunaga
Collins, Ill.	Hanna	Mayne
Conable	Hanrahan	Mazzoli
Conlan	Hansen, Idaho	Meeds
Conte	Harsha	Melcher
Conyers	Harvey	Metcalfe

Mezvinsky	Regula	Stratton
Michel	Reid	Stubblefield
Milford	Rhodes	Stuckey
Miller	Riegle	Studds
Mills, Ark.	Rinaldo	Symington
Minish	Roberts	Talcott
Mink	Robinson, Va.	Taylor, Mo.
Minshall, Ohio	Robison, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Mitchell, Md.	Rodino	Teague, Calif.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Roe	Thomson, Wis.
Mizell	Rogers	Thone
Moakley	Roncalio, Wyo.	Thornton
Mollohan	Roncalio, N.Y.	Towell, Nev.
Montgomery	Rooney, Pa.	Treen
Moorhead,	Rose	Udall
Calif.	Rosenthal	Ullman
Moorhead, Pa.	Rostenkowski	Van Deerlin
Morgan	Roy	Vander Jagt
Mosher	Roybal	Vanik
Moss	Runnels	Veysey
Murphy, Ill.	Ruppe	Vigorito
Murphy, N.Y.	Ruth	Waggonner
Myers	St Germain	Waldie
Natcher	Sarasin	Walsh
Nedzi	Sarbanes	Wampler
Nelsen	Satterfield	Ware
Nichols	Saylor	Whalen
Nix	Scherle	White
Obey	Schneebell	Whitehurst
O'Brien	Schroeder	Whitten
O'Neill	Sebelius	Widnall
Owens	Seiberling	Williams
Parris	Shipley	Wilson, Bob
Passman	Shoup	Wilson,
Patman	Shriver	Charles H.,
Patten	Sikes	Calif.
Pepper	Sisk	Wilson,
Perkins	Skubitz	Charles, Tex.
Pettis	Slack	Winn
Peyser	Smith, Iowa	Wolff
Pickie	Smith, N.Y.	Wylder
Pike	Snyder	Wylie
Poage	Spence	Wyman
Podell	Staggers	Yates
Powell, Ohio	Stanton	Yatron
Preyer	J. William	Young, Alaska
Price, Ill.	Stanton,	Young, Fla.
Price, Tex.	James V.	Young, Ga.
Pritchard	Stark	Young, Ill.
Quillen	Steed	Young, S.C.
Rallsback	Steele	Young, Tex.
Randall	Steelman	Zablocki
Rangel	Stephens	Zion
Rees	Stokes	Zwach

NAYS—11

Collins, Tex.	Haley	Rarick
Crane	Jones, Okla.	Shuster
Gonzalez	Landgrebe	Symms
Gross	Mathis, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—52

Andrews,	Fisher	Madden
N. Dak.	Flowers	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Ford,	Quile
Ashley	William D.	Reuss
Badillo	Fuqua	Rooney, N.Y.
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Roush
Blackburn	Griffiths	Rousselot
Blatnik	Gubser	Ryan
Breaux	Gunter	Sandman
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Harrington	Steiger, Wis.
Danielson	Hébert	Sullivan
Delaney	Hungate	Teague, Tex.
Dent	Hunt	Thompson, N.J.
Derwinski	Jones, Ala.	Tiernan
Evins, Tenn.	Keating	Wiggins
Fascell	King	Wright
Fish	McSpadden	Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Quile.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Keating.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hunt.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Bell.
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. King.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Danielson with Mr. Badillo.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. William D. Ford.
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Gunter.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hungate.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. O'Hara.
 Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Roush.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Harrington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6187. An act to amend section 502(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

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

H.R. 5452. An act to extend and make technical corrections to the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8537) entitled "An act 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."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks on the bill just passed, and that I may include therein certain tables and extraneous material. Further, Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1972) to further amend the United States Information and Educa-

tional Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1972

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 703 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to insert the following sentence between the first and second sentence thereof: "There are further authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 1973 not to exceed \$1,150,000 for nondiscretionary costs."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill S. 1972 provides an authorization for a supplemental appropriation of \$1.15 million for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The executive branch requested \$40 million for these two radio stations for the fiscal year 1973.

The Congress appropriated \$38.5 million.

That amount did not take into account the possibility that the dollar would be devalued during this fiscal year.

As we know, the devaluation of the dollar which occurred in February of this year cut its purchasing power in terms of European currencies by nearly 20 percent.

This has had a very serious effect on the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty since most of their costs occur in Europe and have to be paid with European currencies—mostly the German mark.

In order to cover urgent operating expenses, the two radio stations have had to dip into their pension funds.

This simply meant postponing expenditures which are legally binding and which have to be made at some point.

To help offset the deficits caused by devaluation, the executive branch has requested a supplemental appropriation of \$1.8 million.

The appropriations committees have allowed \$1.15 million. That amount was included in the supplemental appropriation bill, approved earlier today by the House.

The appropriation, however, is subject to an authorization.

Yesterday, the Senate approved S. 1972 which would authorize this appropriation.

This morning, the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered the matter and unanimously instructed me to move that the House accept the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental authorization is urgently needed. We believe it is justified by development over which Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty had no control.

I urge the House to pass the bill, S. 1972.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if I am correct in assuming that the authorization for this money has not yet been signed by the President?

Mr. MORGAN. The supplemental appropriation?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I imagine that it has not been signed, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) I do not know whether it has passed the other body as yet.

Mr. GROSS. So that this provides for \$1.15 million for nondiscretionary costs, is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman please explain to the House what "nondiscretionary costs" may mean?

Mr. MORGAN. I would say that this is an old story to the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman knows the full story about the devaluation of the dollar which occurred in February of this year, and as a result the purchasing power of the dollar in Europe has diminished by about 20 percent. The RFE-RL people are mostly paid with German marks. Consequently, the devaluation has resulted in a deficiency which the administration is trying to cover at least partly in this authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania know how many billions of dollars we will have to spend to take care of the devaluation of those dollars that we send abroad, including the \$1.15 million contained in this bill, and when, if ever, the taxpayers of this country are going to get a break of this kind?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I cannot answer that question of the gentleman from Iowa because it would be impossible for me to keep track of all of the agencies and programs affected by the devaluation of the dollar. I try to keep up with those agencies and programs pertaining to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. The devaluation of the dollar was supposed to be for the purpose of encouraging foreign trade; is that not correct? Exports from the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. For that first devaluation, I thought that was one of the reasons given.

Mr. GROSS. That was the main reason given, and yet we find that the administration has now put a ban on the export of soybeans and cottonseed oil; is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. I read that in the press this morning, but, of course, not being a member of the Committee of Agriculture, I do not know the reason why the ban was imposed.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, in the devaluation of the dollar the taxpayers of this country are getting clobbered going and coming; is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from

Iowa, of course, knows my strong feelings about the trade negotiations. I have long thought we had to have trade agreements that had escape clauses intended to protect the American businessman, the American farmer, and the American worker.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania indulge me one other observation? I will be brief. May the Lord help the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. MORGAN. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD).

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I support this supplemental authorization request for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for fiscal year 1973. The amount is relatively small—only \$1,150,000.

The House and Senate conferees earlier agreed to a \$1.15 million supplemental appropriation for the two radios for fiscal year 1973. This amount was in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1973 which was passed by both the House and the Senate.

We are advised by the executive branch that the additional funds are needed because of certain "nondiscretionary cost increases," including those resulting from the devaluation of the dollar. A significant increase in costs to the two radios has resulted from devaluation since 80 percent of the operating expenses of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are paid in local currencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this supplemental authorization request.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1972, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1759) authorizing further appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Illinois give us at least a brief explanation of what he proposes?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to explain to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa and my colleague the bill before us. This bill is identical to the bill that the House passed on a rollcall vote on May 30 of this year by a vote of 291

to 75 authorizing appropriations to continue the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center. To obviate the necessity of going to conference we are prepared to accept one amendment that was added by the other body cutting it back to a 2-year authorization. The House bill carried a 3-year authorization, so we are merely substituting the Senate bill cutting back 1 year, which I am sure is in line with the gentleman's thinking of having the Congress review this project frequently.

Mr. GROSS. I would have been more pleased had they cut the money figure, I assure the gentleman from Illinois. I am, however, thankful always for small favors, especially when it comes to the cultural center and other boondoggles in the city of Washington.

Does the gentleman from Illinois think that by rushing this bill through without going to conference that this will save more of the gold faucets in the rest rooms at the cultural center from being stolen, or some of the draperies from being stolen?

Mr. GRAY. Yes. I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that by agreeing to this bill now, we are cutting back \$2.5 million in authorized expenditures by setting a 2-year authorization. If we had gone to conference we would merely have agreed on something higher, so I am sure the gentleman from Iowa will want to support the motion before us now.

Mr. GROSS. If this is a Senate bill, I am constrained to think that this is the result which would come out of a conference, but let me say to the gentleman if I thought there was any way in the world I could head this off and stop any Federal funds for this purpose, I certainly would do it, but I bow to the inevitable and I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 1759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of subsection (e) of section 6 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (72 Stat. 1698), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this subsection, not to exceed \$2,400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8410, PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report and the Senate amendment reported from the conference in disagreement on

the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 1973, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us what is in the proposal that is coming before us on the debt limit?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. With respect to what particular issue?

Ms. ABZUG. With respect to the particular issue of Cambodia.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There is nothing in the conference report nor in the proposed amendment that will be offered to the Senate amendment involving the subject matter of Cambodia.

Ms. ABZUG. And there is nothing in it concerning the question of bombing or with respect to Laos or Indochina?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is true. We had agreed in the conference to accept the so-called Eagleton amendment, and it became a little bit superfluous, we thought, to this conference report in view of the actions of the House today and in view of the amendment that is being discussed and probably will be accepted a little bit later this afternoon in the Senate.

Ms. ABZUG. In other words, we do not have a cutoff provision of any kind in this?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Not in this, but the cutoff is in the supplemental that passed, and the Senate is expected to adopt in the continuing resolution a similar provision.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, indicate to the House the situation in which we find ourselves?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in the process of amending the debt limit bill in the Senate both on the Senate floor and in the Finance Committee the many subject matters that were appended to the bill were appended in the form of one amendment, which I must say to my friend is not the proper way, in my opinion, for amendments to be considered that are not germane to the subject matter of a bill, because it results when the matter comes to the House and the House is in disagreement and wants to make changes with respect to these various subject matters, that the House has to consider all these changes in one amendment to the Senate amendment. So we are in the position of suggesting to the House that the House recede and concur in the one Senate amendment with one suggested House amendment

that will include changes in several areas of the Senate amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate very much the honest statement of the gentleman from Arkansas, may I inquire of the Chair as to whether or not it is possible to have a division or a separation of any of the matters to be considered in the one Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what motion might be made. The Chair cannot rule on that sort of thing.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what concerns me in this, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is that the conference report, as it was brought to us is without benefit of any explanation other than that which the distinguished chairman always gives.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Actually there is not a conference report—in the usual sense—when we have a conference report in disagreement. This conference report therefore does not provide an explanation of amendments, because the amendments are all subject to a point of order if included in a conference report. So, we have no conference report in the usual sense. We have no statement of the managers on the part of the House which can be read, because there is no conference report, in effect, in the usual sense, I must say. Under the new rules we do have reference to conference reports in disagreement.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes, except that the gentleman will remember that we amended the rule.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, I remember that.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. What we have done is to go back to the situation that developed in June 1972.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Rules Committee changed that. They were unaware of the fact, apparently, that a conference report in disagreement does not have to lay over for 3 days. It does have to now.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. All I am talking about is that rule which is found in rule XXVIII, subsection 4(a), the rule under which this is called up, which says:

With respect to any report of a committee of conference called up before the House containing any matter which would be in violation of the provisions of clause 7 of Rule XVI if such matter had been offered as an amendment in the House.

We do have a chance under the new rule that was adopted in October and modified that old rule, to ask for a separate vote on a nongermane amendment.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is getting a separate vote on a nongermane amendment because there is only one nongermane amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. That is the reason I made the parliamentary

inquiry to the chair as to whether or not it would be possible under what the Senate has done, which I think is wrong. I think at some point we are going to have to reflect on what the Senate did to us, but given the fact that we are in this conference report dealing with what, unemployment compensation, social service, social security—

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Medicaid.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. All of these are nongermane amendments, no matter how one cuts that cake. All I am trying to figure out is whether or not it is possible to divide the question. When we move to recede and concur with an amendment, we are amending that one Senate amendment in a number of various areas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is talking about dividing the question. I do not know what he has in mind, but in all fairness to the gentleman, let me suggest that it is possible always to divide the question between receding and concurring, but what would be the purpose of a separation of the two if we are to recede with an amendment and if we voted to recede separately, then I would move to concur with an amendment.

It is my understanding of the rules of the House that that motion will take precedence over any other motion that could be made.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. All I am saying, in a situation like this which the House is faced with, when we get to almost June 30 when the debt expires, it is really an incredibly difficult problem for the individual Member of the House. It has to be passed, but I think all of us might have different views about the variety of different provisions that are contained in that Senate amendment.

Thus, from my standpoint, the procedure under which we bring this conference report to the House tonight is unconscionable. It makes it exceedingly difficult for the Members of the House both to know what is in the conference report and to deal with it because of the way the Senate has handled it.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I have told the gentleman I disapprove of the procedure that was followed in the Senate. The blame is not with respect to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Of course not.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Nor with respect to the House. This conference report in disagreement very materially reduces the costs that were to be incurred under the Senate amendment.

We have delayed, for example, the effectiveness of the social security increase itself. We have cut back on other areas of cost in the conference.

We have provided what the Senate did not do. We have provided for the financing of the increase in the retire-

ment test, and the increase in social security cash benefits.

Bear this in mind, also. It is now estimated that at the end of June the Government will announce that there has been, since June of last year, an overall cost-of-living increase of some 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 percent, or somewhere in that neighborhood. We have taken 5.6. So these people on social security would be entitled to that under the automatic provisions of the Social Security Act, not now but January 1, 1975. Perhaps by that time there would be another 5 percent or so added to it.

We thought it would be advisable to move that effective date of January 1, 1975, forward. The Senate set January 1, 1974. The amendment that will be suggested to the Senate amendment says April 1, 1974. This is done out of deference of this situation, because there will be two payments made in fiscal year 1974. The April payment will be made about May 3. The May payment will be about June 3. The next payment will be on the 3d day of July, in the next fiscal year, 1975.

Many of these things we did in order to minimize the effect upon the budget. I cannot help but say to the gentleman that in all probability this gets down to a question of priority. We say that we are exceeding the budget, but we have not completed our work. I am perfectly willing to vote and will vote, as I have consistently, to take this amount of increase out of some other program of the Government. I believe we can do it with readiness and with ease.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate very much the explanation and the view of the gentleman from Arkansas.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing tonight is, I suspect, but a further ramification of the problem which arose when we first passed that resolution this week which authorized the Speaker to recognize this process, and, further, it is but another example of where I believe the rules of the House are going to have to be more explicit in terms of dealing with the fact that the rule which provides an amendment versus an amendment in the nature of a substitute did not catch the rather clever way the other body dealt with this particular amendment tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and hope that we will not find ourselves in this situation again.

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is well known for the fights he has made for the prerogatives of the House, if he is satisfied with this procedure? We went through this procedure last year as well as this year. No responsible committee of the Congress was seriously considered not just the social security measure and all its ramifications but also very substantial ad hoc welfare reform measures which have been added by the other body following their rejection of our comprehensive wel-

fare reform procedures during the last two Congresses.

Does the gentleman feel satisfied with this procedure and, if not, will he be able to tell us some time during the debate tonight as to how we can avoid this happening again 5 weeks from now without anybody seriously considering the implications of what we are doing or understanding what we are doing in the time allotted for debate?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The one point, may I suggest to the gentleman now, if he will yield, is that perhaps the rules of the House should provide protection against so many subject matters nongermane to a bill being considered as one amendment: that is, the House is entitled to vote on each and every subject matter which is added to a House-passed bill that is not germane to that bill, rather than having to do it en bloc in the nature of one amendment.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask, is my distinguished chairman satisfied with the procedure for increasing the debt ceiling on a temporary basis, thus permitting the entire Government to be held hostage in this way?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, that gets down to the question of the will of the committee. The committee has continually voted, perhaps rather facetiously, that \$65 billion of our debt is temporary. Now, maybe I do not understand the meaning of the word "temporary," but we will have this back in the committee later in the year, and if the gentleman wants to decide upon a total permanent debt, I am perfectly willing to go along with him.

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

However, I want to express my grave misgivings about the repetition of a process that has already happened too many times already.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say very briefly to the very distinguished chairman of our committee and certainly to every Member of this House, regardless of whatever subsequent disagreements or agreements we might have, can understand from the precedent we have set here what an actually dangerous legislative procedure this is. At some point we may all find ourselves in a real bind if we allow it to continue.

Mr. Speaker, unless we correct it, from this time on every Member sitting in this House risks becoming the victim of this kind of procedure. It is the most disorderly manner I can think of in which to legislate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, first let me say to the distinguished chairman that I would like to associate myself with the colloquy that he has had with the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE), with the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER), and with the last gentleman who spoke, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER). I think it is quite expressive of the feelings of the House toward the way we are being forced to legislate in this fashion by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an inquiry to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), the chairman, and ask him about one item that still is not clear to me.

I can well appreciate that it is possible, though not necessarily desirable, to divide the question between receding and concurring. If it is was, hypothetically speaking, decided to divide the question and the House agreed to recede, then there would be a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, and my question is whether the items in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas would be divisible under the rules of the House.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, they would not be. There could be no division of the amendment. It is an amendment to a Senate amendment. An amendment is not divisible.

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

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) this question?

Am I of a correct understanding in regard to this matter of the social security? As I listened to what the gentleman said, it seemed to me that he was indicating that since there has already been at least a 5.6 percent increase in the cost of living, the other body had determined in a portion of their conglomerate amendment that we should increase the social security by 5.6 percent, which under this device will come out of the general funds because at this point in time it is not tied with the tax.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, no.

Mr. HANNA. Because at this point in time it is not tied in with the tax.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. It comes out of the social security trust fund.

Mr. HANNA. Does the tax at the present time generate a sufficient amount of funds to absorb a 5.6-percent increase?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. Actually that is not what was involved. We were told we would have to increase the \$12,000 which goes into effect the first of the year subject to the tax; \$12,100.

Mr. HANNA. We are presently unable to do that?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It is a one-shot proposition. If we did not do this now, we would be giving them a much bigger increase, which is about \$8 million beyond that.

Mr. HANNA. I understand that, but I was trying to get the sense of it, because the gentleman said something that really bothered me. He said that they will receive both. You said some of these increases would have to come out of other programs.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No.
Mr. HANNA. The social security does not?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman must have misunderstood me or else I misspoke, because what I said was that the Senate does not provide for increases in income to compensate for the change in the retirement test and this change in cash benefits, but the proposed amendment I will offer to the Senate amendment does include the financing necessary to defray that cost.

Mr. HANNA. And neither of these costs comes out of the general fund?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, sir. They come out of the social security trust fund.

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time to ask the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, did the Senate or the conferees take off of the debt limit the so-called Eagleton amendment?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. The Senators agreed to allow us to change the position that had been taken earlier and to exclude the Eagleton amendment from the amendment we will offer to the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman: Is this considered to be a conference report, or what is it?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. It has a new name. It is a conference report in disagreement. There is nothing in the House-passed bill that was changed. That is all that could have been in the usual conference report, were amendments by the Senate to the language of the House-passed bill. They refrained, at least, from changing the language of the House-passed bill.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman how was it proposed to consider what is to be considered here this evening?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There was an amendment offered by the Senate added to the language of the House-passed bill.

Mr. GROSS. No. I am not asking that, but under what procedure will this be handled now? Would it be in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. It is handled in the House with the Speaker presiding. The conference group will have 1 hour to discuss the conference report in disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. And that will be divided between both sides for the usual length of time?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Oh, yes. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will have 30 minutes to yield.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman one question. The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee is not on the floor. The gentleman referred to taking this out of other Federal programs. Actually, he did not mean it, but it works exactly

that way, because if he raises the social security 5.5 percent, they take exactly the same amount off the veterans' pension and off welfare. Has the gentleman made any provision at all for that?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. That is a veterans law which becomes effective for veterans. As you know, the gentleman you refer to, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), while he was chairman and I am satisfied the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), who succeeded him as chairman have always seen fit to provide for a degree of exception so that some part or all of the social security increase is not considered income for veterans pension purposes.

Mr. ROBERTS. But we were not able to do that with the 20 percent and now we have a 25.6 percent. We have not touched it, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Up to this time the committee as a rule has acted to not include that increase as income for the purpose of determining veterans' rights to a pension.

Mr. ROBERTS. Of course, the gentleman realizes the Committee on Veterans' Affairs cannot do this, because it is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, the point that the gentleman from Texas raises is a provision of the veterans law which determines what is income for purposes of pension, and they include social security for that purpose.

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

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin may propound a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: that if an objection is heard to the request made by the gentleman from Arkansas, is it in order for the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to move to suspend the rules to bring this to the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has the authority to recognize the gentleman for such a motion.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the Chair's indulgence in a question relating to rule XXVIII, clause 2(b), as to whether we have waived that part of the rule XXVIII governing conference reports, which says: Nor shall it be in order to consider any such amendment that is to the conference unless copies of the report and accompanying statement together with the text of the amendment are then available on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that copies of the Senate amendment

and conference report are available, but that suspension of the rules will suspend all rules.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it possible for Members of the House to have copies available?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield, we have copies of the proposed amendment, and there are copies of the Senate-passed bill that are available to every Member of the House.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 28, 1973.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, after line 9, insert:

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

PART A—INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

SEC. 201. (a) (1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall, in accordance with the provisions of this section, increase the monthly benefits and lump-sum death payments payable under title II of the Social Security Act by the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index prepared by the Department of Labor for the month of June 1973 exceeds such index for the month of June 1972.

(2) The provisions of this section (and the increase in benefits made hereunder) shall be effective, in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, only for months after December 1973 and prior to January 1975, and, in the case of lump-sum death payments under such title, only with respect to deaths which occur after December 1973 and prior to January 1975.

(b) The increase in social security benefits authorized under this section shall be provided, and any determinations by the Secretary in connection with the provision of such increase in benefits shall be made, in the manner prescribed in section 215(1) of the Social Security Act for the implementation of cost-of-living increases authorized under title II of such Act, except that the amount of such increase shall be based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index described in subsection (a).

(c) The increase in social security benefits provided by this section shall—

(1) not be considered to be an increase in benefits made under or pursuant to section 215(1) of the Social Security Act, and

(2) not (except for purposes of section 203(a)(2) of such Act, as in effect after December 1973) be considered to be a "general benefit increase under this title" (as such term is defined in section 215(1)(3) of such Act);

and nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing any increase in the "contribution and benefit base" (as that term is employed in section 230 of such Act), or any increase in the "exempt amount" (as such term is used in section 203(f)(8) of such Act).

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize (directly or indirectly) any increase in monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for any month after December 1974, or any increase in lump-sum death payments payable under such title in the case of deaths occurring after December 1974. The recognition of the existence of the increase in benefits authorized by the preceding subsections of this section (during the period it was in effect) in the application, after December 1974, of the provisions of sections 202(g) and 203(a) of such Act shall not, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be considered to be an increase in a monthly benefit for a month after December 1974.

PART B—PROVISIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL PROGRAM OF SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

INCREASE IN SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFITS

SEC. 210. (a) Section 1611(a)(1)(A) and section 1611(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972) are each amended by striking out "\$1,560" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,680".

(b) Section 1611(a)(2)(A) and section 1611(b)(2) of such Act (as so enacted) are each amended by striking out "\$2,340" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,520".

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFITS FOR ESSENTIAL PERSONS

SEC. 211. (a) (1) In determining (for purposes of title XVI of the Social Security Act, as in effect after December 1973) the eligibility for and the amount of the supplementary security income benefit payable to any qualified individual (as defined in subsection (b)), with respect to any period for which such individual has in his home an essential person (as defined in subsection (c))—

(A) the dollar amounts specified, in subsection (a)(1)(A) and (2)(A), and subsection (b)(1) and (2), of section 1611 of such Act, shall each be increased by \$840 for each such essential person, and

(B) the income and resources of such individual shall (for purposes of such title XVI) be deemed to include the income and resources of such essential person;

except that the provisions of this subsection shall not, in the case of any individual, be applicable for any period which begins in or after the first month that such individual—

(C) does not but would (except for the provisions of subparagraph (B)) meet—

(1) the criteria established with respect to income in section 1611(a) of such Act, or

(2) the criteria established with respect to resources by such section 1611(a) (or, if applicable, by section 1611(g) of such Act).

(2) The provisions of section 1611(g) of the Social Security Act (as in effect after December 1973) shall, in the case of any qualified individual (as defined in subsection (b)), be applied so as to include, in the resources of such individual, the resources of any person (described in subsection (b)(2)) whose needs were taken into account in determining the need of such individual for the aid or assistance referred to in subsection (b)(1).

(b) For purposes of this section, an individual shall be a "qualified individual" only if—

(1) for the month of December 1973 such individual was a recipient of aid or assistance under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, and

(2) in determining the need of such individual for such aid or assistance for such month under such State plan, there were taken into account the needs of a person (other than such individual) who—

(A) was living in the home of such individual, and

(B) was not eligible (in his or her own right) for aid or assistance under such State plan for such month.

(c) The term "essential person", when used in connection with any qualified individual, means a person who—

(1) for the month of December 1973 was a person (described in subsection (b)(2)) whose needs were taken into account in determining the need of such individual for aid or assistance under a State plan referred to in subsection (b)(1) as such State plan was in effect for June 1973,

(2) lives in the home of such individual, (3) is not eligible (in his or her own right) for supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act (as in effect after December 1973), and

(4) is not the eligible spouse (as that term is used in such title XVI) of such individual or any other individual.

If for any month after December 1973 any person fails to meet the criteria specified in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of the preceding sentence, such person shall not, for such month or any month thereafter be considered to be an essential person.

MANDATORY MINIMUM STATE SUPPLEMENTATION OF SSI BENEFITS PROGRAM

SEC. 212. (a) (1) In order for any State (other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands) to be eligible for payments pursuant to title XIX, with respect to expenditures for any quarter beginning after December 1973, and prior to January 1, 1975, such State must have in effect an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") whereby the State will provide to individuals residing in the State supplementary payments as required under paragraph (2).

(2) Any agreement entered into by a State pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide that each individual who—

(A) is an aged, blind, or disabled individual (within the meaning of section 1614(a) of the Social Security Act, as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972), and

(B) for the month of December 1973 was a recipient of (and was eligible to receive) aid or assistance (in the form of money payments) under a State plan of such State (approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, of the Social Security Act)

shall be entitled to receive, from the State, the supplementary payment described in paragraph (3) for each month, beginning with January 1974 and ending with the close of December 1974 (or, if later, the close of the month the State, at its option, may specify in the agreement or in a subsequent modification of the agreement), or, if earlier, whichever of the following first occurs:

(C) the month in which such individual dies, or

(D) the first month in which such individual ceases to meet the condition specified in subparagraph (A);

except that no individual shall be entitled to receive such supplementary payment for any month, if, for such month, such individual was ineligible to receive supplemental income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act by reason of the provisions of section 1611(e) (2) or (3) or section 1611(f) of such Act.

(3) (A) The supplementary payment referred to in paragraph (2) which shall be paid for any month to any individual who is entitled thereto under an agreement entered into pursuant to this subsection shall (except as provided in subparagraph (D)) be an amount equal to (1) the amount by which such individual's "December 1973 income" (as determined under subparagraph (B)) exceeds the amount of such individual's "title XVI benefit plus other income" (as determined under subparagraph (C)) for such

month, or (2) if greater, such amount as the State may specify.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), an individual's "December 1973 income" means an amount equal to the aggregate of—

(i) the amount of the aid or assistance (in the form of money payments) which such individual would have received (including any part of such amount which is attributable to meeting the needs of any other person whose presence in such individual's home is essential to such individual's well-being) for the month of December 1973 under a plan (approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, of the Social Security Act) of the State entering into an agreement under this subsection, if the terms and conditions of such plan (relating to eligibility for and amount of such aid or assistance payable thereunder) were, for the month of December 1973, the same as those in effect, under such plan, for the month of June 1973, and

(ii) the amount of the income of such individual (other than the aid or assistance described in clause (i)) received by such individual in December 1973, minus any such income which did not result, but which if properly reported would have resulted in a reduction in the amount of such aid or assistance.

(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the amount of an individual's "title XVI benefit plus other income" for any month means an amount equal to the aggregate of—

(i) the amount (if any) of the supplemental security income payment to which such individual is entitled for such month under title XVI of the Social Security Act, and

(ii) the amount of any income of such individual for such month (other than income in the form of a payment described in clause (i)).

(D) If the amount determined under subparagraph (B) (i) includes, in the case of any individual, an amount which was payable to such individual solely because of—

(1) a special need of such individual (including any special allowance for housing, or the rental value of housing furnished in kind to such individual in lieu of a rental allowance) which existed in December 1973, or

(2) any special circumstance (such as the recognition of the needs of a person whose presence in such individual's home, in December 1973, was essential to such individual's well-being),

and, if for any month after December 1973 there is a change with respect to such special need or circumstance which, if such change had existed in December 1973, the amount described in subparagraph (B) (i) with respect to such individual would have been reduced on account of such change, then, for such month and for each month thereafter the amount of the supplementary payment payable under the agreement entered into under this subsection to such individual shall (unless the State, as its option, otherwise specifies) be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the amount (described in subparagraph (B) (i)) would have been so reduced.

(b) (1) Any State having an agreement with the Secretary under subsection (a) may enter into an administration agreement with the Secretary whereby the Secretary will, on behalf of such State, make the supplementary payments required under the agreement entered into under subsection (a).

(2) Any such administration agreement between the Secretary and a State entered into under this subsection shall provide that the State will (A) certify to the Secretary the names of each individual who, for December 1973, was a recipient of aid or assistance (in the form of money payments) under a plan of such State approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, together with the amount of such assist-

ance payable to each such individual and the amount of such individual's December 1973 income (as defined in subsection (a)(3)(B)), and (B) provide the Secretary with such additional data at such times as the Secretary may reasonably require in order properly, economically, and efficiently to carry out such administration agreement.

(3) Any State which has entered into an administration agreement under this subsection shall, at such times and in such installments as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the State, pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the expenditures made by the Secretary as supplementary payments to individuals entitled thereto under the agreement entered into with such State under subsection (a).

(c) (1) Supplementary payments made pursuant to an agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall be excluded under section 1612(b)(6) of the Social Security Act (as in effect after December 1973) in determining income of individuals for purposes of title XVI of such Act (as so in effect).

(2) Supplementary payments made by the Secretary (pursuant to an administration agreement entered into under subsection (b)) shall, for purposes of section 401 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972, be considered to be payments made under an agreement entered into under section 1616 of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972); except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to waive, with respect to the payments so made by the Secretary, the provisions of subsection (b) of such section 401.

(d) For purposes of subsection (a)(1), a State shall be deemed to have entered into an agreement under subsection (a) of this section if such State has entered into an agreement with the Secretary under section 1616 of the Social Security Act under which—

(1) individuals, other than individuals described in subsection (a)(2)(A) and (B), are entitled to receive supplementary payments, and

(2) supplementary benefits are payable, to individuals described in subsection (a)(2)(A) and (B) at a level and under terms and conditions which meet the minimum requirements specified in subsection (a).

(e) Except as the Secretary may by regulations otherwise provide, the provisions of title XVI of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972), including the provisions of part B of such title, relating to the terms and conditions under which the benefits authorized by such title are payable shall, where not inconsistent with the purposes of this section, be applicable to the payments made under an agreement under subsection (b) of this section; and the authority conferred upon the Secretary by such title may, where appropriate, be exercised by him in the administration of this section.

(f) The provisions of subsection (a)(1) shall not be applicable in the case of any State—

(1) the Constitution of which contains provisions which make it impossible for such State to enter into and commence carrying out (on January 1, 1974) an agreement referred to in subsection (a), and

(2) the Attorney General (or other appropriate State official) of which has, prior to July 1, 1973, made a finding that the State Constitution of such State contains limitations which prevent such State from making supplemental payments of the type described in section 1616 of the Social Security Act.

PREFERENCE FOR PRESENT STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 213. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the recruitment and selection for employment of personnel whose services will be utilized in the administration

of the Federal program of supplemental security income for the aged, blind, and disabled (established by title XVI of the Social Security Act), shall give a preference to qualified applicants for employment who are employed in the administration of any State program approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act or who were so employed and were displaced from their employment as a result of the displacement of such State program by such Federal program.

DETERMINATION OF BLINDNESS UNDER SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

SEC. 214. Section 1633 of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 1633";

(2) by striking out "The Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection.

"(b) In determining, for purposes of this title, whether an individual is blind, there shall be an examination of such individual by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select."

INCREASE IN EARNINGS LIMITATION

SEC. 215. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (4)(B) of section 203(f) of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "\$175" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250".

(b) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 203(f) is amended to read as follows: For purposes of paragraph (1) and subsection (h), an individual's excess earnings for a taxable year shall be 50 per centum of his earnings for such year in excess of the product of \$250 multiplied by the number of months in such year."

(c) Paragraph (1)(A) of section 203(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$175" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250".

(d) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973.

PART C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

PASS-ALONG OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE TO RECIPIENTS OF AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

SEC. 220. (a) Section 402(a)(8)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting ", and, effective February 1, 1974, shall, before disregarding the amounts referred to in subparagraph (A) and clauses (i) and (ii) of this subparagraph, disregard an amount equal to 5 per centum of any income received in the form of monthly insurance benefits paid under title II" immediately after "\$5 per month of any income".

(b) Any State plan approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act shall effective February 1, 1974, be deemed to contain a provision (relating to the disregarding of income) which complies with the requirement imposed with respect to any such plan under the amendment made by subsection (a).

PART D—SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS POSTPONED

SEC. 230. (a) Subject to subsection (b), no regulation and no modification of any regulation, promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") after January 1, 1973, shall be effective for any period which begins prior to January 1, 1974, if (and insofar as) such regulation or modification of a regulation pertains (directly or indirectly) to the provisions of law contained in section 3(a)(4)(A), 402(a)(19)(G), 403(a)(3)(A), 603(a)(1)(A), 1003(a)(3)(A), 1403(a)(3)(A), or 1603(a)(4)(A), of the Social Security Act.

(b) (1) The provisions of subsection (a)

shall not be applicable to any regulation relating to "scope of programs", if such regulation is identical (except as provided in the succeeding sentence) to the provisions of section 221.0 of the regulations (relating to social services) proposed by the Secretary and published in the Federal Register on May 1, 1973. There shall be deleted from the first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 221.0 the phrase "meets all the applicable requirements of this part and".

(2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any regulation relating to "limitations on total amount of Federal funds payable to States for services", if such regulation is identical (except as provided in the succeeding sentence) to the provisions of section 221.55 of the regulations so proposed and published on May 1, 1973. There shall be deleted from subsection (d)(1) of such section 221.55 the phrase "(as defined under day care services for children)"; and, in lieu of the sentence contained in subsection (d)(5) of such section 221.55, there shall be inserted the following: "Services provided to a child who is under foster care in a foster family home (as defined in section 408 of the Social Security Act) or in a child-care institution (as defined in such section), or while awaiting placement in such a home or institution, but only if such services are needed by such child because he is under foster care."

(3) The provisions of subsections (a) shall not be applicable to any regulation relating to "rates and amounts of Federal financial participation for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam", if such regulation is identified to the provisions of section 221.56 of the regulations so proposed and published on May 1, 1973.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 553(d) of title 5, United States Code, any regulation described in subsection (b) may become effective upon the date of its publication in the Federal Register.

PART E—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MEDICAID

COVERAGE OF ESSENTIAL PERSONS UNDER MEDICAID

SEC. 240. (a) In addition to the requirements imposed by other provisions of law as a condition of approval of a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act, there is hereby imposed the requirement (and each such plan shall be deemed to require) that assistance be provided under such plan to any individual who, as an "essential person" (as defined in subsection (b)), was eligible for assistance under such plan (as such plan was in effect for December 1973), for each month, after December 1973, that such individual continues to meet the criteria, as an essential person, for eligibility under such plan (as such plan was in effect for December 1973).

(b) As used in subsection (a), the term "essential person" means a person who—

(1) for the month of December 1973, was present in the home of an individual who was a recipient of aid or assistance under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, of the Social Security Act, and

(2) was not a recipient of such aid or assistance (in his or her own right) for such month, but whose needs were taken into account in determining the need of such individual for and the amount of aid or assistance (referred to in paragraph (1)) provided to such individual.

PERSONS IN MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 241. For purposes of section 1902(a)(10) of the Social Security Act, any individual who—

(1) for all (or any part of) the month of December 1973 was an inpatient in an institution qualified for reimbursement under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and

(2) would (except for his being an inpatient in such institution) have been eligible to receive aid or assistance under a State

plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act.

shall be deemed to be receiving such aid or assistance for such month and for each succeeding month in a continuous period of months if, for each month in such period—

(3) such individual to be (for all of such month) an inpatient in such an institution and would (except for his being an inpatient in such institution) continue to meet the conditions of eligibility to receive aid or assistance under such plan (as such plan was in effect for December 1973), and

(4) such individual is determined (under the utilization review and other professional audit procedures applicable to State plans approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act) to be in need of care in such an institution.

BLIND AND DISABLED MEDICALLY INDIGENT PERSONS

SEC. 242. For purposes of section 1902(a) (10) of the Social Security Act, any individual who, for the month of December 1973 was eligible (under the provisions of subparagraph (B) of such section) for medical assistance by reason of his having been determined to meet the criteria for blindness or disability (established by a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act), shall be deemed to be a person described as being a person who "would, if needy, be eligible for aid or assistance under any such State plan" in subparagraph (B) (1) of such section for each month in a continuous period of months (beginning with the month of January 1974), if, for each month in such period, such individual continues to meet the criteria for blindness or disability so established by such a State plan (as it was in effect for December 1973).

EXTENSION OF SECTION 249E OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SEC. 243. Section 249E of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1972 is amended by striking out "October 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1975".

REPEAL OF SECTION 225 OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SEC. 244. (A) Section 1903 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out subsection (j) thereof (as added by section 225 of Public Law 92-603).

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable in the case of expenditures for skilled nursing services and for intermediate care facility services furnished in calendar quarters which begin after December 31, 1972.

PART F—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

SEC. 250. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 502 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "each of the next 4 fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the next 5 fiscal years".

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

(3) Section 505(a)(8) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(4) Section 505(a)(9) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(5) Section 505(a)(10) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(6) Section 508(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(7) Section 509(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(8) Section 510(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(b) Title V of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 516. (a) (1) For each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975), there shall (subject to paragraph (2)) be allotted to each State (from funds appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to subsection (b)) an amount, which shall be in addition to and available for the same purposes as the allotments of such State (as determined under sections 503 and 504), equal to the excess (if any) of—

"(A) the amount of the allotment of such State (as determined under sections 503 and 504) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, plus the amounts of any grants to such States under sections 508, 509, and 510, over

"(B) the amount of the allotment of such State (as determined under sections 503 and 504) for such fiscal year which commences after June 30, 1973.

"(2) No State shall receive an allotment under this section for any fiscal year, unless such State (in the administration of its State plan, approved under section 505) has in effect arrangements which the Secretary finds will provide for the continuation of appropriate services to population groups previously receiving services from funds made available (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974) to such State pursuant to section 508, 509, and 510.

"(b) (1) (A) There are (subject to subparagraph (B)) hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975) such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to make the allotments authorized under subsection (a).

"(B) Nothing contained in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to authorize, for any fiscal year, the appropriation under this subsection of any amount which is in excess of the amount by which—

"(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 501 for such year exceeds

"(ii) the total amounts appropriated pursuant to section 501 for such year.

"(2) If, for any fiscal years, the total amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) is less than the total amount allotted to all States under subsection (a), then the amount of the allotment of each State (as determined under subsection (a)) shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for such fiscal year as the amount of the allotment of such State (as determined under subsection (a)) bears to the total amount allotted to all States under subsection (a) for such fiscal year."

(c) (1) In the case of any State, if for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the sum of—

(A) the amount of the allotment which such State would have received under section 503 of the Social Security Act for such year (if subsection (a) of this section had not been enacted), plus

(B) the amount of the allotment which such State would have received under section 504 of such Act for such year (if subsection (a) of this section had not been enacted), is in excess of the sum of—

(C) the aggregate of the allotments which such State received (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973) under such sections 503 and 504, plus

(D) the aggregate of the grants received (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973) under sections 508, 509, and 510 of such Act, then, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, there shall be added to the allotments of such State, under sections 503 and 504 of

such Act, in such proportion to each such allotment as the State shall specify, an amount equal to such excess.

(2) (A) There are (subject to subparagraph (B)) hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, such amounts as may be necessary to make the increase in allotments provided for in paragraph (1).

(B) Nothing contained in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to authorize, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the appropriation under this paragraph of any amount which is in excess of the amount by which—

(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 501 of such year, exceeds

(ii) the total amounts appropriated pursuant to section 501 for such year.

(3) If, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the amount appropriated pursuant to the preceding provisions of this subsection is less than the total of the amounts authorized to be added to the allotments of States (as determined under paragraph (1)), then the amount to be added to the allotment of each State shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated for such year as the amount to be added to the allotment of such State (as determined under paragraph (1)) bears to the total of the amounts to be added to the allotments of all States (as determined under paragraph (1)).

PART G—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CHILD'S SOCIAL SECURITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

BENEFITS FOR ADOPTED CHILDREN

SEC. 260. (a) Section 202(d)(8)(D) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out clause (ii) thereof.

(d) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted on the basis of application for such benefits filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted.

PART H—SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

COVERAGE OF ESSENTIAL OUT-OF-HOSPITAL PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

SEC. 270. It is the sense of Congress that—

(a) the President prepare and submit, not later than September 1, 1973, a proposal to provide for the coverage, under the supplementary medical insurance program established by part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, of essential out-of-hospital prescription drugs, and such other proposals as he deems appropriate for the extension of the benefits provided under parts A and B of such title,

(b) the recommendations of the President to increase out-of-pocket payments for the aged and disabled under the health programs established by such title XVIII should be withdrawn.

TITLE III—IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL PROCEDURES

SEC. 301. The Congress finds that—

(1) the Congress has the sole authority to enact legislation and appropriate moneys on behalf of the United States;

(2) the Congress has the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution its own powers;

(3) the Executive shall take care that the laws enacted by Congress shall be faithfully executed;

(4) under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress has the authority to require that funds appropriated and obligated by law shall be spent in accordance with such law;

(5) there is no authority expressed or implied under the Constitution of the United States for the Executive to impound budget authority and the only authority for such impoundments by the executive branch is that which Congress has expressly delegated by statute;

(6) by the Antideficiency Act (Rev. Stat. sec. 3679), the Congress delegated to the President authority, in a narrowly defined area, to establish reserves for contingencies or to effect savings through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which appropriations are made available;

(7) in spite of the lack of constitutional authority for impoundment of budget authority by the executive branch and the narrow area in which reserves by the executive branch have been expressly authorized in the Antideficiency Act, the executive branch has impounded many billions of dollars of budget authority in a manner contrary to and not authorized by the Antideficiency Act or any other Act of Congress;

(8) impoundments by the executive branch have often been made without a legal basis;

(9) such impoundments have totally nullified the effect of appropriations and obligatory authority enacted by the Congress and prevented the Congress from exercising its constitutional authority;

(10) the executive branch, through its presentation to the Congress of a proposed budget, the due respect of the Congress for the views of the executive branch, and the power of the veto, has ample authority to affect the appropriation and obligation process without the unilateral authority to impound budget authority; and

(11) enactment of this legislation is necessary to clarify the limits of the existing legal authority of the executive branch to impound budget authority, to reestablish a proper allocation of authority between the Congress and the executive branch, to confirm the constitutional proscription against the unilateral nullification by the executive branch of duly enacted authorization and appropriation Acts, and to establish efficient and orderly procedures for the reordering of budget authority through joint action by the Executive and the Congress, which shall apply to all impoundments of budget authority, regardless of the legal authority asserted for making such impoundments.

Sec. 302. (a) Whenever the President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any officer or employee of the United States, impounds any budget authority made available, or orders, permits, or approves the impounding of any such budget authority by any other officer or employee of the United States, the President shall, within ten days thereafter, transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a special message specifying—

(1) the amount of the budget authority impounded;

(2) the date on which the budget authority was ordered to be impounded;

(3) the date the budget authority was impounded;

(4) any account, department or establishment of the Government to which such impounded budget authority would have been available for obligation except for such impoundment;

(5) the period of time during which the budget authority is to be impounded, to include not only the legal lapsing of budget authority but also administrative decisions to discontinue or curtail a program;

(6) the reasons for the impoundment, including any legal authority invoked by him to justify the impoundment and, when the justification invoked is a requirement to avoid violating any public law which establishes a debt ceiling or a spending ceiling,

the amount by which the ceiling would be exceeded and the reasons for such anticipated excess; and

(7) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect of the impoundment.

(b) Each special message submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each such message may be printed by either House as a document for both Houses, as the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House may determine.

(c) A copy of each special message submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the Comptroller General of the United States on the same day as it is transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Comptroller General shall review each such message and determine whether, in his judgment, the impoundment was in accordance with existing statutory authority, following which he shall notify both Houses of Congress within fifteen days after the receipt of the message as to his determination thereon. If the Comptroller General determines that the impoundment was in accordance with section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665), commonly referred to as the "Antideficiency Act", the provisions of section 303 and section 305 shall not apply. In all other cases, the Comptroller General shall advise the Congress whether the impoundment was in accordance with other existing statutory authority and sections 303 and 305 shall apply.

(d) If any information contained in a special message submitted pursuant to subsection (a) is subsequently revised, the President shall transmit within ten days to the Congress and the Comptroller General a supplementary message stating and explaining each such revision.

(e) Any special or supplementary message transmitted pursuant to this section shall be printed in the first issue of the Federal Register published after that special or supplementary message is so transmitted and may be printed by either House as a document for both Houses, as the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House may determine.

(f) The President shall publish in the Federal Register each month a list of any budget authority impounded as of the first calendar day of that month. Each list shall be published no later than the tenth calendar day of the month and shall contain the information required to be submitted by special message pursuant to subsection (a).

Sec. 303. The President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any officer or employee of the United States shall cease the impounding of any budget authority set forth in each special message within sixty calendar days of continuous session after the message is received by the Congress unless the specific impoundment shall have been ratified by the Congress by passage of a concurrent resolution in accordance with the procedure set out in section 305: Provided, however, That Congress may by concurrent resolution disapprove any impoundment in whole or in part, at any time prior to the expiration of the sixty-day period, and in the event of such disapproval, the impoundment shall cease immediately to the extent disapproved. The effect of such disapproval, whether by concurrent resolution passed prior to the expiration of the sixty-day period or by the failure to approve by concurrent resolution within the sixty-day period, shall be to make the obligation of the budget authority mandatory, and shall preclude the President or any other Federal officer or employee from reimposing the specific budget authority

set forth in the special message which the Congress by its action or failure to act has thereby rejected.

Sec. 304. For purposes of this title, the impounding of budget authority includes—

(1) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to expend any part of budget authority made available (whether by establishing reserves or otherwise) and the termination or cancellation of authorized projects or activities to the extent that budget authority has been made available.

(2) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to make any allocation of any part of budget authority (where such allocation is required in order to permit the budget authority to be expended or obligated),

(3) withholding, delaying, deferring, freezing, or otherwise refusing to permit a grantee to obligate any part of budget authority (whether by establishing contract controls, reserves, or otherwise), and

(4) any type of Executive action or inaction which effectively precludes or delays the obligation or expenditure of any part of authorized budget authority.

Sec. 305. The following subsections of this section are enacted by the Congress:

(a) (1) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by this section; and they shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(b) (1) For purposes of this section, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, which is introduced and acted upon by both Houses at any time before the end of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the special message of the President is transmitted to the two Houses.

(2) The matter after the resolving clause of a resolution approving the impounding of budget authority shall be substantially as follows (the blank spaces being appropriately filled): "That the Congress approves the impounding of budget authority as set forth in the special message of the President dated _____, Senate (House) Document No. _____."

(3) The matter after the resolving clause of a resolution disapproving, in whole or in part, the impounding of budget authority shall be substantially as follows (the blank spaces being appropriately filled): "That the Congress disapproves the impounding of budget authority as set forth in the special message of the President dated _____, Senate (House) Document No. _____ (in the amount of \$_____)."

(4) For purposes of this subsection, the continuity of a session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the sixty-day period.

(c) (1) A resolution introduced, or received from the other House, with respect to a special message shall not be referred to a committee and shall be privileged business for immediate consideration, following the receipt of the report of the Comptroller General referred to in section 302(c). It shall at any time be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the

consideration of the resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) If the motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution is agreed to, debate on the resolution shall be limited to ten hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. Debate on any amendment to the resolution (including an amendment substituting approval for disapproval in whole or in part or substituting disapproval in whole or in part for approval) shall be limited to two hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the amendment.

(3) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the consideration of a resolution, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

(d) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a special message, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same message, then—

(1) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such message has been introduced, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any other resolution with respect to the same message may be made (despite the provisions of subsection (c) (1) of this section).

(2) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such message has been introduced—

(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such message shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such message had been received; but

(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such message the resolution from the other House with respect to such message shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

(e) If a committee of conference is appointed on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to a resolution, the conference report submitted in each House shall be considered under the rules set forth in subsection (c) of this section for the consideration of a resolution, except that no amendment shall be in order.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, it shall not be in order in either House to consider a resolution with respect to a special message after the two Houses have agreed to another resolution with respect to the same message.

(g) As used in this section, the term "special message" means a report of impounding action made by the President pursuant to section 302 or by the Comptroller General pursuant to section 306.

Sec. 306. If the President, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any officer or employee of the United States takes or approves any impounding action within the purview of this title, and the President fails to report such impounding action to the Congress as required by this title, the Comptroller General shall report such impounding action with any available information concerning it to both Houses of Congress, and the provisions of this title shall apply to such impounding action in like manner and with the same effect as if the report of the Comptroller General had been made by the President: *Provided, however,* That the sixty-day period

provided in section 303 shall be deemed to have commenced at the time at which, in the determination of the Comptroller General, the impoundment action was taken.

Sec. 307. Nothing contained in this title shall be interpreted by any person or court as constituting a ratification or approval of any impounding of budget authority by the President or any other Federal employee, in the past or in the future, unless done pursuant to statutory authority in effect at the time of such impoundment.

Sec. 308. The Comptroller General is hereby expressly empowered as the representative of the Congress through attorneys of his own selection to sue any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States in a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to enforce the provisions of this title, and such court is hereby expressly empowered to enter in such civil action any decree, judgment, or order which may be necessary or appropriate to secure compliance with the provisions of this title by such department, agency, officer, or employee. Within the purview of this section, the Office of Management and Budget shall be construed to be an agency of the United States, and the officers and employees of the Office of Management and Budget shall be construed to be officers or employees of the United States.

Sec. 309. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all funds appropriated by law shall be made available and obligated by the appropriate agencies, departments, and other units of the Government except as may be provided otherwise under this title.

(b) Should the President desire to impound any appropriation made by the Congress not authorized by this title or by the Antideficiency Act, he shall seek legislation utilizing the supplemental appropriations process to obtain selective rescission of such appropriation by the Congress.

Sec. 310. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person, impoundment, or circumstance, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and the application of such provision to other persons, impoundments, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 311. The provisions of this title shall take effect from and after the date of enactment.

TITLE IV—CEILING ON FISCAL YEAR 1974 EXPENDITURES

Sec. 401. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, expenditures and net lending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, under the budget of the United States Government, shall not exceed \$268,700,000,000.

(b) If the estimates of revenues which will be received in the Treasury during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, as made from time to time, are increased as a result of legislation enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act reforming the Federal tax laws, the limitation specified in subsection (a) of this section shall be reviewed by Congress for the purpose of determining whether the additional revenues made available should be applied to essential public services for which adequate funding would not otherwise be provided.

Sec. 402. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President shall, in accordance with this section, reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations, or other obligational authority otherwise made available, such amounts as may be necessary to keep expenditures and net lending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, within the limitation specified in section 401.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the President shall reserve amounts proportionately from new obligational authority and other obliga-

tional authority available for each functional category, and to the extent practicable, subfunctional category (as set out in table 3 of the United States Budget in Brief for fiscal year 1974), except that no reservations shall be made from amounts available for interest, veterans' benefits and services, payments from social insurance trust funds, public assistance maintenance grants, and supplemental security income payments under the Social Security Act, food stamps, military retirement pay, Medicaid, and judicial salaries.

(c) Reservations made to carry out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the provisions of title III of this Act, except that—

(1) if the Comptroller General determines under section 302(c), with respect to any such reservation, that the requirements of proportionate reservations of subsection (b) of this section have been complied with, then sections 303 and 305 shall not apply to such reservation, and

(2) the provisions of section 303 which preclude reimpoundment shall not apply with respect to any such reservation.

(d) In no event shall the authority conferred by this section be used to impound funds, appropriated or otherwise made available by Congress, for the purpose of eliminating a program the creation or continuation of which has been authorized by Congress.

Sec. 403. In the administration of any program as to which—

(1) the amount of expenditures is limited pursuant to this title, and

(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount available for expenditure (after the application of this title) shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula.

TITLE V—LIMITATION OF USE ON APPROPRIATED FUNDS

PROHIBITION AGAINST THE USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR COMBAT ACTIVITIES IN CAMBODIA AND LAOS

Sec. 501. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated under any Act of Congress may be obligated or expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over, or from off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces.

TITLE VI—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT

Sec. 601. Section 203(e) (2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of the enactment of this sentence (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), the State may by law provide that the determination of whether there has been a State 'on' or 'off' indicator beginning or ending any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if paragraph (1) did not contain subparagraph (A) thereof and as if paragraph (1) of section 203(b) did not contain subparagraph (B) thereof."

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 701. (a) Section 6096(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to manner and time of designation) is amended—

(1) by striking out "in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations", and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such designation shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or

his delegate prescribes by regulations except that, if such designation is made at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year, such designation shall be made on the first page of the return."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the publishing and broadcasting of information concerning the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act during each year, with particular emphasis upon the taxpayer's right to designate a portion of his tax payment for payment into the Presidential Election Campaign Fund for the use of the candidates of a political party without any increase in his tax liability. The Secretary shall report to the Congress not later than the first day of September of each year a detailed account of the means by which he intends to carry out his duty under this section, which shall include, but not be limited to, a description of facsimile copy of all public notices, the availability of such notices to broadcasting stations, and any other arrangements he may have made to publicize the fund and the taxpayers' right of designation under section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Sec. 703. (a) Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to designation of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Fund) is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Every individual (other than a nonresident alien) whose income tax liability for any taxable year is \$1 or more may designate that \$1 shall be paid over to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 9006(a)."

(b) Section 9006 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to payments to eligible candidates) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9006. PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES.

"(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF CAMPAIGN FUND.**—There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury of the United States a special fund to be known as the 'Presidential Election Campaign Fund.' The Secretary shall, from time to time, transfer to the fund an amount equal to the sum of the amounts designated (subsequent to the previous Presidential election) to the fund by individuals under section 6096.

"(b) **TRANSFER TO THE GENERAL FUND.**—If, after a Presidential election and after all eligible candidates have been paid the amount which they are entitled to receive under this chapter, there are moneys remaining in the fund, the Secretary shall transfer the moneys so remaining to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) **PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.**—Upon receipt of a certification from the Comptroller General under section 9005 for payment to the eligible candidates of a political party, the Secretary shall pay to such candidates out of the fund the amount certified by the Comptroller General. Amounts paid to any such candidates shall be under the control of such candidates.

"(d) **INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FUND.**—
"(1) If at the time of a certification by the Comptroller General under section 9005 for payment to eligible candidates of a political party, the moneys in the fund are insufficient to pay to all eligible candidates the amounts to which they are then entitled (as determined by the Secretary after consultation with the Comptroller General), payments to each eligible candidate shall be reduced pro rata, and the amounts not paid at such time shall be paid when there are sufficient moneys in the fund.

"(2) If, at the close of the expenditure report period, the moneys in the fund are not

sufficient to satisfy the unpaid entitlements of all eligible candidates, the balance in the fund shall be paid to eligible candidates in the following manner:

"(A) For the candidates of a major party, compute the percentage which the number of popular votes received by the candidates for President of the major parties is of the total number of popular votes cast for the office of President in the election, and divide such percentage by the number of major parties.

"(B) For the candidates of a minor or new party, compute the percentage which the popular votes received for President by the candidate of such party is of the total number of popular votes cast for the office of President in the election.

"(C) Pay to the eligible candidates of each party the same percentage of the amount of the money in the fund as the percentage obtained under subparagraph (A) or (B) for candidates of such party."

Sec. 704. Section 1130(a)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "of the amounts paid (under all of such sections)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of the amounts paid under such section 403(a)(3)"; and

(2) by striking out "under State plans approved under titles I, X, XIV, XVI, or part A of title IV" and inserting in lieu thereof "under the State plan approved under part A of title IV".

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, because this is a rather long amendment, as properly described by some as being a conglomerate, especially in view of the fact that it will be fully described, as will the amendment that we propose to offer in lieu of it, that we dispense with further reading of the Senate amendment, and that it be printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

PART A—INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Sec. 201. (a) (1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") shall, in accordance with the provisions of this section, increase the monthly benefits and lump-sum death payments payable under title II of the Social Security Act by the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index prepared by the Department of Labor for the month of June 1973 exceeds such index for the month of June 1972.

(2) The provisions of this section (and the increase in benefits made hereunder) shall be effective, in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, only for months after March 1974 and prior to January 1975, and, in the case of lump-sum death payments under such title, only with respect to deaths which occur after March 1974 and prior to January 1975.

(b) The increase in social security benefits authorized under this section shall be provided, and any determinations by the Secre-

tary in connection with the provision of such increase in benefits shall be made, in the manner prescribed in section 215(1) of the Social Security Act for the implementation of cost-of-living increases authorized under title II of such Act, except that the amount of such increase shall be based on the increase in the Consumer Price Index described in subsection (a).

(c) The increase in social security benefits provided by this section shall—

(1) not be considered to be an increase in benefits made under or pursuant to section 215(1) of the Social Security Act, and

(2) not (except for purposes of section 203(a)(2) of such Act, as in effect after March 1974) be considered to be a "general benefit increase under this title" (as such term is defined in section 215(1)(3) of such Act);

and nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing any increase in the "contribution and benefit base" (as that term is employed in section 230 of such Act), or any increase in the "exempt amount" (as such term is used in section 203(f)(8) of such Act).

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize (directly or indirectly) any increase in monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for any month after December 1974, or any increase in lump-sum death payments payable under such title in the case of deaths occurring after December 1974. The recognition of the existence of the increase in benefits authorized by the preceding subsections of this section (during the period it was in effect) in the application, after December 1974, of the provisions of sections 202(g) and 203(a) of such Act shall not, for purposes of the preceding sentence, be considered to be an increase in a monthly benefit for a month after December 1974.

Sec. 202. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (4)(B) of section 203(f) of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "\$175" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200".

(b) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 203(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$175" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200".

(c) Paragraph (1)(A) of section 203(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$175" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$200".

(d) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1973.

Sec. 203. (a) (1) Section 209(a)(8) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(2) Section 211(b)(1)(H) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(3) Sections 213(a)(2)(ii) and 213(a)(2)(iii) of such Act are each amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(4) Section 215(e)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(b) (1) Section 1402(h)(1)(H) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of self-employment income) is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(2) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, section 3121(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking out the dollar amount each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(3) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, the second sentence of section 3122 of such Code is amended by striking out the dollar amount and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(4) Effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1973, section 3125 of such Code is amended by striking out the dollar amount

each place it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(5) Section 6413(c)(1) of such Code (relating to special refunds of employment taxes) is amended by striking out "\$12,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(6) Section 6413(c)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to refunds of employment taxes in the case of Federal employees) is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(7) Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after 1973, section 6654(d)(2)(B) (ii) of such Code (relating to failure by individual to pay estimated income tax) is amended by striking out the dollar amount and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(c) Section 230(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(d) Paragraphs (2)(C), (3)(C), (4)(C), and (7)(C) of section 203 (b) of Public Law 92-336 are each amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600".

(e) The amendments made by this section, except subsection (a)(4), shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after, and taxable years beginning after, 1973. The amendments made by subsection (a)(4) shall apply with respect to calendar years after 1973.

(f) Effective April 1, 1974, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register such modifications and extensions in the table contained in section 215(a) of the Social Security Act (which shall be determined in the same manner as the revisions in such table provided for under section 215(i)(2)(D) of such Act) as may be necessary to reflect the amendments made by this section; and such modified and extended table shall be deemed to be the table appearing in such section 215(a).

PART B—PROVISIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL PROGRAM OF SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

INCREASE IN SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFITS

SEC. 210. (a) Section 1611(a)(1)(A) and section 1611(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972) are each amended by striking out "\$1,560" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,680".

(b) Section 1611(a)(2)(A) and section 1611(b)(2) of such Act (as so enacted) are each amended by striking out "\$2,340" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,520".

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFITS FOR ESSENTIAL PERSONS

SEC. 211. (a)(1) In determining (for purposes of title XVI of the Social Security Act, as in effect after December 1973) the eligibility for and the amount of the supplemental security income benefit payable to any qualified individual (as defined in subsection (b)), with respect to any period for which such individual has in his home an essential person (as defined in subsection (c))—

(A) the dollar amounts specified in subsection (a)(1)(A) and (2)(A), and subsection (b)(1) and (2), of section 1611 of such Act, shall each be increased by \$840 for each such essential person, and

(B) the income and resources of such individual shall (for purposes of such title XVI) be deemed to include the income and resources of such essential person; except that the provisions of this subsection shall not, in the case of any individual, be applicable for any period which begins in or after the first month that such individual—

(C) does not but would (except for the provisions of subparagraph (B)) meet—

(i) the criteria established with respect to income in section 1611(a) of such Act, or

(ii) the criteria established with respect to resources by such section 1611(a) (or, if applicable, by section 1611(g) of such Act).

(2) The provisions of section 1611(g) of the Social Security Act (as in effect after December 1973) shall, in the case of any qualified individual (as defined in subsection (b)), be applied so as to include, in the resources of such individual, the resources of any person (described in subsection (b)(2)) whose needs were taken into account in determining the need of such individual for the aid or assistance referred to in subsection (b)(1).

(b) For purposes of this section, an individual shall be a "qualified individual" only if—

(1) for the month of December 1973 such individual was a recipient of aid or assistance under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, and

(2) in determining the need of such individual for such aid or assistance for such month under such State plan, there were taken into account the needs of a person (other than such individual) who—

(A) was living in the home of such individual, and

(B) was not eligible (in his or her own right) for aid or assistance under such State plan for such month.

(c) The term "essential person", when used in connection with any qualified individual, means a person who—

(1) for the month of December 1973 was a person (described in subsection (b)(2)) whose needs were taken into account in determining the need of such individual for aid or assistance under a State plan referred to in subsection (b)(1) as such State plan was in effect for June 1973,

(2) lives in the home of such individual,

(3) is not eligible (in his or her own right) for supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act (as in effect after December 1973), and

(4) is not the eligible spouse (as that term is used in such title XVI) of such individual or any other individual.

If for any month after December 1973 any person fails to meet the criteria specified in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of the preceding sentence, such person shall not, for such month or any month thereafter be considered to be an essential person.

MANDATORY MINIMUM STATE SUPPLEMENTATION OF SSI BENEFITS PROGRAM

SEC. 212. (a)(1) In order for any State (other than the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands) to be eligible for payments pursuant to title XIX, with respect to expenditures for any quarter beginning after December 1973, and prior to January 1, 1975, such State must have in effect an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") whereby the State will provide to individuals residing in the State supplementary payments as required under paragraph (2).

(2) Any agreement entered into by a State pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide that each individual who—

(A) is an aged, blind, or disabled individual (within the meaning of section 1614(a) of the Social Security Act, as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972), and

(B) for the month of December 1973 was a recipient of (and was eligible to receive) aid or assistance (in the form of money payments) under a State plan of such State (approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, of the Social Security Act)

shall be entitled to receive, from the State, the supplementary payment described in paragraph (3) for each month, beginning with January 1974 and ending with the close of December 1974 (or, if later, the close of the month the State, at its option, may specify in the agreement or in a subsequent modification of the agreement), or, if earlier, whichever of the following first occurs:

(C) the month in which such individual dies, or

(D) the first month in which such individual ceases to meet the condition specified in subparagraph (A);

except that no individual shall be entitled to receive such supplementary payment for any month, if, for such month, such individual was ineligible to receive supplemental income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act by reason of the provisions of section 1611(e)(2) or (3) or section 1611(f) of such Act.

(3)(A) The supplementary payment referred to in paragraph (2) which shall be paid for any month to any individual who is entitled thereto under an agreement entered into pursuant to this subsection shall (except as provided in subparagraph (D)) be an amount equal to (i) the amount by which such individual's "December 1973 income" (as determined under subparagraph (B)) exceeds the amount of such individual's "title XVI benefit plus other income" (as determined under subparagraph (C)) for such month, or (ii) if greater, such amount as the State may specify.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), an individual's "December 1973 income" means an amount equal to the aggregate of—

(i) the amount of the aid or assistance (in the form of money payments) which such individual would have received (including any part of such amount which is attributable to meeting the needs of any other person whose presence in such individual's home is essential to such individual's well-being) for the month of December 1973 under a plan (approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, of the Social Security Act) of the State entering into an agreement under this subsection, if the terms and conditions of such plan (relating to eligibility for and amount of such aid or assistance payable thereunder) were, for the month of December 1973, the same as those in effect, under such plan, for the month of June 1973, and

(ii) the amount of the income of such individual (other than the aid or assistance described in clause (i)) received by such individual in December 1973, minus any such income which did not result, but which if properly reported would have resulted in a reduction in the amount of such aid or assistance.

(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the amount of an individual's "title XVI benefit plus other income" for any month means an amount equal to the aggregate of—

(i) the amount (if any) of the supplemental security income benefit to which such individual is entitled for such month under title XVI of the Social Security Act, and

(ii) the amount of any income of such individual for such month (other than income in the form of a benefit described in clause (i)).

(D) If the amount determined under subparagraph (B)(i) includes, in the case of any individual, an amount which was payable to such individual solely because of—

(i) a special need of such individual (including any special allowance for housing, or the rental value of housing furnished in kind to such individual in lieu of a rental allowance) which existed in December 1973, or

(ii) any special circumstance (such as the recognition of the needs of a person whose presence in such individual's home, in December 1973, was essential to such individual's well-being),

and, if for any month after December 1973 there is a change with respect to such special need or circumstance which, if such change had existed in December 1973, the amount described in subparagraph (B) (1) with respect to such individual would have been reduced on account of such change, then, for such month and for each month thereafter the amount of the supplementary payment payable under the agreement entered into under this subsection to such individual shall (unless the State, at its option, otherwise specifies) be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the amount (described in subparagraph (B) (1)) would have been so reduced.

(b) (1) Any State having an agreement with the Secretary under subsection (a) may enter into an administration agreement with the Secretary whereby the Secretary will, on behalf of such State, make the supplementary payments required under the agreement entered into under subsection (a).

(2) Any such administration agreement between the Secretary and a State entered into under this subsection shall provide that the State will (A) certify to the Secretary the names of each individual who, for December 1973, was a recipient of aid or assistance (in the form of money payments) under a plan of such State approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, together with the amount of such assistance payable to each such individual and the amount of such individual's December 1973 income (as defined in subsection (a) (3) (B)), and (B) provide the Secretary with such additional data at such times as the Secretary may reasonably require in order properly, economically, and efficiently to carry out such administration agreement.

(3) Any State which has entered into an administration agreement under this subsection shall, at such times and in such installments as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the State, pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the expenditures made by the Secretary as supplementary payments to individuals entitled thereto under the agreement entered into with such State under subsection (a).

(c) (1) Supplementary payments made pursuant to an agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall be excluded under section 1612(b) (6) of the Social Security Act (as in effect after December 1973) in determining income of individuals for purposes of title XVI of such Act (as so in effect).

(2) Supplementary payments made by the Secretary (pursuant to an administration agreement entered into under subsection (b)) shall, for purposes of section 401 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972, be considered to be payments made under an agreement entered into under section 1616 of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972); except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to waive, with respect to the payments so made by the Secretary, the provisions of subsection (b) of such section 401.

(d) For purposes of subsection (a) (1), a State shall be deemed to have entered into an agreement under subsection (a) of this section of such State has entered into an agreement with the Secretary under section 1616 of the Social Security Act under which—

(1) individuals, other than individuals described in subsection (a) (2) (A) and (B), are entitled to receive supplementary payments, and

(2) supplementary benefits are payable, to individuals described in subsection (a) (2) (A) and (B) at a level and under terms and conditions which meet the minimum requirements specified in subsection (a).

(e) Except as the Secretary may by regulations otherwise provide, the provisions of title XVI of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security

Amendments of 1972), including the provisions of part B of such title, relating to the terms and conditions under which the benefits authorized by such title are payable shall, where not inconsistent with the purposes of this section, be applicable to the payments made under an agreement under subsection (b) of this section; and the authority conferred upon the Secretary by such title may, where appropriate, be exercised by him in the administration of this section.

(f) The provisions of subsection (a) (1) shall not be applicable in the case of any State—

(1) the Constitution of which contains provisions which make it impossible for such State to enter into and commence carrying out (on January 1, 1974) an agreement referred to in subsection (a), and

(2) the Attorney General (or the other appropriate State official) of which has, prior to July 1, 1973, made a finding that the State Constitution of such State contains limitations which prevent such State from making supplemental payments of the type described in section 1616 of the Social Security Act.

PREFERENCE FOR PRESENT STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 213. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the recruitment and selection for employment of personnel whose services will be utilized in the administration of the Federal program of supplemental security income for the aged, blind, and disabled (established by title XVI of the Social Security Act), shall give a preference, as among applicants whose qualifications are reasonably equal (subject to any preferences conferred by law or regulation on individuals who have been Federal employees and have been displaced from such employment), to applicants for employment who are or were employed in the administration of any State program approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act and are or were involuntarily displaced from their employment as a result of the displacement of such State program by such Federal program.

DETERMINATION OF BLINDNESS UNDER SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY PROGRAM

SEC. 214. Section 1633 of the Social Security Act (as enacted by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 1633,"

(2) by striking out "The Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary", and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In determining, for purposes of this title, whether an individual is blind, there shall be an examination of such individual by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist, whichever the individual may select."

PART C—SOCIAL SERVICES

SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS POSTPONED

SEC. 220. (a) Subject to subsection (b), no regulation and no modification of any regulation, promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") after January 1, 1973, shall be effective for any period which begins prior to January 1, 1974, if (and insofar as) such regulation or modification of a regulation pertains (directly or indirectly) to the provisions of law contained in section 3(a) (4) (A), 402(a) (19) (G), 403(a) (3) (A), 603(a) (1) (A), 1003(a) (3) (A), 1403(a) (3) (A), or 1603(a) (4) (A), of the Social Security Act.

(b) (1) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any regulation relating to "scope of programs", if such regulation is identical (except as provided in the succeeding sentence) to the provisions of section 221.0 of the regulations (relating to

social services) proposed by the Secretary and published in the Federal Register on May 1, 1973. There shall be deleted from the first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 221.0 the phrase "meets all the applicable requirements of this part and".

(2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any regulation relating to "limitations on total amount of Federal funds payable to States for services", if such regulation is identical (except as provided in the succeeding sentence) to the provisions of section 221.55 of the regulations so proposed and published on May 1, 1973. There shall be deleted from subsection (d) (1) of such section 221.55 the phrase "(as defined under day care services for children)"; and, in lieu of the sentence contained in subsection (d) (5) of such section 221.55, there shall be inserted the following: "Services provided to a child who is under foster care in a foster family home (as defined in section 408 of the Social Security Act) or in a child-care institution (as defined in such section), or while awaiting placement in such a home or institution, but only if such services are needed by such child because he is under foster care."

(3) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not be applicable to any regulation relating to "rates and amounts of Federal financial participation for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam", if such regulation is identical to the provisions of section 221.56 of the regulations so proposed and published on May 1, 1973.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 553(d) of title 5, United States Code, any regulation described in subsection (b) may become effective upon the date of its publication in the Federal Register.

SEC. 221. Section 1130(a) (2) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "of the amounts paid (under all of such sections)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of the amounts paid under such section 403(a) (3)"; and

(2) by striking out "under State plans approved under titles I, X, XIV, XVI, or part A of title IV" and inserting in lieu thereof "under the State plan approved under part A of title IV".

PART D—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MEDICAID

COVERAGE OF ESSENTIAL PERSONS UNDER MEDICAID

SEC. 230. In the case of any State plan (approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act) which for December 1973 provided medical assistance to persons described in section 1905(a) (vi) of such Act, there is hereby imposed the requirement (and such State plan shall be deemed to require) that medical assistance under such plan be provided to each such person (who for December 1973 was eligible for medical assistance under such plan) for each month (after December 1973) that—

(1) the individual (referred to in the last sentence of section 1905(a) of such Act) with whom such person is living continues to meet the criteria (as in effect for December 1973) for aid or assistance under a State plan (referred to in such sentence), and

(2) such person continues to have the relationship with such individual described in such sentence and meets the other criteria (referred to in such sentence) with respect to a State plan (so referred to) as such plan was in effect for December 1973.

Federal matching under title XIX of the Social Security Act shall be available for the medical assistance furnished to individuals eligible for such assistance under this section.

PERSONS IN MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 231. For purposes of section 1902(a) (10) of the Social Security Act, any individual who, for all (or any part of) the month of December 1973—

(1) was an inpatient in an institution

qualified for reimbursement under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and

(2) (A) would (except for his being an inpatient in such institution) have been eligible to receive aid or assistance under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act, or

(B) was, on the basis of his need for care in such institution, considered to be eligible for aid or assistance under a State plan (referred to in subparagraph (A)) for purposes of determining his eligibility for medical assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of such Act (whether or not such individual actually received aid or assistance under a State plan referred to in subparagraph (A)).

shall be deemed to be receiving such aid or assistance for such month and for each succeeding month in a continuous period of months if, for each month in such period—

(3) such individual continues to be (for all of such month) an inpatient in such an institution and would (except for his being an inpatient in such institution) continue to meet the conditions of eligibility to receive aid or assistance under such plan (as such plan was in effect for December 1973), and

(4) such individual is determined (under the utilization review and other professional audit procedures applicable to State plans approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act) to be in need of care in such an institution.

Federal matching under title XIX of the Social Security Act shall be available for the medical assistance furnished to individuals eligible for such assistance under this section.

BLIND AND DISABLED MEDICALLY INDIGENT PERSONS

SEC. 232. For purposes of section 1902(a) (10) of the Social Security Act, any individual who, for the month of December 1973 was eligible (under the provisions of subparagraph (B) of such section) for medical assistance by reason of his having been determined to meet the criteria for blindness or disability (established by a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act), shall be deemed to be a person described as being a person who "would, if needy, be eligible for aid or assistance under any such State plan" in subparagraph (B) (1) of such section for each month in a continuous period of month (beginning with the month of January 1974), if, for each month in such period, such individual continues to meet the criteria for blindness or disability so established by such a State plan (as it was in effect for December 1973). Federal matching under title XIX of the Social Security Act shall be available for the medical assistance furnished to individuals eligible for such assistance under this section.

EXTENSION OF SECTION 249E OF SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SEC. 233. Section 249E of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 is amended by striking out "October 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1975".

REPEAL OF SECTION 255 OF SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SEC. 234. (a) Section 1903 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out subsection (j) thereof (as added by section 225 of Public Law 92-603).

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable in the case of expenditures for skilled nursing services and for intermediate care facility services furnished in calendar quarters which begin after December 31, 1972.

PART E—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD CARE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD CARE

SEC. 240. (a) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 502 of the Social Security Act is amended

by striking out "each of the next 4 fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the next 5 fiscal years".

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

(3) Section 505(a)(8) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(4) Section 505(a)(9) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(5) Section 505(a)(10) of such Act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1974".

(6) Section 508(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(7) Section 509(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(8) Section 510(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

(b) Title V of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOTMENTS

"Sec. 516. (a) (1) For each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975), there shall (subject to paragraph (2)) be allotted to each State (from funds appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to subsection (b)) an amount, which shall be in addition to and available for the same purposes as the allotments of such State (as determined under sections 503 and 504), equal to the excess (if any) of—

"(A) the amount of the allotment of such State (as determined under sections 503 and 504) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, plus the amounts of any grants to such States under sections 508, 509, and 510, over

"(B) the amount of the allotment of such State (as determined under sections 503 and 504) for such fiscal year which commences after June 30, 1973.

"(2) No State shall receive an allotment under this section for any fiscal year, unless such State (in the administration of its State plan, approved under section 505) has in effect arrangements which the Secretary finds will provide for the continuation of appropriate services to population groups previously receiving services from funds made available (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974) to such State pursuant to sections 508, 509, and 510.

"(b) (1) (A) There are (subject to subparagraph (B)) hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975) such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to make the allotments authorized under subsection (a).

"(B) Nothing contained in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to authorize, for any fiscal year, the appropriation under this subsection of any amount which is in excess of the amount by which—

"(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 501 for such year exceeds

"(ii) the total amounts appropriated pursuant to section 501 for such year.

"(2) If, for any fiscal years, the total amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) is less than the total amount allotted to all States under subsection (a), then the amount of the allotment of each State (as determined under subsection (a)) shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for such fiscal year as the amount of the allotment of such State (as determined under subsection (a)) bears to the total amount allotted to all States under subsection (a) for such fiscal year."

(c) (1) In the case of any State, if for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the sum of—

(A) the amount of the allotment which such State would have received under section 503 of the Social Security Act for such year (if subsection (a) of this section had not been enacted), plus

(B) the amount of the allotment which such Act for such year (if subsection (a) of this section had not been enacted), is in excess of the sum of—

(C) the aggregate of the allotments which such State received (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973) under such sections 503 and 504, plus

(D) the aggregate of the grants received (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973) under sections 508, 509, and 510 of such Act, then, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, there shall be added to the allotments of such State, under sections 503 and 504 of such Act, in such proportion to each such allotment as the State shall specify, an amount equal to such excess.

(2) (A) There are (subject to subparagraph (B)) hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, such amounts as may be necessary to make the increase in allotments provided for in paragraph (1).

(B) Nothing contained in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to authorize, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the appropriations under this paragraph of any amount which is in excess of the amount by which—

(i) the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 501 of such year, exceeds

(ii) the total amounts appropriated pursuant to section 501 for such year.

(3) If, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the amount appropriated pursuant to the preceding provisions of this subsection is less than the total of the amounts authorized to be added to the allotments of States (as determined under paragraph (1)), then the amount to be added to the allotment of each State shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated for such year as the amount to be added to the allotment of such State (as determined under paragraph (1)) bears to the total of the amounts to be added to the allotments of all States (as determined under paragraph (1)).

PART F—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CHILD'S SOCIAL SECURITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

BENEFITS FOR ADOPTED CHILDREN

SEC. 250. (a) Section 202(d)(8)(D)(ii) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "or (III) if he is an individual referred to in either subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B) and the child is the grandchild of such individual or his or her spouse, for the year immediately before the month in which such child files his or her application for child's insurance benefits, and".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after the month in which this Act is enacted.

TITLE III—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT

SEC. 301. Section 203(e)(2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Effective with respect to compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning before January 1, 1974 and beginning after the date of the enactment of this sentence (or, if later, the date established pursuant to State law), the State by law may provide that the determination of whether there has been a State 'off' indicator ending any extended benefit period

shall be made under this subsection as if paragraph (1) did not contain subparagraph (A) thereof and may provide that the determination of whether there has been a State 'on' indicator beginning any extended benefit period shall be made under this subsection as if (i) paragraph (1) did not contain subparagraph (A) thereof, (ii) the 4 per centum contained in subparagraph (B) thereof were 4.5 per centum, and (iii) paragraph (1) of subsection (b) did not contain subparagraph (B) thereof. In the case of any individual who has a week with respect to which extended compensation was payable pursuant to a State law referred to in the preceding sentence, if the extended benefit period under such law does not expire before January 1, 1974, the eligibility period of such individual for purposes of such law shall end with the thirteenth week which begins after December 31, 1973."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 401. (a) Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to designation by individuals of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Fund) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6096. DESIGNATION BY INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Every individual (other than a nonresident alien) whose income tax liability for the taxable year is \$1 or more may designate that \$1 shall be paid over to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 9006(a). In case of a joint return of husband and wife having an income tax liability of \$2 or more, each spouse may designate that \$1 shall be paid to the fund.

"(b) INCOME TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of subsection (a), the income tax liability of an individual for any taxable year is the amount of the tax imposed by chapter 1 on such individual for such taxable year (as shown on his return), reduced by the sum of credits (as shown in his return) allowable under sections 33, 37, 38, 40, and 41.

"(c) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—A designation under subsection (a) may be made with respect to any taxable year—

"(1) at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year, or

"(2) at any other time (after the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year) specified in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

Such designation shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate prescribes by regulations except that, if such designation is made at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year, such designation shall be made either on the first page of the return or on the page bearing the taxpayer's signature."

(b) Section 9006 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to payments to eligible candidates) is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 9006. PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CAMPAIGN FUND.—There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury of the United States a special fund to be known as the 'Presidential Election Campaign Fund'. The Secretary shall, as provided by appropriation Acts, transfer to the fund an amount not in excess of the sum of the amounts designated (subsequent to the previous Presidential election) to the fund by individuals under section 6096.

"(b) TRANSFER TO THE GENERAL FUND.—If, after a Presidential election and after all eligible candidates have been paid the amount which they are entitled to receive under this chapter, there are moneys remaining in the fund, the Secretary shall transfer the moneys so remaining to the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—Upon receipt of a certification from the Comptroller General under section 9005 for payment to the eligible candidates of a political party, the Secretary shall pay to such candidates out of the fund the amount certified by the Comptroller General. Amounts paid to any such candidates shall be under the control of such candidates.

"(d) INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS IN FUND.—If at the time of a certification by the Comptroller General under section 9005 for payment to the eligible candidates of a political party, the Secretary or his delegate determines that the moneys in the fund are not, or may not be, sufficient to satisfy the full entitlements of the eligible candidates of all political parties, he shall withhold from such payment such amount as he determines to be necessary to assure that the eligible candidates of each political party will receive their pro rata share of their full entitlement. Amounts withheld by reason of the preceding sentence shall be paid when the Secretary or his delegate determines that there are sufficient moneys in the fund to pay such amounts, or portions thereof, to all eligible candidates from whom amounts have been withheld, but, if there are not sufficient moneys in the fund to satisfy the full entitlement of the eligible candidates of all political parties, the amounts so withheld shall be paid in such manner that the eligible candidates of each political party receive their pro rata share of their full entitlement."

(c) Sections 9003(b)(2), 9007(b)(3), and 9012(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by striking out "9006(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "9006(d)".

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972. Any designation made under section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as in effect for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1973) for the account of the candidates of any specified political party shall, for purposes of section 9006(a) of such Code (as amended by subsection (b)), be treated solely as a designation to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this amendment will be fully described, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with further reading of the motion and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I appreciate the patience and perseverance of the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, the question that I asked earlier I should now like to put as a parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 4, to demand or to make a point of order that there is included within the conference report non-germane matter upon which a separate vote may be demanded?

The SPEAKER. The conference report was in disagreement. There is nothing in it but the statement of disagreement.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state

that it might save time if the gentleman would let the amendment be read.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. May I say to the Chair that it seems to me that this is a highly unusual procedure in which we find ourselves in the position of having "no conference report," and, therefore, the inability to in any way follow even those limited rules that have been adopted by the House.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has used in effect a mechanism to bring a conference report here which is a conference report. The conferees met. They discussed it, according to the way the report reads, "free and full," and having reached a disagreement—when in fact they have not reached a disagreement; they have reached an agreement. That agreement that the gentleman intends to offer in his motion to recede and concur.

That kind of process, if it were used by the Committee on Education and Labor, would not be allowed.

I withdraw my reservation, objecting strenuously to this kind of process.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as we have been discussing, the Senate added a number of non-germane provisions to the debt ceiling bill. These provisions relate to the Old-Age Survivors' Insurance program, certain other titles of the Social Security Act, including unemployment compensation; social services, as well as medicaid. It contains, in addition, a provision dealing with the cessation of bombing in Cambodia; a provision dealing with the presidential election campaign check-off system; and a spending limit; and an impoundment procedure. We discussed these provisions in conference, but under the rules we bring the conference report back in disagreement, totally and completely within the new rules adopted by the House.

We do it because we cannot include non-germane Senate amendments under the rules of the House in a conference report. So we have abided by the rules of the House.

The motion which I have offered is to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which includes the matters on which we felt that the two Houses would agree.

The amendment which I have offered will give the House an opportunity to vote on what the House conferees believe is a good solution to the problem presented to us by the Senate. Let me first enumerate the principal items contained in the amendment which I have offered. I will then discuss the items in somewhat more detail.

The amendment includes the estimated 5.6 percent across-the-board increase in social security payments effective beginning with the month of April 1974, instead of the month of January 1974, as provided by the Senate amendment. We also increased the retirement test from \$2,100 to \$2,400 per year. The provision also raises the tax and benefit computa-

tion base by \$600 beginning January 1974, which provides financing for the benefit increase and the increase in the retirement test.

Another principal provision of the amendment relates to the supplemental security income program which essentially increases the amounts for the aged, the blind, and the disabled persons from \$130 for an individual to \$140, and from \$195 for a couple to \$210 for a couple.

Another principal provision would postpone the effective date of the regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on social service programs funded under the Social Security Act from July 1, 1973, to January 1, 1974.

All we do here is to suspend the effectiveness of announced regulations.

Still another principal provision of the amendment would extend the authorization for project grants under the maternal and child health care program until June 30, 1974.

I am sure all Members have heard from all their welfare directors and Governors about all of these points.

With respect to two amendments to the Internal Revenue Code, the principal provision included in the amendment relates to the campaign checkoff. I will describe this a little bit later.

In the area of unemployment compensation, we have included a provision which would permit the States that have an insured unemployment rate of 4.5 percent to pay rates under the Extended Unemployment Compensation Act through December 31, 1973, without regard to the requirement of present law that their insured unemployment rate must be 20 percent higher than it was in the prior 2 years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the amendment which I have offered does not include within it any provision relating to impoundment, nor any relating to Cambodia, nor does it include any ceiling on fiscal year 1974 expenditures. The latter two provisions were in the Senate amendment but they are not in the amendment which I have offered.

I want to take time to discuss certain of these amendments in a little bit more detail.

PROVISIONS AMENDING THE OASDI PROGRAM

The Senate amendment contained three changes in the social security cash benefits program. The first of these modifications is to provide a social security benefit increase payable for January 1974 geared to the cost-of-living increase between June 1972 and June 1973, which is estimated to be 5.6 percent. The second social security modification would increase the social security retirement test, or earnings limitation, from \$2,100 to \$3,000 a year effective January 1, 1974. The third of these modifications would eliminate the provision of present law that requires a child who is adopted by a social security beneficiary to have been living with and dependent upon the beneficiary for 12 months before the beneficiary became disabled in the case of a disability beneficiary or before he became entitled to a social security benefit in the

case of a retired beneficiary. The Senate amendment contains no provision for increasing the financing of the social security program.

The conferees discussed these changes at great length and concluded that provisions along these lines with some modifications should be adopted and that provision should be made to provide financing to pay for their cost. These modifications are contained within the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

With respect to the social security benefit increase, the motion would provide for an increase in social security benefits in the same amount as provided for in the Senate amendment—that is, 5.6 percent—but it would be effective for the month of April 1974, rather than January 1974. This would increase benefits to the estimated 30 million beneficiaries then on the rolls by an estimated \$2.4 billion for calendar year 1974.

Under the automatic benefit increase provisions that were adopted last year, the first time that an automatic benefit increase can occur is in January 1975. This seemed reasonable at that time when phase II was holding down the rate of inflation fairly successfully. Since that time, however, we moved from phase II to phase III and as a result have witnessed the most rapid rate of price increase that we have seen for many years. Food prices in particular have skyrocketed.

I think it would be unconscionable to require those who are dependent on social security benefits to bear the brunt of inflation by not having their benefits increased for another year and a half.

This provision allows the social security beneficiaries to receive a portion of the first automatic benefit increase in their benefit checks for April of next year. Then when the automatic benefit provisions are applied to raise their benefits for January 1975, they will receive a complementary benefit increase which when added to this increase will result in raising their benefits by the same percentage as they would have been increased under the automatic benefit increase provisions.

The motion provides for raising the earnings limitation from the present \$2,100 a year to \$2,400 a year beginning January 1974. This increase in the retirement test would provide for additional benefits of \$200 million for calendar year 1974 for approximately 1½ million beneficiaries.

It was the opinion of the conferees that to make the benefit increase effective for January 1974, and to raise the retirement test to \$3,000 as provided in the Senate amendment would have required additional financing that is not available at this time without increasing the social security tax rates. The financing provisions which I will describe in just a minute provide additional financing for the system by adjustments to the taxable wage base only without making any change in the social security tax rates.

The third modification in the Senate amendment, relating to the eligibility of adopted children, would also have had

a significant cost. The modification contained in the motion is in the nature of a substitute amendment which the conferees believe will make it possible for benefits to be paid to children who are adopted after a beneficiary is entitled to benefits in the most compelling cases without permitting children to be adopted for the sole purpose of increasing social security payments as the Senate amendment would have done. The proposed change would make it possible for social security beneficiaries to adopt grandchildren without the requirement that the child must have lived with them and been supported by them for a year before they became entitled to benefits but would require that the children have lived with and been supported by them for a year before the child becomes entitled to a social security benefit.

The financing for these changes in the law would be provided for under the motion by increasing the social security wage base which is used for taxation and benefit computation purposes to \$12,600 beginning in 1974. Under present law, the wage base is scheduled to increase from \$10,800 in 1973 to \$12,000 in 1974 and to be automatically increased in the future as the average level of earnings covered under the social security system increases. Under the amendment provided for in the motion, \$12,600 would be the new base figure which would be used to compute automatic increases in the taxable wage base in the future.

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The Senate amendment would make a number of warranted changes in the new program of supplemental security income which will replace the State welfare programs for needy aged, blind and disabled persons in January 1974. As enacted last year, basic Federal benefits at that time were to be \$130 for an individual and \$195 for a couple. With the rapid inflation which has occurred since last fall, an increase in these amounts is clearly justified. They would be raised to \$140 for an individual and \$210 for a couple.

A number of features of the program have caused widespread concern. To meet these concerns several provisions were adopted and the first and perhaps most important of these is an assurance that anyone receiving welfare payments under the existing programs for the aged, blind, and disabled in December 1973, will not receive a reduction in total income when the program becomes Federal in January 1974. The amount of the supplemental security income payment, together with a State supplementation, if one is necessary to achieve this result, will at least equal the amount of assistance which they receive in December 1973. This provision would be a requirement only for 1 calendar year in order to prevent need requirements in the States for supplementation. It has been suggested that if the pattern is required for a year, there would be some assurance that it would be continued to the States after that time. The requirement would not apply where there was

a bona fide change in circumstances which reduced need and a specific exception is made for one State which cannot provide State supplementation under its constitution.

One of the major sources of concern in the supplemental security income program has been the lack of any provisions for the so-called essential persons. These are generally wives of eligible aged recipients who have not themselves reached age 65. In practically all States, some recognition is given to their needs. It accordingly is only fair that those individuals who are currently responsible for larger payments to the recipients be recognized and some provision made for them. The Federal payment in such a case would be increased to \$210 a month, the same amount as for an individual living with an eligible spouse. This provision would not apply to persons becoming eligible for the supplemental security income program after December 1973. These provisions will do much to make the transition from the 50 different Federal-State assistance programs to the new Federal program smoother than it might otherwise be.

A provision of the Senate amendment would provide that in hiring Federal employees for the supplemental security income program a preference in employment would be given to State and local employees with comparable qualifications to other candidates and who would be involuntarily displaced when the new supplemental security income program goes into effect. Unlike the other provisions relating to supplemental security income, a modification to the Senate amendment is proposed in this case.

Another provision of the Senate amendment would establish for the supplemental security income program a requirement that blind applicants might have their blindness determined by either a physician skilled in diseases of the eye or an optometrist, whichever the individual might select. A similar provision has been in title X of the Social Security Act as a requirement for State aid to the blind programs since 1950 and has proved entirely workable.

Two provisions of the Senate amendment would greatly relieve the current concern regarding limitations on social services. One of these would postpone the regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which are scheduled to become effective July 1, 1973, until January 1, 1974. This would not apply to those sections of the regulations which carry out explicit provisions of the last Congress putting fiscal limitations on social service limitations. They preserve this limitation.

A companion provision would repeal the so-called 90-10 rule with respect to services for aged, blind, and disabled persons. This provision of Public Law 92-512 provides that at least 90 percent of the services to aged, blind and disabled persons must be for actual applicants and recipients as compared to potential and former recipients.

While these steps do not solve the social service problems in its entirety, they will make it possible for States to continue existing activities and afford time

for a permanent solution to be developed.

MEDICAID CHANGES

The Senate amendment included several provisions which would protect people from loss of eligibility to the medical program when the new Supplemental Security Income program becomes effective in January 1974. The House conferees believe that these amendments are meritorious and are ones which would have been made in the last Congress had the consequences of the changeover to a federalized adult assistance program been fully realized. Specifically, the Senate amendment would provide that individuals who were eligible for Medicaid in December 1973, will not lose their eligibility for Medicaid when the new Supplemental Security Income program goes into effect. Three groups would be protected:

First, the disabled individual who does not meet the Federal definition of disability and who is eligible as a medically needy person,

Second, an individual who is an inpatient of a medical institution whose special needs as an inpatient make him eligible for assistance, and

Third, the eligible spouse of an eligible recipient of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled who is essential to the recipient's welfare.

In addition, the Senate amendment would extend from October 1974, through June 1975, the provision in present law which continues Medicaid eligibility for those who would have lost their eligibility by reason of the 20 percent social security benefit increase effective last September. The House conferees believe that this amendment is also meritorious.

The final Medicaid provision in the Senate amendment would delete a provision in present law which limits the average per diem costs for skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities to no more than 5 percent a year. The wage-price guidelines which apply to such institutions already perform the type of function intended by this provision and will no doubt continue to do so for some time. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that there will be no cost to this provision if the wage-price controls are kept in effect. For these reasons the conferees recommend adoption of this provision.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

The Senate amendment also contained a provision amending the Maternal and Child Health program under title V of the Social Security Act. The Senate bill would extend the direct project grants for 1 year—from June 30, 1973, to June 30, 1974—and would make the following additional changes:

For fiscal year 1974 only, each State would receive [under authorization authority] the greater of first, the total of fiscal year 1973 project and formula grants or second, the sums such State would have received had the project grants not been extended for fiscal year 1974.

For fiscal year 1975 and later years,

no State would be eligible for less funds than it received in fiscal year 1973 for both project grants and formula grants.

When the project grant authority lapses on June 30, 1974, the States would be required to make arrangements to provide for the continuation of appropriate services to groups previously receiving project grant funds.

The House conferees believe this would be a meritorious provision since it should assure the continuation of many existing worthwhile projects which are benefiting thousands of mothers and children in low-income ghetto and rural areas. The Senate amendment also provides assurance that States will not be disadvantaged by this change as compared with present law and that when the direct projects are phased out a year from now, the States will be ready to take over their support.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN CHECKOFF PROVISION

The Senate amendment contained a provision providing for a modification in the presidential election campaign checkoff provision. This is the provision which provides for \$1 per taxpayer being set aside for presidential campaign purposes. The amounts which were checked off for future presidential campaigns on the tax returns this year were relatively small. I understand that this year only 3.1 percent of the taxpayers used the provision. It is believed that the reason for this being so small was the fact that the Internal Revenue Service used a separate form to provide the checkoff.

To overcome this problem, the Senate amendment would have provided that the campaign checkoff designation is to be on the first page of the income tax return. It also would have required the Secretary of the Treasury to provide appropriate publicity with respect to the campaign checkoff each year, with emphasis on the taxpayers' rights to designate a portion of their tax payments for payment into the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. Finally, the Senate amendment would have converted the campaign fund checkoff to a nonpartisan checkoff.

At present, taxpayers can designate the party of their choice or can make a nonpartisan designation. The difficulty with the present procedure is that the partisan designation requires too much space to be placed on the front of the tax return form. In addition, it seems inappropriate for the person examining a tax return to know the taxpayer's political affiliation. Because of these problems, the Senate amendment modified existing law to provide for the nonpartisan designation.

The amendment which I bring to you retains the basic substance of the Senate provision. We found some modifications, however, to be desirable. We modified the Senate provision by providing that the checkoff provision can either be on the front of the return or on the side of the return where the taxpayer's signature is required. For the regular 1040 return, this is the front of the return, but for the short form, 1040A, the signature is on the second page of the return

and in this case it may be desirable to have the checkoff here. We gave the Treasury some flexibility but have still required it to have the checkoff where it will readily come to the taxpayer's attention.

We have also omitted from the Internal Revenue Code the requirement that the Treasury Department give publicity to the checkoff. We have assurances from the Secretary of the Treasury, however, that the checkoff will get a great deal of publicity year after year. In view of this, we could not see that adding the provision to the Internal Revenue Code achieved anything more.

Finally, we retain without change the Senate provision which required that the checkoff be in a nonpartisan form. This is essential if we are to have a simple checkoff on the return itself and also if we are not to disclose to the IRS the political affiliation of the taxpayer.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROVISION

The Senate amendment contains a provision to amend the Extended Unemployment Compensation Act by modifying the "on" and "off" indicators which trigger the extended benefits program on and off in individual States. Under the Senate amendment, the present requirement that unemployment in a State must be 120 percent higher than it was in the comparable period in the prior 2 years in order to trigger the program into operation would be eliminated and the requirement that there be a 13-week period between the end of one State extended benefit period and the start of another would also be eliminated. These would have been permanent changes in the law.

Under the motion, States would be permitted from the date of enactment until December 31, 1973, to disregard the 120-percent requirement of existing law but the rate of insured employment in such States would have to be 4.5 percent rather than the 4 percent insured unemployment rate required under the regular trigger provision. The amendment further provides that an extended benefit period could remain in operation in such a State during this time so long as the insured unemployment rate remained 4 percent or above. In those States which paid extended benefits under this modification, persons who qualify for extended benefits under this authority prior to December 31, 1973, could continue to receive the extended benefits to which they are entitled during an additional 31 weeks or until the end of March 1974.

The extended benefits paid under this provision, including those paid during the tail-out period after December 31, 1973, would be financed equally from State and local funds as extended benefits are regularly financed under existing law.

According to the best estimates which the Department of Labor could furnish us, if all of the States affected by the amendment took full advantage of it, this temporary modification of the State "on" and "off" indicators would allow extended benefits to be paid in 6 States. The estimated additional benefits payable would be \$115.7 million, at a cost of

\$60.6 million in Federal funds and \$55.1 million in State funds and an estimated 176,500 workers would be able to receive extended benefits.

State	Number of beneficiaries (thousands)	State share of cost (millions)	Federal share of cost (millions)
Alaska.....	2.9	\$0.8	\$0.9
Massachusetts.....	52.7	13.7	16.8
New Jersey.....	55.9	22.4	22.4
Puerto Rico.....	28.8	5.2	5.2
Rhode Island.....	7.8	2.8	2.8
Washington.....	28.4	10.2	12.5
Total.....	176.5	55.1	60.6

PROVISIONS WHICH ARE IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT BUT WHICH ARE NOT IN THE HOUSE AMENDMENT

ANTI-IMPOUNDMENT AND EXPENDITURE CEILING

The Senate amendments would have provided an expenditure ceiling and would also have provided an anti-impoundment procedure. The expenditure ceiling would have been \$268.7 billion and would have provided that, with the exception of a series of uncontrollable items, any reduction made in order to bring expenditures down to the ceiling would have to be made on a pro rata basis.

The impoundment procedure would have required reports on impoundments from the President, the review of these reports by the Comptroller General and his report to the Congress of those impoundments which did not comply with the antideficiency law. These impoundments within 60 days thereafter would become null and void if the Congress did not approve of them. Congress could also provide for their nullification within the 60-day period by action in a concurrent resolution.

The conferees concluded that these provisions should not be in our agreement because we know that other committees of the House are working on different answers to this spending ceiling problem and also the problem of controlling impoundments. We thought that the House should have an opportunity to work its will on these matters.

PASS-ALONG OF BENEFITS TO AFDC RECIPIENTS

One of the provisions in the Senate amendment to which the House conferees could not agree and do not recommend, is a provision of the amendment which would have provided a disregard of 5 percent of social security income for recipients of aid to families with dependent children program. This would affect only about 6 percent of AFDC families and create an additional inequity between social security income and income from other sources. It would also be difficult to administer on a percentage basis.

MEDICARE PROVISIONS

The Senate bill included a provision which expressed the sense of Congress that first, the President prepare and submit by September 1, 1973, a proposal to cover drugs under medicare, and second, the President's recommendations for medicare legislation to increase the deductibles and coinsurance should be withdrawn. Since no legislation to carry out the President's recommendations on

the medicare program has been introduced in either House, the House conferees recommend that this provision of the Senate bill not be agreed to.

These are people who need protection against what we have allowed to happen in the field of inflation, in my book, the most. These are the disabled and the others covered by social security. I could go on and on talking about this, Mr. Speaker, but I hear some reports—I want to refer to those—I hear some reports that there are those downtown in the administration who would have the President veto this bill because the total cost in it involving the matter of the social services, the increase in the amount we will pay to people in the adult categories of welfare coming into social security might add \$1.4 billion to the amount of his budget.

However, that leaves us in a position of assuming that every penny he asks for in his budget, Congress is going to give him. We have the right, I think, to make the determinations here in the Congress as to what priorities will enjoy what moneys. That is a part of the constitutional responsibility of the Congress.

Let me say this to the President: I did not vote for it, but a majority of the House voted to authorize the President to bomb in Cambodia and Laos for 45 days between now and August 15. I would like to know how much that costs compared with the cost that is involved in this bill.

I would ask those Members who voted to authorize that bombing—the first time Congress has done it—I would ask them to make up their minds whether or not that expenditure, which is heavy, enjoys a higher priority than protecting these people from the ravages of inflation. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8410 as reported from conference.

My opposition is based on two areas: first, the adverse fiscal impact, and second, the disorderly process by which this bill came to the floor of the House.

The chairman referred to the fiscal impact in his closing remarks. In fiscal 1974, the increased outlays will be \$1.5 billion and by increasing the base we will bring in \$100 million, for a net loss of \$1.4 billion. In fiscal 1975, by the act we are discussing in this legislation, the increase in 1975 will be \$2.9 billion with a revenue increase of \$0.8 billion or a net loss of \$2.1 billion. This is a total loss by this one bill which was rammed down our throats in conference of \$3.5 billion.

Now, lest anyone think we are hard-hearted about social security increases, let me point out that since January 1, 1970, social security benefits have been increased more than 51 percent. In those 3 years the cost of living has gone up 17 percent, by less than one-third of the increase we provided. The 20-percent increase that we put into effect last year was to carry us to January 1, 1975, but this increase in effect moves that date forward by 9 months.

There was reference made to the fact that the President might veto this measure. Under the chaotic procedures employed in this bill, he is confronted with

a Hobson's choice: veto the bill, with its unstabling impact on Federal finances, or sign an irresponsible increase in Federal spending into law. The President, after being presented by Congress with this irresponsible dilemma, may well decide it is the lesser of two congressionally imposed evils to veto the bill. In the event he does, what will the fiscal consequences be in the event we have no debt ceiling?

At the close of business June 30, the debt subject to statutory limit will be \$460 billion, well above the \$400 billion permanent debt limit, and the Treasury operating balance will be \$11-12 billion.

If the temporary debt limit is not extended, the Treasury could not issue any new debt after June 30.

The Treasury would immediately have to stop the sale of U.S. savings bonds. About 20,000 financial institutions acting as issuing agents would have to be notified that no further savings bonds could be issued. Over 40,000 corporate payroll savings plans, 9½ million individual payroll savers, and sales of \$600 million a month would be affected. The consequences would be extremely disruptive to the savings bond program.

Savings bond redemptions are about \$500 million per month. If after June 30 savings bond sales were stopped, redemptions would continue with a resulting net cash drain of about \$500 million per month or more if the interruption of sales impaired the credit of the Government as it might.

Treasury securities reaching maturity could not be refunded and would have to be redeemed with cash. Treasury bills, amounting to \$4.3 billion weekly, mature on July 5 and each Thursday thereafter. Another \$1.7 billion of the monthly series of Treasury bills matures on July 31. Also, \$800 million of special nonmarketable securities issued to foreign official institutions, which normally would be rolled over by July 5, would mature and have to be paid off in cash with a threat to already weakened international confidence in the dollar.

Reductions in the Treasury's cash balance and other monetary assets and receipts from taxes would be the only practical resources available to redeem maturing debt securities and to pay the Government's other bills as they came due. The Secretary of the Treasury has no authority to set priorities as to which of the Government's obligations to pay. Such obligations would have to be paid on a first-come-first-served basis for as long as the money lasted, whether the obligations were for maturing securities, interest on the debt, social security benefits, payments on contractual obligations, revenue sharing or salaries of Federal employees. Once the Treasury ran out of money, none of the Government's bills could be paid. The Government's credit would be impaired and the confidence of the people in the Congress, the Executive, indeed in all elected officials, would be impaired.

This is a sad situation. I intend to vote against the motion that will be offered to recede and concur with an amendment for the reasons I have out-

lined. If these nongermane amendments can be considered by the Ways and Means Committee after appropriate hearings that are consistent with orderly procedures, I urge my colleagues to join me in this approach.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. ULLMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID. I should like to ask a question about part D, social services regulations, social services regulations postponed.

First, it is my understanding that this amendment contains a prohibition for 6 months. To put it another way, there is a postponement by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of those regulations permitted earlier this year for 6 months.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REID. Second, am I correct that the amendment contains the provision that eliminates the 90-10 provision for the aged, blind, and disabled, but leaves it for AFDC, with the five exemptions, including family planning, day care, alcoholism, and drug addiction?

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REID. Lastly, might I ask whether this amendment has the effect of retaining in force the provisions of Public Law 92-512 with the exception of the 90-10 provision I mentioned, which has the effect of a limitation of \$2.5 billion on social services, but the clear mandate, if we want to put it that way, is the spending of the \$2.5 billion.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. REID. In other words, if I may ask this question, this would permit the States to proceed on the basis in essence of the old regulations for a period of 6 months with the one amendment that I mentioned?

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman will be a little patient with this Member.

I am sitting here looking at the Senate-proposed amendments covering 49 pages and then the alternative amendments proposed by the chairman of the committee covering 39 pages. It is somewhat difficult for me to assimilate all of this in the very short time we have here tonight.

I have had added to that the confusion, however, from the statement of the chairman of the committee, and from what I thought I heard from the gentleman in the well, the very qualified minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I asked how we were going to pay for this increase in the social security, and I understood from what the gentleman from Arkansas said, that

it was provided for in his amendment by increasing the base against which the present existing percentage, which, as I understand it, is 5.5 percent by the employer and 5.5 percent by the employee, and that base, as I read the bill, is changed from \$12,000 to \$12,600; is that correct?

Mr. ULLMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HANNA. Now, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman in the well said was that that would raise \$100 million, and the cost of this bill is \$1.5 billion.

Now, that has me definitely confused, and I think, with that kind of a disparity, I should have a further explanation.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct about the \$100 million, but what we are doing is financing the cost of the increase from \$2,100 to \$2,400 in the retirement test, and also the 5.6-percent increase in cash benefits, not over the 1-year period, but over the lifetime of the actuarial determination—75 years.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, what does that do in terms of the impact of this bill upon this budget this year?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There will be a greater outflow in the fiscal year 1974, and that is the figure we have described to the gentleman. I think it is \$500 million, or \$600 million for two of them—the benefit increase and the earnings test increase. It is that much more than we take in. There will be a greater amount of outflow in fiscal year 1974, it is true, but we do not have a budget for 1974 before us as yet.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, what I was trying to determine—and I think now the crux of it is finally explained—is whether or not there is an amount of money which will not be covered by the present financing of this program, and the gentleman has now told me it will be between \$500 and \$600 million.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. For 1 year.

Mr. HANNA. The gentleman in the well described this along with the other program as having a projected impact of \$1.5 billion.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) will yield further, the total cost of the bill over the budget, according to the administration's estimate—and I quarrel with two of those estimates—is \$1.4 billion. But bear in mind that it is almost equally divided between the Federal fund and the social security trust fund.

I can assure the gentleman that the social security trust fund remains actuarially sound as a result of these two increases.

Mr. HANNA. But that we may have to have a coverage over the shortfall of other funds in order to meet the test?

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to rely on this

concept of unified budget, yes. What I am saying is this: In the past we never included the social security trust fund in consideration of whether we have a balance or not. If we look at the unified budget, we have always got a lesser deficit. The people in America have never been able to understand, if you have a \$200 billion budget, why we have to increase it by bringing it up to \$20 billion. It is because we have the \$18, \$19, or \$20 billion deficit through Federal funds. We have always got a surplus in the trust fund.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to clarify these points.

May I suggest to the gentleman and to the House that I, as one Member, if I was cynical, would tend to look at this package as if it were something that was made up by a very outstanding leader of finance in the Senate and a very outstanding leader of finance in the House and their staffs and brought to us at a rather late time in the night with some very complicated matters.

Try as you will as a serious and dedicated representative, it is just very difficult for us to understand precisely what is in these two packages of 49 pages on the one hand and 38 pages on the other hand.

I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to be patient with a person with as small an understanding as that of the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) a very valued member of the committee.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the colloquy that you have just heard between the members of the committee and the distinguished gentleman from California I think bears out exactly the dilemma in which we find ourselves in trying to legislate at this late hour on this type of procedure.

On repeated occasions over the months I have heard deep concern expressed by Members of this House, and indeed justifiably so, over the usurpation of the powers of this body and in fact the erosion of the prerogatives and responsibilities of this House of Representatives.

Let me tell you, if you ever had an opportunity and a responsibility to preserve and maintain some of these prerogatives, it is in voting down this conference report this evening. Here you have a sickening example of the roughshod way in which the Senate because of its procedures which defy logical and orderly rules of germaneness seeks to legislate as it darned pleases without regard for the prerogatives of this House.

I think the gentleman pointed out, and very significantly so, that when you get these types of procedure which invades several existing statutes on a take-it-or-leave-it basis with absolutely no opportunity to be selective, you can expect exactly what you have here this evening.

There are many things in the proposal that are good and amendments upon which we can all agree on; but is this the way to legislate?

Let me tell you why you do not have to take this action right now and why it is absolutely unnecessary to do it in this way. Starting at the top, the social security increases will not become effective, as you know, until April 3, 1974. We have plenty of time to deal with this problem, and I am sure that the committee would do this. We would have an opportunity, also, to determine sensibly, in accordance with the actuaries of the social security fund, what the raise should be and not arbitrarily grab 12.6 as the taxable base. It should probably be 13.2, and I would vote for 13.2, as I am sure most Members of this House would, in order to maintain the soundness of the social security fund.

The retirement test does not become effective until January 1. Why in the name of commonsense are we here at this hour before a recess dealing with these things when their effective dates are down the road 9 months to a year? As I just pointed out, you have plenty of time to do this, and we would do it in a responsible way during the ensuing months and not in the manner in which we are doing it here.

The other amendments, if you look at them, are mostly very minor, but there is not a single one that should be attached to the debt ceiling bill that we are dealing with today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say to all of you that you should really stop to think about the procedure before us. I think it bears repeating, because I have substantially said this earlier this evening.

Look down the road a few months, and there is no one in this Chamber, not a Member of this House who would some time or other, if we accept this type of arrogant procedure—and that is exactly what it is—tonight, we will have established a precedent that every Member of this House will be foreclosed at some time in the future from the right to be selective as competent legislators, from the right to handle legislation in the orderly manner in which I think all of the Members believe. And if we do not do this we will be victimized by this type of procedure again and again and again in this House. And I implore all of the Members of the House to make certain that we are never faced with this kind of a situation again. And the best way to correct it is to vote down this proposition tonight.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me if there are provisions in this amendment which guarantee that the increases will not result in disadvantaging—in disadvantaging the aged, the blind, or those on welfare who may not become eligible for their benefits as a result of the increase?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill overall is a tremendous advantage to the disadvantaged people of this country, the aged, the blind, and the disabled. The supplemental benefits, the SSI benefits, are increased from \$130 to \$140.

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

Ms. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentlewoman from New York is talking about is protection for these people against a reduction in payment by the State. The States, all of the States with the exception of Texas, are mandated to maintain those levels of benefits which are being paid on December of 1973. We have excluded Texas because of a provision in the constitution of that State that would make it impossible for that State to comply with the mandate.

Ms. ABZUG. In other words, as a result of the increases in their income this will not be a disadvantage to those who are presently receiving Medicaid?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. We have protected everyone who is eligible for Medicaid for a period to June 30, 1975. We also protected those people who are called essential persons in the household in their rights to Medicaid.

Ms. ABZUG. What about those who are receiving assistance in public housing?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, we do not have jurisdiction over that, I will say to the gentlewoman from New York, if the gentlewoman will yield for one more second, that was not in the conference.

Ms. ABZUG. What about the other assistance programs?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Other assistance programs? We did not do it with respect to food stamps because that too was not in the conference, and was not in the jurisdiction of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. But we did take those provisions that were in the conference that tended to protect presently eligible people against any loss in their eligibility for the programs that are mentioned.

Ms. ABZUG. And on veterans benefits, I take it that is true also?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House will have to make a decision of whether or not it wants the social security increase to be disregarded as income for purposes of determining a veteran's eligibility under the veterans laws to a pension.

Ms. ABZUG. What would happen then with respect to those who are receiving assistance in public housing, and those receiving food stamps?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. This has no effect whatsoever upon those programs.

Ms. ABZUG. So that that would have to be done by having the committees who have jurisdiction over those subject matters provide that the increase in social security will in no way affect the benefits which they would receive under present law?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is within their jurisdiction to do if they decide to do it, yes, but we did not do it.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to one of the conferees on our side, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr.

Speaker, it has become obvious that we are confronted with an ironical, if not a ridiculous, situation. We have here a bill before us for reconsideration which, when it passed the House a few weeks ago, would not have cost the taxpayers one thin dime, not one red cent. Since that time the other body has added on a long list of nongermane amendments that will cost, when they have been implemented by the end of fiscal year 1975, over \$3.5 billion.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the cost of these amendments would have been even higher than that if the conferees had not provided some funding for the social security increases. The total first year cost of these Senate amendments would have been over \$4.6 billion. We did provide for an increase in the wage base in conference, an increase in the total wage base up to \$12,600 beginning on January 1, 1974, and up to \$13,500 in 1975. But even the \$1 billion a year addition to the social security fund we provided, will still not pay the cost of the social security benefit increase alone. So, these Senate amendments are still inflationary and all of us are aware of the complaints of our constituents about the constant increase in the cost of living. This type of legislation cannot but add to the existing inflationary pressures.

As all of us know, we are never going to stop inflation unless we do something about stopping spending or stopping the increase in spending.

Here is an interesting point, Mr. Speaker. When the other body added on this total of somewhere around \$4.6 billion in increases, in order to show their fiscal responsibility, they added on an amendment restricting spending for fiscal year 1974 to \$268.7 billion. Then, in addition to that, they added on an anti-impoundment provision which requires the President to send his intended impoundments to the Congress and obtain approval before funds can be impounded. They were the only two items of any consequence that we were able to have removed in conference. And then, it was for the most part because they were contradictory to the other increases in the Senate bill.

Nevertheless, as long as the spending items remain in the bill, other programs are going to have to be cut. Funds are going to have to be impounded by the President, or we are going to continue to have runaway inflation.

The main point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, and a point on which so many Members who have already spoken here have expressed their concern is that none of the items are added by the Senator or contained in this Senate amendment have been given any consideration in hearings. Had they originated in the House, as they should have, they would have received thorough consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. They would have been the subject of several weeks of public hearings, many hours of discussion with the executive branch, and probably they would have been brought to the floor of the House under a closed rule which, in

my view, would have been accepted because we could have reported to the Members and assured the Members of the House that they had received thorough consideration. It would have been and remains improper and unwise to write this type of bill on the floor of the House.

But what happened? Over in the other body they added all these provisions onto this debt ceiling bill without public hearings, without any real serious consideration, with absolutely no discussion whatsoever with any representative of the executive branch. In fact, many of these amendments were added on the floor of the Senate by a voice vote. None of the amendments was on the same subject matter of the original bill.

Yet, we are called upon in the closing hours of this particular day, to accept them en bloc with very limited debate. I say this is not a good way to legislate. In fact, it is an incredible way to legislate, and the chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means admitted that himself. It is not fair to the Members of this House, because we do not have the same opportunity to work our will as that afforded the Members of the other body.

I think it is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments have been attached to a bill that must be enacted into law by tomorrow night. Unfortunately, we may not really have any other choice but to accept this amendment, approve the bill, and send it down to the White House for signature. However, even if that is the result, I think all of us have an obligation to protest this procedure to insure that it will not be used again.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what everybody is getting so aroused about. All we are talking about is raising social security 5.6 percent and raising the earning test from \$2,100 to \$2,400 per year, and there is no big increase in the social security tax. In fact everybody earning under \$12,000 a year will not pay an additional penny to finance these adjustments. They will cost approximately \$34.80 a year for all those people earning \$12,000 or more. In other words, if a fellow is earning \$100,000 in salary, he is going to contribute \$34.80 a year more to help pay for this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not see what the great disturbance is about. I can understand my friends on the other side on some of the minute issues, but this is a very small increase. If I had my way I would increase social security by 50 percent. That would be more realistic. When we are talking about the increases which were granted since 1970, we are talking about an increase on a very low base. What is 50 percent of nothing? It is nothing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the chairman is successful in his move here tonight and I hope the entire membership will vote for this 5.6 percent and not vote against it. Do not vote against the 25 million,

already people in this Nation who are looking for this slight increase.

Mr. SCHNEEBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE), a member of the committee.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am sad at heart to be back in the well under these circumstances again after having been through this procedure last year with respect to the 20-percent benefit increase. I personally think that a pretty good case can be made for the 5.6-percent social security increase that is being suggested here because the people who are dependent on these benefits probably spend a larger proportion of their income for food than most other economic groups in the country and the cost of food has gone up.

A great stress has been put on the 30 million people who receive benefits under the Social Security Act. There are 90 million people who are paying into the social security at this point, and if I were one or those—of course we in this body are not—I would be deeply concerned about where the Social Security Administration is headed. Twice now we have come before the House under this kind of subverted procedure and have made major changes in the Social Security Act. We have no idea what the fiscal impact of these changes is going to be, what the actuarial impact will be, and what long-term economic consequences will flow from this uncertain provision.

I tell my friends in this House that we have no business playing politics with something as important to the American people as their social security system. They deserve better.

I myself therefore can perhaps resolve in my own mind the issue of the 5.6-percent benefit increase which after all is going to come out of a cost-of-living increase to take effect the beginning of 1975 in any event, but do not let anyone tell you that is the only issue in this bill. That is only the bait. There are major revisions of the Welfare Act here.

The Members have heard a laundry list of changes relating to other provisions of the law. I do not think there is a person in this Chamber who does not feel some uneasiness at this point about legislating under these circumstances. I myself, who am proud to be a Member of this House and proud to be a member of the Ways and Means Committee, have a somewhat dirty feeling to be manipulated in this way, as we are being manipulated, cynically.

It seems to me, therefore, that there is an issue here which overrides the good that can be achieved if we accept this measure. We should know from studies of government that the end does not justify the means. We should know also that anything as important as the welfare of all under the social security law should be studied by Members of the House, as well as by those few people in the Senate who may have understood what their individual amendments were as they pressed them on the members of the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I myself am deeply concerned about this procedure. I would hope

that my distinguished chairman is concerned about it also. I have the feeling that we are being manipulated, and it demeans us to permit ourselves so to be manipulated.

I would hope that we will have hearings somewhere, in some responsible committee of the House or the Senate, or a joint committee, to find out where we are headed in social security; where we are headed in welfare and what the full implications of these measures being rammed down our throats tonight are.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to look into their hearts as they are asked to vote in this kind of a subverted procedure, and decide if they really want to legislate in this way.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONABLE. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to object most strongly to the procedure adopted by the House and the Senate in considering this bill.

Several weeks ago the House passed the debt ceiling increase bill. This legislation must be passed by the Congress by June 30, or the credit of the U.S. Government will be called into question. We will not be able to meet our responsibilities, nor will the Government be able to function. So the bill must be passed.

What happened when the bill passed the House and reached the Senate? Some 20 nongermane amendments—amendments that have nothing to do with the debt ceiling increase—were attached by the Senate. We now have a bill before us—a \$3 billion bill that contains social security benefit increases, welfare rules changes, old-age and disability pension rules changes, among other things.

With no debate on the merits of these issues, with no committee consideration of far-reaching changes in the law—in short, with nothing but irresponsible legislative procedure on the part of the U.S. Senate, we are asked to approve this bill.

The people of Delaware and the Nation deserve adequate, responsible, and careful consideration of any expenditure of \$3 billion—let alone major revisions to more than half a dozen governmental programs.

Will the amendments be fiscally sound? We do not know. Will the social security system be able to afford a benefit increase without a tax increase? We do not know. What will the effect of the various regulation changes be on their programs? We do not know.

I do not believe that I, or any other Member of Congress, can responsibly vote for such a measure. I do not believe that I can support a procedure that forbids me from voting on these unrelated measures individually—but insists that I vote up or down on all the programs at once in a bloc.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the House—and, indeed the Senate—should be ashamed of the irresponsible procedure it is adopting this evening. The nongermane amendments should be stricken from the bill,

and given adequate consideration by the committees of the Congress. Any other procedure is indefensible.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, as Member after Member of this body has already stated, we have been forced into the ridiculous and embarrassing situation of giving final approval to a mixed bag of nongermane junk under a system of closed rule, gag rule, or no rule.

This sort of procedure does no credit to this body or any of its Members, but it reflects especially on the leadership of both Houses.

If the people of this country ever imagined that Congress wrote laws without consideration, and approved laws without ever seeing the language, their confidence would not be low, their confidence in their Government would absent completely.

If this procedure were used only once, it would merely be an outrage. This is the second time on this bill. The outrage has been compounded.

Thirty-nine pages or 48 pages of law—what does it matter? Since we haven't considered it, and have not even seen it, it may as well be 1,000 pages. I wish the leadership of this House and this committee would help me explain how we passed this law to the young people of my district when I visit them in their classrooms or in their homes.

I cannot vote for a bill under these circumstances. I have misgivings about voting for a bill that will add at least \$1.4 billion of expense over the budget. That's a serious problem. But it's not nearly so serious as the disregard for order, reason, and rule.

It is obvious to me that a body which cannot follow its own rules cannot possibly regain, assert, or exercise its constitutional powers. Worse, it cannot hold, nor does it deserve, the confidence of the people it poorly represents.

I strongly urge that the motion to recede be defeated and that the conferees be sent back to conference, and instructed to bring a report on each element of which this House can at least express its opinion.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN).

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the proposal of the committee, and I hope it is adopted.

It is my understanding that it will then be flown to San Clemente. I request that something else be flown to San Clemente with this bill: The speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) because he portrayed for this Congress very clearly the impact on the Treasury, on the dollar, if we do not increase the debt ceiling.

I hope the President will read Mr. SCHNEEBELI's speech before he decides whether to veto or to sign the bill. I sincerely hope he reads that speech and decides to sign the bill. If he does not, if he vetoes it, three possibilities then face the Nation.

First, we may have two-thirds to override the veto, and then there will be no

great problem. If we do not, the President may have a majority of the House who will again give in to his pressure and give him the debt ceiling that pleases him. But there is a strong probability that neither of those two things will happen. We will not have the two-thirds to override, but the Congress may refuse to do precisely what the President asks.

I hope he reads Mr. SCHNEEBELI's remarks and decides to sign the bill.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed about two aspects of the situation we face today, at this time, on this legislation. I am disturbed as to the procedure that we are utilizing in bringing this legislation before the House today. I have some grave concern about certain financial aspects of this legislation.

To some extent, the procedure and the financial aspects are intertwined. The facts are that no hearings were held in the House Committee on Ways and Means in 1973 on anything other than the problems involving the debt limitation.

I add, no hearings in 1973 were held in the Senate Committee on Finance on anything other than the debt limitation problems in this legislation.

I believe this is very bad procedure, when we consider the amount of money involved, the tax problems involved, and many other ramifications concerning this legislation.

As I said at the outset, there are some questions raised as to the financial aspects involved in this legislation. I have before me a chart or a sheet prepared by the executive branch. It points out the cost projection for the amendments to the debt ceiling bill. It shows that in fiscal year 1974 the total deficit because of this legislation would be \$1,328 million, of which \$500 million would come in the account of the social security. The same material furnished to me by the executive branch shows that in fiscal year 1975 there will be a net deficit of \$2,414 million, of which \$1.2 billion comes from a social security account.

I have talked with my friend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and asked him his impression and his opinion as to these figures. I believe the chairman agrees with the figures so far as social security is concerned for fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975, but he has grave doubts and misgivings about the accuracy of the figures as to the other amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I have great respect for the chairman of the committee, and I cannot challenge his figures, and I cannot challenge the figures given to me by Social Security. What these differences illustrate is that there were no hearings in the House and no hearings in the Senate, so we have no way of hav-

ing a give and take as to the validity of their figures or of the gentleman's figures.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman should take note that it is not a deficit being created in the social security fund. There will still be more money, in calendar year 1973, 1974, and 1975, taken in, far more than we will be spending. We merely reduce the surplus in each of those years.

I can assure my friend that the motion I have made maintains the actuarial soundness of the social security system.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Am I correct in understanding that the amendments included here for social security maintain the financial integrity over a period of 75 years?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So we have to run out 75 years before we come to the conclusion that we really are being honest with ourselves.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Surely.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me translate it another way. We were told in conference by the actuaries that this increase, moving forward this cost of living from the 1st of January, 1975 to the 1st of April of 1974 involved as a percent of payroll 0.01 percent. That is over a 75-year period, because they are really getting it about 9 months earlier.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad there are some prospective amendments resulting from the conference, because this amendment before us is far superior to the bill passed by the other body.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. May I ask the chairman if it is not true that the trust fund now will go down below the standards we ourselves set for the cushion we should have in it at any given time.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It will go down for a period of about 2 or 3 years. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CONABLE. It will be below the total of the last 2 or 3 years?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It will be above that figure but it will go down for 2 or 3 years.

Mr. CONABLE. Assuming that we do not do anything further. However, that is a rather interesting assumption.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two other points.

Number one, the other body has used a very skillful but, I think, a very unfair device to prevent the House from having a vote on each of the areas of disagreement. They have put a number of amendments in one amendment. They bundled them together, and we either accept all of them or we reject all of them. This is, I think, a very unfortunate parliamentary situation.

Number two, it appears to me that the fact that we do not have a permanent debt ceiling means that every 4, 6,

or 12 months we are going to be faced with this problem. I think this is the best argument I know of for a permanent debt ceiling, because people who believe in the financial integrity of the Federal Government are getting, if I might be very blunt, "shafted" because you now have these questionable amendments on legislation that comes up every 4, 6, or 8 months, and we are caught in the bind of having to take this kind of nongermane provisions whether we like it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I think people who have financial integrity as a guidepost, legislatively speaking, ought to learn a lesson from not having a permanent debt ceiling.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me under the circumstances.

Given the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves, it seems to me that the only alternative that we have got left is to attempt to divide the question. Let us vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to recede. If the House votes it down, as I would hope it would, then under the rules it would be permissible to recede in the conference. We have lost the option to send this back to the conference. We have lost the option because of the way in which the Senate defined the amendment to try to separate out the issues.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I shall seek at least to divide the question, and hopefully we can vote down the question to recede and try to send this back for conference and find out what the problem is between the conferees.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think the President and most of us could take the debt ceiling with the social security provisions, but I do not think the House in its wisdom ought to approve the amendment to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, because of certain other aspects. I think it is an amendment which contains points which in my opinion are fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Pension and Compensation Committee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and a number of the Members have asked me tonight how this will affect the veteran who draws a Government pension check and also a social security check.

Mr. Speaker, up until the 20-percent social security increase that we had, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs considered legislation that was passed by the House and the Senate that made up for the pension loss of the social security increase, but we have not yet brought out a bill that takes care of the 20-percent increase in social security. So many of the Members have been hearing from their constituents that their veterans'

checks were cut. It is left up to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to bring out a bill. We are now having hearings at this time and hope to bring out a bill, particularly correcting this problem.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, that the veteran's check would be decreased again when you add on a 5-percent social security increase.

You say now why does not your committee bring this bill out. We are considering a bill for a cost-of-living increase to at least 8 percent. This will increase the veteran's check up some but not to what he lost before. I wish we could raise the veteran back to his original pension, but the cost would be almost impossible to the Treasury.

I only bring out this point to say that there will be another decrease in the veteran's pension check when you add on 5 percent more.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wonder if the gentleman has any comments as to why the Senate could not take care of this problem and at the same time add on these other items in the bill.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. They should have taken care of it.

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

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas I demand a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded. The question is, Shall the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman's demand for a division vote failed, did it not?

The SPEAKER. There was a demand for a division of the question.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That was the request, and that was defeated? I am sorry. I thought the gentleman asked for a division vote.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a demand for a division of the question is in order, is it not, at any time without reference to a rollcall on that question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, until the question is put.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, as a further parliamentary inquiry, the motion is put by the Chair, Shall the House recede, and the Chair ruled, did he not, that the yeas had it?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet asking for a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from

Ohio was on his feet, but the Chair did not hear him.

RECORDED VOTE

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 190, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—185

Abzug	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Adams	Gude	Peyser
Addabbo	Hamilton	Pickle
Alexander	Hammer-	Pike
Anderson,	schmidt	Poage
Calif.	Hanley	Podell
Andrews, N.C.	Hawkins	Preyer
Annunzio	Hays	Price, Ill.
Barrett	Hechler, W. Va.	Randall
Bergland	Heckler, Mass.	Rangel
Bevill	Helstoski	Rees
Blaggi	Hicks	Reid
Blester	Holifield	Reuss
Bingham	Holtzman	Riegler
Boggs	Howard	Rinaldo
Boland	Ichord	Rodino
Bolling	Johnson, Calif.	Roe
Bowen	Jones, Okla.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Brademas	Jones, Tenn.	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Jordan	Rose
Brooks	Karth	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Burleson, Tex.	Kazen	Roy
Burlison, Mo.	Kluczynski	Roybal
Burton	Koch	St Germain
Carey, N.Y.	Kyros	Sarbanes
Carney, Ohio	Leggett	Schroeder
Casey, Tex.	Lehman	Seiberling
Chisholm	Litton	Shipley
Clay	Long, La.	Sisk
Collins, Ill.	Long, Md.	Slack
Conte	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Corman	McDade	Staggers
Cotter	McFall	Stanton,
Cronin	McKay	James V.
Culver	Macdonald	Stark
Daniels,	Mahon	Steed
Dominick V.	Mann	Stephens
Davis, S.C.	Matsunaga	Stokes
de la Garza	Mazzoli	Stratton
Dellums	Meeds	Stubblefield
Denholm	Melcher	Stuckey
Diggs	Metcalfe	Studds
Dingell	Mezvisinsky	Symington
Donohue	Milford	Thornton
Dorn	Mills, Ark.	Udall
Drinan	Minish	Ullman
Dulski	Mink	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	Mitchell, Md.	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Moakley	Vigorito
Ellberg	Mollohan	Waldie
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead, Pa.	White
Flood	Morgan	Wilson,
Foley	Moss	Charles H.,
Ford,	Murphy, Ill.	Calif.
William D.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson,
Fraser	Natcher	Charles, Tex.
Fulton	Nedzi	Wolf
Gaydos	Nichols	Yates
Gettys	Nix	Yatron
Giaimo	Obey	Young, Ga.
Gibbons	O'Neill	Young, Tex.
Gonzalez	Owens	Zablocki
Grasso	Patten	
Gray	Pepper	

NOES—190

Abdnor	Camp	Dellenback
Anderson, Ill.	Carter	Dennis
Archer	Cederberg	Devine
Arends	Chamberlain	Dickinson
Armstrong	Chappell	Downing
Bafalis	Clancy	Duncan
Baker	Clausen	du Pont
Beard	Don H.	Edwards, Ala.
Bennett	Clawson, Del	Erlenborn
Bray	Cleveland	Esch
Breckinridge	Cochran	Eshleman
Brinkley	Cohen	Findley
Broomfield	Collier	Flynt
Brotzman	Collins, Tex.	Ford, Gerald R.
Brown, Calif.	Conable	Forsythe
Brown, Mich.	Conlan	Fountain
Brown, Ohio	Coughlin	Frelinghuysen
Broyhill, N.C.	Crane	Frenzel
Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Dan	Frey
Buchanan	Daniel, Robert	Froehlich
Burgener	W., Jr.	Gilman
Butler	Davis, Ga.	Ginn
Byron	Davis, Wis.	Goldwater

Goodling	Mathias, Calif.	Sikes
Gross	Mathis, Ga.	Skubitz
Guyer	Mayne	Smith, N.Y.
Haley	Michel	Snyder
Hanna	Miller	Spence
Hanrahan	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stanton,
Hansen, Idaho	Mizell	J. William
Harsha	Montgomery	Steele
Harvey	Moorhead,	Steelman
Hastings	Calif.	Steiger, Wis.
Heinz	Mosher	Symms
Henderson	Myers	Talcott
Hinshaw	Nelsen	Taylor, Mo.
Hogan	O'Brien	Taylor, N.C.
Holt	Parris	Teague, Calif.
Horton	Passman	Thomson, Wis.
Hosmer	Pettis	Thone
Hudnut	Powell, Ohio	Towel, Nev.
Hunt	Price, Tex.	Treen
Hutchinson	Pritchard	Vander Jagt
Jarman	Quillen	Veysey
Johnson, Colo.	Rallsback	Waggonner
Johnson, Pa.	Rarick	Walsh
Jones, N.C.	Regula	Wampler
Kemp	Rhodes	Ware
Ketchum	Roberts	Whalen
Kuykendall	Robinson, Va.	Whitehurst
Landgrebe	Robinson, N.Y.	Whitten
Latta	Rogers	Widnall
Lent	Roncalio, N.Y.	Williams
Lott	Runnels	Wilson, Bob
McClary	Ruppe	Winn
McCloskey	Ruth	Wyder
McCollister	Sarasin	Wyllie
McEwen	Satterfield	Wyman
McKinney	Saylor	Young, Alaska
Madigan	Scherie	Young, Fla.
Mailliard	Schneebeli	Young, Ill.
Mallory	Sebelius	Young, S.C.
Maraziti	Shoup	Zion
Martin, Nebr.	Shriver	Zwach
Martin, N.C.	Shuster	

NOT VOTING—58

Andrews,	Fish	McSpadden
N. Dak.	Fisher	Madden
Ashbrook	Flowers	Minshall, Ohio
Ashley	Fuqua	O'Hara
Aspin	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Badillo	Griffiths	Quile
Bell	Grover	Rooney, N.Y.
Blackburn	Gubser	Roush
Blatnik	Gunter	Rousselot
Breaux	Hansen, Wash.	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Harrington	Sandman
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Hillis	Sullivan
Conyers	Huber	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Hungate	Thompson, N.J.
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Tiernan
Dent	Keating	Wiggins
Derwinski	King	Wright
Evins, Tenn.	Landrum	Wyatt
Fascell	Lujan	

So the motion to recede was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mrs. Burke of California for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Blackburn against.

Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Huber against.

Mr. Danielson for, with Mr. King against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Steiger of Arizona against.

Mr. Roush for, with Mr. Wiggins against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Andrews of

North Dakota against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Lujan against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Flowers.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Fuqua

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Gunter with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Aspin with Mr. Quile.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Patman.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Teague of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement and request a further conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS of Arkansas, ULLMAN, BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Messrs. SCHNEEBELI, COLLIER, and BROYHILL of Virginia.

FURTHER CONFERENCE

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote to not recede, it is necessary to return to conference. I am not certain when we can return, but I am convinced, in conversation with others, that it will not be possible for us to do it tonight.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman from Arkansas yielding to me.

Would it be possible for the gentleman from Arkansas to attempt to give the House some idea as to whether or not, when a new report comes from the conference, that we can find ourselves with a conference report rather than the system that was used tonight?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot concede to the gentleman from Wisconsin, because we are still operating under the rules of the House, which provide that any amendment which is not germane to the subject matter of the bill under the rule of the House should not be included in a conference report, and therefore should be brought back for a separate vote.

The situation in that respect would not vary one iota. The subject matter within the amendment in disagreement could vary, but still we would have one amendment because we are dealing with one Senate amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the gentleman from Arkansas knows that we have a provision, rule XXVII, clause 4, in which in fact it is possible for the House to accept nongermane amendments.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, it is possible if there is no point of order made. We could include nongermane amendments within a conference report, but I have been trying to follow the spirit of the rules of the House.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, is there any

chance that when the gentleman goes back to conference, that they could clean this thing up so that when a social security recipient gets raised 5 percent, he does not get cut 10 percent by the Federal Government if he is a veteran, or by the State if he is getting welfare?

That is what lost the motion for the gentleman here this morning. I talked with 15 or 20 Members who do not want to raise the social security of a veteran and then have his veteran's pension cut. What good would that do him? If this is a cost-of-living increase, he would gain no ground whatsoever.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will allow, that is not in the conference related or unrelated to the subject matter.

Mr. HAYS. It does not need to be related. If it is nongermane, just put it in and let the House vote.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Then any one Member could object to its inclusion.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman does not do that, he can let it lay over the proper number of days. I had intended to make a trip to Ohio. I could make the objection and let it lay over.

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

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

Mr. CORMAN. Is a motion to instruct conferees in order at this time?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It comes too late.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I have been voting on social security amendments for at least a couple of years now. I just wonder, when it comes to increasing social security benefits, if the chairman can tell us whether his committee ever intends to originate such a bill in this House.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The Ways and Means Committee on many, many occasions, has originated social security benefit increase bills in the House.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Which ones, Mr. Speaker, have been passed in the last few years?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The benefits since 1950 have been increased by about 356 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would ask about the last 2 years?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The 20 percent last year did originate in the Senate, but I would remind the gentleman that the House had acted earlier by including a benefit increase in H.R. 1. Furthermore, in February of 1972 I introduced a 20-percent increase which was cosponsored by many Members of the House and recommended that the Senate include such an increase in H.R. 1. The only reason why social security benefit increases have originated in the Senate during the past 2 or 3 years is that the Senate has been unable to complete action on the social security bills we have sent them.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I would suggest that the last one which originated in the House was in 1969, as I recall.

The point is that some of these days, once in awhile, they should originate here instead of constantly being riders from the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8537, AMENDING DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. STRATTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8537) 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:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-361)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8537) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

On page 6 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out titles III and IV, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 206. This Act shall become effective July 1, 1973.

And the Senate agree to the same.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
F. EDWARD HEBERT,
BILL NICHOLS,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
JOHN E. HUNT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STUART SYMINGTON,
HARRY F. BYRD,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
JOHN TOWER,
WILLIAM L. SCOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The Managers on the part of the House and Senate at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8537), an Act 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, submit the following joint statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House on June 19, 1973 passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 8537.

The Senate on June 22, 1973 amended H.R. 8537 by striking all after the enacting clause and substituting new language in the form of an amendment.

As a consequence of the Senate action, there existed three substantive differences in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 8537. The differences are identified below, together with an explanation of the action taken thereon in the conference report.

DEPENDENCY STATUS FOR ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN

The Senate amendment contained language amending Section 401 of Title 37, United States Code, to add to the definition of a military dependent an unmarried, acknowledged, illegitimate child or an unmarried illegitimate child whose alleged service member father has been judicially

decreed to be the father of such child or judicially ordered to contribute to the child's support, who is in fact dependent on the member and is over 21 years of age or is incapable of self-support. The provision would entitle the armed services member having such an illegitimate child as a dependent to certain allowances or increase in allowances because of the dependency status of the child. The language of the Senate amendment also repealed a provision in Section 401 of Title 37, United States Code, which states that "a person is not a dependent of a female member unless he is in fact dependent on her for over one-half of his support."

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The conferees agreed to accept the Senate provision with the understanding that it would be implemented by the Department of Defense in such a manner as to prevent abuse and that the phrase "in fact dependent on the member" would normally be interpreted to mean dependent for over one-half of his support on the member. The conferees also agreed that the language of the provision was to be implemented in such a way as to not determine the payment of allowances on the basis of a decree by a foreign court.

The House recedes.

COMBAT ENLISTMENT BONUS

Section 204 of the House bill would extend for two years, until June 30, 1975, Section 308(a) of Title 37, United States Code, which authorizes payment of a bonus of up to \$3,000 for an initial enlistment for at least three years, or extension of an initial period of active duty for at least three years, in "a combat element of an armed force." The Senate amendment contained language to limit the extension of authority for one year, until June 30, 1974, and further limited the career fields eligible for the bonus so as to insure that only individuals who enlist in skills in the infantry, armor, and artillery would be eligible for such a bonus.

The House conferees in accepting the limitation of the bonus authority in the Senate amendment do so with the understanding that such action does not preclude the possibility of considering bonus legislation further in this Session of Congress.

The House recedes.

FLIGHT PAY

Section 715 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal 1973 (Public Law 92-570) prohibited after May 31, 1973, the payment of flight pay to officers in the grade of O-6 and above who are not assigned to duties requiring active participation in operational flying. Title III of the Senate amendment would extend for 6 months, until December 31, 1973, the effective date for implementing the prohibition. Title III of the Senate amendment would be retroactive to June 1, 1973.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The House, on Thursday, June 28, by a vote of 238 to 175, instructed its conferees, "to insist on disagreement to title III of the Senate amendment." The House conferees were, therefore, adamant in their opposition to title III of the Senate amendment.

The Senate conferees, therefore, reluctantly recede with the understanding that the House Armed Services Committee will initiate hearings on the Department of Defense legislative recommendation as soon as committee business will permit.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
F. EDWARD HEBERT,
BILL NICHOLS,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
JOHN E. HUNT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STUART SYMINGTON,
HARRY F. BYRD,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
JOHN TOWER,
WILLIAM L. SCOTT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8537) 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.

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same legislation which we were told yesterday, if we instructed the House conferees, then 300,000 or 400,000 people would not be able to get their dependents' allowance upon schedule?

Mr. STRATTON. This is the same legislation that the House instructed the conferees on yesterday.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that the Senate did yield on the subject of flight pay for the nonflying generals and admirals?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has already been advised of that point. That is my understanding. If the gentleman will not object to the unanimous consent request, I will report the result, I will report the result of the conference, which is completely in accord with the wishes of the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple conference report, and as the gentleman from New York pointed out a moment ago, the House yesterday instructed the conferees to go to the conference and to insist on opposition to the Senate amendment with regard to flight pay.

There was considerable disagreement on the part of the Senate in going to a conference today. We succeeded in getting them to go to a conference. We succeeded in getting them to withdraw their position on flight pay.

Mr. Speaker, the balance of the conference report is exactly as it was originally reported from the Senate and ac-

cepted unanimously in the Committee on Armed Services.

I think that, although the chairman of the managers on the part of the House was not entirely sympathetic with the instruction of the House, he could read the voting tally loud and clear. We have strongly defended the position of the House and have come out of the conference completely successfully.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about the items that are left that we will be considering tomorrow.

There will be and not necessarily in this order: House Joint Resolution 636, the continuing appropriations resolution, which is being debated in the Senate at the present time. I presume there will be a conference report that will be reported back to this Chamber tomorrow.

There will be H.R. 9055, the supplemental appropriations bill which we acted upon today and which we anticipate the Senate will act upon later in the evening. There is a possibility that if there is a disagreement, that bill may be back here on the floor tomorrow as a conference report.

There is the conference report on H.R. 7445, the Renegotiations Act extension.

There is H.R. 5452, agreeing to Senate amendments on the National Sea Grant College Extension Act.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the public debt limitation bill on which conferees were just appointed.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, let me advise my friend, the majority leader, that I will make every effort to complete the conference report on H.R. 8410 in time for the House to vote tomorrow. I do not want to be a party to keeping the House in session unduly next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

With the accomplishment of all that I have announced, I can say that I hope a recess resolution would then be in order.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a.m.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. O'NEILL. I would have been disappointed if you had not.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure you would have been.

Will there be legislation at that time of any consequence?

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, I just read the list and you just heard the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means who said he hoped the conference report would be ready at that time in the morning.

Mr. GROSS. Will it be ready at 10 o'clock in the morning with no conference tonight?

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, let me say that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations believes he will have legislation ready at that time. This has been agreed to by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and we would not be asking for it if we did not think we had legislation at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be any assurance we will not have a session on Monday next?

Mr. O'NEILL. No assurance whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Or Tuesday?

Mr. O'NEILL. Or Tuesday or Thursday.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 307, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and recorded my presence.

TRIBUTE TO HALE BOGGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a close friend is not something that is easily put behind you. For moments shared together leave lasting impressions that cannot be so suddenly taken away. This has been especially true for me with the passing of my good friend from Louisiana, Hale Boggs. For, although Hale is no longer with us, memories of our relationship linger on.

I regret that I was not able to be here on the day that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee reserved time to pay tribute to the late majority leader, but I do hope that what I say today can be added to the remarks of so many of my colleagues who have paid their respects both to the man and to what he stood for in this Chamber.

Very early during my days in the Congress, I grew to know Hale Boggs. I saw him both in the Committee on Ways and Means and in his majority whip office. I saw him as a determined man, but as a man who carefully considered any problem confronting him before acting. But, also, I saw a man who, once he had

acted—acted with conviction and with authority. He was an able and knowledgeable debator who was never reluctant to speak his mind. I can remember in the 1960's, sitting with him in his office as he struggled with the problems in our "Great Society" programs. The passage of these bills has often been attributed to the courageous stand that Hale took behind so many of them. I know that his efforts to temper these programs to make them acceptable to the great mass of middle Americans, while at the same time carefully protecting the principles embodied in them, will stand as one of the most difficult legislative achievements in many years. The pens that he received from both President Kennedy and President Johnson for his work on these matters were among his most cherished mementos.

His election as majority leader stood as a truly significant step in his tragically abbreviated career. The ability to work well with all the diverse groups that make up the democratic majority in the Congress is an ability that few men possess. Hale Boggs was one of these men. We can now only speculate as to what his full legacy might have been had he had the opportunity to work with us for only a while longer.

In this body where the divisive issues of the day often promote more disagreement than harmony and comradeship, it is impossible for us all to agree on every issue, and Hale and I were not immune from this. The differences that we had however, we never allowed to penetrate to the core of our relationship. We had the unique ability to disagree strongly yet remain strong friends.

To his dear wife LINDY, I would like to say that I will indeed miss him. I will miss the good times and the tough times. They are experiences that are a part of me and I shall cherish them forever.

INTERN PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, as some of my colleagues may recall, in April of last year I experimented with an intern program designed specifically for senior citizens. The summer intern program for college students had become a valuable experience in my office, as it has with so many Members, and I felt a program with similar goals—but for the elderly—could be equally productive.

Last year a senior citizen couple from the Eighth District of Pennsylvania worked for 2 weeks in my Washington office. They studied pending legislation of concern to older Americans, discussed these matters with experts in the field, and made legislative recommendations to me based on what they had learned. After returning to the District, they reported on their experiences to senior citizen groups in the community and became a communications link between the elderly in the District and my congressional office.

The program proved a solid success. My personal awareness of the special problems confronting the elderly was sharpened through the exchanges and close working relationship developed with the senior interns, and the interns took back with them a greater understanding of the complexities of the legislative process and how the Federal Government is dealing with the situation of the elderly in our society.

I believe it is tremendously important for the elderly to understand how and why Congress and the Federal Government function as they do. My colleagues are all too aware that few groups in our country feel as alienated and forgotten as do the elderly. It is imperative that senior citizens feel they are a part of the system with inputs into that system. Through a better understanding of the process itself, they can learn how to maximize their impact in politics and government.

Based on what this test project had revealed to me last year and the potential it appeared to hold if it were enlarged and formalized, I introduced a resolution in the 92d Congress funding a senior citizen intern program and making it available to all Members of the House of Representatives. The resolution reflected broad bipartisan and geographic support among the entire House membership. It was reintroduced in the current session with over 40 cosponsors.

I had decided to repeat the program in my office this year regardless of the status of the resolution at the time. It was my hope that several of my colleagues would be willing to join with me in working together on a senior intern program. In this way, through a group effort albeit on a small scale, it could be possible to demonstrate the effectiveness and desirability of such an organized program. I was encouraged that my colleagues from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS and Mr. ZION) and the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. ROTH, had expressed an interest in working out a joint intern program. May is traditionally designated senior citizen month, and it was agreed that May was the appropriate month during which to have the internship.

Following the procedure I instituted last year, my senior interns were selected at the recommendation of senior citizen groups in my congressional district. This year Russell and Pearl Struble of Cornwells Heights were chosen to represent the elderly residents of the district. Both Strubles are retired from the education profession. Russ had been a mathematics and science teacher before serving 15 years as a high school principal. Pearl formerly taught physical education and social studies. The Strubles are active members of a wide variety of community organizations in Bucks County in addition to their involvement in senior citizen affairs.

In accordance with the terms of the resolution I had introduced, the Strubles each received \$100 per week for their internship. It was estimated that a stipend in this amount would almost cover the food, lodging, and transportation expenses involved in their stay. Accommodations were arranged for them at a

comfortable, moderately priced hotel near the White House, convenient to reasonably priced restaurants and bus transportation to Capitol Hill. Their hotel room was equipped with a kitchenette which enabled them to prepare some of their meals.

The internship period for Mr. and Mrs. Struble ran for 2 workweeks from May 14 to 25 while those of Senator ROTH and Congressmen HILLIS and ZION were scheduled for the week of May 21. For this reason, since all the interns would be here for the second week, meetings and briefings which would benefit all the interns were arranged for the week of the 21st.

The Strubles stepped right into the office schedule and became regular members of the staff. When they first arrived, we spent a good portion of the morning discussing what we all hoped to derive from the internship experience. Russ and Pearl displayed a keen grasp of legislative matters, and I was confident that the senior citizens in the District had once again made an excellent choice in their selection of interns.

During the first week in my office, the Strubles analyzed some of the legislation directed toward meeting the needs of senior citizens. This included employment programs, housing, tax proposals, and transportation. From their study they accumulated questions to ask the experts in the field with whom they would be meeting the following week.

Russ was particularly concerned about the provisions of the Older Americans Act amendments which had just been signed into law by President Nixon, and he was especially interested in its applicability to the efforts of his local senior citizen group to construct a center for its activities. Russ also attended two sessions of the Subcommittee on Consumer Economics of the Joint Economic Committee which was holding hearings on medical costs and health care delivery.

In addition to studying legislation and some recent reports of the Senate Select Committee on Aging, Pearl familiarized herself with office procedure and filled in as receptionist by answering the telephone, greeting visitors, and opening the mail. She attended Senate Finance Committee hearings on revisions in social services regulations and arranged a special visit to Virginia Knauer's Office of Consumer Affairs.

The second week was filled with meetings and briefings with the interns from the other three offices. All the senior interns—a total of nine—stayed at the same hotel, and this helped contribute to a group spirit which was evident throughout the week. At this point I would like to insert a brief listing of the group's activities during the week:

Meetings with representatives of: Senate Special Committee on Aging, National Council of Senior Citizens, Administration on Aging of HEW, American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, and Older Americans Volunteer programs of ACTION.

Tour of the White House and meeting

with Max Friedersdorf, Special Assistant to the President.

Tour of the Eisenhower Republican Center and meeting with George Bush, Chairman, and Bernard Van Rensselaer, Director of Senior Citizens Division, of the Republican National Committee.

Tour of the State Department and tours and meetings with officials of the Singapore and Australian Embassies.

Attendance at hearings of the Senate Finance Committee on proposed reform of private pension plans.

Their activities and contacts were extensive and varied, and their busy schedules were supplemented with additional projects planned by each office for its own interns. Overall, they learned about the congressional role in developing legislation, the implementation of legislation and interest group involvement in this process. The impact of "senior power" and citizen action on the governmental system was stressed. To draw some comparisons regarding the role of senior citizens in foreign nations, the interns were treated to a description of governmental and citizen attitudes toward the elderly in Singapore—with its heavy influence of Chinese culture—and Australia—with its mix of British and American culture—by officials of the Embassies of those two countries.

Each of the interns had specific points to raise and particular concerns to express during their many discussions with the experts. One of the most frequently and strongly voiced was that senior citizens want to be involved; they desperately want to remain active in their retirement years and have useful outlets for their interests and skills. While they have definite feelings that the government must adequately provide for the elderly who are unable to do so for themselves, the interns indicated their strong endorsement of a governmental attitude which both recognizes and seeks the contributions and productive capabilities of older Americans.

I am convinced, based on the program last year and again this year, that the senior citizen intern program is worthy of continuance on even a larger scale. It is my hope that this legislation will be considered by the House Administration's Subcommittee on Accounts during this session in order that the program can be made available to the entire House just as the college intern program. In the event it is not, I hope more of my colleagues will cooperate in another joint venture of the type we had this year. The participation of more colleagues will contribute to a richer and more varied experience for everyone involved. Senior citizens from vastly different backgrounds with divergent interests and views will help assure a program truly representative of senior citizens in all parts of the country and from all social strata. In this way, our senior interns will be able to share ideas and experiences in a manner which might not be possible through any other available mechanism.

The senior intern program is a learning adventure, not only for the interns but for the Congressmen as well. Mr. HILLIS and Mr. Zion can attest to the fact that these interns were sharp and

alert. They had questions, and they wanted answers. If the answers were not satisfactory, they let you know that, too.

The intern group prompted a great deal of interest in the project both here and back in their home areas. At each of the briefings and meetings the interns attended, the speakers were impressed with the intern idea and the potential it offers for increased congressional responsiveness to the elderly. What is more, I am sure each of the speakers learned some new things about senior citizens from the interaction with our group. The media, as well, appreciated the human interest aspects of the program, and reporters from television, radio and newspapers gave the interns extensive coverage.

In closing, I do want to commend this program to the consideration of my colleagues. With the enthusiasm and commitment of Messrs. HILLIS, ROTH, and ZION, I believe we have shown that the senior citizen intern idea is more than just an idea. It is a workable program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS).

INTERN PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER).

Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation which would institute a senior citizen intern program in the House of Representatives. Such action was brought about by a project designed for senior citizens in which I participated during May.

Each summer we have young college interns who come to Washington to engage in a work-study program. The same idea, applied to individuals over 65, proved to be an excellent means of communicating with the elderly in my congressional district.

With the help of a district committee, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Perdiue of Anderson, Ind., were chosen to spend 1 week in my Washington Office.

All too often we forget that older Americans are still alive. They have much to contribute to society. We must remember that while it is their hope to live comfortably in their last years, it is also their desire to remain active and, when able, render some service to their community. This was evidenced many times during my conversations with the Perdiues. And, after a week of close contact with the interns, I have concluded that I learned as much from the project as did the interns.

The Perdiues were enthusiastic and eager to see just how a Congressional office functioned as well as learn how the Federal Government operated and what was being done for the elderly. Now they are back in Indiana and attending many group meetings of senior citizen councils and reporting to me the thoughts of their fellow seniors. At this point I submit their report which follows:

SENIOR CITIZEN INTERN REPORT

On May 1, I was notified by Congressman Hillis that I had been chosen to serve as a Senior Citizen Intern in his Congressional Office in Washington for the week beginning May 20. My wife was also invited to accompany me. Earlier I had applied by letter giving the reasons I wanted to serve which I thought would be of interest to the Congressman and those who were to choose his interns. Needless to say, I was surprised and excited. I had never met Mr. Hillis prior to this.

We arrived in Washington late on Sunday afternoon, May 20. There was some bad weather between Anderson and Washington. However, the Congressman landed in Columbus, Ohio, for a short time and we waited for the sky to clear. From then on the weather was smooth and we landed in Washington to a lovely scattering of lights upon the monuments.

On Monday morning, we met with other Senior Citizen Interns in the lobby of our hotel and proceeded by bus to Capitol Hill for breakfast. At 9:00 a.m., we reported to 1721 Longworth House Office Building and our week of busy activities began. Awaiting us were photographers and newspaper reporters representing the news media back home. We felt like movie stars.

We were overwhelmed after looking at our schedule for the week but were relieved to learn that interns from three other offices would be accompanying us during the week. There were nine of us altogether—three other people from Indiana, two from Pennsylvania and two from Delaware.

Aside from the specially oriented briefings for the interns, we engaged in a work-study program in the Hillis office, along the lines of that for young college interns who serve each summer.

We sat in on a Senate Finance Committee hearing concerning private pension in which Treasury Secretary George Schultz testified on the Administration proposals on vesting and portability of pensions.

Briefings included sessions with representatives of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, National Council of Senior Citizens, American Association of Retired Persons and National Retired Teachers Association.

We were also privileged to talk with Victor Hruska, Director of the Older American Volunteer Programs at ACTION. He discussed Foster Grandparents and the RSVP programs which are community service programs involving senior citizens. We were encouraged to learn of senior citizens who were older than us participating in programs to help infants and the young.

Max Friedersdorf, Special Assistant to President Nixon and also a former Hoosier, was host for a coffee-conference at the White House. We discussed our needs as senior citizens and legislation which we thought would be needed. Mr. Friedersdorf presented us with pens used by President Nixon in signing legislation as a gift from the President who was unable to attend. All interns later toured the White House.

At the Administration on Aging headquarters in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare complex there was a two-hour session on what the federal government is doing in the area of senior citizen concerns. Officials representing various phases asked the interns about primary concerns and needs of older Americans.

Bernard Van Rensselaer, 87-year-old director of the Republican National Committee Senior Citizens Division, hosted a coffee-conference in the headquarters of the Republican National Committee. George Bush, Republican National Chairman, spoke during the discussion on senior citizen action in politics.

At the end of our week we met for a long session with Congressman Hillis and his Legislative Assistant, Judy Watson, and Miss

Donna Norton to discuss what legislation we felt was necessary. The Congressman has already sponsored a number of bills to benefit the senior citizen and intends to push others through Congress. We were impressed by his interest in us and the problems we as older Americans face.

We were honored at the Singapore Embassy and Australian Embassy one afternoon where we spoke with their representatives in Washington. After seeing a film at each embassy, we were given an opportunity to ask questions about the care of senior citizens in their country.

Congressman Hillis and Congressman Zion of Evansville who represents Indiana's 8th District, were co-hosts for a wind-up luncheon in the Joe Martin Dining Room of the Capitol to honor their Indiana interns. Invited guests were other Indiana Congressmen and Leaders of the House.

On Friday morning, May 25, we were up early along with a heavy rain for the flight back to Indiana on the Congressman's plane. Our week in Washington will be one to be remembered for a long time. We made many new friends whom we shall not forget.

We learned that much is being done for the senior citizen to make his life more comfortable. There are many bills pending in Congress. However, we realize that any real accomplishments will take time. We are encouraged that things are not at a stand-still. Action is on its way.

Numerous Congressmen, enthusiastic after seeing the initial Senior Citizen Intern Program in operation, plan to sponsor older interns next year during Senior Citizens Month. It is expected that the intern group will reach 100 in 1974.

We thank Congressman Hillis for his interest in senior citizens which prompted him to sponsor such a program. We are grateful to have had the opportunity to participate. We learned much which we hope to share with other senior citizen groups throughout the 5th Congressional District in the coming months.

Our thanks also go to the staff of Congressman Hillis for the kindness extended to us, and to Miss Norton, his assistant and coordinator of the program, who spent much of the week with us.

PAUL PERDUE.

ANDERSON, IND.

BENEFITS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, all too often sports are looked upon as either an extracurricular activity or a vicarious form of entertainment. Yet history and our current experience illustrates repeatedly the benefits of physical education and competitive sports.

I think it is vitally important that the amateur athlete in this country be given the greatest opportunities possible to develop and exhibit his or her talents. This means an end to all artificial and meaningless restraints on his freedom to participate.

For this reason, I am today introducing a bill which would establish a Federal Amateur Sports Commission. This Commission would promulgate rules and regulations which would improve the coordination of the various amateur athletic organizations and aid in the development of amateur athletic programs in the United States. This would enhance the competitive ability of Amer-

can athletes in international competition.

This Commission would also have under its jurisdiction, a Division on the Olympic Games which would be authorized to review the participation of the United States in the Olympic games. This Division would be required to recommend the form of organization by means of which the United States should participate in the Olympic movement and present specific proposals for any legislation required to implement its recommendations.

Congress and the public at large need to become more informed about the purpose and objectives of the U.S. participation in the Olympics and about the methods by which that participation is accomplished.

This bill is concerned with improving the quality and personal values associated with international competition which is the highest level to which any of our athletes can aspire at the amateur level.

It must be recognized from the outset that the major problem confronting sports in the United States is not domestic in origin. Various organizations have in the past, and are presently, and will in the future, be able to conduct their own national programs for the benefit of the participant and to the advancement of the sport because of a free and unrestricted opportunity to do so. To a considerable degree, these programs conducted under high competitive standards, enable the United States to traditionally be well represented, and this includes at the Olympic level.

The present problem in the U.S. amateur athletics has an international origin. It emanates from membership in international sports governing bodies. From this membership comes authority and control which affects all of our country's participation. Some international sports governing bodies refused to take into consideration the development and growth of athletics in the country and the resulting change in the organizations which now sponsor the programs which make the most significant contributions to sports in the United States.

The governing body of a sport automatically carries with it the majority vote of its representatives on the all-important games committee of the U.S. Olympic Committee. What a farce it was when in the past Olympiad an organization such as the AAU, which contributes little to international amateur basketball, automatically had the majority of votes—23 of 45—while the NCAA had 8, junior colleges had 1, and the 21,000 high schools had 2. An organization that is practically dead in a sport determined who were to be the coaches, managers, and players for an Olympic team.

Is it not reasonable to expect that an organization which contributes the overwhelming majority in terms of players, coaches, facilities, finances, and leadership in a sport should be the country's international representative in that sport?

It seems apparent that the U.S. Olympic Committee has demonstrated that it will not voluntarily provide the reforms that are absolutely needed and, therefore, has not been efficient in striving for

maximum production of our great potential in international competition.

Mr. Speaker, the field of sport has been a tradition in America since our beginning. It has been important in achieving international friendship with so many nations throughout the world. If we do not act in such a way as to give lasting meaning to our individual commitments, Congress will have lost a golden opportunity to accomplish something good for the people of this country, and especially for the many talented athletes who represent American excellence in sports.

TRUST FUND FLEXIBILITY: MORE IMPERATIVE THAN EVER

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last spring 190 Members of the House voted to permit cities and States to use some of their urban road funds for mass transit. I still believe that this flexibility is essential for the development of balanced transportation systems in our cities. Events over the last 2 months have convinced me, however, that it is more important than ever that the option to use urban road funds for needed public transportation programs be incorporated in this year's highway act. In particular, the fuel shortages and the traffic control strategies required under the Clean Air Act make it abundantly clear that we must begin now to shift our urban transportation spending priorities away from yet more highways and automobiles toward improved public transportation facilities and services.

At the same time many States are running out of highway dollars. This situation has been seriously aggravated by the fact that the House-Senate Conference on the Highway Act has been deadlocked for nearly 8 weeks over the issue of permitting the use of highway trust funds for public transportation. While recognizing the importance of producing a comprehensive highway bill as soon as possible, the Senate has consistently taken the position that the Federal-aid highway program ought not to suffer pending final passage of a comprehensive Highway Act. As early as last March the Senate-passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 which would have released \$1 billion in fiscal year 1974 interstate funds in order to minimize any damage to the program caused by failure to pass a bill in 1972. The House Public Works Committee, however, refused even to consider, much less favorably report Senate Concurrent Resolution 6.

The Senate tried again in May, by which time seven States—Vermont, West Virginia, Washington, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, and Maine—had already run out of interstate funds. The Senate vehicle was S. 1808 which called for the release of \$1 billion in fiscal year 1974 interstate funds and \$500 million in fiscal year 1975 primary, secondary, and urban extension funds. The House conferees finally agreed to accept S. 1808 on

June 27 and the House passed S. 1808 on June 28.

It would have been most prudent for the House to have passed these interim authorizations much earlier. Passing the bill earlier would have allowed the States more highway dollars and more planning time for the summer construction season. As it is, the following 28 States had virtually exhausted their interstate or other highway program dollars: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Waiting to pass this interim measure until yesterday helped neither the "highway only" advocates nor the "transit option" advocates. It only hurts the highway program.

The House-Senate conference on the highway bill has been meeting for 2 months. It is essential that a long-term comprehensive highway bill be agreed upon as quickly as possible so that the States can plan ahead. Toward this end the Senate not only passed its version of the 1973 Federal-Aid Highway Act more than a month before the House did, but the Senate conferees have also put forward compromise proposal after compromise proposal aimed at resolving differences between the House and Senate bills. All of these compromise proposals have been rejected by the House conferees. The most recent Senate proposal ought to have been particularly attractive to the House conferees.

The Senate offer essentially called for substituting urban system flexibility, as under the Senate-passed Muskie-Baker amendment, for a "tax turnback" or revenue sharing. Under the Senate offer, 20 percent of the annual Federal gasoline tax revenues, or approximately \$800 million per year, would be returned to the States in proportion to their gasoline tax contributions to the highway trust fund. Their returned tax dollars could be used on any surface transportation project excluding waterway or pipeline development.

Thus, in lieu of permitting cities and States to use their shares of the \$850 million per year allocated to the urban system for bus or rail capital projects as well as urban highway programs as under the Senate-passed bill, this proposal would permit cities and States to use their shares of this new \$800 million per year program—out of which approximately \$588 million would be earmarked for expenditure in urban areas of 5,000 or more in population—for highway construction or highway maintenance, bus and rail mass transit operating costs, or intercity rail programs.

There were elements in the Senate proposal that ought to have had great appeal to the House conferees. For one thing, it could be argued that the proposal did not call for using highway trust fund revenues for nonhighway purposes, but rather that what was being proposed was, in effect, an \$800 million a year reduction in the highway trust fund

coupled with a tax turnback to the States according to their contributions to the trust fund:

Thus, Montana's highway user taxes could not, under any stretch of the imagination, be said to be paying for New York City's or Chicago's subways. Further, the proposed block grant or revenue-sharing approach would relieve the States of much of the Federal redtape that contributes to the long leadtime required for Federal-aid highway projects.

The proposal, however, was rejected. Instead, the House conferees worked up a counterproposal which was essentially similar to the House-passed bill, except that it would permit the use of up to \$100 million per year out of the urban system authorization for the purchase of buses. The House conferees counterproposal, incidentally, included features of the House bill, such as the 10,000-mile priority primary highway system and several highway beautification provisions, which the Senate conferees had already rejected. And so, the Senate conferees unanimously rejected the House conferees' package. Consequently, the conference appears for the time being, at least, to be hopelessly deadlocked.

Meanwhile, from one end of the country to the other, the warning flags are flying: The fuel shortage will become increasingly serious in the months ahead. The manufacture and operation of automobiles accounts for more than a fifth of all the energy consumed in the United States. Worse still, automobiles effectively use only 5 percent of the potential energy they burn; the rest is wasted. The average car has about 120 horsepower per passenger—roughly the amount required by a subsonic aircraft for take-off. Per passenger mile, a car consumes five times as much fuel as a train, and six times as much as a bus.

In light of an increasingly serious shortage this waste is unacceptable. Gasoline stations are closing on Sundays; some travelers can only fill their tanks one half at a time. The American Automobile Association states that last week of 3,417 reporting gasoline stations, 1,592 or 47 percent were operating fewer hours on weekdays, were closed on Sundays, or has otherwise curtailed normal operations.

Ironically, the fuel shortage has already had a significant impact on highway construction in some instances. As the highway-building season began, in the words of the head of the Associated General Contractors of America:

Hundreds of construction firms . . . can get no firm commitments on fuel for projects now slated to begin in 30 to 90 days, ranging from highways in Virginia to industrial plants in California.

City governments, too, are feeling the fuel crunch. Detroit, Birmingham, Ala., and Atlanta, Ga., are only a few of the cities which have had trouble finding bidders for city fuel supplies.

Last winter fuel shortages caused the closing of schools and industries in the Midwest. And at this time it appears that there will be shortages of fuel for farm machinery needed to plant and harvest the Nation's agricultural products. Can we really afford to feed our cars at the

expense of closing our schools, factories, and farms?

I do not believe we can. Furthermore, I am convinced that improved urban mass transportation could provide significant relief. For example, if we could shift one-fourth of urban travel in major metropolitan areas from private automobiles to public transportation, we could expect to save nearly a million barrels of petroleum a day by 1980. It has been said that energy is the ultimate natural resource. It is also a limited resource. Unless we begin to conserve energy, by eliminating wasteful uses, and providing for more energy efficient uses of the limited resources we have, we may soon be paying a tremendously high price for our energy needs. While mass transit may not be the whole answer, it is a beginning. Interestingly enough, many major oil companies agree and have publicly endorsed highway trust fund flexibility. They include: Exxon, Mobil, Gulf, Texaco, and Atlantic Richfield.

The transportation control strategies required under the Clean Air Act further underscore the importance of providing cities with the option to use some of their highway funds for public transportation. The Environmental Protection Agency is currently planning transportation control strategies for at least 18 urban areas in the United States. The measures proposed by EPA just 2 weeks ago are indeed stringent. Plans include limitations on gasoline sales, outright bans on automobiles in certain areas, and increases in off street parking taxes. These measures are presently subject to review, after public comment, to determine whether or not such plans are implementable, and whether they are desirable.

However, regardless of the immediate impact of the transportation control strategies, the long term implications of the role of transportation in achieving ambient air quality standards is clear.

In spite of stringent emission controls being required for installation on vehicles, the automobile pollution problem will continue to be dictated by the total number of vehicle miles driven in any given urban area. It is not to complex a proposition to realize that gains in air quality attributable to a decrease in emissions per vehicle mile will be offset by any increase in the total number of vehicle miles driven. Thus a key element of any plan to achieve the ambient air quality standards of automobile use within the region.

It is equally obvious that reducing the overall use of automobiles in urban areas cannot be accomplished without providing alternative forms of transportation. Clearly we cannot accept the choice presently before us: Our air or our cars. Nor can the public be expected to voluntarily limit their use of automobiles if no alternative form of transportation is available. To do so would create little but chaos.

Thus it is imperative that our urban areas be allowed to develop their transportation systems to remedy such situations. In order to do this we must remove the financial constraints presently placed

on our urban areas by the bias in Federal transportation funding; and because of the "lead time" required for effective transportation planning, the bias must be removed now. Only when alternative forms of transportation are available, be it exclusive buslanes, entirely new bus systems, or the construction and operation of rail systems in high density areas, can we begin to achieve the kind of ambient air quality that will not subject our populace to breathing air that is hazardous to their health.

THE ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED AMERICANS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with 39 of my colleagues, legislation to make travel around town or across country easier and cheaper for elderly and handicapped Americans.

The bill, "the Elderly and Handicapped Americans Transportation Services Act," would:

Make it possible for persons 65 and older to travel at free or reduced fares on airlines, railroads and buslines.

Permit similar discounts for the blind, the mentally and physically handicapped, and persons traveling in their attendance on airlines. Rail and bus lines already are covered under present law.

Provide for special services and facilities to eliminate travel barriers encountered by handicapped and elderly persons on mass transit facilities.

Beneficiaries of this bill are the Nation's more than 21 million handicapped Americans—including many Vietnam veterans—20 million elderly Americans who wish to remain active and keep in touch with society, the friends and relatives who these persons will be able to visit, and the transportation industry.

Getting out of their homes and traveling, whether for pleasure or for a job previously unavailable, is certain to give elderly and handicapped Americans a new sense of belonging and a feeling of independence.

This bill not only makes travel easier for those who would have trouble doing so, but it would also help to fill commercial transports that usually run well below capacity. Over 100 urban transport systems around the country have reduced fare programs, and most are finding that their business has been spurred. For example, since the New York City subway started its reduced-fare program, there has been a reported 30 percent increase in travelers.

The transportation industry would soon find that this virtually untapped segment of the American population would bring considerably more business to commercial transportation. The fare provisions of the bill are discretionary, allowing each carrier to decide for itself how much, if any, discount to offer.

The potential mobility of those who would benefit is severely limited by lack of income: 25 percent of the Nation's

elderly are below the poverty level. Yet reducing fares is not enough. If the handicapped and the elderly are to take advantage of the reduced fares, special facilities will have to be made for them. Through this bill, special grants and loans will be allocated to State and local agencies to assist them in providing mass transportation services that are planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of these people. These include ramps at subway stations, sheltered waiting areas with special areas for wheelchairs, and stanchions running from floor to ceiling in subway cars instead of overhead grips. The Secretary of Transportation would prescribe design standards to insure that the elderly and handicapped would have ready access to these services.

In addition, the bill provides for special consideration of applications for Federal transportation grants and loans to those agencies taking measures to aid the elderly and handicapped. It also authorizes \$40 million over the next 2 years for special transportation planning, research and demonstration grants.

The public fails to realize that the greatest single obstacle of the handicapped is the physical design of buildings and facilities they must use. Alternatives will have to be found to such barriers as: bus and train steps, of which 30 percent of the handicapped cannot now use; escalators; long staircases, and a multitude of obstacles which do not even warrant a second thought by the able-bodied majority.

I believe that many measures can be taken to relieve the strain of urban and cross-country travel: special ticket lines; turnstiles that have been redesigned to accommodate not only the elderly and handicapped but also shoppers with packages, children or anything that restricts their movements; travel lanes set aside for those people unable to move quickly; wider doors on all vehicles, and shuttles or minibuses where a long walk is required, as in airline terminals.

Since handicapped people tend to suffer more from the confusion and panic experienced when they become disoriented, visual indicators, illuminated sign boards, audio signals, and floor texture pathways would greatly benefit these people and help to keep the masses of travelers flowing smoothly. These special adaptations for the handicapped need not be separate from the normal traffic patterns. It may prove to be even more convenient, and preferable to the general public.

More than anything else, this bill will aid our aged and disabled in achieving a dignified and meaningful life.

Sponsors of the bill are:

JOSEPH ADDABO, HERMAN BADILLO, JONATHAN BINGHAM, CHARLES CARNEY, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, WILLIAM CLAY, CARL DISS COLLINS.

JOHN CONYERS, DOMINICK V. DANIELS, ROBERT DRINAN, DON EDWARDS, DONALD FRASER, RICHARD FULTON.

HENRY GONZALEZ, ELLA GRASSO, WILLIAM GREEN, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER.

HENRY HELSTOSKI, EDWARD KOCH, ROBERT MOLLOHAN, WILLIAM MOORHEAD, JOHN MURPHY, MORGAN MURPHY.

ROBERT NIX, CLAUDE PEPPER, CARL PERKINS, BERTRAM PODELL, CHARLES RANGEL, OGDEN REID.

PETER RODINO, ROBERT ROE, PAUL SARBANES, FORTNEY STARK, ROBERT TIERNAN, CHARLES H. WILSON, ANTONIO WON PAT, GUS YATRON.

The text follows:

H.R. 9096

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation to handicapped persons and persons who are sixty-five years of age or older, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for persons who are sixty-five years of age or older, and to provide new and improved transportation programs for the handicapped and the elderly.

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 Elderly and Handicapped Americans Transportation Services Act".

SEC. 2. Section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1373(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "persons in connection with such accident;" the following: "person who are sixty-five years of age or older, handicapped persons when the handicapped person requires an attendant, and such attendant;" and

(2) by inserting at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of this subsection the term 'handicapped persons' means persons who have severely impaired vision or hearing, and other physically or mentally handicapped persons as defined by the Board."

SEC. 3. Section 22(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 22(1)) is amended by inserting after "or commutation passenger tickets" the following: "or the transportation of persons who are sixty-five years of age or older free or at reduced rates", and is amended by striking out "to the extent of requiring such attendant, at the usual and ordinary fare charged to one person" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to the extent of requiring such attendant, or from carrying such attendant free or at reduced rates".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1602) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) In providing financial assistance under this Act the Secretary shall give preference to applications made by State and local public bodies and agencies thereof which agree to adopt and maintain (or require the adoption and maintenance of) specially reduced rates, not exceeding 50 per centum of regular rates, for persons who are handicapped (including the deaf and blind) or who are sixty-five of age or over, on all days of operation (by the applicant or any person covered by the application) of the facilities and equipment to be financed under the application."

(b) Section 16(b) of such Act of 1964 (49 U.S.C. 1612(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to any grant or loan otherwise authorized by this Act, the Secretary may make grants and loans to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the specific purpose of assisting them to provide mass transportation services that are planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of handicapped persons (including the deaf and blind) and persons sixty-five years of age and over.

Grants and loans made under the preceding sentence shall be subject to all of the terms, conditions, requirements, and other provisions applicable to grants and loans under section 3(a) of this Act, and shall be considered for the purpose of all other laws to have been made under such section. Of the total amount of obligations which the Secretary may incur on behalf of the United States under the first sentence of section 4(c), 2 per centum may be set aside and used to finance the programs and activities authorized by this subsection, including administrative costs."

SEC. 5. The Act entitled "An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped", approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151-4156), is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (3) in the first section;

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) in the first section and inserting in lieu thereof "; or";

(3) by adding at the end of the first section the following:

"(5) to be constructed with financial assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964";

(4) by redesignating sections 5 and 6 as sections 6 and 7, respectively;

(5) by inserting after section 4 the following:

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may prescribe standards for the design of buildings, structures, and facilities which are provided with financial assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 and are subject to this Act, to insure that persons sixty-five years of age and over, and physically and mentally handicapped persons (including the deaf and the blind) will have ready access to, and use of, those buildings, structures, and facilities."; and

(6) by inserting "and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to standards issued under section 5," immediately before the words "is authorized—" in section 7, as redesignated by this Act.

SEC. 6. Title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3031 and 3032) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"Sec. 403. (a) The Secretary, after consulting with the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, may make grants to any public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution, and may contract with any agency, organization, or institution, or any individual, to—

"(1) study the economic and service aspects of transportation for persons sixty-five years of age and over living in urban or rural areas;

"(2) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects regarding the feasibility of special transportation subsystems for persons sixty-five years of age and over and for persons with mobility restrictions;

"(3) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects on portal-to-portal service and demand actuated services for persons listed in paragraph (2);

"(4) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects concerning the impact of transportation pricing structures on the comfort and morale of persons sixty-five years of age and over;

"(5) study transportation and social service delivery interfaces;

"(6) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects to coordinate and develop better transportation services per-

formed by health and social service agencies for persons sixty-five years of age and over;

"(7) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects regarding off-hour use of schoolbuses for transportation services for persons sixty-five years of age and over;

"(8) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects concerning other relevant problems affecting the mobility of persons sixty-five years of age and over;

"(9) conduct planning, research, and demonstration projects concerning the uses of transportation personnel to assist persons sixty-five years of age and over who use public transportation; and

"(10) conduct research on transportation vehicles which will best serve the needs of the handicapped, including persons with severely impaired vision or hearing, and those persons sixty-five years of age and over.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GUGLIELMO MARCONI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 1974 is the centennial anniversary of the birth of Guglielmo Marconi, the scientific genius who invented and developed the wireless telegraph. Born in Bologna, Italy, on April 25, 1874, Marconi received most of his education from tutors at home and never studied at a university. He did, however, study physics privately and was acquainted with Prof. Augusto Righi of the University of Bologna, a pioneer in the study of electromagnetic waves.

While on vacation in the Italian Alps during the summer of 1894, Marconi picked up an electrical journal containing an article describing the electromagnetic wave experiments of Heinrich Hertz. From this he conceived the idea of using Hertzian waves for communications, and he returned to his home in Pontecchio eager to test the idea. Within several months he completed his apparatus and transmitted signals through the air from one end of the house to the other, then from the house to the garden. These experiments were in effect the dawn of practical wireless telegraphy.

Since communications at sea presented the greatest promise for development and use of the invention, Marconi decided to go to England in 1896, where there was greater shipping activity. British Army and Navy officials were invited to observe his historic experiments on Salisbury Plain. Modestly, Marconi declared that his discovery was not the result of long hours of labor and thought, but of experiments with devices invented by other men, to which he applied certain improvements. First, he increased the effectiveness of wireless by connecting both transmitter and receiver with the earth, that is, grounding them; second, he used the vertical wire, or antenna, insulated from the earth, which was the more important of the two innovations.

In 1897, Marconi rigged up a new station at The Needles on the Isle of Wight,

and in 1898 the first paid Marconigrams were sent by Baron Kelvin to his friend George Stokes and to Sir William Preece, engineer in chief of the British Post Office, who was deeply interested in signaling without wires. Wireless messages could now be sent about 18 miles. Encouraged, Marconi built a new station at Bournemouth. Shipping interests began to show an interest in this new form of communication, and Queen Victoria invited Marconi to establish communication between Osborne House on the Isle of Wight and the royal yacht *Osborne*. In March 1899 he flashed the first signal across the English Channel from France to the cliffs of Dover. He was then invited to the United States by the New York Herald, which arranged for installation of his apparatus on the steamship *Ponce*, from which bulletins were flashed on the progress of the international yacht races off the New Jersey coast.

The dawn of the 20th century found Marconi possessed with the idea of sending messages across the Atlantic. At Poldhu, on the southwest tip of England, he built a transmitter 100 times more powerful than any previous station, and in November 1901 he went to America to install a receiving station at St. John's, Newfoundland. December 21, 1901, became a historic date in the annals of wireless when the 27-year-old Marconi received signals across the ocean from Poldhu. News of his achievement sped around the world, and he was acclaimed by outstanding scientists, including Thomas Edison, Michael Pupin, Charles Steinmetz, and Sir Oliver Lodge.

Marconi then turned his attention to the application of wireless to ships at sea, conducting historic tests from the steamer *Philadelphia*. Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, was selected as a site for a transmitter to demonstrate further the capabilities of the invention by transatlantic contacts with Poldhu. The scene then shifted to Cape Cod, Mass., and from a station built at South Wellfleet communication was established with England. An exchange of messages between President Theodore Roosevelt and King Edward VII, on January 19, 1903, heralded Marconi's "wonderful triumph of scientific research and ingenuity."

Marconi next selected Clifden, Ireland, as the location for a 300-kilowatt station, and there he incorporated many new ideals and improvements which resulted from the earlier tests. So strong were the signals that Glace Bay and Clifden seemed only a short distance apart as thousands of words crossed the sea. Press and commercial service were established in 1907.

Wireless met its first big test in time of disaster at sea on January 23, 1909, when the *SS Republic* was rammed by the *SS Florida*, 26 miles south of Nantucket Lightship. Rescue ships came from all directions, and only six lives were lost, although the *Republic* sank while the crippled *Florida* was towed to port. Three years later—on April 12, 1912—the *SS Titanic* bound for New York City on her maiden voyage, crashed into an iceberg in midocean, and its wireless frantically called for help as the SOS flashed from the masthead. From

that day no one argued that wireless was just a dream or a toy, and honors were heaped upon Marconi as a benefactor of mankind. Previously, in 1909, his achievement had been recognized by the award of the Nobel Prize in physics.

During World War I, Marconi was in Italy aiding the Italian Navy in communications. Wireless emerged from the war with new records of accomplishment, and Marconi, entranced by the possibilities of shortwaves, directed his experiments toward this new field. He bought a yacht, which he named *Elettra*, equipped it as a floating laboratory, and established communication between the Mediterranean and Australia and other points around the world. From shortwaves he went to microwaves and, in 1922, demonstrated their possibilities, especially directional effects and their application to radiotelephony. He predicted that a revolution in wireless was coming with the harnessing of tiny waves that would vastly improve worldwide communication. Beyond that he foresaw the possibilities of sending radio-photos and eventually pictures in motion—in other words, television.

Marconi continued his research and development activities, especially in the area of microwaves, but by 1935 his health was failing, and doctors ordered him to take a complete rest. Two years later the wireless that he developed startled the world with the news that Marconi's "race of existence" had ended with tragic suddenness in a heart attack.

Mr. Speaker, Marconi was one of the giant figures in the history of modern science. He either developed or foresaw the development of most of the revolutionary innovations in 20th century communications, developments which literally transformed the conditions of modern life. The United States, and indeed the entire world, have benefited immeasurably from this great man's work.

For this reason, I am today introducing a bill for the issuance of a commemorative stamp by the U.S. Postal Service in honor of Marconi's birth. I feel that this is an appropriate tribute to the great "Son of Italy" who contributed so much to the quality of our society, and I urge my colleagues' support.

CONGRESSMAN DRINAN HOLDS DISTRICT HEARINGS ON HEALTH PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1973, at a public hearing I held at Newton City Hall in Newton, Mass., I heard testimony from many expert witnesses representing various disciplines of the medical profession on the impact of the administration's proposed fiscal 1974 health budget.

Specifically, the witnesses focused on the effects of the proposed budgetary cutbacks upon medical education, biomedical research, nurse training, and other Federal health-care efforts, such as the regional medical programs. These doctors, nurses, medical educators, and health administrators, emphasized the

need for continuing medical school capitation grants, biomedical research, and research training programs.

The testimony in these hearings, which I have shared with my colleagues in Congress, confirmed my belief that in seeking to terminate certain health programs and substantially reduce funding, the administration has made a decision which will be harmful not only to us, but also to our children, who will not have the benefits, which we now take for granted, that result from ongoing programs of medical research and education. Without this life-saving research, future generations will have only as much medical knowledge as we possess today. To pursue such a policy is, in fact, uneconomical. We have spent millions of dollars in research projects which would have to be halted, if the administration's proposals are accepted. Considerable previous research would go to waste.

At these hearings, no single issue received as much attention as did the biomedical research programs administered by the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health. Despite overwhelming evidence of the success and value of the NIH and NIMH research training programs, the administration has chosen to seek their termination. The administration has also sought to end the peer review mechanism of awarding NIH research grants in favor of a contractual method. I must question whether these approaches are the mark of responsible leadership.

The administration position on public health programs also represents an abdication of responsibility. Throughout the latter part of the 92d Congress, the administration requested the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to delay extending authorizations for health programs until the administration completed its review of the programs and formulated a position. The position that finally resulted cannot be characterized as constructive. Five public health programs, including the Hill-Burton program, the regional medical program, and the community mental health centers program, were to be eliminated. Five other programs were to be left essentially unchanged and reauthorized, and two others were to be consolidated. No proposals were made to improve any of the programs on the administration's termination list, regardless of need or the value of the program's concept.

The administration proposed no substantive improvements in the public health programs or in the NIH biomedical research training programs; it only designated those programs that it would either "keep or throw." Fortunately, Congress has stepped in to fill the void of responsible leadership. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and particularly the Subcommittee on Public Health, chaired by my colleague PAUL ROGERS, has done a most commendable job in reporting to the whole House legislation to continue all 12 public health programs and to reauthorize and improve NIH and NIMH biomedical research training programs.

Happily, on May 31, 1973, the House passed both of these bills by overwhelm-

ing margins, and on June 18, 1973, the President signed one of these bills, H.R. 7806, the Health Programs Extension Act of 1973, into law. The other bill, H.R. 7724, the National Biomedical Research Fellowship, Traineeship, and Training Act of 1973, is presently being considered by the Health Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, where hearings are now in progress.

As passed by the House, H.R. 7724 authorizes \$415.6 million for NIH and NIMH biomedical research training programs over the next 2 years. H.R. 7274 also establishes a procedure whereby those who receive Government support for their research training and who subsequently go into private practice or pursue a career in industry shall repay the Government for the costs of their advanced education. This repayment clause, which does not apply if the individual goes into public health, medical education, or public medical research, arose in part in response to administration criticisms of the NIH research training programs. I believe the repayment scheme is sufficiently flexible as to not interfere with the vast majority of those individuals who receive NIH financial assistance.

Just a few days ago, on June 26, the House passed legislation, H.R. 8877, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the 1974 fiscal year. This bill includes funding of \$4.76 billion for health programs administered by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration and by the National Institutes of Health. This total budget for health is \$33 million above the President's request.

The sum of \$171 million is included in the bill for NIH and NIMH biomedical research training grants. The President had requested no funds for this purpose. Fifteen million is included for construction of community mental health centers. Again, the President's budget contained no funds for this program. Eighty-two million is contained for the regional medical program; the President had requested phaseout money only. The sum of \$197.2 million is included for the Hill-Burton medical facilities construction programs. No money was requested for these programs.

The National Cancer Institute received \$522.4 million in the House-passed budget, an increase of \$22.4 million over the President's request, and the National Heart and Lung Institute received \$281.4 million, an increase of \$16.4 million.

Significantly, the bill contains \$706.8 million for health manpower programs, \$324.6 million more than was contained in the President's request. Included in the increase is \$68.6 million for capitation grants for school of nursing, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, and pharmacy; \$100 million for construction grants for schools of medicine, dentistry, and other health professions; \$20 million for construction of schools of nursing; and \$60.9 million for public health and allied health support programs.

All in all, this appropriations bill signifies a firm resolve on the part of Congress to continue those health programs

which had been endangered. In particular, Congress has acted to continue at workable funding levels programs in nursing education, biomedical research training, and other capitation and medical school construction programs that were to have been eliminated, to the great detriment of health in our country.

The testimony that I received during the May 5 hearings enabled me to be more effective in my efforts to continue health programs at adequate funding levels. I hope that my colleagues with whom I have shared this information found it as worthwhile as I.

I would like to include at this point a list of the witnesses who appeared at the hearings or submitted testimony to me, and a summary of their testimony:

LIST OF WITNESSES

Dr. Ephraim Friedman, Dean of the Boston University School of Medicine.

Dr. Lauro F. Cavazos, Associate Dean, Tufts University School of Medicine.

Dr. Lamar Soutter, Dean of the University of Massachusetts Medical School.

Dr. Irene S. Palmer, Dean of the Boston University School of Nursing.

Dr. Norman Levinsky, Chairman, Department of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine.

Mr. Richard E. Sobota, Executive Director, Health Planning Council for Greater Boston, Inc.

Mr. William S. Oshima, Assistant Professor, Boston College Graduate School of Social Work.

Dr. Mitchell T. Rabkin, General Director, Beth Israel Hospital.

Dr. Roger Jeanloz, Chief of Unit, Laboratory for Carbohydrate Research, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Dr. Kurt Isselbacher, Chief of Gastrointestinal Unit, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Dr. Frederick J. Stohlman, Director of Medicine and Research, St. Elizabeth's Hospital.

Dr. Thomas Ryan, Chief of Clinical Cardiology, University Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts.

Dr. Leo Stolbach, Chief of Medicine, Pondville Hospital.

Dr. William Fishman, Director, Cancer Research Center, Tufts University.

(Drs. Stolbach and Fishman offered joint testimony).

Dr. Jerome Gross, Professor of Medicine, Harvard Medical School.

Dr. Elliot G. Mishler, Associate Professor, Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

Dr. Theodore B. Bayles, Director of Training Grants, Robert Breck Brigham Hospital.

Dr. Peter Shur, Immunologist and Rheumatologist, Robert Breck Brigham Hospital.

Mr. William S. Brines, Administrative Vice President, Newton Wellesley Hospital.

The following three people did not appear at the hearings; but submitted written statements:

Ms. Anne Quackenbos, President, Diabetes Research, Inc.

Dr. John Nelson, Director of Child Psychiatry Training, South Shore Mental Health Center, Dean of the Harvard Medical School.

Dr. Robert H. Ebert, President, Association of American Physicians (Dr. Ebert submitted as testimony his address to the annual convention of the Association of American Physicians.).

MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH: MEDICAL SCHOOL DEANS SPEAK

Dr. Ephraim Friedman, dean of the Boston University School of Medicine, described in detail the reductions in medical education and research, as well

as the decline in services offered by medical schools, that would result from administration cutbacks in health programs.

First, he said, the enrollment of students of minority groups and from lower socioeconomic levels in medical schools would sharply decline. These students are understandably reluctant to undertake indebtedness. Further, recruiting and support of students from the ghetto areas would, of necessity, be eliminated.

The reduction in NIH training and research grants, Dr. Friedman stated, would have several tragic effects. Junior faculty would be hardest hit. They have been lured into the field of medical research by the availability of financial support which would disappear if the administration's proposals take effect. Older researchers are far less likely to embark on new or innovative programs because of the possibility of the sudden disappearance of funds.

Dr. Friedman feels that the medical schools will survive but at a price. Allow me to quote his eloquently profound words:

But survival for what? To return to the era when a medical education was the privilege of the progeny of the wealthy? To return to the era of "diploma mills," of largely voluntary faculty led by obsequious deans too timid to innovate or insist on high standards of education for fear of offending students who paid tuition, faculty who donated their time, or wealthy contributors whose price consisted of the admission of applicants who could not make it on their own? Are we returning to the era when pharmaceutical houses could "buy" research results from impoverished medical schools?

Finally, Dr. Friedman accused the administration of "anti-intellectualism" and "political cowardice." While the administration has attacked a "relatively small, impoverished, but vital part of the health care system, it has ignored the far more important health problem facing the country—the absence of universal entitlement or national health insurance." National health insurance, according to Dr. Friedman, is long overdue. It will require a comprehensive approach to health care as well as a reordering of budget priorities.

Dr. Lauro F. Cavazos, associate dean of the Tufts University School of Medicine, testified that the Tufts University School of Medicine would be severely affected by the administration's proposed budget cuts. He cited three factors upon which the quality and cost of health are dependent: First, the education of the physician; second, research or the acquisition of new knowledge or information; and third, the provision of clinical care itself.

Dr. Cavazos pointed out that, in response to the recently emerged critical shortage of medical manpower, the Nation's medical schools increased their enrollment by about 50 percent. According to Dr. Cavazos, this increase was made possible only by massive assistance from Federal funds. These Federal funds insure that all students will have an equal financial opportunity to enter medical school—that the criterion for entrance into medical school will be the student's

academic qualifications, rather than the parents' financial qualifications. Without adequate Federal scholarship assistance, Dr. Cavazos said that the opportunity to study medicine at Tufts would be denied to all but those who are the children of wealthy parents.

In the area of research, Dr. Cavazos cited numerous diseases and afflictions which have been at least partially overcome through biomedical research. Continuing, he pointed out that if Federal biomedical research funds were cut, many research projects would come to a tragic halt. Even research on cancer and heart disease would be harmed, for this research depends on basic biomedical research efforts which would be sharply curtailed.

If Federal funds are withdrawn from medical education, Dr. Cavazos continued, the results for Tufts would be a reduction in student enrollment, a loss in teaching and research faculty, and a reduction in biomedical research carried out under the auspices of the Tufts Medical School.

Finally, Dr. Cavazos described the neighborhood health centers which had their origin at Tufts. These centers have been revolutionary in providing family health care. He noted an ever increasing interest on the part of prospective students in these centers, and expressed concern that funds for neighborhood health centers be continued.

Dr. Lamar Soutter, dean of the University of Massachusetts Medical School, has a different type of problem. The Federal Government had approved a grant of \$16,500,000 for construction of the University of Massachusetts Medical School Hospital. Subsequently, the administration decided to withhold grants for teaching hospitals. This means that Massachusetts taxpayers will now have to bear the burden of this \$16,500,000 alone, having contributed in the past to the construction of hospitals in other States.

Dr. Soutter also expressed great concern over proposed curtailments of scholarship funds and reductions in research funds. According to Dr. Soutter, cutbacks in research programs would "cripple the research efforts of new schools" such as the University of Massachusetts Medical School.

NURSING EDUCATION

Dr. Irene S. Palmer, R.N., Ph. D., dean and professor of the Boston University School of Nursing, appeared with three other nursing educators to discuss funding of nurse training. Participating with Dr. Palmer were: Mary A. Dineen, R.N., Ed. D., dean of Boston College School of Nursing; Juanita O. Long, R.N., Ed. D., dean of the Northeastern University School of Nursing; and Elaine C. Hubbard, R.N., Ed. D., chairman of the Department of Nursing at Simmons College.

Dr. Palmer stated that exorbitant cutbacks in Federal nursing funds would drastically curtail the ability of nursing schools to provide competent, soundly educated nurses, who are vital to health care delivery in the United States. Nurses, she said, aid tremendously in pro-

viding health care by relieving the physician of many health-related activities.

Dr. Palmer pointed out that if the administration's proposed cutbacks in funds for nursing education take effect, nursing faculties across the country will have to be reduced by about 50 percent. These faculties have taken some schools up to 30 years to develop. In addition, she said, the cuts will make it extremely difficult for the average nursing student, being female and of a lower socioeconomic status, to obtain funding for her nursing education.

She objected specifically to the suggestion made by the administration that the general need for doctorally trained researchers in the health and biomedical fields had been met and that continued Federal support for training of Ph. D.'s would lead to an oversupply. Dr. Palmer felt that it is important for nurses to have a sound body of knowledge on which to base their judgments so as to be able to work out an organized scheme for patient care rather than merely perform certain fixed tasks and skills. Further, she said that there was no basis for the administration's voiced fears of an oversupply of trained nurses. In fact, Dr. Palmer suggested a need of 250,000 additional nurses by 1975.

Dr. Palmer also noted that the modest salary expectations of nurses—usually no more than \$15,000—would in many cases make it impossible for them to bear the costs of their training, despite administration assertions to the contrary.

Dr. Norman Levinsky, chairman, Department of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, pointed out three of the many serious problems which would result from a reduction of the Federal commitment to biomedical research.

NIH BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH TRAINING

First, Dr. Levinsky pointed to the verbal commitment of Congress and the President to investigate the major causes of disability and death—particularly by expanding research efforts on cancer and heart disease. He noted that the amount of additional funds actually provided for this research is not nearly commensurate with the great publicity given the commitment. Further, he said, additional funds provided for cancer and heart disease research are not new funds, but have been taken from the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. Dollars taken away from such ongoing research projects as those conducted by the NIAMD affect the budget adversely, because research on which funds have already been spent will not be completed, and hence the previously expended funds will have been wasted. "Precipitous shifts" in funds from one research effort to another, Dr. Levinsky stated, are "notoriously cost-ineffective."

The second problem Dr. Levinsky addressed is the proposed elimination of Federal support for NIH research training grant programs. During their training, medical researchers are directly responsible for the conduct of many research projects. NIH training programs have been a primary source of investigators now conducting major programs of research. If these training programs are eliminated, the result will be a grave

reduction in existing biomedical research as well as a limitation on future health-related research.

Finally, he cited the cut in funds as having serious consequences for the Boston University School of Medicine in terms of faculty salary support. The faculty already teaches twice as many students as it did 5 years ago, but if the administration cutbacks go into effect, some faculty members will have to be released.

HEALTH PLANNING

Mr. Richard E. Sobota is the executive director of the Health Planning Council for Greater Boston, Inc. In his testimony, he noted that the comprehensive health planning program had for a long time been paralleling and occasionally duplicating the regional medical program, which the administration wants to end. This has occurred, Mr. Sobota said, because of the "vague," "inconsistent," and "meandering" Federal approach to health planning.

Mr. Sobota reemphasized the notion that health and health care should be viewed as rights rather than as privileges; but he noted that currently the impression is left by the actions of the Federal Government that "Health is a Fiscal Option." If health care is to be viewed as a right, he said, Congress must take definitive legislative action to create a national health care system that guarantees "universal entitlement" to health care.

Mr. William Oshima, assistant professor, Department of Community Organization—Social Organization, Boston College School of Social Work, and project director, NIMH community mental health training project, testified with Frederick L. Ahearn, Ph. D., chairman, Department of Community Organization—Social Planning, Boston College Graduate School of Social Work, and project director, section 314(c) comprehensive health planner training program.

Mr. Oshima and Dr. Ahearn testified that recent Federal cutbacks in health education have seriously jeopardized the Boston College Graduate School of Social Work's program in comprehensive health planning. The school is being cut by about 50 percent this year for student and faculty support. Next year the program will not exist. Not only does this program provide health services which restore, rehabilitate, and revitalize, but it is equally concerned about the creation of services directed at the prevention of disabilities and at the promotion of positive social and health functioning.

EQUATION AND RESEARCH: A BARGAIN

Dr. Mitchell T. Rabkin, general director of the Beth Israel Hospital in Boston and associate professor of medicine at the Beth Israel Hospital, Harvard Medical School, holds the view that when the benefits of Federal support for medical education and research are taken into account, these programs are really a bargain for their price. By funding training and research in university hospitals, he said, we insure that there will be sufficient numbers of practicing physicians, teachers, and researchers for the future. Dr. Rabkin also took exception to the administration's arguments that medical

researchers could afford the costs of their advanced training, and he also disagreed with the contention that there are already sufficient numbers of medical researchers and teachers. Summing up, he said that the decision to cut grants for training and research may save money now, but result in a lack of physicians for the future. In short, it may be a decision penny wise but pound foolish."

BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH: ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS AND RESPONSES

Dr. Roger W. Jeanloz is the chief of unit, Laboratory for Carbohydrate Research, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass. and professor of biological chemistry at the Harvard Medical School.

Like many of his colleagues in the health profession, Dr. Jeanloz was concerned about the impact of proposed reductions in Federal support of biomedical research, and noted that these cutbacks would take the following forms: first, reduction in the total amount of research money available; second, shifting distribution of medical research funds from a grant system, which is accessible to nonprofit institutions, to a contract system which gives an advantage to industrial laboratories; and third, a substantial decrease in scholarship and training fund grants.

If these administration proposals are allowed to take effect, he said, the result will be unfortunate not only for the medical institutions, faculties, researchers, and students who will be most directly affected. Rather the real losers will be the rest of us and future generations, who will be deprived of long term benefits in health care that stem directly from biomedical research.

Continuing, Dr. Jeanloz pointed out that as the wealthiest Nation in the world, other, smaller, nations look to us for leadership in this field. We can afford to fund research which will result in benefits to all mankind. Due to our position, other countries turn to us for aid and training of their own physicians and researchers. We must not let them down.

Dr. Kurt Isselbacher of the Harvard Medical School, commented on four areas of research. Dr. Isselbacher is the Mallinkrodt professor of medicine at the Harvard Medical School, chairman of the Executive Committee on the Department of Medicine at the Harvard Medical School, and chairman of the Harvard University Cancer Committee.

Dr. Isselbacher stressed the importance of the medical research training and fellowship programs. These training programs, he asserted, are the mechanisms for encouraging the best minds of our Nation to be brought into the field of medical research and medical school teaching. While such private organizations as the American Cancer Society do provide some financial support, only the Federal Government has funds of the necessary magnitude to adequately fund training and fellowship programs.

Dr. Isselbacher responded to the argument that there are already enough medical research by noting that less than 4 percent of medical school graduates go into full-time medical academic careers and even fewer into full-time research.

In addition, in response to the argument that an individual can bear the costs of research training by taking out loans, Dr. Isselbacher pointed out that—

Over 36% of graduate students have a major indebtedness and over 56% of medical students are in debt by the time they graduate. More than 50% of the individuals who are in training and fellowship programs are in debt and 70–75% of this group have indicated that they would not be able to continue their research training if their training had to be achieved on the basis of loans because of their already significant indebtedness . . .

Continuing, Dr. Isselbacher pointed out the importance of basic or fundamental research. Dr. Isselbacher cited several examples where important discoveries have been made by accident, sometimes during the course of nonrelated research.

Specifically, he noted recent advances in understanding the role of viruses in the causation of cancer, the eradication of poliomyelitis, the breakthrough in the antibiotic treatment of tuberculosis, the control of viral hepatitis, and the treatment of Parkinson's disease.

Next, he noted that funding of applied research cannot be carried out at the expense of basic research. Every major scientific breakthrough has been based on a solid foundation of fundamental research which extended over a long period of years.

Finally, Dr. Isselbacher chided the administration for its desire to eliminate the peer review mechanism of determining the awarding of NIH research funds. The substitute would be a system which would spread research dollars across the country on a geographically equitable basis. While this may yield the best results politically, Dr. Isselbacher said, it leaves much to be desired scientifically. The peer review system awards grants solely on the basis of scientific merit.

Dr. Frederick J. Stohlman, Jr., director of medicine and research at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Brighton, Mass., criticized the spending priorities of the administration. He was particularly irked by the retroactive nature of cuts in NIH biomedical research funding:

In March (1973), Directors of existing Training Programs were advised that no new commitments made after the 29th of January would be honored.

These retroactive cuts posed numerous problems for the directors who had to make immediate and drastic cuts in areas for which funding had been anticipated.

Continuing, Dr. Stohlman refuted two arguments used by the administration in defense of the cutbacks. First, the administration contends that a significant number of researchers whose training had been financed by the Government have not proven to be successful investigators and hence have not gone into the academic field. Drawing an analogy to the President's favorite pastime, everyone who goes out for the football team does not necessarily make it. Why, Dr. Stohlman asks, should not this be recognized in research also?

The second argument—and the most common—made by the administration is that if the financial rewards of medical research are great enough, people will

make sacrifices and incur debts to achieve the necessary training. Dr. Stohlman pointed out that individuals considering advanced training already have a college degree and a degree in medicine and hence would be understandably reluctant to undertake further debts for advanced training, given the questionable financial rewards of biomedical research, especially with the lucrative option of private practice.

Dr. Stohlman also noted that current reduction in biomedical research training funds would sharply reduce the number of investigators a decade from now. In addition, Dr. Stohlman spoke of the need to continue basic medical research and not spend all funds on medical "development" projects.

NIH TRAINING GRANTS: CANCER AND HEART RESEARCH

Dr. Thomas Ryan, chief of clinical cardiology, University Hospital, Boston, Mass., and professor of medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, noted that the method of funding currently employed by the Massachusetts Heart Association will be useless if Federal funds are cut off.

The Massachusetts Heart Association will fund any single project or trainee at a level up to \$10,000 annually. The idea behind this is that with this initial money, the research will be able to progress to the point where it would compete more successfully at the Federal level and receive realistic budgetary support.

Dr. Ryan also spoke of the protected time, for the teacher, that NIH biomedical research grants and fellowships pay for. Noting that this protected time, which benefits both the teacher and the trainee, would be reduced without NIH grants, Dr. Ryan commented that while there may be some inequities in the present NIH grant system, there are ways to deal with these inequities short of "precipitously shutting down the whole system."

Dr. Leo Stolbach is the chief of medicine, Pondville Hospital, Walpole, Mass., and associate professor of medicine, Tufts University School of Medicine. Dr. William Fishman is the director of the Cancer Research Center at Tufts University.

In their joint testimony, Dr. Stolbach and Dr. Fishman pointed out that despite the President's conquest of cancer pronouncements and other verbal attacks on this disease, he has consistently released substantially less money than has been appropriated for cancer research. This policy of saying one thing and doing another is both deceptive and destructive, according to Dr. Stolbach and Dr. Fishman.

Dr. Stolbach and Dr. Fishman also stated that as a result of the anticipated termination of NIH research fellowships, fully 50 percent of the medical staff positions at the Tufts Cancer Unit would have to be eliminated. In addition, the operations of the Tufts Cancer Unit would also be adversely affected by the proposed elimination of the regional medical program, which has facilitated communication between cancer specialists. Finally, the two doctors criticized

the proposal to shift to research contracts, stating that this approach would "stifle original thinking * * *."

NIH RESEARCH GRANTS: PEER REVIEW AND SCIENTIFIC MERIT

Dr. Jerome Gross, biologist at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, Mass., and professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School, addressed himself to the proposed elimination of the NIH peer review method of awarding research grants.

According to Dr. Gross, it seems that there has been a concerted and thinly disguised effort which began over 7 years ago to abolish the peer review system. In 1966, the Massachusetts General Hospital was visited by three paid industrial consultants to the National Institutes of Health. These consultants suggested that the hospital should "get smart" and administer their research "more in line with industrial procedures. Suggesting that the proposal to do away with the peer review system were at least in part an industry effort to grab a larger part of the research funding pie, Dr. Gross echoed criticism of other witnesses by noting that in a contract system, the importance of the scientific merit of a research proposal would be diminished. Dr. Gross argued vigorously that Congress and the NIH should receive outside opinions on the relative merit of the peer review system before doing away with it.

NIMH TRAINING GRANTS

Dr. Elliot G. Mishler is the director of psychological research at the Massachusetts Mental Health Center in Boston, Mass., and an associate professor, department of psychiatry, Harvard Medical School.

Dr. Mishler's testimony was concerned with budget cuts as they apply to psychiatric research. He cited numerous ongoing research projects which would be suddenly terminated if NIMH training grants are ended. Since a great deal of research in the field of mental health and changes in mental health services have resulted directly from these research grants, he felt that actions of the Federal Government eliminating these programs would have a destructive impact on research in mental health and thus on our knowledge and understanding of the causes of and therapies for mental illness. If these cutbacks take place, the research training program in social psychiatry at Harvard University, which Dr. Mishler directs, would, within a year, cease to exist in all but name.

TRAINING GRANTS AND MEDICAL EDUCATION

Dr. Theodore B. Bayles is the director of training grants, Robert Breck Brigham Hospital, and clinical associate professor of medicine at the Harvard Medical School. He gave evidence to lay to rest claims of the administration that NIH training programs finance at Government expense doctors who go into private practice. Seventy-seven percent of the graduates of the training program at the Robert Breck Brigham Hospital with which Dr. Bayles is involved are currently involved in research, whereas only 16 percent are in private practice. The remaining 7 percent are mothers who are

at home with their children. They indicated that they would be returning to research soon.

Dr. Peter Shur, immunologist and rheumatologist at the Robert Breck Brigham Hospital, and associate professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School, entered as testimony the address of Dr. Neal S. Bricker before the 65th annual meeting of the American Society for Clinical Investigation, Inc., in Atlantic City, N.J., April 30, 1973. He cited three major elements as composing the present threat to medical and biomedical research.

The first element is the termination of Federal support for the training of new biomedical scientists and teachers. He refuted three of the administration's arguments for cutting off all research training funds. First, the administration says that there is an excess of qualified manpower in many areas of biomedical research. He commented that this argument is totally in error. The administration's evidence for this argument is the number of requests for grants for research. This, Dr. Bricker contends, is not an accurate measure of the number of researchers or the need for more researchers.

Second, the administration contends that the Federal Government does not support graduate training in any other area. He notes here that the administration seems to be confusing graduate training with postdoctoral training. Further, in contrast to other areas of research, the Federal Government is the major investor in biomedical research in this country. To protect its investment, the Government must insure that the research is carried out by highly skilled and trained personnel.

Finally, the administration argues that students may take out low-cost loans to compensate for the removal of grants. Here, again, the argument in response was made that by the time a student reaches the postdoctoral level, he or she does not want to incur any further debt when the lucrative option of private practice is available.

Dr. Bricker's second major point was in opposition to the downgrading of basic research. He pointed out that basic research is essential inasmuch as it provides medical researchers with an unremitting flow of basic information upon which other discoveries can be made.

Finally, Dr. Bricker discussed contracts versus grants for medical research. The contract system is unworkable, Dr. Bricker states, because there is no way to tell beforehand which line of research will be fruitful and which will be useless. There is no one who knows what unpredicted benefits will result from the research in any particular field.

DIABETES RESEARCH

Anne Quackenbos is the president of Diabetes Research, Inc., of Wayland, Mass. In her submitted testimony, she conceded that there were, indeed, research programs which had outlived their usefulness. But, she said, the meat ax was not the right approach. All research programs should be studied in order to determine which ones should be

terminated and which ones should continue to be funded.

Further, she chided the administration for its support of only programs which will yield quick results. One never knows, she stated, when a major breakthrough will be made in the cure for cancer or the treatment of heart diseases. Speaking specifically of diabetes research, Mrs. Quackenbos noted in behalf of Diabetes Research, Inc., that the \$8.2 million spent by the NIH for diabetes research grants is uneconomical in view of the fact that diabetes costs this Nation \$2 billion a year. Mrs. Quackenbos also expressed the support of her organization for the peer review mechanism of determining NIH research grants.

PSYCHIATRIC RESEARCH

Dr. John Nelson, director of child psychiatry training at the South Shore Mental Health Center, submitted a statement also on the effects of the budget cuts on psychiatric research. He pointed out that, despite the fact that psychiatry and child psychiatry have been supported since World War II by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, child psychiatrists are still scarce and poorly distributed. Removing training support at this time will, in all likelihood, choke off the supply of these necessary specialists.

Dr. Nelson also noted that, rather than terminating NIH and NIMH research training programs as a result of a few abuses, whereby individuals receiving Government-subsidized training went into private practice, a better answer would be to expect trainees receiving Government financial support to spend some time in service in public institutions. In fact, I might add parenthetically that H.R. 7724, passed by the House on May 31, 1973, established such a "required service or repayment" scheme.

A NATIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH POLICY

Dr. Robert H. Ebert, dean of the Harvard Medical School and president of the Association of American Physicians, submitted as testimony the address which he delivered to the 85th annual meeting of the association held on May 1, 1973, in Atlantic City, N.J. Dr. Ebert also discussed five proposals which should be considered in the reformulation of a national policy of biomedical research, and, at the same time, would protect universities and medical schools from the kind of distortion which has characterized medical research in the past several decades.

First, there should be as sharp a separation as possible between the funding of medical education and medical research.

Second, members of the university community must begin to think more as faculties and less as special interest groups. Such an approach is more likely to solve the fundamental problems of disease.

Third, training programs should be redefined as training of future faculty rather than solely for research.

Fourth, the usefulness of very large center grants should be questioned both from the vantage point of the university and the possible distortion of its mission

as well as the research productivity of such grants.

Lastly, the university should use its influence to counterbalance the overemphasis on the categorical approach to research. Dr. Elbert would go even one step further and urge the complete dissolution of the categorical institutes.

HOSPITAL COSTS

On another area of health care under financial stress, William S. Brines, administrative vice president of the Newton Wellesley Hospital in Newton, Mass., and governor of district 1 of the American College of Hospital Administrators, addressed the increase in hospital costs. Refuting the administration's charges that increased hospital costs have resulted from inefficient, wasteful, or unreasonable practices, Mr. Brines cited several of the reasons for increases in costs, such as: the purchase of new and advanced equipment; changes in the hospitalization practices of physicians; and lack of concern by individuals about their own health. It is unreasonable, according to Mr. Brines, to expect that the employees of the hospital should bear the full burden of the cost increases, in the form of ceilings on wages. Hospitals must receive financial support from the Government.

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS: DAMAGE FOR YEARS TO COME

In conclusion, the testimony that I received from the distinguished individuals who appeared before my health hearings in Newton, Mass., as well as from those who were unable to attend but submitted testimony, constitutes a valuable compilation of expertise on the critical questions of Federal health care programs that are now under congressional scrutiny.

The evidence of these hearings is that the administration proposals to reduce funding for medical education, biomedical research, and other health programs would have a seriously damaging effect not only on the current quality and availability of health care, but also on health care and medical knowledge in the years to come.

Congress has taken commendable action in supporting health programs that benefit millions of Americans. This House in particular deserves praise for its far-sighted approach to health research and program. There is still much to be done, however. I hope that the President will take to heart the great weight of evidence in support of the Federal health programs that he has previously opposed, and I hope that he will approve the pending legislation to continue the biomedical research training programs of the NIH and the reasonable appropriations bill for health programs in the 1974 fiscal year.

THE NORTHEAST RAIL TRANSPORTATION ACT

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation intended to

bring about a long-range solution to the northeast rail crisis. The chronic ailment of the rail transportation system in the Northeast has now reached a crisis stage. On Monday, July 2, the trustees of the Penn Central must present to the judge in the Penn Central reorganization case either a plan for reorganization or liquidation of that huge transportation enterprise. The clock is beginning to run and we are at the eleventh hour.

Even if the judge does not order liquidation to begin on October 1 of this year, hard economics may bring an end to rail service on the Penn Central. The cash projections show that the Penn Central will run out of money during the winter quarter of 1974. Without cash to meet its payroll, the railroad will stop. There are five other railroads in bankruptcy in the Northeast whose fate also hangs in the balance. The Congress must act, and act before the end of this session, if necessary rail service to the Northeast and throughout the territory served by the bankrupt railroads is to be continued.

I think there is general agreement among my colleagues that rail service is too vital to the Northeast and to the economy of the Nation to be allowed to totally cease. This was demonstrated by the prompt action the Congress took to forestall a strike in the labor dispute in February. The question now is not whether rail service should be saved, but how best this should be done.

Over the past months I have worked to develop an orderly and fair solution which would recognize the many interests involved in this complex problem—the shippers, rail labor, cities and communities dependent on rail service, the rail industry and the creditors. The proposal I offer today represents an honest attempt at consensus, and I do not claim sole authorship of the ideas it contains. The proposal has elements of the DOT plan, the recommendations of the ICC and the helpful suggestions of the Union Pacific. It reflects input from the rail brotherhoods and their willingness to accept some basic changes in the Northeast, if the design of the new rail system were done by a public blue ribbon commission, the basic rights of the rail worker to just compensation were respected and the rail system in the Northeast remained in the private sector.

The bill I am introducing today seeks to meet not only the needs of the Northeast, but of the railroad system nationally. Title I provides financial assistance for all the surface transportation modes for needed capital investment through a program of guaranteed loans and help for the freight car shortage through insured loans for the purchase of rolling stock by railroads. The Title I insured loan program is similar to that contained in S. 1149, now pending in the Senate. Title III provides for speedier procedures for abandonment of railroad lines, but adds a 70-percent Federal, 30-percent State subsidy to cover the losses on a line proposed for abandonment, which a State wanted kept in operation. Both of these titles are similar to the provisions of the Surface Transportation Act (H.R. 5385) which I introduced earlier. They have been modified to include amend-

ments agreed to by rail labor and the surface transportation carriers.

Title II of the bill is the Northeast Transportation Act, the suggested solution I am offering to the rail crisis in the Northeast.

In describing the provisions of title II, I would first identify its basic components.

First, the rail system for the Northeast must be defined. Second, there must be created a means of financing a viable, restructured system. Third, a new corporation, with a self-liquidating Government investment, must be established to operate the system.

My bill would create a blue ribbon Northeast Transportation Commission—NETC—on which would serve representatives of all the interests involved, to design the new system. A Federal corporation, the Federal National Railway Association—FNRA—would provide financial backing. A new rail carrier, the Northeast Rail Corp.—NERC—would operate the system.

At its outset, the Northeast Rail Corp. would be owned by FNRA, which would purchase \$500 million of its class A preferred stock. The Northeast Rail Corp. would also issue a class B preferred stock and common stock, which could be used to purchase the transportation assets of the bankrupt railroads. It would also have available cash and Government guaranteed bonds issued by FNRA.

Thus the NERC would have cash from the sale of its class A preferred stock and from FNRA "soft loans," as well as its class B preferred stock and its common stock to exchange with the bankrupt railroads for the transportation assets needed to serve the northeastern part of the United States.

The most difficult problem is to determine what is the necessary public rail service for the Northeast, and who should make that decision. Frankly, there is not much support for allowing the Secretary of Transportation to design the system by himself, and then to allow Presidentially appointed incorporators of a new corporation to designate the points to be served and the lines to serve them. My bill would establish broadly representative Northeast Transportation Commission—NETC—to develop a comprehensive regional plan for rail service in the Northeast. The NETC would use as the basis of its work a basic point-to-point outline which the Secretary of the Department of Transportation would submit to it within 30 days of enactment of the statute. The NETC would be composed of 13 members, with an executive director who would serve ex officio. The composition would be:

One upon recommendation of the National Governor's Conference; one upon recommendation of the NARUC; one upon recommendation of the National League of Cities/Conference of Mayors; two upon recommendation of the AAR; one upon recommendation of the Consumer Federation of America; three upon recommendation of the National Industrial Traffic League; one upon recommendation of the National Association of Railroad Passengers; two

upon recommendation of the AFL-CIO, one representing the operating employees and one who represents the non-operating employees.

The regional plan would be a detailed plan for the reorganization and restructuring of the rail system in the Northeast. It would be the operating mandate of the Northeast Railroad Corp. It would designate those rail lines on which service shall be provided by the corporation; those lines and facilities which should be offered for sale to solvent railroads for inclusion in their systems; those rail lines which should be kept in operation only if a State or local subsidy is available; and those lines which should be "mothballed" so that the right of way would be available for future use if needed.

The regional plan would also set forth the estimated fair and equitable value of the rail lines and properties to be acquired and would describe the capital and debt structure of the new corporation.

In designating the plan, the NETC would be required to take in account, among other things:

First, the need for continued rail service by persons, communities, geographic zones, and cities presently served;

Second, existing patterns of service by railroads and alternative modes of transportation;

Third, present and projected future patterns of economic and population growth and the effect that continuation or cessation of rail service may have upon them;

Fourth, the requirements of commuter and intercity rail passenger service.

The bill directs that the members of the NETC incorporate and also be the first Board of Directors of the NERC. This provision will insure that the designers of the system use prudent judgment in designating the specific lines to be used, because they will be responsible for the corporation which would conduct business over such lines. This group—NETC—would be given a period of 10 months to complete a preliminary regional plan which would then be submitted to FNRA for comments as to financial feasibility, and to the ICC and the DOT. At the end of 12 months a final regional plan would be submitted to the Congress for ratification. The plan would become effective in 30 days unless rejected by a majority of either the House or the Senate.

If the regional plan was not rejected by Congress, it would be transmitted to NERC as its operating mandate. The corporation would then start operating on the designated lines as stated in the plan and proceed with the disposition of lines for which no subsidy was received either by selling them to other railroads or mothballing them for future use by beginning abandonment proceedings.

The plan would also provide that any State, local community, or shipper would have the right to have service continued so long as they paid a subsidy equal to 30 percent of the operating loss. The remaining 70 percent of the subsidy would be paid by the DOT to maintain that service.

Title II of my bill also creates a means

of determining the value of transportation assets of the bankrupt railroads and a mechanism for the acquisition of these assets by NERC. It would also protect the creditors from continued erosion of the estates of the bankrupt railroads.

Within 60 days of enactment, the judge in each bankruptcy would be required to make a finding as to whether the railroad could or could not proceed with an income-based reorganization or would have to be liquidated. The ICC would be directed to conduct a study and to send to the NETC within a year a report as to the liquidation value of the transportation assets of the bankrupt railroads, those which a judge has ruled cannot be reorganized. The valuation would be as of September 30, 1973. The NETC would include this valuation in the regional plan.

If necessary during the planning period, the NERC would be authorized to lease the transportation assets of the bankrupts both to maintain the status quo in service and to stem the erosion of the debtors' estates. At any time after approval by Congress of the regional plan the transportation assets would be conveyed upon demand to NERC by the trustees of the bankrupt railroads. At the same time, the claims of creditors of the bankrupt railroads acquired by NERC would be transferred to a single Federal court. NERC would deposit with that court class B preferred and common stock equivalent to the fair and equitable value of the properties as determined by the Commission in its valuation study and included in the regional plan. The judge would be empowered to rule on both the valuation set on the transportation properties and the value of the securities offered in exchange for them.

NERC would have available to it its own common and preferred class B stock outstanding as well as bonds and loans from FNRA. It would also, once it had obtained the assets free and clear from the bankrupt railroads, have the ability to borrow on these assets from the private sector.

Thus, NERC would have available capital for rehabilitation and funds to pay for a labor settlement to obtain the employees it will need in order to operate. If this corporation proves to be profitable—and it should be if the designated group and DOT do their jobs properly—then its earnings would be used to first retire the FNRA-owned, class A preferred stock. When this is accomplished, the voting power would shift to the common stockholders who would then elect the directors. Thus, ultimately, the corporation would be privately owned and operated. Its only connection with the Federal Government would be the availability of FNRA loans and Federal involvement will soon cease if the corporation achieves the earnings which are anticipated for it.

Title II of the bill will thus create a new common carrier by rail, operating in the Northeast, regulated by the ICC in the public interest, and owned and supported by private investment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my bill not as a final flat on the Northeast rail crisis. Rather, it is a

reasoned attempt at a solution. I know that the problem of rail service in the Northeast is of great concern to my colleagues who represent the States affected. I look forward to their comments and suggestions on this proposal. I hope it will have their support.

At the same time, I cannot state too strongly that this is a matter of national concern. My own city of Seattle, a continent away from the eastern seaboard, would very soon suffer the results of the collapse of rail service in the Northeast. The goods we export from Seattle to Asia and the East depend on a national system of rail transport. The grain and lumber we ship to the largest internal market in the world, the United States, depend on a unified and healthy transportation system, of which rail service is an essential part. Therefore, I offer my proposal today in the hope that it will be the basis for a solution to this transportation crisis which affects all our Nation. It deserves, and should have, the thought and attention of every Member of Congress.

THE FLEXIBLE HOURS EMPLOYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that will, if enacted, be a breakthrough in meeting the employment needs of thousands of Americans. It would institutionalize the practice of flexible hours employment positions for workers in Federal civil service jobs and help to end discrimination generated by the standard pattern of working hours.

The bill which has been introduced in the other body by Senator TUNNEY, calls for a 5-year, phase-in period, at the end of which 10 percent of all Federal civil service jobs will be on the flexible hours arrangement. This 5-year period will allow for study and experimentation as to the various types of jobs which can be placed in this arrangement. We must expand the concept of what kind of work will be considered for flexible hours. This bill provides across-the-board permanent positions in which workers receive on a pro rata basis all benefits—including promotion—normally available to full-time employees in similar positions or grades.

This is not a new concept. Ventures of this sort have been successfully tried in the past with other governmental agencies, and flexible hours were found to be mutually beneficial to both employers and workers because the worker can experience an improved quality of work and family life.

The flexible hours employment option will be a step in providing job designs which further the advancement of women—especially working mothers—by offering them greater employment opportunities. Together with more comprehensive maternity benefits and greater availability of child care, the restructuring of job patterns such as this bill provides will help speed the implementation

of the affirmative action programs to which we are all committed.

Many Americans cannot or do not desire to work on a full-time basis. For example, some working parents desire shorter workdays in order to return to childrearing responsibilities. Students need time to pursue their education. Older workers approaching retirement age may want to ease their workload. Handicapped individuals may prefer shorter workdays. There are countless reasons why a person would require or desire this option. But a person who desires full-time employment rather than flexible hours, should not be required to accept flexible hours as a condition for job hiring.

A current civil service employee who already has a satisfying full-time position must not be forced to accept flexible hours as a condition of continuing employment. A person who currently holds a full-time position and desires flexible hours, however, should have first priority in obtaining flexible hours for that position.

It is imperative that we create different job designs to meet different people's needs. A person who prefers to work flexible hours should be able to contribute to our society by so doing. And, while this bill will not by itself create fulfilling work, it will increase the satisfaction derived from a job making the conditions of employment more responsive to the individual worker's needs and desires.

I urge swift action on this bill. When enacted, it can serve as an example to many private and public employers, helping them to set up more flexible hour positions. Thousands of Americans will benefit from the increased flexibility in job options and the resulting enhancement in quality of work and family life.

A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY IS VITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a reassessment of energy consumption in this country. The fuel shortage of last winter and the gas shortage of this summer are but two indications that there is indeed an "energy crisis."

Dr. Paul E. Gray, chancellor of MIT and one of our most eminent scientists, delivered a statement on the energy problem several months ago that is particularly comprehensive and enlightening. I would like to paraphrase his remarks here, as they reflect my own view of the massive problems at hand.

Present energy consumption in this Nation is prodigious. Energy sales constitute approximately 10 percent of the GNP. The per capita rate of consumption is 10 kilowatts or 13 horsepower hourly. In other terms, each U.S. resident uses for personal needs in light, heat, and transportation and in the provisions of services we depend on, energy totalling 80 times the average daily caloric input.

This is markedly more than consumption in any other country. The United States, with 6 percent of the world population, consumes 35 percent of the energy used throughout the world.

This rate of consumption is not merely a reflection of our level of industrialization in all sectors of our economy. In addition, it is the most conclusive indication of the American habit of luxury items. We drive larger cars that consume more gas than any other people; we are accustomed to central heating and air conditioning; and we have a national love for TV, dishwashers, and washing machines. Every home that can afford such appliances possesses them.

In the last century the use of energy in the United States has doubled, on the average, every 22 years. The rate of energy use today grows at 4.3 percent annually, or, it doubles in 16 years. When further broken down, it appears that electricity consumption is growing nearly twice as fast—at a rate of 10 percent per year, or a doubling time of 7 years.

Certain "ecological" standards, such as those for automotive emissions, tend to increase the rate of growth of consumption. For example, the cost of removal of lead from gasoline equals a 12 percent increase in gasoline use for the same power output. Reduction of carbon monoxide and other exhaust to meet the 1975 standards will also be accompanied by a 20- to 30-percent increase in gas consumption. The day of the 6-mile-per-gallon automobile is no longer in the distant future.

Similar growth rates can be cited for the use of air conditioning in private homes, in industry and in transportation.

It must be noted that energy consumption and growth of the economy are closely related factors. A book entitled "Energy in the World Economy," by Darmstadter, Teitelbaum and Polach, documents the interdependence. This universal relationship, found in countries as diverse as the United States and Thailand, leads to the conclusion that economic growth is inevitably dependent on energy supply.

However, data leads us to the inescapable conclusion that our reserves are dwindling. If the demand for energy continues to grow at its historic rate we will exhaust our fossil fuel reserves, proven and anticipated, in less than a century, and possibly in 50 years. Such an accomplishment will mean that we will have used up in less than 200 years a resource that was made over hundreds of millions of years.

We do have several alternatives. The first choice, and perhaps the least wise, will be to turn increasingly to foreign sources of energy—Mideast oil or Russian liquefied gas. There are large reserves in these areas but such dependence would be a blow to our diplomatic integrity. And the strain on our balance of payments would have serious ramifications to the world economy.

A second course of action is the development of alternative non-fossil-fuel energy sources. Solar energy, geothermal energy, and nuclear energy are some possibilities.

Solar energy is in abundant supply,

but the capital costs associated with conversion to a more useful form are prohibitive. The matter of energy storage also presents many problems.

Similar objections are raised about geothermal energy—that energy associated with the hot, radioactive core of the earth. We are still many years away from an accurate assessment of costs and impacts of its use on a large scale.

Nuclear energy is, of course, our primary non-fossil-fuel energy resource, for the relatively inexpensive isotope of uranium as a fuel can provide an unlimited supply of energy. However there are still problems associated with nuclear powerplants. For example, such plants emit small amounts of ionizing radiation into the environment. The risk associated with this emission is still undetermined. The possibility of an accident cannot be dismissed and memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki still linger. And nuclear fission generates poisonous radioactive waste that is long-lived and potent. We have not yet adequately prepared for the management of this waste.

These problems can undoubtedly be solved, but it is difficult to predict how far in the future such resolution is. Thus, fusion power, while still a feasible long-range alternative, will not be a factor in meeting our energy appetite this century.

Clearly the most viable course of action involves reducing the rate of growth of energy demand. It would reduce future demand for energy and would buy us valuable time to develop non-fossil-fuel alternatives. This is not an impossible proposition. Full insulation of homes, and proper siting, could reduce home heating and air-conditioning energy demand by 30 percent. Smaller automobiles and efficient mass transit systems would result in tremendous gasoline savings. Home appliances could be manufactured with energy utilization as a prime consideration. Many industrial processes could be redesigned. For example, Alcoa has a new process for smelting aluminum that requires 40 percent less energy. Adoption of this process by the aluminum refining industry could have a significant effect in reducing energy consumption. Finally, office building designs could be altered so that the dependence on energy for comfortable air is not so great. Tremendous economies are feasible in all areas of our society.

For the present, it seems unavoidable that energy conservation will become imperative. Market forces will require it. As energy becomes a more precious resource, rapidly rising costs will cause all of us to be much more frugal with it.

Our response to this energy crisis must be multiple: We must consume energy more carefully. We must develop alternatives to fossil fuels. Most important, we must develop a national structure to deal with the complex problem of energy in an integrated fashion. We must learn to plan more than a century ahead. At present there is no clear level of responsibility for exploring energy alternatives, let alone for developing policy. Concern at the Federal level is fragmented and the power industry has shrugged off any responsibility.

We must be hopeful that the heat of the debate, growing more powerful each day between the factions concerned with energy, will yield fruitful plans for confronting the crisis headon. A rational, comprehensive, and viable energy policy, emanating from the national level, is imperative.

GAO INVESTIGATION OF PRIVATE RESIDENCE EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recent press reports indicate that the General Services Administration has expended close to \$2 million on permanent home improvements, furnishings, landscaping, and facilities for the private homes of the President in California and Florida and the private residence of the Vice President in Maryland. These expenditures, made in the name of "national security necessities," raise serious questions of propriety in light of the fact that these homes will remain in private ownership after the owners have left public office, and the permanent structural improvements will accrue to the benefit of the owners.

Accordingly, I have today written to the Honorable Elmer Staats, the Comptroller General of the Government Accounting Office, requesting that the GAO undertake a full investigation of this matter, in order to determine the specific purposes for which the funds were spent, whether there appears to be any violation of Federal law involved, and whether any claim may be made by the Federal Government upon the President and Vice President to reimburse the Treasury for these expenditures for permanent improvements upon private property.

The American taxpayer, faced with increasing rents, skyrocketing housing construction and repair costs, and impoundments of Federal funds for reconstruction of the inner cities and provision of new and rehabilitated housing, cannot be expected to condone the expenditure of millions of tax dollars on Government officials' private residences. This reverse Robin Hood philosophy of taking from the working person to house the rich and powerful must not go unchallenged. In the congressional district which I represent, homeowners who want to repair or renovate their residences do not receive any handouts from GSA to fix the roof over their heads or the floors under their feet, and the high rents paid by apartment dwellers more than reflect the costs of any improvements and upkeep made by the landlords. Obviously, the same is true in every congressional district across the country.

If the Government wishes to retain the confidence of the American people, it is imperative that the very highest standards of conduct be adhered to by the President and Vice President.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including the press reports to which I referred and a copy of my letter to the Comptroller General for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1973.

HON. ELMER STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: Recent press reports indicate that the General Services Administration has furnished the privately-owned homes of the President in Florida and California, as well as the private home of the Vice-President in Maryland, with permanent, nontransferable "home improvements," furnishings, landscaping, and facilities in the name of "national security." According to these press reports, total costs involved may run in the vicinity of \$2 million.

In light of the fact that the law affords the President the more than adequate living accommodations of the White House and Camp David, Maryland, the propriety of expending large amounts of the taxpayers' money on home improvements for private residences which will remain in his ownership after he leaves public office is questionable. No provision is made by law for any federally-subsidized Vice-Presidential housing.

Therefore, I request that the GAO undertake a full investigation of this matter, in order to determine first, the specific purposes for which these funds were spent, second, whether these expenditures meet the standards of existing federal statutes, and third, whether any funds expended on these home improvement projects should be repaid to the Treasury by the President and Vice-President.

Thank you for your kind attention and consideration, and I shall look forward to hearing from you.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1973]

UNITED STATES PAID FOR ROUTINE NIXON HOME REPAIRS

(By Ronald Kessler)

A government breakdown of \$1.3 million spent to improve President Nixon's properties in California and Florida shows that large sums of federal money have been used for what appear to be routine house repairs and for furniture for the President's den.

The official accounting lists \$4,834 spent by the government for furnishings in Mr. Nixon's den in San Clemente, \$3,200 for tiling a roof, \$998 for replacement of a "hazardous" wrought iron railing, \$1,600 for window alterations, \$1,105 for cleaning the beach, \$1,950 for pruning "hazardous" dead tree branches, and \$1,950 for repairing a wall.

The White House yesterday referred all questions on the improvements to the GSA and Secret Service. The GSA said all but two of the improvements to the San Clemente house were requested by the Secret Service for security purposes. The Secret Service confirmed that it had asked for many of the improvements, but said more time would be required to confirm each one.

Among the government expenditures for furnishings to the President's den are \$472 for a leather top desk, \$171 for a chair, \$504 for a sofa, \$201 for a club chair, \$141 for a swivel chair, \$268 for two chairs, \$544 for two more chairs, and \$86 for decorative pillows.

Permanent improvements made to the properties include \$1,853 for a flagpole in San Clemente, \$476 to paint the flagpole, \$388 for an exhaust fan in San Clemente, \$314 for a sea wall ladder in Key Biscayne, \$475 for a swimming pool cleaner in Key Biscayne, \$621 for an icemaker for Secret Service agents in Key Biscayne, and \$826 for storm shutters in Key Biscayne.

These items are in addition to such previously reported expenditures for the San

Clemente house as \$13,500 for new heaters in San Clemente, \$3,800 for a connection to the city sewer system in San Clemente, \$184,174 for interior and exterior electrical work, \$2,400 for septic tank repairs, \$42,500 for a wall, \$10,612 for roadways and parking lots, \$2,800 for a swimming pool heater, \$11,561 for a redwood fence, and \$22,000 for guard houses.

The breakdown showed that the taxpayers have a big investment in the plants, trees, lawns, and landscaping of the President's San Clemente property. In the past four years the government has spent more than \$100,000 for landscaping at the California estate, nearly \$10,000 for weed removal, more than \$8,600 for plants, and \$5,600 for moving trees.

Altogether, \$703,367 has been spent on permanent improvements to the San Clemente home and \$579,907 to the Key Biscayne complex, which includes two houses owned by the President.

The figures do not include \$600,000 spent to operate and maintain the Key Biscayne compound or an as yet undetermined sum spent to operate the Western White House. The figures also do not include any expenditures made by government agencies other than the General Services Administration.

For example, some \$340,000 was spent by the Army Corps of Engineers to install a helicopter landing pad at the Key Biscayne location.

The GSA breakdown shows that large sums have been spent on items normally considered to be related to the protection of the President and the prevention of communications breakdowns.

These payments include \$42,293 for a "security" lighting system at Key Biscayne, \$128,708 for bullet-resistant glass doors and windows at Key Biscayne, \$4,786 for removing a low wall and planting high hedges at Key Biscayne and \$7,631 for bullet-resistant glass at the San Clemente swimming pool.

Other items for repairs and improvements that home owners routinely make were defended by the Secret Service and GSA as being necessary for the protection of the President.

GSA's audit of expenditures labeled \$1,950 for pruning trees as being for "eliminating safety hazards caused by dead branches." Some \$8,800 for landscaping, including removal of dry weeds, was listed as being to "eliminate fire hazard." Replacement of a wrought iron railing for \$998 was because the railing was "hazardous."

Arthur F. Sampson administrator of GSA, said \$1,600 spent for window alterations was for "security" purposes.

Carl H. Davis, the San Clemente building inspector who approved the building permit for the windows, said the windows were replaced because "they just wouldn't close properly."

"The windows were of wood sash and they had dry rot in the sills and frames," he told The Washington Post. "They were just falling apart."

Davis said the windows were replaced with aluminum sashes.

John W. Warner, assistant to the director of the Secret Service, said the existing heaters in the San Clemente home were replaced for security reasons because they were unsafe.

Davis, the San Clemente building inspector who approved the permit for the new heaters, said the old equipment was corroded, antiquated, and "inoperative."

"If you had bought the house, you'd have done it too," he said.

Sampson, the GSA administrator, defended the connection to the city sewer system as being necessary for "guests like (Soviet Communist Party Leader Leonid I.) Brezhnev, for government guests, for functions."

He said the government paid for only \$3,800 of the \$9,000 cost of the new line because the remaining share of the pipe was for the personal use of the President and his family.

Warner, the Secret Service official, said the line was for the use of Secret Service agents as well as for the personal use of the President.

Davis, who also approved the permit for the sewer line, said the septic tank that came with the San Clemente house when the President bought it in 1969 represented a violation of the city building code. He said it was the last septic tank in the city and should have been eliminated long ago.

In addition, he said, it would have been illegal to build the swimming pool that was installed by the President on the property without a connection to the city sewer system.

Davis said the sewer line services the President's residence, the pool, and a guest house where the President's daughters and their husbands stay.

He said Secret Service agents have their own offices that are separate from the President's residence and generally live in apartments in the downtown section of the city.

The sewer connection "had to be done to comply with the law," he said.

One Secret Service official, who asked not to be quoted by name, laughed repeatedly when many of the expenditures said to be for national security were read off.

"Frankly, I have a feeling GSA is trying to squirm their way out by blaming these things on us," he said. However, Warner, the assistant to the director of the Secret Service, said he found authorizations by his agency for many of the expenditures. He said he hasn't yet had time to check them all.

Both the Secret Service and GSA agreed that the personal furniture and the flagpole at the San Clemente residence had not been requested by the Secret Service and were not for security purposes.

Sampson, the GSA chief, said GSA "has" to provide office furniture for government officials "anywhere, as long as it's reasonable."

He said the furniture is still owned by GSA, but since presidents are given government offices by law after they retire, President Nixon will "keep it until he dies." After that, Sampson said, the furniture will revert to the government.

Sampson acknowledged that there is no specific congressional act authorizing GSA to furnish the private residences of presidents while in office. But he said a government official such as a senator could take furniture to his home, so long as he does not receive more government furniture than is authorized.

William M. Cochrane, staff director of the Senate Rules Committee, which develops rules governing the Senate and its members, said, "The GSA never gives any furniture to senators (for their homes). It would take a formal resolution (by the Congress) to allow it. It would be illegal to keep it," he said.

GSA LISTS BILLS IT PAID ON NIXON HOMES

The General Services Administration yesterday made available a breakdown of improvements made by the GSA at President Nixon's San Clemente home and at his Key Biscayne presidential complex. A partial list includes:

SAN CLEMENTE

\$4,834 for furniture in President's den: includes \$72 for brass lamp, \$79 for table lamp, \$146 for end table, \$186 for coffee table, \$419 for lounge chair and ottoman, \$472 for leather top desk, \$171 for chair, \$504 to recover a sofa, \$201 to recover a club chair, \$141 for swivel chair, \$131 for lamp, \$268 for two chairs, \$544 for two additional chairs, \$237 for desk chair, \$86 for decorative pillows, \$523 for blinds, and \$654 for a carpet and underpadding.

\$312 for restraining entrance gates and doors.

\$388 for installing exhaust fan.

\$523 for repairing gazebo and removing beach debris and for anchoring planks in nearby railroad crossing.

\$1,950 for pruning trees.

\$3,200 for roof tile.

\$6,642 for tiling the roof and floor of a gazebo.

\$1,950 for repairing walls.

\$8,810 for landscaping, including removal of dry weeds.

\$2,496 for asphalt paving.

\$2,630 for relocating a tree and replanting a fallen tree.

\$130,530 for exterior electrical work.

\$53,644 for interior electrical work.

\$13,500 for heating system.

\$3,800 for sewer line.

\$2,916 for surveying to determine property lines.

\$1,600 for window alterations.

\$1,105 for cleaning the beach.

\$1,853 for installation of flagpole and \$476 for painting flagpole.

\$1,525 for surveying residence.

\$998 for replacement of hand rail.

\$460 for fertilizer.

KEY BISCAVNE

\$4,786 for security screening project.

\$3,898 for demolishing trees and plants.

\$122,714 for constructing Secret Service command post.

\$128,708 for bullet-resistant glass doors and windows.

\$587 for flagpole.

\$3,030 for golf carts for Secret Service patrol.

\$621 for ice-maker for Secret Service men.

\$475 for swimming pool cleaner.

\$119 for washing machine.

\$2,000 for design to correct beach erosion.

\$314 for sea wall ladder.

\$995 for septic tank and lid.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1973]

UNITED STATES TO PAY \$125,000 ON AGNEW HOME

(By Martha M. Hamilton)

The federal government has contracted to pay for \$125,000 in "protective" improvements to Vice President Agnew's new home in suburban Kenwood, the General Services Administration reported yesterday.

The GSA released the list of improvements in response to an inquiry from the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which is conducting a probe into the \$1.3 million the government paid for alterations to President Nixon's private homes in San Clemente, Calif., and Key Biscayne, Fla. The improvements at Mr. Nixon's homes have been defended by the Secret Service as necessary to protect the President.

The improvements to Agnew's home, a 12-room colonial at 6514 Shadow Rd., include: \$39,500 for the construction of a brick and redwood fence, described as necessary for security by a Secret Service spokesman, around the back of the property.

\$15,979 for the installation of bullet-proof glass throughout the home.

\$6,000 for the widening of driveway to accommodate Secret Service limousines.

More than \$9,000 in electrical work and on indoor and outdoor lighting.

Though many of the expenditures appeared to be for security devices related to the Vice President's position—\$4,000 for smoke and radiation detectors for the 12-room fieldstone house, for instance—others appeared to be for normal repairs.

Taxpayers paid \$800 to repair and strengthen a "loose main starway railing which is hazardous," according to the report, for instance.

Other items, such as \$4,367 for air-conditioning, \$503 for carpeting and \$200 for a new exhaust fan and ceiling light for a basement toilet, were part of the expenditures for the construction of a Secret Service head-

quarters on the second floor of the Agnews' home.

The Secret Service initiated all requests for the items listed, spokesman Jack Warner said.

The Agnews, who still live in a rented apartment in the Sheraton Park Hotel, are expected to move into their new home in the affluent suburb soon, according to an aide to the Vice President. The improvements to provide security arrangements are "almost completed," a GSA spokesman said.

The improvements are permanent or non-transferable and will be of use to the taxpayers only as long as the Vice President occupies both the house and his office, GSA and Secret Service spokesmen indicated.

The permanent improvements include the \$39,500 fence, replacement of a "hazardous walk" at the cost of \$1,978, electrical and lighting work costing more than \$9,000 and the construction of a wider driveway and parking area at the cost of \$12,000.

The Secret Service provides equipment to protect presidential and vice presidential families and candidates, but that equipment is portable and can be used again.

Former Vice President Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) lived in a rented apartment during his term in office and was protected primarily with portable equipment requiring no major structural changes to the building, Secret Service spokesman Jack Warner said.

GSA, which paid for the permanent improvements, "would have been minimally involved," in providing security for then-Vice President Humphrey, Warner said. But he and a spokesman for the GSA both said that comparisons between the costs of providing security for this administration and previous ones are difficult to make.

The House Appropriations Subcommittee, which requested the expenditure information on the Agnews' house, had asked for similar figures from the Eisenhower and Johnson administrations, but later decided not to push the request, a Subcommittee spokesman said.

IMPROVED MEDICAL CARE FOR DISABLED VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will allow us to make a significant advance in the quality of medical care afforded our disabled veterans.

While VA hospitals are literally bursting at the seams, we are more and more frequently informed of yet another civilian hospital in financial difficulty due to a lack of patients. It is common knowledge that hospitals in some areas are now standing up to 30 percent empty, and this at a time when 45 percent of all veterans seeking admission to VA hospitals are being refused.

The plan I have proposed in my bill would help to alleviate both problems. It would provide medical and hospital care to veterans on a similar basis to the Champus program for military families. This would enable the disabled veteran to be treated by the private physician of his choice and admitted to the hospital of his choice for treatment of service-connected disabilities when area VA facilities are filled—at no cost to the veterans. I expect this program to provide the following benefits:

Substantially alleviate overcrowding

in VA medical facilities, thereby upgrading the quality of medical care while making such care available to all deserving veterans;

Utilize idle hospital beds, some of which were provided through Federal assistance under the Hill-Burton program; and

Relieve veterans of the necessity to travel long distances, in some cases up to 200 miles to undergo treatment.

I would like to emphasize that this program would be completely voluntary on the part of veterans, physicians, and hospitals; no one would be compelled to participate.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge early consideration of this measure. Every day of delay sentences thousands of deserving veterans to forgo the quality medical treatment they have earned. When we asked these men to serve, they served without complaint; we must never allow ourselves to forget our obligation to them.

RETIREMENT OF FRANK E. BATTAGLIA, DEAN OF THE OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that one of the most dedicated public servants and a good friend of mine and of many other Members of this House will be retiring tomorrow.

Mr. Frank E. Battaglia, dean of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates of the House of Representatives, is leaving us after 30 years of service with the House.

Going on 65 years of age, Frank was born and raised in New York City, worked his way through several years of the City College of New York, and Fordham Law School, where he received his LL.B. degree.

Frank studied shorthand in DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, and utilized his skill in several secretarial jobs while attending night school. He acquired an exceptional skill in verbatim shorthand reporting as a result of his continued studies and subsequently worked as a free-lance shorthand reporter in practically every court in New York City. He took depositions in several States in the Northeast section of the country.

More than 30 years ago Frank decided to come to Washington, D.C., after hearing of the need for shorthand reporters. After reporting for various Government agency hearings, he confined his work as a free-lance reporter to congressional committee hearings. In 1943, Frank was appointed an Official Reporter of Debates of the House of Representatives by the late Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, who remarked that he had not hired anyone with such glowing recommendations as had Frank Battaglia.

I am sure Frank is retiring with many happy thoughts of the privilege and honor of serving the House of Representatives. While I deeply regret that he is terminating his service with the House, I know my colleagues all join me in

congratulating Frank E. Battaglia on his retirement and in wishing him well in all his future endeavors.

RETIREMENT OF MISS SALLY MORGAN, MRS. MILDRED BASINGER, AND MRS. MILDRED HALL

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Mrs. Boggs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. **BOGGS**. Mr. Speaker, three lovely ladies who have dedicated many years of hard and effective work in service to the Members of this House are retiring today.

Miss Sally Morgan of Fredericktown, Pa., the House Librarian since 1956, has been on the Hill for 23 years, all of them in the House Library where she has tutored many law students and others now working on the Hill in administrative capacities.

Mrs. Mildred Basinger is retiring after 32 years on Capitol Hill. For the past 8 years she has been the cordial, helpful, efficient secretary to the Doorkeeper. Prior to that time she was in the offices of a number of Tennessee Members including Senator McKellar and Congressman "Fats" Everett. A native of Bells, Tenn., she plans to return there later.

Mrs. Mildred Hall has 30 years of Government service; the last 18 as secretary to the Architect of the Capitol. She will be remembered for the warm manner in which she has conducted her numerous duties, especially in arranging the band concerts on the steps of the Capitol and receptions and parties, and in her service as secretary to the House Office Building Commission. She has been efficient and pleasant in her many contacts with Members.

I know they take into retirement our gratitude and commendation and our sincere wishes for many years of health and happiness.

THE PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE AGED

(Mr. **PRICE** of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the **RECORD** and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **PRICE** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are 21 million citizens of this Nation who are known as senior citizens, a label which may be somewhat deceiving since many of these older Americans are accorded not the respect they rightfully deserve, but rather only neglect and scorn. While we may speak of "senior citizens," for many disturbing reasons these Americans might be classified as second-class or "junior" citizens.

The problems confronting the aged are myriad and manifest. Almost 15 percent of them live in poverty. In Illinois alone some 250,000 elderly live below the poverty line. For these and even for aged persons of moderate means, housing, taxes, transportation and medical care can be an unbearable strain on their limited, fixed incomes.

In the face of these problems, the administration has proposed reductions in

medicare benefits. Under this plan, a patient's out-of-pocket hospitalization costs would be expanded from the present \$72 for the first 60 days to include the entire first day's cost plus 10 percent of the remaining charge. This plan would also significantly increase the amount an elderly person must pay on a doctor bill.

Older Americans do not need a reduction in medicare benefits at a time when they are paying almost 20 percent more for out-of-pocket medical expenses than they did the year before medicare was passed. Instead of limitation, medicare should be expanded to include prescription drugs and care of eyes, ears, teeth, and feet. Legislation aimed at this end is being sponsored by myself and others in both House and Senate and deserves the strong support of anyone sensitive to the crisis in health care for the aged.

Mr. Speaker, competent medical care is not a luxury reserved only for the affluent. Every American should be guaranteed his physical integrity, a condition so essential to human happiness that it exceeds all others in practical importance. Freedom of speech, equal opportunity and other valued but abstract principles can have little meaning for one enduring physical pain. Since it is the aged who are naturally the most often afflicted, it is with them that the effort to guarantee health care should begin. Medicare was the first important step in effecting this guarantee and to limit it now would be unconscionable regression.

A problem related to health care in the substandard conduct of many nursing homes, where life for the aged becomes a degrading existence in a health-care limbo. Many persons are forced into these homes by the high cost of long-term institutional care. All nursing homes must be made responsible to the communities they serve. Rehabilitative services, including physical and speech therapy administered by trained therapists, must be afforded every nursing home patient who would benefit by them. Legislation aimed at improvement of nursing home care deserves unqualified support of the Congress.

Health care is only one of the major concerns of the elderly. Whenever a person lives on a fixed income, he is adversely affected by any increase in prices affecting the cost of living, such as food, housing, and taxes. Fortunately, the Social Security Amendments of 1972 included an automatic cost-of-living escalator. However, due to other legislation, these amendments will not wholly neutralize the effects of rising prices upon the elderly, nor will it aid those not receiving social security benefits.

For example, H.R. 1, which finally established a base income for the aged, also cut them off from the benefits of the food stamp program. These benefits must be restored to insure that no older Americans at the lower income levels are left undernourished.

Under the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972, a ceiling of \$2.5 billion was placed on Federal funds for social services under programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled. Each State is limited, then, to its share of the \$2.5 billion based on its proportion of the U.S. population.

In Illinois, this means a 50-percent cut in the amount of funds received by the State office of social services, and a further cutback on aid to the elderly.

Escalating property taxes, which affect every American, are especially burdensome upon older Americans. The administration has proposed a reform program in this area, but under it the poorest of elderly persons would be treated the same as retired professional people who have adequate retirement finances and expensive homes. If all the elderly are to keep their homes and if property tax reform is to be equitable, it must be based on the need of the individual taxpayer.

It is a seldom noted fact that the high incidence of crime in urban areas has a disproportionate impact on the elderly. Low-income senior citizens often are forced to seek out cheaper housing in the cities, and crime therefore strikes them with greater frequency. Further, due to their low incomes, property loss due to crime is felt with much greater effect. Long range, cause-oriented solutions to the crime problem are of little consolation to those seeking to live peacefully for the remainder of their years. As an interim solution, security must be strengthened in areas of high concentration of the elderly. Many methods of deterrence, from formation of special security patrols to issuing of personal electronic distress devices, have been suggested and deserve serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that if relief is to come to our older citizens, it must be at the initiative of the Congress. Let us not shun this obligation to those who most deserve our attentions. The elderly, unlike most interest groups, are ill-disposed to organization for political purposes, and for this reason their problems all too often remain inconspicuous and remote. We must compensate for the softened voices of the aged by raising our own with greater force on their behalf.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY MESSAGE OF JUNE 29, 1973

(Mr. **PRICE** of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the **RECORD** and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. **PRICE** of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of the President's energy message. Based on a short briefing on the content prior to its release and a quick review today, it appears that the message reflects an increased responsiveness on the part of the administration to our energy supply problem. I plan to study the full message in depth in order to fully understand the basic plan that is proposed.

One aspect gives me special satisfaction. This is the emphasis given to the acceleration of research directed toward finding economic processes for gasification and liquefaction of coal. The State of Illinois is blessed with large coal reserves. Unfortunately, the coal is high in sulfur content. The coal research program will include an increased effort to find ways to bring about a desulfurization of the coal so that it can be used in nearby electric powerplants, perhaps

mine mouth plants, which must comply with the existing Federal and State standards for air quality. Gasification and/or liquefaction of coal will permit conversion to a form which is easily transportable, for example, by pipeline or railroad tank car.

There is hardly a thinking person in our Nation who does not now fully realize the significance of the short-term energy dilemma which we face. Fortunately, the reserves of coal throughout our Nation are plentiful and therein lies a partial solution to our short-term energy problems. If we can find better ways to utilize coal for energy production, we can ease our current and projected deficiencies in supplies of fuel oil and gasoline.

It is also encouraging to know that further work will be done on improving mining techniques which both increase productivity and improve the health and safety of the miner.

THE TRADE BALANCE

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee now has before it a bill which would grant the administration the most extensive powers in the field of foreign trade and investment ever permitted.

Administration officials insist that the sweeping authority sought for the President in this bill to raise and lower tariffs and other trade barriers almost without restriction is necessary if we are to right our badly out-of-kilter trade balance.

The Congress should take a very careful look at this grant of authority to see whether in fact it is all needed.

What has the President done with the authority he now has? A look at the record will show that there are presently available to the President many powers in the foreign trade and investment field which he has not utilized—and shows no current signs of utilizing.

For example, the President is asking for new authority to take "safeguard" action against the erection of foreign barriers to U.S. goods. Yet, present trade law gives the President authority to withdraw tariff reductions if foreign nations erect barriers which affect U.S. exports. In the decade since this provision was enacted, thousands of barriers to U.S. goods have been erected—yet the authority to take away tariff concessions to these same nations has not been used.

Another provision of existing trade law allows the President to impose "safeguards" when any foreign nation maintains restrictions against U.S. agricultural products. This authority has been used only on very rare occasions.

Present trade law also provides for withdrawing tariff reductions where special preferential trade arrangements are made by one country with another at the expense of U.S. exports. These agreements are common in international trade, but the President has not used this authority.

The President also is seeking new authority to act in behalf of industries which are being injured by imports. Existing trade law says that whenever imports are increasing in major part as a result of tariff concessions at such a rate as to be the major cause of import injury, the President may put on tariffs, negotiate orderly marketing agreements, and take other steps. However, in January of 1971, the Tariff Commission took an action which gave the President the authority to use the law's powers to help the U.S. shoe industry. The shoe industry and its workers have been waiting for that action for more than 2 years.

There are other industries and workers that have faced similar problems, including the steel industry, which is important to the people of the 23d District of Illinois.

The consumer has a substantial stake in the administration's proposal also. If the administration's trade bill passes in the form now before the House Ways and Means Committee, it would give the President the absolute power to give away a very important consumer right.

This is the present right of the American consumer to know where the products he buys come from. Under current law, the country of origin must be stamped on every product made in another country and sold in this country. If it is made in Japan, Taiwan, Korea, or Hong Kong, it must say so. If the product bears an American brand name but is manufactured in a foreign nation, that nation must be identified.

This marking of origin requirement is termed a "nontariff barrier" to trade. Many people—among them foreign nations, U.S.-based multinationals, and U.S. importers—want this requirement removed so that they can flood the United States with cheaply-made goods.

And if the President's trade bill is passed in its present form they would get their way. One of the powers sought in that legislation is the absolute authority for the President to remove certain nontariff barriers, without being answerable to the Congress or to anyone else. One of the nontariff barriers included in this power is the marking of origin.

Both American businessmen and American consumers find this protection important. Businessmen are proud of the "made in U.S.A." label on their products; recently, an official of Magnavox Corp., one of the few electronics companies which has chosen to keep its plants, its production and its jobs at home rather than take them overseas, declared that an important reason for staying in the United States was "because we have pride in our product and we do not want the stigma of a foreign label." Not so long ago, pollster Louis Harris reported that:

There is a distinct sense among the American people today to rally in support of our own economy here at home. The proposition that "if our people don't buy American more in the products we purchase, the U.S. economy will be in real trouble" met with 61 percent to 17 percent agreement.

The American buying public has long been confident that American-made goods are the best that can be had in the

world, the product of skilled American labor, highly sophisticated production methods, and careful product quality control. "Made in the U.S.A." is a badge of honor.

But if the marking of origin requirement is removed, the American consumer would have no way to exercise the choice of buying American. All products made abroad come into this country without any identification. American brand name products could be produced abroad by 12-cent an hour labor, and brought into this country without anything to show the consumer where they were made, and sold to the unsuspecting public at American prices.

Not only would the removal of this consumer right to know deceive the public, but it would sell out to cheap foreign competition those American businesses such as Magnavox, who are proud enough of the U.S. label to keep their plants and production in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of Congress wants to help America solve its many problems in the field of foreign trade. But giving away the consumer's right to know the country of origin of the products he buys is not the way to do it.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICY REVIEW

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the trade reform bill of 1973 is currently under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee. During the extensive hearings of the committee, one of the witnesses was Mr. O. R. Strackbein of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. In his statement, Mr. Strackbein provided a brief review of our trade program and quoted from some of his previous testimony on the same subject, before the same committee, 10 and 12 years ago. It is interesting to note what he said on those previous occasions.

I shall quote only a few lines and leave the rest to his prepared statement which I offer with the sincere hope that all Members will read and reflect on the message therein. On May 5, 1960, Mr. Strackbein said:

It took 25 years of doing, including much domestic economic legislation, a world war, a local war (Korea) and the cold war to stack up the international competitive situation as we see it today. . . .

We are on the eve of an earthquake that will shiver us to our economic foundations if we do not soon take thought and reverse some of our romantic policies. If we do not do this the economic waters of the world will inundate us and the outflow will rend us and swirl us to the common level. We will no longer reside on a plateau, a beacon to other lands. . . . Our leadership of the free world will dissolve into a sea of impotence and our ideals for building a peaceful world will be of little avail.

Mr. Strackbein issued many warnings including a 5-year tariff moratorium in 1963 while the Kennedy round was under negotiation. His warnings were not

heeded. Had we paid more attention to his urgings, we would not be in the unenviable position in world trade today that we find so distressing. Mr. Strackbein's statement of May 15, 1973 follows:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is O. R. Strackbein. I am president of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. This organization was formed 20 years ago, but I have been appearing before your Committee for 25 years on the subject of trade legislation.

On this occasion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back a few years in the nature of background data so that perspective may be achieved.

The first trade bill was passed in 1934 and there have been about a dozen renewals and extensions, with modifications. The protective effect of our tariff has been reduced over 80%, from a level of over 50% to about 9% on dutiable items. However, during the first twenty years after 1934 the world was so upset by wars that no true measure of the effects of our freer-trade policies could be made. World War II was followed by the Korean conflict. It was really only in the late fifties and the early sixties that definite results began to appear.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a few passages from speeches that I made in 1959 and 1960, i.e., some 12 or 13 years ago.

On September 2, 1959, speaking before the Plumbing Brass Institute, I said:

"We have saved a number of countries a generation of research and development by making available to them our latest technology. This is not said by way of complaint, but we should at least have sufficient insight to comprehend the probable consequences of our policies. The echoes are coming in from many directions."

At that time steel imports for the first time exceeded our steel exports. The rise in imports was generally attributed to the 1959 strike. The speech noting this said:

"Also, it may be questioned whether steel imports will fall substantially after the strike (1959). They began rising over a year ago before the strike was called and price comparisons with the foreign product would indicate a continuation of imports at a level considerably higher than in the past."

Indeed, imports of steel did continue to climb and reach some 14-15% of our market before the steel import restrictions put into effect in 1969.

"Yes, we will live on expansion and expansion—in all directions, across national borders into foreign lands. Optimism and expansion will conquer all! So say the present-day professional optimists."

"Of course no one wants a breakdown; but we can import one if we refuse to recognize the realities. Among these realities are:

1. An untenable international competitive position;
2. A heavy and stubborn deficit in our total foreign account;
3. An expansion of imports and a shrinkage in exports;
4. High domestic production costs compared with other countries;
5. A sharp uptrend in foreign productivity per man-hour;
6. A wage lag in relation to rising productivity abroad;
7. Loss of (U.S.) technological leadership among the nations;
8. Increasing trend toward mass production abroad;
9. Emigration of American capital to lower-wage countries;
10. Discouragement of expansion plans among domestic industries, especially suppliers, dedicated to the American market;
11. Increasing importation of parts and

semi-manufactures as a means of competing with imports of finished manufacture;

12. Automation as a means of improving competitive position, resulting in unemployment and failure to absorb millions of additions to the labor force.

"What does all this mean?

"The Answer can be given by looking around us. Let me offer a few examples:

"Steel, automobiles, typewriters, sewing machines, and petroleum are products that we were long accustomed to export while we imported little of them. These were the output of our most advanced industries in point of mass production and technology.

"If imports were able to attack and take the very ramparts of our highly productive industries what can they do and what have they already done to others of our industries?"

"The prospects are not bright for a pull away by this country. Not at all. The other countries now have all that it takes to catch up with us, including the creation of mass markets. The question is how their catching up is to be accomplished. Must we be torn down in the process, or can we hold our own while the other countries come up?

"We need a holding defense. This can best be contrived through a combination of tariffs and quotas, by the use of which suitable shares of our market can be opened to imports while reserving the remainder for ourselves!"

From another speech I made before the AFL-CIO Union Label and Service Trades Department, September 15, 1959, San Francisco, the following extracts are taken:

"Shall we recognize the fact that we are facing something we have not faced before and take some holding action with which to buy time? . . . To bring up wages abroad . . . will in any case be slow and we must do something in the meantime . . . or we will fall in order to meet them."

"We must not be deluded into thinking that our competitive discomfiture is a passing nightmare. In the nature of things, considering all the factors on the horizon, it is an ominous confrontation, not a mirage."

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to bore you with irrelevant quotations. Yet the observations of twelve or thirteen years ago indicate that our situation of today was already visibly on the way at that time. On December 9, 1959, in a speech before the Washington Trade Association Executives in a reference to direct foreign investment abroad which at that time was about \$38 billion and close to \$100 billion now, appear the following passages:

"We have high wages, high employment, high profits; and these are needed to meet high national budget as reflected in high taxes. We cannot reduce the major elements of our national income without courting bankruptcy. We cannot go back to a lower price level for that very reason."

"Up to now we have managed to juggle sufficiently to avoid facing the facts. Recently it has become apparent that there must be an end to the success even of juggling."

The last speech from which I quote was delivered on May 5, 1960, before my own Committee. I said:

"It took 25 years of doing, including much domestic economic legislation, a world war, a local war (Korea) and the cold war to stack up the international competitive situation as we see it today: . . .

"We are on the eve of an earthquake that will shiver us to our economic foundations if we do not soon take thought and reverse some of our romantic policies. If we do not do this the economic waters of the world will inundate us and the outflow will rend us and swirl us to the common level. We will no longer reside on a plateau, a beacon to other lands. . . . Our leadership of the free

world will dissolve into a sea of impotence and our ideals for building a peaceful world will be of little avail."

I confess that this latter might be characterized as purple prose. However, such a characterization might be regarded as being on a par with the one that was applied to my warnings by a former member of your Committee, that I was a prophet of doom and gloom.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the principal obstacle to bringing the facts before the public lay with the press which was overwhelmingly committed to freer trade. The press, which is firmly dedicated to the right of the people to know, did not wish the same public to know enough about the results of our trade policy to question its widely heralded blessings. There was a further effective silence by the press that concealed the facts when in 1966 the Senate Finance Committee held hearings on S. J. Res. 115 which called for a revision of our official trade statistics. The purpose was to make them a more faithful reflection of our balance of trade. Existing statistics undervalued our imports and over-valued our exports so far as private competitive trade is concerned. This they (1) did by reporting imports on their foreign value rather than the landed cost, including freight, insurance, etc., and (2) reporting as exports all the goods that we shipped under Foreign Aid, Food for Peace and those we moved because of high federal subsidies. The result was that defenders of the faith could point to our so-called favorable trade balance and say that we are indeed competitive in foreign markets and could stand further tariff reductions.

In 1972 instead of a deficit of \$6.4 billion it was nearer \$13-\$14 billion if the transactions had been properly reported.

Now, after more than six years and after the deficit broke through even the concealing cover, we are about to have official statistics on the basis of c.i.f. import values rather than merely on their foreign value.

Mr. Chairman, in August, 1971, some steps were taken to meet what had by that time reached crisis proportions. We put on a 15% additional duty on most imports and then devalued the dollar. This action turned out to be inadequate and recently another devaluation was announced. The average devaluation of the dollar is now over 20% while the yen has been up-valued close to 35% and the German mark somewhat less.

With respect to currency realignment it should be said that the action was necessary but that it should not be relied on as a long-range solution. It treats all products alike, and they do not all stand on the same competitive level. Furthermore, other countries can take countervailing action at will, and unilaterally. It is therefore an unsatisfactory instrument because of the uncertainty attendant on recourse to it. Great secrecy and denials usually precede action in this field.

What is needed under the conditions we face in the world today is a restoration or near restoration of the market conditions that made possible and supported the growth of our industries and employment as we moved up the ladder to world industrial leadership.

The foundation of this highly successful system rested on recognition of the fact that consumer income must be sufficient to absorb the output of mass production. This called for higher rather than lower wages as a means of achieving lower production costs. The British had taken the opposite tack. To achieve low costs they sought low wages. Then they could export to the whole world. Henry Ford turned the formula around. Mass production would lower the costs and higher wages would assure a market for the rising output.

This system worked miracles in terms of in-

dustrial expansion. After World War II, however, we helped other countries adopt our system and, with the exception of the Communist bloc, they made amazing headway. In many instances they built new industries almost from the ground up, and by installing the most modern equipment gained astounding advances in productivity. We helped them financially and with technical assistance.

Their wages, however, were so low that even though they started upward more rapidly than we they have not yet caught up, and the competitive gap has not been closed. In dollars and cents it is wider today in many instances than it was ten or twenty years ago.

Our industry has been accused of inefficiency and there may be some of that, but we have no bill of particulars. When our industries go abroad, carrying their managerial forces with them, they do very well. Unless the sea-change brings on greater efficiency it would appear that they reflect no more than the going level of efficiency in this country.

With so much of our capital moving abroad, near \$100 billion to date, and with other countries increasingly well equipped and using our technology plus their own, the domestic industries remaining behind, and particularly their workers, face a different world from pre-1955 or 1960.

We built our system by replacing workers with machinery that was more productive. In those instances in which demand for the product was elastic, mass production, by lowering costs, greatly increased consumption. Before long employment expanded beyond the level at which it stood when workers were laid off. The automobile industry after some years employed many more workers than the buggy and wagon makers.

However, if the demand for the product is not elastic consumption will not respond much to lower prices. Food products are of this class; and that is why the farm workers who were displaced by the millions because of the great rise in agricultural productivity, remained unemployed and flocked to the cities to give us our stubborn urban problem.

When coal mining made great strides in productivity 3 out of 4 miners lost their jobs; and they too remained unemployed. The price of coal remained very low but faced an inelastic demand. Recently the price has gone upward, thanks to exports and an expanded demand but the unemployed Appalachian workers are still with us.

Mr. Chairman, we come now to a very important point.

Imports that bear an appreciable price advantage confront the domestic producers with a situation such as they face if the demand for their product is inelastic. If they displace workers in order to become or remain competitive with imports these workers very likely will remain displaced. Imports, if unimpeded, will prevent the expected increase in consumption of the domestic product, even though total consumption of the product does increase. Even if the demand for the product is elastic the increased employment that formerly took place here will occur abroad instead. With our population increase we will under such circumstances look in vain to the "growth industries" to come effectively to the rescue.

Agricultural exports will not fill the gap. Agricultural employment is down to a little over 3 million, half of what it was in 1955, and still declining. So we need not expect much help from the present agricultural exports so far as employment is concerned. These booming exports, incidentally, have lifted greatly the price of soybeans, wheat and corn. It is often said about import quotas that they raise prices. Of this there is proof to the contrary, but lively exports demonstrably raise prices. Import quotas

usually have the purpose of preventing prices from falling to disastrously low levels. (I would like to offer for the record two short papers on this point.)

The question naturally arises what can be done to restore the domestic market conditions so that growth industries may again flourish.

Import quotas should be used judiciously for this purpose, being used to assure the domestic producer of a predetermined share of our market, so that he can be sure that it will be his or that of his domestic competitors when they have developed the product and created a market for it. If his product is patented the market should be his for the life of the patent while allowing imports to increase, let us say, to 15% or some other stated share. The domestic producer would then have restored to him the incentive the pursuit of which brought this country world industrial leadership in the first place.

With import quotas designed with the conscious purpose of accomplishing this end they will have performed their principal function. They may also be used in other instances as our agricultural quotas have been used, to prevent demoralization of the market by low-priced imports.

Such injury as may be done to domestic employment by the multinational corporations would be neutralized if total imports of a product were limited to a share of the market. Such economic benefits as these corporations bring to the developing countries could continue.

Turning now to the proposal to vest the President with *carte blanche* powers to modify the tariff and impose quotas, such authorization would be an abdication of powers conferred on Congress by the Constitution. We do not regard this as desirable. The likely effect would be an unequal application of the law. The larger and politically powerful groups would gain accommodation while the smaller ones would be left to shift for themselves.

Another important part of the bill is adjustment assistance. It is limited to the workers. We do not believe that such assistance should be relied on as a remedy but if it is, industries and companies should be equally eligible.

It has never been satisfactorily explained why imports should be vested with the right of eminent domain over domestic industries and their workers. Foreign competitive advantage usually is unearned in the sense that it is usually based on the simple fact of lower wages.

Our industries are legally bound to pay minimum wages that are usually higher than the average foreign wages. We should not force our industries by law into a competitive disadvantage and then sometimes come to their rescue through adjustment assistance. Rather we should prevent the injury in the first place. If we had a proper import quota system we would have no need of adjustment system.

Washington, D.C.

WINNERS ANNOUNCED IN "KEEP CHICAGO CLEAN" ESSAY CONTEST

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the winners in the essay contest sponsored by Mayor Daley's Citizens Committee For A Cleaner Chicago, myself, and Alderman Anthony Laurino.

The essay contest, in conjunction with a program called "Pitch In For Chicago," is part of a nationwide antilitter project

which invites all Americans to join in the important task of ridding our country of litter, and I am delighted to contribute \$25 Savings Bonds to the five winners.

The pupils in grades 5 through 8 from 5 schools in the 39th Ward area of the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am proud to represent, were asked by their principals and teachers to write an essay entitled "How I Can Help Keep Our Community Clean and Beautiful." The teachers selected the best entry from their room and the best of those were then judged by the principals and their staff, who selected the top two entries for their schools.

In order for our democracy to remain strong and viable, it is necessary for all our citizens to participate. A program such as this helps to prepare our youngsters to assume their obligations and responsibilities in a democratic society such as ours for they are not only future citizens but future office holders.

Next week I shall present each first place winner with a \$25 U.S. Savings Bond, and each runner-up with a special certificate of recognition, but I also wish to take this opportunity to extend to them my heartiest congratulations and warmest good wishes for their future.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly announce the winners in the "Keep Chicago Clean" essay contest: Regina Foran, 6156 N. Knox, of Queen of All Saints School, Camille Blachowicz, principal; Kathleen Hoppa, 4243 N. Keeler, of Hiram H. Belding School, Agenor E. Osuch, principal; Rita Kanaya, 5125 N. Central Park, of Alessandro Volta School, Norman Glick, principal; Maureen LaPorta, 4854 N. Kilpatrick, of John M. Palmer School, Theodore W. Wallschlaeger, principal; and Dana Parker, 3915 N. Lawndale, of John B. Murphy School, William G. Rankin, principal.

Mr. Speaker, I am also proud to announce the runners-up in the contest: Josephine Gariti; Carolyn Hinkle, 3841 N. Lawndale; Karen Johnson, 5121 N. Kildare; Leslie Schmidt, 4258 W. Montrose; and Jane Wetterling, 5625 N. Knox.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include in the Record the five winning Essays:

REGINA FORAN, GRADE 6

Take a look down your street. All you have to do is Pitch In. Just pick up a piece of paper. Keep garbage bags in your cars. Think the next time you eat a candy bar. Throw that wrapper in the right place. Then take a look.

KATHLEEN HOPPA, GRADE 6

The best help I, as an individual, can give is to avoid littering and to try and convince others to do the same. In that way my community will stay clean. With the parks, forests preserves, and surroundings uncluttered, their beauty can be enjoyed by everyone.

RITA KANAYA, GRADE 7

A clean Chicago is a lot to do, but if we start littering, we can stop it. Don't say, "What's a little scrap of paper?" and throw away. Multiply it by 2 million and that adds up to a lot. It's not going to break your fingers. Pick it up!

MAUREEN LAPORTA, GRADE 6

I can help fight pollution by not littering, participating in "Project SOAR," and by bringing in glass and newspapers to recycling

plants. We must keep our waters free from oil spills and deposit trash.

I can help keep my immediate area clean by preventing fire hazards, cleaning out basements and attics, and keeping lawns clean.

DANA PARKER, GRADE 6

Get your bags, rakes, shovels, and anything else needed ready. Come with me! We're all going to walk down the streets and pick up anything useless. Don't you wish this were possible? It is—if we all do our share in cleaning up. We can!

THE OUTSTANDING SERVICES OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH E. BELIEU

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1973, marks the departure of the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu from his position as Under Secretary of the Army. There are many of us who are proud of Ken and Markie BeLieu and who comprehend the outstanding work he has done for many years for the Government of the United States. Certainly as one who has been privileged to be a long-time friend. I am happy to join in recording and commending the achievements of this great American.

Ken BeLieu has a long record of service to the Nation. He had an outstanding combat record in Korea and was grievously wounded there while fighting our Nation's battles. Subsequently he served with distinction as a staff director of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

He was appointed as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics and later served as Under Secretary of the Navy. In these positions he added to the luster of his contributions.

Later he came back to serve the Army and, during a period of great challenge, Ken BeLieu brought to the Army vision, integrity, and a genuine concern for both the individual soldier and for the Army as an institution in our Nation. His vast experience of Defense requirements, management competence, and concern for the needs of soldiers and their families, have characterized his brilliant service. He exerted pride in the Army's past service to the Nation and confidence in its future.

Few Americans have given more to their country than Ken BeLieu. Fewer still have achieved such high regard as a citizen-soldier in the finest traditions of selfless service. The cause of freedom has benefited by his great contributions to our Nation. In all of this, his beloved wife Markie has stood proudly and helpfully by his side. They are a truly great American team.

I attach a biographical sketch for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BIOGRAPHY—KENNETH E. BELIEU, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Kenneth E. BeLieu, Under Secretary of the Army, was born in Portland, Oregon, February 10, 1914. He attended Roosevelt High School in Portland ('33) and the University

of Oregon ('37) at Eugene, Oregon and subsequently the Harvard Business School Advanced Management Program ('55).

Mr. BeLieu was sworn in as Under Secretary of the Army on September 22, 1971.

In 1940, after three years of business in Portland, he volunteered for active duty as a Second Lieutenant in the Infantry. By 1945, he had participated in the Normandy Landing and campaigns in France, the Battle of the Bulge, Germany and Czechoslovakia. He was awarded the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, Purple Heart and Croix de Guerre.

Following World War II, he served in various assignments with the Army in the War Department and Department of the Army General Staff. In 1950, during the Korean Conflict, he lost his left leg below the knee as a result of wounds received in combat. Upon his discharge from the hospital he was assigned to the office of the Secretary of the Army where he served as Executive Officer to two Secretaries of the Army before his retirement as a Colonel in 1955.

From 1955 to 1960, BeLieu was a professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the first Staff Director of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and at the same time was Staff Director of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In February 1961, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. In February 1965, he was appointed Under Secretary of the Navy. While in the Navy Mr. BeLieu was awarded the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award. He returned to private life in July of 1965.

During the period of July 1965 to January 1969, Mr. BeLieu held positions as Executive Vice President, President and Member of the Board of the Leisure World Foundation, Laguna Beach, California; Member, Defense Science Board; Member of the Board of Advisors, Ryan Aeronautical Corporation and Continental Motors; and Member, Technical Advisory Board, RCA.

On January 21, 1969 Mr. BeLieu was appointed by President Nixon as Deputy Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations, the position he held until he was appointed Under Secretary of the Army.

Mr. BeLieu and his family reside in Alexandria, Virginia.

MAYOR BETTY WILSON OF SANTA FE SPRINGS, CALIF., TO VISIT THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an American delegation comprising Mayor Betty Wilson of Santa Fe Springs, Calif., and three other people has been invited by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries to be the guests of the Russian Government for the purpose of discussing guidelines for the development of sister city relationships between the United States and the U.S.S.R. This invitation represents a dramatic new step toward furthering direct relationships between the cities and citizens of the two countries.

The trip, scheduled for July 1 through July 14, will be the initial step of an exchange that will bring a four-member Soviet delegation to the United States, September 1 through September 15.

En route to Russia, Mrs. Wilson will attend the World Congress in Lausanne,

Switzerland, which is sponsored by the International Union of Local Authorities. Mayor Wilson will be a delegate representing the United States. At this meeting representatives from over 70 countries will be meeting together to compare approaches to solving local government problems. The World Congress is in effect a clearinghouse for ideas and experiences.

Mayor Wilson is chairman of the National League of Cities Committee on International Municipal Cooperation and regional vice president of the Town Affiliation Association which has as its principal program, Sister Cities International.

Expenses for the trip will be paid by the Russian hosts, with the exception of air fares which will be paid by the Town Affiliation Association.

When Mrs. Wilson arrives in Russia she will be joined by the other members of the delegation who are: Louis Wozar, president of the Town Affiliation Association; Frederick W. Brittan, chairman of the board of the Town Affiliation Association; and Thomas W. Gittins, executive vice president of the Town Affiliation Association.

I have inserted an article from the Whittier Daily News, June 16, 1973, which further illustrates Mayor Wilson's Russian trip:

FOR SISTER CITY PROGRAM—SPRINGS MAYOR GOING TO RUSSIA

SANTA FE SPRINGS.—The mayor is going to Russia.

On the heels of Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev's conference with President Nixon next week, Santa Fe Springs Mayor Grace (Betty) Wilson and three other officials of the Town Affiliation Assn. will travel to Russia to begin negotiations to establish a Sister Cities program between the USSR and the United States.

A cable this week confirmed an invitation by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries to the association for a two-week, four-city tour of Russia July 1 through 15.

The trip will be the initial step of an exchange that will bring a four-member Soviet delegation to the Town Affiliation Assn. conference in Atlanta in September.

EXCHANGE PROGRAM

"You have to go slow on these things, but at least we'll get the door open for future talks. We will probably discuss what cities should be paired and what type of an exchange program we want to set up," she said.

"I'm really excited about the trip," she said. "Not about the trip as such, but about the meaning."

"We will be getting together to plan a program of cooperation between the people. I feel like a pioneer."

In his news conference Thursday, Brezhnev called for closer people-to-people ties between the two countries.

"I don't know whether it was deliberate or a coincidence," Mrs. Wilson said, "but it's certainly timely. That is exactly what the Sister Cities program does."

Mrs. Wilson was selected to make the trip, she said, "Mainly because I'm a woman and because I will be the only elected official going. Also, I serve on the National League of Cities Committee on International Municipal Cooperation."

The other Town Affiliation Assn. members in the delegation are Louis Wozar, of Dayton, Ohio, Frederick Brittan, of Dover, Del., and Thomas Gittins, of Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Wilson will be the only representative from the western states.

GROUNDWORK LAID

Some of the groundwork for the exchange is done, in the form of a similar program in the Soviet Union.

"They have a program similar to Sister Cities, but, of course, it's called something else," Mrs. Wilson said.

"They have a sister city in Japan, one in India, and some in Europe, but they've never had one in the United States, and that is why I'm so excited about going."

En route, Mrs. Wilson said, she will stop in Lausanne, Switzerland to act as an official delegate representing the United States at the International Union of Local Authorities Conference the last week in June.

"This has been in the works for some time," she said, "but I refused to let myself get excited about it until we had a definite answer."

Mrs. Wilson plans to leave June 22 and return July 16.

Expenses for the trip will be paid by the Russian hosts, with the exception of air fares which will be paid by the Town Affiliation Assn.

Chairing her second meeting as the city's newly selected mayor, Mrs. Wilson made the announcement at Thursday's City Council meeting to ask the council to excuse her from the next two sessions.

FIRST OF ITS KIND

"This is the first time an exchange like this has involved the people of the two countries," Mrs. Wilson said, "not the governments, not industry or science figures."

"In the past the overtures have been in the area of economics, sports, the arts and so forth, but this is the first time that the people have been directly involved."

The cable confirming the invitation, she said, was brief, only laying out the four-stop itinerary of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and an option of either Tashkent or Bologrado.

"The cable didn't say much," she said, "but I'm sure that what we'll do is discuss and lay ground rules for a Sister Cities exchange. I do not know for sure, but it makes sense that that's what we'll do."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, since 1916 the Federal Employees Compensation Act has stood as the finest example of compensation for injury statutes in our country. It was the forerunner of many of the State laws on this subject. Federal employees view with pride the consideration extended to employees and their families who experienced disability or death from job-related causes.

The last revision of this excellent Federal law occurred in 1966. Those amendments represented an updating of the statute in terms of changes in the needs of Federal workers and the desire of the Federal Government to continue its pre-eminent position in the field of employee benefits.

Quite appropriately, the 93d Congress should consider further revisions of the statute to insure its continuance as the model employer. Since 1956 many State compensation laws have been liberalized. Benefits for Federal workers have been

improved in many respects. Updating of the Civil Service Retirement Act was approved by the 91st Congress.

A comprehensive revision of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act was reported from the Select Subcommittee on Labor, which I chair, and was enacted by the 92d Congress.

The cost of living has soared since 1966. A keystone of compensation law is a guarantee to disabled workers that they and their families will have income related to their wages when they suffer on-the-job injuries.

For these reasons, I have introduced a bill designed to assure injured employees that the Federal Government will continue its enlightened policy in the field of compensation.

In summary, the bill proposes these revisions in the Federal Employees Compensation Act:

The present statute permits a widower of a deceased Federal worker to receive benefits only when he is wholly dependent on her, because of physical or mental disability. Similarly, a husband can be considered a dependent in determining the rate of compensation a disabled female employee will receive only if he is totally dependent on the injured worker, because of total disability. Our pattern of social thinking has changed dramatically in the United States in recent years. No longer can a husband be considered in all cases as the sole breadwinner of the family. In many instances, the family's standard of living and the education and well-being of children are based on the combined income of husband and wife.

My bill erases the artificial differences between the entitlement of husband and wife based upon a concept no longer considered valid. This bill allows a widower to receive benefits, because of the demise of his federally employed spouse, if he lived with her or was dependent upon her at the time of her death or if living apart for good reason or because of the desertion of the husband by the wife.

Also the bill allows an injured female worker to obtain the extra 8½-percent augmented compensation under section 8110 of the act for dependents if she has a husband who is a member of the same household, receiving regular contributions for his support, or if she has been ordered by a court to pay for his support.

Under existing law an injured worker may receive medical services in U.S. facilities such as the Public Health Service, the Veterans' Administration hospitals and by designated private physicians in hospitals, however the latter can be utilized only when Federal Government sources are not available or practicable.

The National Commission on State Workman's Compensation Laws recommended that injured employees be permitted to make their own choice of physicians either from all physicians in the State or from a designated panel. This amendment would bring the FECA into line with the recommendations of the Commission.

The present law requires a reduction in the compensation received by an in-

jured employee if his disability changes from total to partial. If a partially disabled employee is unable to return to the job he held at the time of injury then the Secretary of Labor determines the earning capacity of the partially disabled employee and reduces his compensation—on the basis of 66⅔ or 75 percent compensation rate—to the difference between the employee's pay on the day of injury and his new earning capacity. While this is considered a reasonable practice in the field of compensation, it works a hardship on those who are getting or would like to enter an authorized rehabilitation program at the time of a change in disability from total to partial.

The bill would permit the Secretary of Labor to continue compensation at no less than 80 percent of the total rate as an inducement for partially disabled employees to remain or enter into an approved program designed to rehabilitate them vocationally.

Compensation for loss of an arm, leg, foot, hand, eye, and so forth are specified in the present law by the part of the anatomy and the number of weeks involved. Loss of an organ or the permanent loss or use of a worker's back cannot be compensated in this manner. If an employee suffers this kind of loss due to an on-the-job injury, justice, and logic require that he receive at least the same type of benefits as those who lose an external member.

Under the amendment the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide compensation for such losses, not to exceed 350 weeks.

Some Federal employees become totally helpless, because of the injury they have experienced to the extent that they require the constant service of an attendant. Under the existing statute they are entitled to a monthly allowance not to exceed \$300. The bill eliminates the \$300 monthly allowance and sets no maximum allowance, but leaves the determination of this expense to the Secretary of Labor.

Injured workers who participate in vocational rehabilitation may be paid a maximum of \$100 monthly for maintenance while participating in the program. Increases in the cost of these items since the \$100 figure was established—in 1960—justify advancing this figure to \$200, as recommended in the bill.

A requirement that the Bureau of Employees' Compensation review an individual's case when he reaches age 70 to determine whether his wage-earning capacity has declined is found in the present law. If a determination is made that his earning ability has deteriorated, his compensation may be reduced.

For a worker whose injury is job related to experience reduction in benefits due solely to age portrays the Government as a callous employer. Any step to curtail his benefits is unwarranted from both the economic and social standpoints. The bill proposes to repeal this provision of the law.

The existing statute generally prohibits compensation payments and veterans benefits or military retirement or retainer pay for military service simultaneous.

If a Federal worker incurs a job related injury, which is compensable, it is inequitable to deprive him these benefits solely because he is entitled to payments from other sources for different purposes. His ability to realize compensation payments should be based on the merits of his claim and its compliance with the law governing his injury as a civilian employee.

For this reason, the bill permits compensation payments, regardless of any Veterans' administration or military retirement or retainer pay which may have been authorized.

Unless an individual's injury results in a disability which continues for more than 21 days or the original disability becomes permanent he may not receive compensation for the first 3 days of disability under current law. As a matter of equity a worker should not have to forego any compensation benefits if his condition is work related.

My bill reduced this period of pay loss to the first day of the date of injury that follows the injury or to the date disability begins. The first day would be covered only if the disability continues for more than 3 days or becomes permanent. Of course, medical treatment would be available from the time the injury occurs. In actual practice, most Federal agencies provide full pay on the date of injury or the date disability begins, thus virtually no employee would be forced to underwrite the law.

One of the problems experienced by injured Federal employees is the lapse in time between the injury and the commencement of payments. To alleviate this problem the bill authorizes Federal agencies to continue payment of an injured worker's salary for not more than 90 days at the applicable rate. The interest of the agencies would be protected because they would be required to pay the worker only in instances where they do not disagree with the claim. The rationale of the 90-day period is that it would dispose of the majority of non-controversial claims by the agencies subject to review by the Bureau of Employees Compensation.

Generally speaking, claims for compensation on account of injury or death must now be made within 1 year. Failure to file within 1 year may be waived by the Secretary of Labor if filed within 5 years and the Secretary finds, first, that the failure to comply was due to circumstances beyond the control of the individual claiming benefits or second, the individual claiming benefits has shown sufficient cause or reason in explanation of and material prejudice to the interest of the United States has not resulted by the failure.

A small number of meritorious claims are not paid because of the existing 1-year requirement. The amendment to section 8122 of the act provides that the Secretary may waive notice of the injury in filing claim and compensation for disability of the claim is filed within 5 years after injury or death.

The maximum funeral allowance for death attributable to job related injuries was fixed at \$800 in 1966. Since that time the average cost of funeral services has risen astronomically. For this reason, I

am proposing to raise the maximum allotment for funeral expenses to \$1,250.

When the price index maintained by the Bureau of Statistics rises at least 3 percent and maintains or exceeds that rate for 3 consecutive months compensation beneficiaries are entitled to a corresponding adjustment in monthly benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

The bill adds 1 percent to that adjustment to account for the delay between the determination that the cost of living has advanced to or surpassed the 3-percent figure in reflection of this development in monthly checks. A similar provision was enacted in Congress in 1969 for Civil Service employees.

Agencies are now required to reimburse the employees compensation fund for expenditures for compensation received by their employees. The practice is known as "charge back."

Federal agencies have complained that this practice requires inclusion of compensation costs in their budget requests, thereby creating additional budgetary planning and execution problems. Further, many agencies maintain and compare their records with the charges levied by the Bureau of Employees Compensation thereby further creating administrative expenditures.

The amendments rectify this situation while eliminating the "charge back" procedure. (b) of this section would permit the Bureau to plan to spend for administrative matters when the ceiling of 6 percent of the annual authorized compensation benefits. The figure of 6 percent is considerably lower than the comparable expenditures in the private insurance field, yet it is believed to be sufficiently high to permit flexibility.

The present law limits the maximum level of benefits to surviving widows and widowers and children to 75 percent of the employee's earnings. We have maintained this principle in the proposed legislation. At the same time, the percentage of salary payable has been generally raised by 10 percent and the division of benefits between a child or children and the surviving parent has been changed to provide more for the parent as the party responsible for the welfare of the children.

With this background there follows a comparison of these benefits and those incorporated in the bill:

[In percent]

Survivors	Present total	Proposed total
1. Widow or widower no child.....	45	55
2. Widow or widower 1 child.....	55	65
3. Widow or widower 2 children.....	70	75
4. Child alone.....	35	55
5. 2 children.....	50	65
6. 3 children.....	65	75
7. 1 parent ¹	25	35
8. 2 parents ¹	40	60
9. Wholly dependent brother, sister, grandparent, or grandchild ¹	20	30
10. 2 or more wholly dependent brothers, sisters, grandparents, or grandchildren ¹	30	50
11. 1 or more partially dependent brother, sister, grandparent, or grandchild ¹	10	20

¹ Compensation may not exceed 75 percent after payments to widow or widower and children.

The bill proposes to "make whole" the Federal worker who is disabled by a job related injury and later recovers to the point where he can resume Federal employment. The philosophy of workman's compensation involves a commitment by the employers that an employee disabled, because of conditions beyond their control should receive financial and medical assistance to protect himself and his family.

The Federal Employees Compensation Act Amendments of 1966 unintentionally excluded disabled employees of the Federal Public Works Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Works Projects Administration, and other New Deal agencies from receiving the automatic cost of living increases in compensation as provided by 8146-a.

Consequently, neither these individuals nor their survivors have received an increase in their compensation programs since 1966. These neglected persons do not strictly qualify as "Federal employees" as defined under the Federal Employees Compensation Act. However, it seems to me that the Federal Government would in fact assume responsibility for their welfare and safety when they were given employment in the depression era programs.

The number of persons who would be affected by this provision may be no more than a few hundred. Nevertheless, I do believe that this minor adjustment to the law is needed and justified.

There is another provision in this bill which can be called the "court crew" provision. This provision appears relatively insignificant, but unless enacted a potentially valuable rehabilitative program cannot be expanded.

California has been operating a "court crew" program for some time. Under this program, a judge sentences misdemeanants to work out their fines and sentences in the Federal national forests. As a result, the Forest Service has had many dollars worth of cleanup, maintenance, and development done under the program. The major stumbling block is lack of coverage of the workers in the event of an injury while working on Federal lands. This provision would further the implementation of this very valuable correctional rehabilitative program.

Under current law widows lose their right to benefits upon remarriage. This provision works a hardship on the older widow who chooses to remarry, but may be inhibited from doing so because of the financial loss which would result from the remarriage. The civil service retirement law and the Social Security Act already have provisions which permit aged widows who remarry to continue drawing their widow's benefits. My amendment would permit widows who remarry after age 60 to continue drawing benefits.

Employees who contract occupational diseases often have great difficulty in proving the work-related connection of the disease. H.R. 8771, my bill to strengthen State workmen's compensation programs provides authorization for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a list of occupational diseases and to prescribe standards of proof for determining whether such di-

seases are related to employment. As I believe the Federal Employees' Compensation Act should be a model law, I have incorporated a similar provision as an amendment to that act.

A section-by-section analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Section 1: Redefines widower and amends Section 8101 to mean a husband living with or dependent for support on the decedents at the time of the spouses death or living apart for reasonable cause or because of the spouses desertion.

Section 2: Amends Section 8103(a) (3) of the Act to permit Federal workers to use physicians or medical facilities from a list approved by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 3: Amends Section 8104 to provide that partially disabled workers should, while undergoing vocational rehabilitation at the direction of the Secretary of Labor, be paid compensation at a rate of at least 80% of the compensation they would receive if totally disabled.

Section 4: Amends Section 8107 of the Act to provide compensation for the loss of an internal or external organ or the permanent loss of use of a worker's back for not to exceed 350 weeks of compensation.

Section 5: Amends Section 8110(a) (2) of the Act to allow an injured female worker to obtain the extra 8½% augmented compensation for dependents if she has a husband who is a member of the same household, receiving regular contributions for his support, or if she has been ordered by a court to contribute to his support.

Section 6: Amends Section 8111 of the Act by eliminating the maximum that may be paid services of an attendant as the Secretary considers necessary.

(b) of this Section increases maximum compensation for maintenance from \$100 to \$200.

Section 7: Repeals Section 8113(b) which requires that the Secretary review an individual's case when he reaches age 70 to determine whether his wage-earning capacity has declined.

Section 8: Amends Section 8116 of the Act to permit compensation payments regardless of any veterans administration or military retirement or retainer pay which may have been authorized.

No payment shall be made by reason of such amendment for any period prior to the date of enactment.

Section 9: Amends section 8117 to provide that compensation shall not be paid for the first day of disability unless the disability exceeds 3 days.

Section 10: Amends Section 8118 of the Act to authorize continuation of payment to an injured worker's salary for no more than 90 days at the applicable compensation rate.

Section 11: Amends Section 8122 of the Act and provides that the Secretary may waive notice of injury and the time limit for filing a claim for compensation for disability if a claim is filed within 5 years after injury or death.

Section 12: Sets the maximum funeral allowance at \$1,250.

Section 13a: Amends Section 8133. The present law limits the maximum level of benefits to surviving widows and widowers and children to 75% of the employee's earnings. This maximum has been retained. The percentage of salary payable in families where the maximum is not applicable has been generally raised by 10% and the division of benefits between a child or children of the surviving widow has been changed to provide more for the parent as the party responsible for the welfare of the children.

(b) provides that a widow or widower benefits shall not terminate if he remarries after age 60.

Section 14: Makes the Act applicable to certain prisoners while performing services in national forests.

Section 15: Adds 1% to the present cost of living adjustment.

Section 16: Repeals the "charge back" provision of Section 8147 under which agencies are required to reimburse the Employees' Compensation Fund for the amount of compensation paid to their employees.

Section 17: Provides for the Secretary of HEW to establish a list of employment related diseases and standards for determining whether the disability or death of an employee from a disease sustained in the performance of duty.

Section 18: This section preserves all civil service rights of workers who recover from disabling injuries.

Section 19: This section makes appropriate changes in the table of contents.

Section 20: Provides for cost-of-living increases for employees of certain New Deal agencies.

STOCKTON HOTZE

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the close of business tomorrow, June 30, Mr. Stockton Hotze will retire as an employee in the Sergeant at Arms Office of the House of Representatives.

I have known Mr. Hotze for over 20 years. For 15 years, Stockton has been a dedicated employee in the Sergeant at Arms Office. His experience has been a valuable asset to that Office.

Members of the House will recall his friendly response and assistance when they had contact with him. He was an effective, efficient employee who was always helpful to the Members.

As I previously mentioned, I have known Stockton for 20 years, having had the pleasure of meeting him and his wife, Gladys, 5 years before he began his service on the Hill. I will miss seeing Stockton almost every day here in the Capitol, but I hope Mrs. Price and I will have the opportunity of retaining our long acquaintanceship with him and Gladys.

CAMBODIA STULTIFIED BY COUNSEL OF ROCKS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the following article from the front page of the Denver Post. I hope they think seriously about the regime we are supporting in Cambodia.

[From the Denver Post, Apr. 20, 1973]

CAMBODIA STULTIFIED BY COUNSEL OF KOOKS
(By Larry Green)

PHNOM PENH.—Trying to make sense out of Cambodia is like trying to unscramble eggs.

Lon Nol, the 59-year-old president, is a mystic advised by a staff of wizards, magicians, sorcerers, soothsayers, astrologers and his brother, Lon Non, a ruthless brigadier general who is believed to influence policy totally.

Two years ago, when Lon Nol suffered a cerebral hemorrhage, U.S. Ambassador Emory

Swank reportedly described him as "a sick man, both physically and mentally."

The Cambodian president has turned more and more from conventional government administration toward the occult, carrying his beliefs in magic and fortune tellers to extremes even for Cambodians, who use such things in their daily lives.

Recently Lon Nol dispatched a wizard in a helicopter to sprinkle a ring of colored magic sand around the edge of Phnom Penh to protect it from Communist attacks. The United States was sending B-52 bombers to do the same job at the same time.

A few months ago he ordered a government committee formed to twist clumps of grass into miniature soldier-like shapes, part of the national mobilization effort to raise an army. The committee never met.

Only a few weeks ago he fired his chief fortune teller when the seer failed to predict that a disgruntled air force captain would try to kill Lon Nol by bombing the presidential residence.

Yet another time, Lon Nol warned his country of the "Red rabbit plot." He warned that Communist agents were buying up rabbits, paying 30 and 40 times their normal market price, and training them to hop into military compounds with explosives strapped to their bodies.

The president urged Cambodians to contact the police if strangers attempted to buy rabbits, offering exorbitant amounts for their purchase.

"Everybody on his staff—all his advisers, the entire cabinet—knew there could be no such plot," one Western diplomat said. "But nobody dared to tell him, so the warning went out on national television and radio and appeared in the government's daily press communiqué."

Confusion and instability reign in politics and on both sides of the battlefield.

Until the government and the Communist insurgents get their respective political houses in order, chances for what the United States and Cambodia want most—a negotiated cease-fire—appear remote.

The first sign of movement on the part of the government came when Lon Nol announced the resignation of his 15-member cabinet, something it is required by law to do every six months.

Instead of reappointing the cabinet, Lon Nol, under what diplomatic sources described as "extreme American pressure," said he would try to reorganize his government and attempt to broaden its base of support.

All of this, however, will be largely meaningless, if Lon Nol refuses to relinquish his virtually total hold on power and if he remains on the political scene, diplomatic observers here say.

Lon Nol, once a hero for his role in leading the happenstance coup that resulted in the ouster of the former ruler, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, has become increasingly isolated from the people since suffering a stroke two years ago.

He has driven political opponents loyal to the Cambodian republic out of the government.

Newspapers that angered him by criticizing his government and his brother and by disclosing rampant corruption have been closed. Universities also are closed.

Until now, at least, the presidential cabinet has had virtually no authority under a constitution Lon Nol drafted. The country's general assembly is nothing more than a rubberstamp body.

Sirik Matak, one of the founders of the three-year-old republic and a former prime minister and general, is under house arrest. His chief aide fled after surviving an assassination attempt and is in Paris with his family.

In Tam, former interior minister, a defeated presidential candidate and popular leader of the opposition Democratic party resigned as the president's special adviser on

national reunification several weeks ago, charging he had been given no authority by Lon Nol.

The insurgents aren't in any better shape, from what is known of their internal affairs.

They are reported to be divided between those who support deposed ruler Prince Sihanouk and those who oppose both his return to power and the continuing rule of Lon Nol.

After discussing Cambodia's political scene for a couple of hours, one diplomat said, "If Cambodia didn't already exist, certainly there would be an author someday with an imagination fertile and bizarre enough to create such a place. And then nobody would believe it. That is this country's tragedy."

HON. KENNETH BELIEU

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Kenneth E. Belieu today resigns as Under Secretary of the Army and leaves Government service after a career of superb service to the Nation.

Ken's personal courage in war time service to the Nation was unsurpassed. He participated in the epic Normandy landing and the Battle of the Bulge. His courage was recognized by the award of the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, Purple Heart and Croix de Guerre.

Ken Belieu has served the Nation with highest distinction and dedication within the Department of Defense and as professional counsel to many committees of the Congress. He possesses an unsurpassed understanding of the operation of the executive and legislative branches of government. As Under Secretary of the Navy, and as Under Secretary of the Army, the position from which he retires today, his devotion to the American service man was a trademark of his service.

Mr. Speaker, as a highly esteemed citizen-soldier, with a deep sense of integrity, Ken played a key role in charting the Army's course toward a peacetime posture. His genuine concern for the soldier and his abiding love for the Army as an institution were his hallmarks. He rose to a high level in the Defense Establishment, yet never lost the human touch. His unusual appreciation for the role of all branches of government in the national security equation enabled Ken to labor successfully to enhance the atmosphere of understanding and confidence between the Army, other governmental agencies, the Congress, and the public. His contributions to improving the country's defense posture were truly significant.

Mr. Speaker, Ken Belieu is much admired by the Honorable Carl Vinson, one of the great committee chairmen of all time. The late Mendel Rivers and the late Richard B. Russell were among his closest friends and admirers. During his outstanding career of national service, Ken was the confidant and adviser of four Presidents of the United States, members of the Cabinet, and our highest ranking defense and military leaders. Ken played a leading role in keeping America strong during these critical years. Ken has earned the admiration

and respect of the great leaders of Congress for more than 20 years. Ken has been all-American in his devoted and dedicated service and has the highest esteem of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me today in wishing for Ken Belieu and his wonderful wife every continued success, many thanks and the very best always.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a brief sketch of the career of this illustrious American and dear friend.

Kenneth E. Belieu, Under Secretary of the Army, was born in Portland, Oregon, February 10, 1914. He attended Roosevelt High School in Portland ('33) and the University of Oregon ('37) at Eugene, Oregon and subsequently the Harvard Business School Advanced Management Program ('55).

Mr. Belieu was sworn in as Under Secretary of the Army on 22 September 1971.

In 1940, after three years of business in Portland, he volunteered for active duty as a Second Lieutenant in the Infantry. By 1945, he had participated in the Normandy Landing and campaigns in France, the Battle of the Bulge, Germany and Czechoslovakia. He was awarded the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, Purple Heart and Croix de Guerre.

Following World War II, he served in various assignments with the Army in the War Department and Department of the Army General Staff. In 1950, during the Korean Conflict, he lost his left leg below the knee as a result of wounds received in combat. Upon his discharge from the hospital he was assigned to the office of the Secretary of the Army where he served as Executive Officer to two Secretaries of the Army before his retirement as a Colonel in 1955.

From 1955 to 1960, Belieu was a professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the first Staff Director of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and at the same time was Staff Director of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In February 1961, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. In February 1965, he was appointed Under Secretary of the Navy. While in the Navy Mr. Belieu was awarded the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award. He returned to private life in July of 1965.

During the period of July 1965 to January 1969, Mr. Belieu held positions as Executive Vice President, President and Member of the Board of the Leisure World Foundation, Laguna Beach, California; Member, Defense Science Board; Member of the Board of Advisers, Ryan Aeronautical Corporation and Continental Motors; and Member, Technical Advisory Board, RCA.

On January 21, 1969 Mr. Belieu was appointed by President Nixon as Deputy Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations, the position he held until he was appointed Under Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Belieu and his family reside in Alexandria, Virginia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence was granted to:

Mr. VEYSEY, at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, for tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), from 5 p.m. on June 28 and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. DANIELSON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness in family.

Mr. BURGNER (at the request of Mr.

GERALD R. FORD), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HUNGATE, for 4:30 p.m., June 29, through June 30, on account of official business.

Mr. LEHMAN, for June 30, on account of illness in family.

Mr. McFALL, for June 30 to July 18, 1973, 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. VEYSEY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BIESTER for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HILLIS for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McCLOSKEY for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ADAMS, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BOGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, to revise and extend his remarks at the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. RHODES.

Mr. GROSS immediately preceding vote on H.R. 9055.

Mr. STRATTON and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL immediately following the remarks of Mr. CONABLE today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VEYSEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. STEELE in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MICHEL in five instances.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. ROUSSELOT in four instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. ABDNOR.
Mr. MIZELL in five instances.
Mr. CARTER in five instances.
Mr. LATTA.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. CRONIN in three instances.
Mr. KEMP in four instances.
Mr. BAFALIS.
Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. MCFALL.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
Mr. NIX.
Mr. WALDIE in eight instances.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. DOWNING.
Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in five instances.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.
Mr. REID in three instances.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. DE LUGO.
Mr. CARNEY of Ohio in two instances.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.
Mr. DORN in three instances.
Mr. MOSS.
Mr. EVANS of Colorado.
Mr. CAREY of New York.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. LITTON.
Mr. FOUNTAIN.
Mr. BRASCO in two instances.
Mr. ROONEY of New York.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 11. An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River Basin compact, Arkansas-Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 343. An act relative to Federal primary elections and national conventions; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 969. An act relating to the constitutional rights of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1443. An act to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1776. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1794. An act to amend section 308 of title 44, United States Code, relating to the disbursing officer, deputy disbursing officer, and certifying officers and employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1795. An act to authorize the Public Printer to adopt an official Government Printing Office seal, and to designate employees to administer oaths; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 1802. An act relating to certain authority of the Joint Committee on Printing; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1884. An act to permit national banks to invest in agricultural credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1904. An act to amend the Act of August 4, 1950 (64 Stat. 411), to provide salary increases for members of the police force of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 1945. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, so as to authorize certain grapefruit marketing orders which provide for an assessment against handlers for the purpose of financing a marketing promotion program to also provide for a credit against such assessment in the case of handlers who expend directly for marketing promotion; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2016. An act to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2079. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1808. An act to apportion funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and to authorize funds in accordance with title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes; and

S. 1938. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1974.

ENROLLED BILLS 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. 5383. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, to authorize for bridge alterations, to authorize for the Coast Guard an end-year strength for active duty personnel, to authorize for the Coast Guard average military student loans, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7200. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise certain eligibility conditions for annuities; to change the railroad retirement tax rates; and to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to improve the procedures pertaining to certain rate adjustments for carriers subject to part I of the Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 30, 1973, at 10 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1089. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote more effective management of certain related functions of the executive branch by reorganizing and consolidating those functions in a new Department of Energy and Natural Resources, by reorganizing and consolidating others in a new Energy Research and Development Administration, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 93-119); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1090. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 4, 1973, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on the National Shoreline Study authorized by section 106 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 13, 1968, in five volumes, volume I (H. Doc. No. 93-121); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1091. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the audit of financial statements of Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (Department of Transportation) for the calendar year 1972, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 841 and 74 Stat. 101 (H. Doc. No. 93-120); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1092. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the progress and problems in achieving the objectives of the school lunch program, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1093. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued by the General Accounting Office in May 1973, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1174; 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. BROOKS: Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. A report on summary of proceedings and debate, a pilot study; (Rept. No. 93-356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. A report on drugs in our schools; (Rept. No. 93-357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Select Committee on Crime. A report on street crime: Reduction through positive criminal justice responses; (Rept. No. 93-358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 8449. A bill to expand the national flood insurance program by substantially increasing limits of coverage and total amount of insurance authorized to be outstanding and by requiring known flood-prone communities to participate in the program, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 93-359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 5356. A bill to regulate interstate commerce to protect health and the environment from hazardous chemical substances; with amendment (Rept.

No. 93-360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.
Mr. STRATTON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 8537; (Rept. No. 93-361). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 9069. A bill to provide for the preservation, improvement, and reorganization of rail service in the Northeast; to establish the Northeast Transportation Commission, the Federal National Railway Association, and the Northeast Rail Corp., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BENITEZ (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. LEHMAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Ms. ABZUG, and Ms. JORDAN):

H.R. 9070. 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. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 9071. A bill to expand the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include elected school board officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9072. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for more effective motor vehicle emission controls at high altitudes, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. HUBER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. SEUSTER, and Mr. TREEN):

H.R. 9073. A bill to deal with the current energy crisis and the serious shortages of petroleum products facing the Nation and to authorize construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 9074. 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. DICKINSON:

H.R. 9075. A bill to authorize the disposition of office equipment and furnishings; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. DICGS, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 9076. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and to restore the United States to its position as a law-abiding member of the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. VANIK, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GUDE, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9077. A bill to establish a comprehensive program of trade adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FROELICH (for himself, Mr. ERLÉNBOHN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin):

H.R. 9078. A bill to repeal the act terminating Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin as a federally recognized, sovereign Indian tribe; and to restore to the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin those Federal services furnished to American Indians because of their status as American Indians; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 9079. A bill to provide, in cooperation with the States, benefits to individuals who are totally disabled due to employment-related respiratory disease and to the surviving dependents of individuals whose death was due to such disease or who were totally disabled by such disease at the time of their deaths; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9080. 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.

H.R. 9081. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 9082. A bill to amend the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 to provide for the audit of certain Federal agencies by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9083. A bill to amend the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 to provide for the audit of the Federal Reserve System by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRASSO (for herself, Mr. BOWEN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9084. 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. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9085. A bill to amend chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional educational benefits to Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9086. A bill to establish a task force within the Veterans' Administration to advise and assist in connection with, to consult on, and to coordinate all programs pertaining to veterans of the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 9087. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to strengthen and improve the private retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9089. A bill to establish a Federal Amateur Sports Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLFELD (for himself and Mr. HORTON) (by request):

H.R. 9090. A bill to promote more effective managements of certain related functions of the executive branch by reorganizing and consolidating those functions in a new Department of Energy and Natural Resources, by reorganizing and consolidating others in a new Energy Research and Development Ad-

ministration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9091. A bill to revise and restate certain functions and duties of the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. MARAZITI, and Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS):

H.R. 9092. A bill to extend benefits under 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in line of duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LITTON:

H.R. 9093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of income tax returns by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. STEELE, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 9094. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act in order to provide that States may not have less strict standards with respect to marketing, labeling, packaging, and ingredient requirements than those made under the Federal Meat Inspection Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. BURTON, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 9095. A bill to promote and enhance interstate and foreign commerce in recyclable and recycled materials; to encourage the utilization of reclaimable postconsumer waste materials; to encourage conservation of our precious energy reserves and natural resources through effective recycling; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 9096. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free- or reduced-rate transportation to handicapped persons and persons who are 65 years of age or older, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize free- or reduced-rate transportation for persons who are 65 years of age or older, and to provide new and improved transportation programs for the handicapped and the elderly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STARK, Mr. TERNAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9097. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free- or reduced-rate transportation to handicapped persons and persons who are 65

years of age or older, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize free- or reduced-rate transportation for persons who are 65 years of age or older, and to provide new and improved transportation programs for the handicapped and the elderly; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9098. A bill to authorize payments to Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority for the construction of certain facilities to make the subway and rapid rail transit system operated by such authority accessible to physically handicapped individuals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9099. A bill to establish within the Peace Corps a special program to be known as the Vietnam assistance volunteers program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9100. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act and other related acts to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9101. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship on certain Vietnamese children and to provide for the adoption of such children by American families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9102. A bill to amend chapters 2 and 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that individuals 65 years of age or over who are eligible for or receiving social security benefits (and employers, with respect to such individuals) shall be exempt from payment of social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9103. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow's or widower's insurance benefit equal to 100 percent of the deceased worker's primary insurance amount shall be payable at age 62 rather than only at age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 9104. A bill to amend section 101(1) (2) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYMMS (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 9105. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9106. A bill to authorize the establishment of a mainland headquarters for the Channel Island National Monument in the State of California and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HOGAN, and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 9107. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9108. A bill to provide for the conservation of fuel by prohibiting the introduction, or the manufacture, production, or importation for introduction, into interstate commerce of any new passenger automobile which weighs 3,500 pounds or more, and by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose on any such automobile with a weight under 3,500 pounds an excise tax at a rate proportionate to such weight; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 9109. A bill to provide increased employment opportunity by executive agencies of the U.S. Government for persons unable to work standard working hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. AD-DABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BELL, Mrs. BOGGS, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CEDERBERG, Ms. CHISHOLM, Ms. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER and Mr. GAYDOS):

H.R. 9110. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRASSO, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MELCHER, Ms. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 9111. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHROEDER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9112. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9113. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HEINZ, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 9114. A bill to deauthorize permanently the recently halted Cross-Florida Barge Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. REES, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, and Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina):

H.R. 9115. A bill to deauthorize permanently the recently halted Cross-Florida

Barge Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. BURKE of California:

H.R. 9116. A bill to provide increased employment opportunity by executive agencies of the U.S. Government for persons unable to work standard working hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. RHODES, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 9117. A bill to authorize financial assistance for service, employment, and re-development (SER) centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS:

H.R. 9118. A bill to amend chapter 81 of subpart G of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 9119. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 9120. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for uniform and full disclosure of certain information with respect to the sale of dwellings for occupancy by not more than four families in order to promote sound and effective price competition and to prohibit unfair and deceptive sales and other anticompetitive practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 9121. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the sale or purchase for slaughter of pregnant mares and mares with foals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 9122. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish independent boards to review the discharges and dismissals of servicemen who served during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9123. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the inclusion of certain information on discharge certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Ms. HOLTZMAN):

H.R. 9124. A bill to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POBELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9125. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prescribe radiation standards for, and conduct regular inspections of, diagnostic and other X-ray systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POBELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9126. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide for the protection of the public health from unnecessary medical exposure to ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 9127. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9128. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for hospital care and medical services for veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 9129. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for the murder, manslaughter, or attempted murder or manslaughter of Federal law enforcement officers, members of federally assisted law enforcement agencies and Federal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. JOHN-

SON of California, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. CAMP, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. CRONIN):

H.R. 9130. A bill to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and to authorize a trans-Alaska oil and gas pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9131. A bill to provide for the conservation protection and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CRONIN,

Ms. GRASSO, Mr. COTTER, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. STEELE, Mr. MACDONALD, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 9132. A bill to create a Marine Resources Conservation and Development Fund, to provide for the distribution of

revenues from outer Continental Shelf lands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. ROE, Mr. THORNTON, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 9133. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to designate certain institutions of higher education as national energy research centers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9134. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 9135. A bill to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface areas affected by the coal mining activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FORSYTHE,

Mr. KYROS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 9136. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MAC-

DONALD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. REES, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9137. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina:

H.R. 9138. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for emergency allotment lease and transfer of certain tobacco allotments or quotas in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 9139. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore the survivor annuities of certain remarried spouses whose remarriages have terminated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9140. A bill to divorce the businesses of production, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 9141. 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. SHOUP:

H.R. 9142. A bill to restore, support, and maintain modern, efficient, rail service in the Northeast region of the United States, to designate a system of essential rail lines in the Northeast region, to provide financial assistance to rail carriers in the Northeast region, to improve competitive equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 649. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Guglielmo Marconi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BROWN

of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.J. Res. 650. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the age requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 651. Joint resolution relating to the taking of the 1974 Census of Agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution designating certain election days as legal public holidays, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a moratorium be declared on any further abandonment of rail services or facilities within the rural nonmetropolitan regions of the United States until such time that appropriate investigations can be conducted to determine what might be done to continue such service where it is determined to be essential to the continued growth and development of communities and industries located within such regions. This moratorium shall remain in effect until at least June 30, 1974; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FRANK KELLOGG RECEIVES AWARD

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Francis L. Kellogg, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs, was

awarded the medallion of the Hebrew University.

This presentation was made in recognition of his work in helping Russian Jews during their trip from the Soviet Union to Israel.

I also believe that Frank Kellogg deserves recognition for the help he gave me in getting the funds appropriated by Congress to help resettle Russian Jews in Israel released and turned over to the agencies which work with the emigrants.

At this time I enter into the RECORD Mr. Kellogg's acceptance speech:

REMARKS MADE BY THE HONORABLE FRANCIS L. KELLOGG

Excellencies, President Harman, Distinguished Faculty and Staff, Friends new and old: I am pleased and honored to accept this award, the Medallion of the Hebrew University.

But, Mr. President, in accepting it, I receive it not for myself but for the American people. Our nation, like yours, has a time-honored tradition of concern for immigrants and refugees. Since our earliest history refugees