of Canada for the purposes set forth in sections 202 through 204.

SEC. 202. The President of the United States is authorized and requested, utilizing the services of the Secretary and the Secretary of State, to enter into negotiations with the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada to ascertain—

(a) the willingness of the Government of Canada to permit the construction of pipelines or other transportation systems across Canadian territory for the transport of natural gas and oil from Alaska's North Slope to markets in the United States;

(b) the need for intergovernmental understandings, agreements, or treaties to protect the interests of the Governments of Canada and the United States and any party or parties involved with the construction, operation, and maintenance of pipelines or other transportation systems for the transport of such natural gas or oil;

(c) the desirability of undertaking joint studies and investigations designed to insure protection of the environment, reduce legal and regulatory uncertainty, and insure that the respective energy requirements of the people of Canada and of the United States are adequately met; and

(d) the quantity of such oil and natural gas from the North Slope of Alaska for which the Government of Canada would guarantee transit.

SEC. 203. (a) If the President, on the basis of the negotiations authorized and requested in section 202, determines—

(1) that the Canadian Government is willing to entertain an application or applications leading to development of a transportation system for the movement of Alaska crude oil to markets in the United States; and

(2) that no technically competent and financially responsible private entity or entities have made and are actively pursuing such an application with the Canadian Government;

the President is authorized and requested to direct the appropriate Federal departments and agencies to initiate and undertake, or to collaborate with appropriate Canadian governmental agencies and responsible private entities in such studies, negotiations, engineering design, and consultations as are necessary to the proparation of an application to the Canadian Government and to enter into specific negotiations concerning the authorization of construction, certification, and regulations of such a transportation system.

SEC. 204. The Secretary shall, within one year of the effective date of this Act, report to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate regarding the actions taken and progress achieved under this title, together with his recommendations for further action.

SEC. 205. This title shall not be construed to reflect a determination of the Congress regarding the relative merits of alternative transportation systems for North Slope crude oil or regarding the merits or legality of a grant by the Secretary of a right-of-way to construct a crude oil pipeline within Alaska from the vicinity of Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, nor to prohibit such a grant, nor to require that the Secretary in the execution of any of his statutory duties await the results of the negotiations with the Canadian Government provided for in this title before making such a grant.

SEC. 206. Such funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated as are necessary to implement the provisions of this title.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for Monday, July 9, 1973, is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 262 as amended. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 2047, a bill to authorize a Federal payment for the planning of a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road and for a feasibility study of rapid transit to Friendship International Airport. There is a time limitation on the bill. Yea and nay votes are expected on amendments thereto and on passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have already been ordered on final passage of S. 2047.

On the disposition of S. 2047, the Senate will resume its consideration of the then unfinished business, the so-called Alaska pipeline bill, S. 1081. Yea and nay votes may occur on amendments thereto, also, on Monday, July 9.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M., MONDAY, JULY 9, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 262, as amended, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m., on Monday, July 9, 1973.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:11 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 9, 1973, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30, 1973:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Robert E. Hampton, of Maryland, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1979.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John Hugh Crimmins, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Fred Charles Ikle, of California, to be Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The following-named persons to be Assistant Directors of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

Amrom H. Katz, of California.

Robert M. Behr, of Michigan.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Sheldon B. Lubar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

George A. LeMaistre, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Albert Faustino Trevino, Jr., of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Community Development Corporation.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Mitchell Kobelinski, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Charles O. Sethness, of New York, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Saturday, June 30, 1973*

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

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

Be strong and of a good courage; for the Lord Thy God is with thee withersoever thou goest.—Joshua 1: 9.

O Thou who makest light to shine out of darkness, lighten our way, we pray Thee, that we may see the path we should take, and being saved from unworthy ambitions, unfriendly attitudes, and unjust activities may walk with Thee in Thy way and thus fulfill Thy great and good purposes for us and for our Nation.

In the mood of the Master 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. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9055. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year

1974, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CHILES, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1636) entitled "An act to amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. PACKWOOD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. STEVENS were appointed as conferees on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes," in lieu of Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. COTTON.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 320]

Alexander	Fisher	Mathias, Calif.
Andrews, N.D.	Flowers	Matsunaga
Ashbrook	Ford,	Morgan
Ashley	William D.	Nedzi
Badillo	Fraser	O'Hara
Bell	Frey	Patman
Blackburn	Fulton	Pettis
Blatnik	Fuqua	Powell, Ohio
Boggs	Giaimo	Quie
Breaux	Gibbons	Rees
Brooks	Gray	Reid
Brown, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Robison, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	Rooney, N.Y.
Buchanan	Grover	Roush
Burgener	Gubser	Rousselot
Burke, Calif.	Gude	Ruppe
Burke, Fla.	Gunter	Ryan
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Sandman
Chappell	Harrington	Shoup
Clancy	Hays	Stanton,
Clark	Hébert	James V.
Clawson, Del	Hillis	Stark
Clay	Hogan	Steiger, Ariz.
Conte	Huber	Stratton
Conyers	Hudnut	Sullivan
Coughlin	Hungate	Symington
Daniels,	Jarman	Teague, Calif.
Dominick V.	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Danielson	Jordan	Thompson, N.J.
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Tiernan
Dellums	Keating	Veysey
Dent	Kuykendall	Waggonner
Derwinski	Landrum	White
Devine	Long, Md.	Wiggins
Dickinson	Lott	Wright
Diggs	McFall	Wyatt
Downing	McSpadden	Wydler
Esch	Macdonald	Wylie
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Young, Alaska
Fascell	Madigan	Young, Ill.
Findley	Mailliard	Zion
Fish	Martin, Nebr.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 311 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 636, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, SIKES, PASSMAN, BOLAND, FLOOD, CEDERBERG, RHODES, MICHEL, and SHRIVER.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the program is as follows for the day:

The first item was to move to go to conference on the continuing resolution, and the unanimous-consent request was just made on that by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who are not aware of the situation, the Senate agreed to the supplemental appropriation bill last night without amendments, so the bill has been sent to the President. Next we will take up the National Sea Grant College Extension Act. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) is here to handle the legislation.

We next will consider the Debt Limit and the Renegotiation Acts.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, we will be awaiting the report of the conferees on the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, that is the program for the day.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES TODAY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 480.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 480

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time today for the Speaker to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I direct an inquiry to the majority leader?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, first will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman if he would like to make a certain statement.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that this has been cleared with the Republican leadership.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I suspected something like this would take place.

Mr. Speaker, do we have any idea whatever as to how long we might be recessed from one time to another? Will we have time between recessess to go out to a golf course and play nine holes?

Mr. O'NEILL. No, I do not think we will have any time to go to any golf course. I would anticipate from my conversation with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that he will be back at a very reasonable hour with the debt limit bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, from all the eager faces I see in the Chamber this morning, I am sure they will be glad to stay here until midnight or 1 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman from Iowa feels that way, but I am hoping to catch a plane at 4 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is unhappy about it?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am unhappy about it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has lots of company, I would say.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if in the course of declaring the recesses the Speaker will attempt, where possible, to set a time certain for our return, because many times in a situation such as presently exists we are constantly subject to the call of the Chair. This means we have to be available at any minute, even though the leadership knows it is going to take an hour or 45 minutes or an hour and a half before they are going to be ready to consider the legislation they are awaiting.

So wherever possible, I would hope that the Speaker would declare a recess to a time certain, and if the conference report, or whatever it may be, is ready 5 minutes before then, it is not going to inconvenience us as much as if we are constantly on call.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Chair will cooperate in every way possible.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Since I understand this is his birthday, I was going to make the suggestion to the gentleman from Massachusetts—that we make this "be kind to GROSS day."

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving

the right to object, I was simply going to suggest to the majority leader that on this particular day we be kind to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

The Chair cannot predict, of course, when conference reports will be ready, but the Chair will always give a 15-minute warning prior to the reconvening of the House.

If the Chair can be more definite, of course, he will be.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. GROSS

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as you know by the standing ovation given my colleague from Iowa, this is his 39th birthday. I think since we are closing out the fiscal year today the greatest gift that this body could give my distinguished colleague is not to pass any budget-busting bills.

With that I extend to my colleague the heartiest congratulations from all of the Members of the House and wish him many happ returns of the day.

EXTENDING NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE AND PROGRAM ACT

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5452) to extend and make technical corrections to the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 18 and 19 and insert:

(8) Amend section 205 to read as follows:

"STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MARINE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to undertake, through the National Sea Grant College Program, a study of the means of sharing, through cooperative programs with other nations, the results of marine research useful in the exploration, development, conservation, and management of marine resources.

"(b) In carrying out the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized, without regard for paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 204(d), to enter into contracts with, and make grants to, institutions, agencies, and organizations described in section 204(c).

"(c) The Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress the results and findings of such study, including specific recommendations, not later than September 30, 1974.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out this section there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $200,000.".

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to H.R. 5452 provides for a study by the Secretary of Commerce, through the sea-grant program, as to the means of sharing marine research information through cooperative programs with other nations. One of the issues in relation to oceanographic research which will be resolved in the Law of the Sea Conference to be held next year concerns the freedom of research, unimpeded by the assertion of restrictions by various coastal nations. The undeveloped countries, without the immediate ability to undertake such research or to utilize the raw research data of others, tend to be suspicious of, and unreceptive to, research off their shores. One way to abate this threat to freedom of research in ocean waters lies in making the results of such research freely available so that the entire international community may benefit. The study authorized by the Senate amendment would contribute to the solution of this interchange problem. In addition, I might say that this study is also entirely consistent with the purposes of the recent agreement with the U.S.S.R., relating to oceanographic research, which was signed at the State Department only last week.

The amendment authorizes necessary sums to conduct the study, not to exceed the sum of $200,000. This authorization is relatively conservative, considering the untold benefits that should result.

The amendment is germane to the bill.

I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that the majority of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries are in agreement with the gentleman from Virginia in urging the House to agree to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE ACTS WISELY IN RETURNING DEBT LIMIT BILL TO CONFERENCE

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the Fourth of July recess, as proposed, and at approximately 8 p.m., the House received from the conference with the other body, appended to the temporary public debt limit, a 51-page bill or succession of nongermane amendments tacked on by that body. After a lengthy day the House was called upon to pass this legislation with only 1 hour of debate. Parts of the bill dealt with the sale of liberty bonds, the provision that checks issued to individuals as refunds may become U.S. savings bonds, and changes in the Social Security Act. The time for debate, discussion, and understanding was so short that I sincerely doubt if the distinguished chairman of that committee knew clearly the content of the legislation.

The House in its wisdom sent the bill back to conference for corrections. I trust in the future the Members will look with scornful disdain and disapproval on so much legislation at so late an hour. Holiday or no holiday, we have a job to do and we should take such time as necessary for adequate study and understanding.

In the 8½ years I have served as U.S. Representative, I have never voted against social security. However, in this bill last night, 51 pages of intricate legislation was simply too much for even the chairman of the committee to digest every feature in 1 hour of debate. The House acted wisely in returning the bill to conference.

It reminded me of the habitual drunkard who came home every night and would vomit spasmodically. His wife told him, "John, if you do not quit drinking, you are going to vomit your insides out."

Just a few nights later John came in in his usual state of inebriation and went into the kitchen without turning on the lights. The same day his wife had cleaned a chicken and had left discarded portions in the sink.

John's wife heard him as he gagged and fumed in the darkened kitchen. Directly he came in and told his wife, "Mary, I did just what you said I would, I vomited my insides up. But with the help of God and a long-handled spoon, I got them back again."

With this iniquitous bill came up before the House, it was my feeling that the good Lord was not listening and the long-handled spoon just was not long enough, so the House acted wisely and the bill was returned to conference.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 382 on the final passage of the State-Justice appropriation bill, I was unavoidably detained and could not be present. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 8152, OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8152) to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to

improve law enforcement and criminal justice, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RODINO, CONYERS, FLOWERS, SEIBERLING, Miss JORDAN, Messrs. MEZVINSKY, HUTCHINSON, MCCLORY, SANDMAN, DENNIS, and FISH.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7445) entitled "An act to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the act for 2 years," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 8410) entitled "An act to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; and agrees to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 7445, EXTENDING THE RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7445) to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the act for 2 years, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8410, PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 93-362)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

W. D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
H. T. SCHNEEBELI,
H. R. COLLIER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
H. E. TALMADGE,
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

W. D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
H. T. SCHNEEBELI,
H. R. COLLIER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
H. E. TALMADGE,
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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 is disagreement on the bill (H.R. 8410) to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

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(i) 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(i) 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(i)(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(q) 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—

(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 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 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—

(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 circumstances (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, at 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 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 Sec-

retary, 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 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.

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 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.

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 AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SEC. 243. 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 225 OF SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1972

SEC. 244. (a) Section 1903 of the Social Security Act as 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 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 year, 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 to 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 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 obligational 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 15 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 supplemental 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 reimpounding the specific 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 space 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 relat-

ing 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 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.

(c) 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 obligational 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 or facsimile copy of all public notices, the availability of such notices to broadcasting stations, and any other ar-

rangements 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 Campiagn 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 (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment, which is some 49 pages long, be considered as read and 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 OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8410) and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 4. (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 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)).

SEC. 5. Section 203(e)(2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensa-

tion 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."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to designation by inidividuals 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 the 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 the 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 covers three matters which we will discuss, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, let me say first that perhaps the House made the proper decision last night, although it was somewhat embarrassing to some of us on the committee. However, I think I can say that it avoided the even greater embarrassment of having a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means bearing my name and, I think, the name of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) vetoed by a President. In the years that I have been chairman of the committee, I have never had that experience; I did not want it.

Actually, in our original meetings, it was not possible for us to obtain sufficient concessions from the Senate to make the debt ceiling bill itself veto-proof.

We have also this morning tentatively discussed the bill involving the Renegotiation Act, and I have been told by the Secretary of Treasury, who recommended to the President the veto of the bill last night, that both the debt limit bill and the Renegotiation Act bill, if they come out as we hope, as far as he is concerned, will be signed by the President. At least he will recommend the President's signature on both these bills.

Mr. Speaker, we will go to conference on the Renegotiation Act very soon, we hope. Having discusssed it this morning, we feel that we can readily agree to the changes that the Senate has wrought upon us, with the amendments that we want to make to it, and that with both these bills being in this condition, as far as the legislation of the Committee on Ways and Means is concerned, we will not have to stay here next week.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

What was done last night was not done with any intention, of course, of embarrassing the Committee on Ways and Means or the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I think the gentleman's heart was really in what was done today and not what was before us last night.

Mr. Speaker, it was due to his ability last night and more importantly, I am sure, in the negotiations today that this matter has been resolved to a satisfactory result.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that this legislation now before us and the legislation to follow will be greatly improved over what we had last night. I think it is mainly the handiwork of the gentleman from Arkansas, his associates, and the conferees. I congratulate the gentleman for what has been accomplished and I am of the opinion that the President will approve the several proposals.

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

Let me discuss very briefly the three matters which are in disagreement and on which I previously moved to recede and concur with amendments.

Mr. Speaker, one has to do with the matter of extended unemployment compensation, which was in the bill discussed last night.

Another has to do with the continuation of the maternal and child health program which, if not continued, would expire tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the third one has to do with the dollar campaign check-off

amendments that we discussed last night. Let me discuss each of these briefly.

EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

The provision relating to extended Unemployment Compensation is identical to the provision contained in the amendment to the debt ceiling bill yesterday.

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 unemployment 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 than 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 13 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.

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 sum 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. As modified by the amendment before us, this provision provides that the campaign checkoff designation is to be either on the first page of the income tax return or on the side of the return where the signature is. 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. There is no statutory requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury provide appropriate publicity with respect to the campaign checkoff each year. However, the Secretary has assured us the Treasury will do so year after year. Finally, the amendment converts the campaign fund checkoff to a nonpartisan checkoff. 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.

All of the other material, including all of the social security and welfare provisions, have been added by the Senate to the renegotiation bill. But when we come back to discuss that conference report, I think the conference report will have provided sufficient amendments to convince my colleagues why the President himself would feel that he would have to sign the bill.

Mr. Speaker, if there are any questions, I will be glad to respond to them. These are the three matters we discussed last night in detail, these three nongermane amendments. They are considered as one amendment again, because we were still faced with the fact that the Senate had added all of these many provisions in the form of one amendment.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS or Arkansas. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY or Ohio. Mr. Chairman, approximately when will the renegotiation bill be ready for a vote by this body?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is our objective that the drafting people will have completed their work by 2:30 or 3 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Will we vote on it today?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Absolutely.

Mr. REID. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. REID. Might I ask him whether the Renegotiation Act is going to have the provisions that were in the conglomerate amendment last night relative to social services and a prohibition on new social service regulations for a 6-month period.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Without committing ourselves, because we have not been in conference officially on it, let me suggest to the gentleman from New York that the objective of the amendment of last night will be included in the conference report to accompany the Renegotiation Act extension.

Mr. REID. The reason why I ask is the question of timing, because obviously the new regulations will go into effect on July 1 absent the committee action.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. In a different form we are carrying out the same objective of suspending the regulation and prevented it from going into effect on July 1.

Mr. PICKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman mind telling the House what is included in the changes in the unemployment compensation measures which is now part of this measure?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I will be glad to discuss it with the gentleman.

The unemployment compensation provision is identical with the unemployment compensation provision which we had in the conference report last night. What it does until December 31 of this year is to disregard the 120-percent requirement of existing law for triggering a State's program provided that the rate of insured unemployment within the State is 4.5 percent.

Under existing law it is 4 percent, as you know, but it does have this 120-percent requirement, that is, that the insured unemployment in the year involved will be 20 percent higher than it was in the 2 previous years.

Mr. PICKLE. Could the gentleman give the House his estimate of what he thinks this will cost the Treasury in extended benefits and unemployment insurance for the rest of this year?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It is about $61 million.

Mr. PICKLE. About $61 million?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. But the gentleman understands that this comes out of a special fund and not out of the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. PICKLE. I understand it comes out of the employers fund.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right. Accumulated by the Federal taxes applicable to wages for this purpose.

Mr. PICKLE. Will the gentleman kindly insert for the RECORD those States primarily that it is anticipated will be affected by this?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman intends to do this and will say also it does not involve your State or my

State, but it takes care of such States as Massachusetts and Washington, and so forth.

Mr. PICKLE. And New York and California. It is the same States basically as——

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. New York would not be eligible for it now. The State of New Jersey would be affected; Rhode Island is another. I can go on, but I will put those States in the RECORD.

The material follows:

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

Mr. PICKLE. If the gentleman will yield further, assuming that the body in its haste for the completion of our business approves this measure and the amendment that contains unemployment, do I understand clearly it is for the rest of this year, December 31, 1973, or 1974?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No; 1973.

Mr. PICKLE. This is, then, a temporary extension and is not to be considered permanent?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No.

Mr. PICKLE. It is not an overall extension?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. It is just for the 6-month period involved. It is only temporary.

Ms. ABZUG. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS or Arkansas. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Will the gentleman explain that extension with regard to unemployment insurance? It does not make any provision for the State of New York. Is that right?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It is my understanding that the unemployment level of the State of New York is not 4.5 percent. If it should become 4.5 percent in the 6-month period, then New York would be included, but you have to have as much as 4.5 percent insured unemployment in order to qualify.

Ms. ABZUG. It does not waive previous requirements?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No. We waived the requirement that your insured unemployment in the State of New York would have to be 20 percent higher than it was in the 2 previous years. This has kept at times during the year, I understand, the State from qualifying.

Ms. ABZUG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DORN. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DORN. I want to thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

In view of some of the discussion on the floor of the House last evening about the veterans pensions, I wonder if the distinguished chairman has anything in this or any other report this afternoon concerning those benefits.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There is a provision put in by the Senate to the Renegotiation Act bill which solves the problem that was raised.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

That solves the problem that was raised by members of the gentleman's committee last night.

Mr. DORN. Would the gentleman yield further and advise what it does at this time?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. I will be glad to.

I am aware of the amendment, so I can discuss it in answer to the gentleman's question.

The provision merely provides that no veteran will lose benefits as a result of the social security increase which is also involved in that bill in determining the veteran's income for purpose of his eligibility for a pension. It is the same thing that the gentleman's committee has done in the past.

Mr. DORN. May I ask the distinguished chairman further, would they be germane, that type?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Oh, no. It is not germane to the bill. That is why we have it back as an amendment in disagreement. It is not germane.

Mr. DORN. I might inform the distinguished chairman that as a representative of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I might be compelled to object on the jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I would not blame the gentleman one iota, but members of the gentleman's own committee were very instrumental last night in calling the attention of the House to the fact that we were depriving about 340,000 veterans of their pensions as a result of a social security increase, and at the same time I think they were overlooking the fact that there are some 30 million people eligible for a social security increase.

Mr. DORN. Not only that, I might say to my distinguished friend, but a 20-percent increase in social security last year. This is being considered by our Committee on Veterans' Affairs. At this very moment public hearings are being held. To interject into a conference report a provision with reference to a 5-percent increase would leave, at this stage of the game, the House wide open. We have been getting a few letters, I might say to the chairman, and he will get millions.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Not about this increase, because it will not cause anyone presently entitled to a pension in any amount to lose that amount of his pension. The amendment was offered in the Senate. The Senate agreed to the amendment by a vote of 77 to 0. It was cosponsored by the gentleman's counterpart in the Senate. The gentleman's counterpart in the Senate was on the conference and indicated to the House conferees that we take the amendment.

Mr. DORN. I might say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, that if this type of approach is taken for the 5 percent, what about the 20 percent?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I have every confidence in the world in the leadership of my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that he will see to it that no veterans are abused or mistreated in the final analysis by an increase in social security.

Mr. DORN. Then I might say that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will take care of both the 20 percent and the 5 percent.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is good. I am glad to hear the gentleman from South Carolina say that.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One point, Mr. Chairman: With regard to the State of New York and unemployment compensation insurance benefits and the eligibility factor with regard to our committee's research on this point, again and again I have run into the problem that the geographical area of reporting that covers the statistics is regional, and until we cure that difficulty of the regional reporting, it is very hard to bring New York in under the 4½ percent without heavily increasing the burden across the country in other States that have a level above that level.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY of New York. I think it is something that is beyond the reach of the conferees. One more thing: I want to commend the chairman for his stamina and steadfastness in bringing into the conference, I believe, the provisions regarding maternal and child health care. Many States would have lost on these, and few States would have gained if the conference report had not gone into this. It is very important to keep these programs for parental and perinatal care ongoing.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to address some brief remarks to a specific amendment House conferees have brought back in disagreement. I refer to the extension, for one fiscal year, of project funding for Maternal and Child Health Care Centers, contained in the Senate version of the Debt Limit Extension.

I am very gratified that the conferees will permit the House to work its will on this and other vital amendments aimed at helping, in a most direct way, those least able to help themselves.

Extension of project funding for these centers will permit the continuation of these essential health care programs in 139 locations, in 38 States and two territories. Service is provided, just under the Maternal and Infant Care programs, to 800,000 expectant mothers, infants and youngsters.

Failure to provide this extension of project funding, under title V of the Social Security Act, would result in the eventual severe curtailment or effective demise of virtually all the centers across the Nation and cost New York City approximately $8 million in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the success of these programs is clearly and magnificently obvious. Infant mortality has decreased substantially in those areas in which a project is operating. In my own district, for instance, the project area of Red Hook showed a reduction of infant mortality from 29.9 precent per one thousand births in 1960 to 17.4 percent in 1971.

Similar results have been achieved in the many projects, 11 in the Metropolitan New York area, throughout the Nation. Intensive care for premature infants has resulted in reductions of up to 25 percent in mortality rates.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, unless the House permits this project-funding extension, funding is just not likely to be forthcoming from the States, and little has been done, to date, to provide for a smooth transition to full formula funding and assurance of adequate state funding for these centers. With no extension, most of these projects will just die, rendering useless over 5 years of progress in a team approach to maternal and child health care. We will also lose what has been gained in parental education in nutrition and hygiene and general prenatal care. These mothers and their children will be thrown back on the medical care junkheap, if we do not instruct our conferees to recede from disagreement to this vital amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the nationwide value of these programs is beyond dispute. Continuation of project funding is clearly of vital and immediate concern to every Member of Congress. I urge overwhelming approval of any motion to instruct the conferees to recede from disagreement to Senate amendment providing for a 1 year extension of project funding for Maternal and Child Health Care programs.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), Congressman BURKE, Congressman ROSTENKOWSKI, myself, and other members of the committee and the House, have worked very hard to secure this continuation of project funding. The distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) and the chairman and members of the Senate Finance Committee are certainly to be commended for the yeoman duty they performed in behalf of this most important amendment.

My only concern, other than House approval of this amendment, is that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, that bastion of defence for the rights, needs and equal opportunities of those unable to defend themselves, has begun to dismantle the present administrative structure that has been caring for these and other programs designed to safeguard the health of the American child.

This morning's Washington Post carries a story on page A2, explaining the reasons for the resignation of Dr. Arthur J. Lesser, veteran head of Federal programs for crippled children, infants, children and expectant mothers. Dr. Lesser states, in reply to Mr. Weinberger's assurances that this is merely an efficiency reorganization:

This is the first step in the elimination of categorical programs. It is another disregard for the intent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it with continued shock and outrage that I have witnessed and continued to witness the arrogant destruction of programs the Congress and the American people have labored for decades to build and improve.

What form of callousness inhabits this administration? Is it that they realize they will not be running things come a few years hence and that they must accomplish this seamy and illegal wasting of our health programs quickly and in such a way that their reconstruction will be a long and difficult work for the Congress and any succeeding administration? That would be the only explanation possible for this rampant disregard for the will of the Congress—a Congress, however, that has begun to fight strongly against this form of constitutional subversion.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the point where the Congress is forced to seek relief in the courts via injunctions and suits to compel the executive to carry out the directives of the elected representatives of the people. I can assure my colleagues that this confrontation is just beginning. But I am sure we will carry it to a successful conclusion—a conclusion that will be effected legally and constitutionally and a conclusion that will restore fully the power of the Congress to legislate for the general welfare of the American people, without the hindrance of an administration supposedly in office to carry out the will of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is my wish to insert at the conclusion of my remarks the Post story concerning the resignation of Dr. Lesser:

HEW AIDE QUITS OVER NIXON PLAN

Dr. Arthur J. Lesser, veteran head of federal health services for crippled children and low-income pregnant mothers said yesterday he is quitting to protest Nixon administration plans to break up his agency and make the director a "figurehead."

"This is the first step in the elimination of categorical programs," Lesser said. "It is another disregard for the intent of Congress."

Congress provides funds for some health services by specific category, such as maternal and child health care. The Nixon administration's revenue sharing concept, which does not apply to these programs, lumps the funds together and lets the states decide what the spending categories should be.

Lesser charged that under a reorganization of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration—a unit of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) the child and maternal health programs staff would be reduced from about 160 to six or seven and the other personnel would be given additional duties with other programs.

"There is no place for me in that kind of business," Lesser told UPI. He has been head of federal health services for children and mothers since 1952 and associated with the programs since 1941, but Friday will be his last day on the job.

At age 63, Lesser said he is not ready to retire. "But I certainly wouldn't continue as a figurehead or exhibit a in support of a reorganization of which I thoroughly disapprove," he said.

The General Accounting Office is investigating the reorganization to determine if any Congressional authority has been violated.

Under the plan to take effect next month, HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger said health services will be split into three major units to "increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the department's health programs."

Under the $244 million maternal and child health services program, some 500,000 crippled children, primarily in rural areas, receive medical care each year; 650,000 infants get well-baby care; 2 million to 3 million children receive school health examinations and immunizations, and needy pregnant mothers and children, mostly in big cities, get health examinations, dental care and other services to reduce high rates of infant mortality and promote good health.

Dr. Paul B. Batalden, chief of the bureau in which these services will be located, said there is no intent to phase them out.

"I would not have accepted that job if that had been the case," he said.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the temporary debt ceiling is extended to November 30?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me explain to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, as I said last night, so far as the text of the House-passed bill is concerned, the Senate did not change a word, or anything else. It accepted the bill as it passed the House, so it is November 30.

Mr. GROSS. So the extension will be for 5 months, not 6 months?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think this will be sufficient to accommodate the increase in the debt?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. In the next 5 months?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, sir. At one point the administration downtown had suggested that we increase the temporary debt from $65 billion to $85 billion. I think I can assure my friend that when we come back, whether it be in the form of a permanent increase or temporary increase, that it will be possible for us to go through the fiscal year with less than a $20 billion increase.

Mr. GROSS. I have had a bill pending before the gentleman's committee for a number of years, H.R. 144, which would obviate the necessity for any increase in the debt ceiling, temporary or permanent. It provides for a balanced budget and orderly annual payments on the Federal debt. Can the gentleman give me assurance of any kind that the com-

mittee will hold hearings on this bill after the July 4 recess? I say again that bill would obviate the necessity for dealing with the debt ceiling in the future.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I would be glad to accommodate the gentleman, but we are busy now and we will be after the recess with trade legislation. Let me point out to the gentleman, and I know he is very sincere in this legislation, if we do pass the gentleman's bill probably the Congress would undo it the next day by exceeding the amount that would be permitted in the gentleman's bill.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think the Congress is that lawless?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, no. The Congress is always changing things.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say that the President has agreed in principle on the Renegotiation Act and he does not think that there will be a veto of it if it comes in the form it has come from the gentleman's conference?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The President's representative said he would recommend the President veto the legislation as it was last night, but he has told me today he would recommend to the President that he sign both this bill and the other bill if the conference does what we tentatively discussed this morning and what is in the conference report.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas has explained a great many of the ramifications of the bill, but one of my colleagues asked if I would explain in some detail what amendments are in the bill.

As the Members know, last night there were about 20 amendments on the bill as it was presented. Today we have a very stripped down bill. We have our basic debt ceiling bill, which has not been changed, and three amendments.

The first amendment is the checkoff in Presidential elections.

The second is an unemployment insurance provision which is for 6 months affecting about six States.

The third amendment is the maternal and child health amendment, which the chairman has described.

Last night the bill we were talking about would have meant a fiscal loss in 1974 of $1.3 billion. The loss is attributable to these same provisions as were included in the debt bill before the House and the argument we hope to work out in the conference on the Renegotiation Act will be around $230 million in fiscal 1974.

So I would like to point out to the gentlemen who supported us in reporting the bill back to conference, that our input was very worthwhile. I know it was rather difficult for the Members to deny themselves part of the 4th of July holiday, but we did a very good job and I think in return the conferees have come back with a very responsible bill.

I would like to make one suggestion. This debt ceiling will come up again on the 1st of October and I hope we do not get another rash of amendments as we on the bill when it first came to us. I would like to suggest that before the debt ceiling comes back for consideration early in October, we might be able to improve the House rules for dealing with nongermane amendments added by the other body since it is a problem that confronts us and will continually confront us until we do something about it.

This is a good bill. The administration representatives this morning indicated they could support this legislation. We are very happy to bring this corrected bill in its reduced form to the Members. I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. DENNIS. I was very pleased to support the gentleman last night and also today. But today I would like to ask the gentleman, and perhaps the distinguished chairman, with reference to the bill which is coming up. As I understand it the social security raise has now been transferred to that bill.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. That is correct.

Mr. DENNIS. Also much, at least, of the other social provisions which were in this bill. As I further understand it, there is no provision made for added taxes. Last year we raised social security 20 percent and added in an escalator cost of living clause which automatically operated.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I think the gentleman is anticipating the next bill.

Mr. DENNIS. I am.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. And I would prefer to discuss this with the gentleman at the time we have something specific and concrete, rather than something that might happen, and if the gentleman will withhold his question until the next bill comes in, I would appreciate it.

Mr. DENNIS. I shall do that, but I will appreciate it if the gentleman will give me the rationale on it at the proper time.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, with respect to one of the amendments which refer to child welfare project grants, which is due to expire and be replaced by formula-type distribution or revenue-sharing-type contribution, is the extension of the project grant program going to be another layer in addition to the formula grant due to take effect July 1?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the total bill will cost $30 million. I believe the chairman would like to elaborate of this point.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the chairman of the committee, Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it should be called to the attention of my friend from Texas that there may be a $30 million additional cost, and there may not be, because it has to go through the appropriation process.

What it does is to retain this formula for the benefit of those States which would get more under that formula, and allows the upcoming formula to also apply to those States which would get more under it. That is why it is here in addition to the other. It is the best of two worlds.

Mr. ARCHER. The best of both worlds to all States.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE).

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman in the well, the Chairman and the other distinguished members of the committee on doing a very fine job. I am going to be pleased to support this conference report.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted a personal observation, I would like to say to the minority leader that I congratulate him on the two victories yesterday. They are very well deserved.

Mr. Speaker, he has the confidence, very obviously, of the Members of our side. The two victories yesterday were certainly in appreciation of the respect and affection we have for our minority leader. He did a great job, and our two victories were the result of his great leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we salute him.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope and urge that the desperately needed social security increase proposal being offered here will be overwhelmingly accepted by the House this afternoon.

Despite some sincere reservations on the part of certain Members I very deeply feel that the adoption of this proposal is simply and basically an extension of equitable and just consideration to the millions of social security recipients in this country who are suffering the most from the accelerating living costs that are plaguing all of our people.

Those who will receive such an increase, the authorities advise, will very likely spend it all and immediately for the purchase of fundamental living necessities.

In practical substance we are not so much granting these recipients any real dollar increase as we are attempting to help them to just keep pace with the alarming climb in all costs arising out of this presently uncontrolled, runaway inflation.

Under all the circumstances surrounding this proposal I earnestly feel the acceptance of this social security increase is in the national interest and I hope it is resoundingly approved.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend our colleagues for adopting as an amendment to the debt limit bill the amendment to extend for 2 years the authority of spe-

cial projects for maternal and child health under title V of the Social Security Act.

These special project grant programs have been working successfully for 6 years now serving over one-half million children and one-half million mothers in low-income areas across the country. Under the present allocation formula, 50 percent of the money has gone directly to the States, 40 percent directly to the projects established in areas of serious health need, and 10 percent of research and development. On July 1, 1973, 90 percent of the funds was scheduled to go to formula grants to the States. All of the project grants authority would have terminated and these programs would have died all across the country.

Under this amendment the project grant authority is extended to June 30, 1974. After that date, the formula to be used in allocating funds to the States will be modified to assure that no State will be eligible for less funds after June 31, 1974 than the total amount allocated to a State in formula and project grants in fiscal year 1973, and that States will be required to make appppropriate arrangements for the continuation of services to the population in areas previously served under project grants. Under a special provision, in fiscal year 1974 a State will be authorized the greater of the total of fiscal year 1973 project and formula grants, or the sum such State would have otherwise been entitled to if the project grants had not been extended during fiscal year 1974.

I have the assurance of many States and many project directors that this amendment is acceptable to them and furthermore, workable and desirable. To fund the States after June 30, 1974, at the higher level and to assure that the special projects are continued is a great step toward reaching those young children in every State in the country who so need health care. And, the programs that deliver this care are ones that have shown their worth.

I wish to commend my colleagues, Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS, and members of that committee, particularly Mr. CAREY and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for their special effective and devoted efforts in working for an extension of these projects. I would also like to thank Finance Committee Chairman Senator LONG, Senator MONDALE and Senator PERCY for their invaluable support and assistance. Support for the extension of the project grant authority has been given by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the American Medical Association.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to extend my deepest thanks and gratitude to the man who has been the guiding light for these maternal and child health programs, Dr. Arthur Lesser. As Director of Maternal and Child Health Services for HEW since 1952, he is held in the highest esteem as the public health leader in the field of maternal and child health, and crippled children's services. His professional standards of competence have been responsible for establishing an excellent staff in the HEW regional offices and for assuring that the patients served by these programs are given the best care that can be provided anywhere.

This week, Dr. Lesser resigned from HEW. He quit to protest Nixon administration plans to break up maternal and child health services as part of their reorganization plans. It was with great sadness that I read yesterday of his departure from HEW in articles in the New York Times and the Washington Post.

I am seriously concerned and distressed at the disregard by the administration of the health problems of children, as evidenced by the reorganization plans for health services. The Health Services Administration program heads are being stripped of their authority without the knowledge of Congress. The Nixon administration plans would effectively bypass Congress and put revenue sharing into operation, and the present system of categorical programs would be superseded. The maternal and child health service staff would be reduced from 160 persons to six or seven.

Congress has not approved any such special revenue sharing and furthermore, these categorical programs are being continued today by an overwhelming mandate of Congress. Since it seems that the implementation of the administration reorganization plans constitutes a violation of the law, I have, on June 8, asked the Comptroller General to ascertain if the law has been broken, and congressional authority violated, and I await his reply.

We know that the Nixon administration has repeatedly shown a disregard and insensitivity to the problems of the poor. This latest action seems to me both illegal and immoral. It is illegal because with this organizational change, Congress will not get the accountability which is called for in the authorizing legislation. It is immoral because it was done with so much subterfuge and secrecy in an apparent effort to deceive the Congress of the intent of the reorganization.

I am thankful we prevailed today in keeping the maternal and child health programs alive.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1973, Judge Gerhard R. Gessell of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, ruling on an impoundment suit brought by the National Council of Community Mental Health Centers, sustained a key provision of the law which is of vital interest to the Congress. The court, in effect, ruled that when the Congress explicitly tells the President he may not impound health funds, then he has no choice but to carry out the directive. The provision of law addressed by the court is section 601 of the Hill-Burton amendments of 1970. The suit was brought against HEW Secretary Weinberger and other administration officials to compel the release of funds appropriated by the Congress for fiscal 1973 pursuant to the continuing resolution for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to begin processing applications and award grants for community mental health center staffing and children's services grants.

Mr. Speaker, the facts surrounding the case are these: For fiscal 1973, the Congress appropriated $165.1 million for regular staffing grants and $20 million for grants for mental health programs for children. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, however, had indicated an intention to spend only $133.7 million, the amount HEW is required to spend to fulfill its statutory obligation to centers already operating under the staffing grant program. Thus, HEW had in fact impounded $51.4 million of appropriated funds which were intended by the Congress to be used to fund new community mental health center programs, and it is these funds that the court, in granting the plaintiffs a preliminary injunction, required not be returned to the Treasury at the end of fiscal year 1973.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the order of the court, and the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law. I particularly want to call my colleagues' attention to item 4b of the conclusions of law which states that—

(W)hile the defendants may continue to exercise their discretion to decide whether to make a particular new grant award on the basis of the merits of the individual application, there is no statutory authority for the defendants to exercise that discretion in a manner calculated to obligate none of the funds appropriated by Congress for new awards in fiscal year 1973, because the obligation and expenditure of all funds appropriated by Congress through fiscal year 1973 under the Act to otherwise eligible applicants is made mandatory by the Act of June 30, 1970, Pub. L. No. 91–296, Title VI, § 601 . . .

I also call my colleagues' attention to item 4c, which states that—

(U)nder the explicit command of Section 601, there is no remaining constitutional authority in the President and these defendants to terminate the statutory program in question . . .

The material follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

[CIVIL ACTION No. 1223–73]

National Council of Community Mental Health Centers, Inc., et al., on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, *v.* Caspar W. Weinberger, et al., Defendants.

ORDER

The Court having entered its Finding of Fact and Conclusions of Law this 28th day of June, 1973, it is hereby

Ordered:

(1) This matter is certified as a class action under Rules 23(b)(1)(A), 23(b)(1)(B) and 23(b)(2), Fed. R. Civ. P. to include all parties who have submitted applications for initial grants for community mental health center staffing or children's services in fiscal year 1973 under Parts B or F of the Community Mental Health Centers Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2681, *et seq.*, (hereinafter "the Act").

(2) Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction shall be and hereby is granted.

(3) Defendants Weinberger, Brown and Ash, and their officers, agents and employees, are restrained and enjoined from carrying out defendant Brown's directive of February 23, 1973.

(4) Defendants Weinberger, Brown and

Ash, and their officers, agents and employees, are enjoined and mandated to take all actions necessary to review and process all applications pending for community mental health center staffing and children's services grants, and, without delay, award grants by Notice to Grant or other lawful means to all applicants found to be qualified pursuant to the same lawful eligibility requirements on the same law as they were applied by the defendants prior to February 23, 1973. Final review and processing of all pending applications shall be completed no later than June 30, 1973.

(5) Defendants shall take all actions, including issuing Notices to Grant, necessary to obligate funds under the Act for community mental health center staffing and children's services grants no later than June 30, 1973, for all duly approved pending applications.

(6) The defendants shall, not later than June 30, 1973, take all actions necessary duly to record as an obligation of the United States pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 200 the amount representing the differential between the $165,100,000 appropriated for community mental health center staffing grants under the Act and the sum obligated by June 30, 1973, for continuation staffing costs, and the amount representing the difference between the $20,000,000 appropriated for children's services grants under the Act and the sum obligated by June 30, 1973, for continuation children's services costs.

(7) The defendants shall, not later than June 30, 1973, take all actions necessary duly to record the sums described in paragraph (6), above, as expended pursuant to all laws, including 31 U.S.C. § 200, and retain said sums in an account earmarked as so expended in the name and credit of this Court.

(8) The sums described in paragraph (6), above, and duly recorded as obligated and expended, shall remain so until further Order of this Court and resolution of this case on its merits and the defendants shall take all actions necessary to achieve that result.

(9) All parties shall submit any additional papers for the Court's consideration of this matter on the merits by July 15, 1973, and the Court will then enter a Final Order viewing the case as one presented on cross-motions for summary judgment on the record and pleadings.

(10) Since no funds will leave the treasury of the United States, plaintiffs need only post a cash or surety bond of $250.00.

GERHARD A. GESELL,
U.S. District Judge.

JUNE 28, 1973.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1223–73

National Council of Community Mental Health Centers, Inc., et al., On their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, *v.* Caspar W. Weinberger, et al., Defendants.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This class action for equitable relief including declaratory judgment, injunction and mandamus questions the defendants' impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress for the Community Mental Health Centers Act as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2681 *et seq.* (hereinafter "the Act"). The Court has considered the verified amended complaint and attached exhibits, the plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction, and the defendants' opposition thereto. Extensive briefs have been filed and after the benefit of a full argument the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law in support of the attached order granting a preliminary injunction.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Community Mental Health Centers Act as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2681 *et seq.* (hereinafter "the Act"), in pertinent part authorizes the awarding of grants to assist in the establishment and initial operation of community mental health centers providing all or part of a comprehensive community mental health program.

2. Once initial general staffing grants or children's service grants are made, the Act authorizes diminished grants for an additional seven years to the recipient of the initial grant in order to meet the continuing costs of the program, Part B of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2688 *et seq.*, and Part F of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2688u *et seq.*, respectively.

3. Grants to meet continuation costs cannot be made under Parts B or F of the Act after June 30, 1973, unless the applicant received a grant under the relevant Part prior to July 1, 1973.

4. The Act authorizes to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $60,000,000 for initial general staffing grants and $30,000,000 for initial children's service grants, and for the following seven years such sums as may be necessary to make grants to eligible applicants who received a prior grant under the Act.

5. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter "HEW") is charged with the administration of the Act, and is entitled to exercise his discretion to determine whether a particular applicant merits a grant under the Act.

6. The Secretary of HEW is authorized to prescribe regulations concerning eligibility for grants, determination of eligible costs, and the terms and conditions for approval of grants, and has promulgated such regulations. 37 Fed. Reg. 2970 *et seq.*

7. Many aspects of the review process under the Act have been delegated by the Secretary to the Regional Health Directors.

8. In practice the review process is exercised so that a recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council constitutes effective approval of the grant application subject to actual funding.

9. Approximately 78 mental health centers, including some of the plaintiffs, have submitted applications for initial staffing grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, which have been duly recommended for approval by the National Advisory Mental Health Council, but which have not been funded.

10. Some other community mental centers, including some of the plaintiffs, have submitted applications for initial staffing grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, which have been recommended for approval by a regional office of HEW, but which have gone no further in the approval process.

11. Still other community mental health centers have submitted applications for initial staffing grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, but which have not yet been approved by the regional office.

12. The defendant Bertram S. Brown, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, under the direction of defendants Weinberger, Secretary of HEW, and Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, issued a directive to the Regional Health Directors and Associate Directors dated February 23, 1973, which provided, in accord with the President's policy as expressed in his fiscal year 1973 Budget, that no new staffing grants would be awarded in fiscal year 1973, all regional office activities relating to the development of additional staffing grant applications were to be discontinued, potential applicants were to be discouraged from making application, and no further work on processing existing applications was to take place.

13. Pursuant to the directive of February 23, 1973, defendant Brown and his subordinates have ceased the processing of applications for new grants under the Act for staffing of community mental health centers and children's programs, and have even declined to take the necessary steps to commit the funds available to approved applications.

14. The defendants continue to make available in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, funds for applicants to meet continuation costs of previously funded staffing grants and children's service grants.

15. The Act of June 30, 1970, Pub. L. No. 92–296, Title VI, § 601, 84 Stat. 353, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 201 note and 2661 note (hereinafter "Section 601"), having been limited from earlier proposed legislation to apply to only two programs, was passed over the veto of President Nixon and provides:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless enacted after the enactment of this Act expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section funds appropriated for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1973, to carry out any program for which appropriations are authorized by . . . or the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–164, as amended) shall remain available for obligation and expenditure until the end of such fiscal year."

16. Statutory language like that used in Section 601 has apparently been recognized by the Congress, the President and the Courts as mandatory language requiring the executive to spend the appropriated funds covered by the language.

17. Although regular appropriation bills for fiscal year 1973 for HEW have twice been vetoed by President Nixon (in August and October), HEW receives its appropriated funds for all of fiscal 1973 pursuant to a "Continuing Resolution," 86 Stat. 402 (1972), which has been extended by amendment four times, 86 Stat. 563, 746, 1204 (1972) and 87 Stat. 7 (1973); the final amendment extended the Resolution through June 30, 1973.

18. Under the proper formula contained in the "Continuing Resolution," which applies the House version of H.R. 15417, 92d Cong., 2d Sess. (passed June 15 1973) to the appropriated funds in question here, the sums of $165,100,000 for Community Mental Health Center staffing and $20,000,000 for Mental Health for Children, including an estimated $40,000,000 and $11,400,000, respectively, for new grants, have been appropriated for obligation and expenditure.

19. The pending applications for new grants under the Act request sums, the total of which is in excess of the amount appropriated by Congress; the applications approved by the National Advisory Mental Health Council alone are in excess of $39,000,000, or approximately 80% of the amount appropriated.

20. The defendants' actions have prevented all funds appropriated under the Act from being obligated for new grants in fiscal year 1973, and therefore all such funds will be withdrawn from HEW and returned to the general treasury fund pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2).

21. Under the language of Section 601, the defendants have not been able to give the Court any assurances that if sums are obligated before July 1, 1973, the funds can and will be expended after June 30, 1973.

22. Unless preliminary relief is granted, plaintiffs will suffer immediate and irreparable harm, and the Court will have lost all power to grant relief to plaintiffs if they prevail on the merits, because the fiscal year 1973 appropriations will lapse and return to general funds and be lost to plaintiffs, who will also be ineligible for grants in subsequent years to meet continuation costs.

23. The public interest will be served by granting plaintiffs preliminary relief.

24. The granting of preliminary relief presents little possibility of substantial injury to defendants, and involves little more than paper work and bookkeeping transactions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This Court has jurisdiction of this matter under 5 U.S.C. §§ 701–706 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1361,

2. Plaintiffs have satisfied the criteria of Rule 23(a), Fed. R. Civ. P., and this suit is maintainable as a class action under Rules 23(b)(1)(A), 23(b)(1)(B) and 23(b)(2), Fed. R. Civ. P., although the class should include persons or institutions with applications that have been submitted, but are still pending, for initial grants for staffing or children's services under the Act.

3. Preliminary relief is necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm to the plaintiffs, and the granting of preliminary relief will cause defendants only slight injury and will serve the public interest.

4. It is highly probable that plaintiffs will prevail on the merits because it appears to the Court that:

a. By a "Continuing Resolution," signed by the President, under the Community Mental Health Centers Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $165,100,000 has been appropriated for Community Mental Health Center staffing grants and $20,000,000 has been appropriated for Child Mental Health Projects, including an estimated $40,000,000 and $11,400,000, respectively, for new awards.

b. (W)hile the defendants may continue to exercise their discretion to decide whether to make a particular new grant award on the basis of the merits of the individual application, there is no statutory authority for the defendants to exercise that discretion in a manner calculated to obligate none of the funds appropriated by Congress for new awards in fiscal year 1973, because the obligation and expenditure of all funds appropriated by Congress through fiscal year 1973 under the Act to otherwise eligible applicants is made mandatory by the Act of June 30, 1970, Pub. L. No. 91–296, Title VI, § 601, 84 Stat. 353, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 201 note and 2661 note. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 91–1167, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 25 (1970); S. Rep. No. 91–634, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 163 (1970); 116 Cong. Rec. 20876 (1970) (veto message of President Nixon); and *State Highway Commission* v. *Volpe*, F. 2d (8th Cir. No. 72–1512, decided April 2, 1973).

c. Under the explicit command of Section 601, there is no remaining constitutional authority in the President and these defendants to terminate the statutory program in question here for reasons offered in the affidavits of Messrs. Stein, O'Neill and Lawrence, which reasons are completely unrelated to the purposes of the Act, and therefore the defendants must process applications and exercise their discretion to review individual applications on their merits. *See Kendall* v. *United States ex rel. Stokes*, 37 U.S. 522 (1838); *Youngstown Sheet & Tube* v. *Sawyer*, 342 U.S. 579 (1952); *State Highway Commission* v. *Volpe, supra*.

———— —. ————,
U.S. District Judge.

JUNE 28, 1973.

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

The previous question was ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, is the vote that is about to occur on the adoption of the motion to recede and concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SCHERLE. 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 294, nays 54, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—294

Abdnor	Frelinghuysen	Natcher
Abzug	Frenzel	Nedzi
Adams	Froehlich	Nelsen
Addabbo	Gaydos	Nix
Alexander	Gettys	Obey
Anderson, Ill.	Giaimo	O'Brien
Andrews, N.C.	Gilman	O'Neill
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Owens
Arends	Grasso	Passman
Ashley	Gray	Patten
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Baker	Gude	Perkins
Barrett	Gunter	Peyser
Bennett	Guyer	Pickle
Bergland	Haley	Poage
Bevill	Hamilton	Podell
Biaggi	Hammer-schmidt	Preyer
Biester		Price, Ill.
Bingham	Hanley	Price, Tex.
Boggs	Hanna	Pritchard
Boland	Hanrahan	Railsback
Bolling	Harvey	Randall
Bowen	Hastings	Rangel
Brademas	Hawkins	Rees
Brasco	Hechler, W. Va.	Regula
Bray	Heckler, Mass.	Reid
Breckinridge	Heinz	Reuss
Brinkley	Helstoski	Rhodes
Broomfield	Hicks	Riegle
Brotzman	Hinshaw	Rinaldo
Broyhill, N.C.	Hogan	Robison, N.Y.
Broyhill, Va.	Holifield	Rodino
Buchanan	Holt	Roe
Burke, Mass.	Holtzman	Rogers
Burleson, Tex.	Horton	Roncalio, Wyo.
Burlison, Mo.	Hosmer	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burton	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Butler	Hutchinson	Rose
Byron	Jarman	Rosenthal
Carey, N.Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Carney, Ohio	Johnson, Colo.	Roy
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Roybal
Casey, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	St Germain
Cederberg	Jones, Okla.	Sarasin
Chamberlain	Jones, Tenn.	Sarbanes
Chisholm	Jordan	Saylor
Clausen, Don H.	Karth	Schneebeli
	Kastenmeier	Schroeder
Cleveland	Kazen	Seiberling
Cochran	Kemp	Shipley
Cohen	Kluczynski	Shoup
Collier	Koch	Shriver
Collins, Ill.	Kuykendall	Sikes
Conable	Kyros	Sisk
Corman	Lehman	Slack
Cotter	Litton	Smith, Iowa
Coughlin	Long, La.	Smith, N.Y.
Cronin	Long, Md.	Snyder
Culver	McClory	Staggers
Davis, Ga.	McCloskey	Stanton, J. William
Davis, S.C.	McCollister	
Davis, Wis.	McCormack	Stanton, James V.
de la Garza	McDade	
Dellenback	McEwen	Stark
Dellums	McKay	Steed
Denholm	McKinney	Steele
Dennis	Macdonald	Steelman
Diggs	Madigan	Steiger, Wis.
Dingell	Mahon	Stephens
Donohue	Mallary	Stokes
Dorn	Maraziti	Stubblefield
Downing	Mathias, Calif.	Stuckey
Drinan	Matsunaga	Studds
Dulski	Mayne	Symington
Duncan	Mazzoli	Talcott
du Pont	Meeds	Taylor, N.C.
Eckhardt	Melcher	Teague, Tex.
Edwards, Ala.	Metcalfe	Thomson, Wis.
Edwards, Calif.	Mezvinsky	Thone
Eilberg	Michel	Thornton
Erlenborn	Milford	Towell, Nev.
Esch	Mills, Ark.	Treen
Eshleman	Minish	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Mink	Ullman
Fascell	Minshall, Ohio	Van Deerlin
Findley	Mitchell, Md.	Vander Jagt
Fish	Mitchell, N.Y.	Vanik
Flood	Moakley	Vigorito
Flynt	Mollohan	Waggonner
Foley	Moorhead, Calif.	Waldie
Ford, Gerald R.		Walsh
Ford, William D.	Moorhead, Pa.	Ware
	Mosher	Whalen
Forsythe	Moss	Whitehurst
Fountain	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Fraser	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Williams	Winn	Young, S.C.
Wilson, Bob	Yates	Young, Tex.
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.	Yatron	Zablocki
	Young, Alaska	Zwach
	Young, Ga.	

NAYS—54

Anderson, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Roberts
	Harsha	Robinson, Va.
Archer	Henderson	Runnels
Armstrong	Hudnut	Ruth
Bafalis	Ichord	Satterfield
Blackburn	Ketchum	Scherle
Brown, Calif.	Landgrebe	Sebelius
Brown, Mich.	Latta	Shuster
Camp	Leggett	Spence
Collins, Tex.	Lott	Symms
Conlan	Lujan	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	Martin, N.C.	Wampler
Daniel, Dan	Mathis, Ga.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Miller	
	Mizell	Wolff
Devine	Montgomery	Wyman
Ginn	Myers	Young, Fla.
Goldwater	Parris	
Goodling	Pike	
Gross	Rarick	

NOT VOTING—85

Andrews, N. Dak.	Flowers	Nichols
	Frey	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Fulton	Patman
Badillo	Fuqua	Pettis
Beard	Gibbons	Powell, Ohio
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Quie
Blatnik	Griffiths	Quillen
Breaux	Grover	Rooney, N.Y.
Brooks	Gubser	Roush
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Wash.	Rousselot
Burgener	Harrington	Ruppe
Burke, Calif.	Hays	Ryan
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Sandman
Chappell	Hillis	Skubitz
Clancy	Huber	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Hungate	Stratton
Clawson, Del	Hunt	Sullivan
Clay	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Calif.
Conte	Keating	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	King	Tiernan
Daniels, Dominick V.	Landrum	Veysey
	Lent	White
Danielson	McFall	Wiggins
Delaney	McSpadden	Wright
Dent	Madden	Wyatt
Derwinski	Mailliard	Wydler
Dickinson	Mann	Wylie
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Young, Ill.
Fisher	Morgan	Zion

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hunt.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Beard.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. King.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Clay with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. White.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Young of Illinois.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Zion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 2:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 636, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-364)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 7, 8, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "activities for which provision was made in section 108 of Public Law 92-571, as amended, and such amounts shall be available notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 655(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; and in addition, unobligated balances as of June 30, 1973, of funds heretofore made available under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, are hereby continued available for the same general purposes for which appropriated: *Provided*, That new obligational authority authorized herein to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended, shall not exceed an annual rate of $2,200,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of the activities contained in this paragraph should be funded at a rate exceeding one quarter of the annual rate as provided by this joint resolution;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 12 and 13.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
HOWARD P. BOLAND,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
JOHN J. RHODES,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
LAWTON CHILES,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The following provision in the opening paragraph of the Senate bill, "and shall be made available for expenditure except as specifically provided by law" was not agreed to by the conferees because it was deemed to be an unnecessary restatement of existing provisions of law. It was therefore deleted without prejudice.

Amendment No. 2: The amendment corrects reference to a public law number, and the House receded.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes the Senate language and restores the House language and adds the following two provisos:

Provided, That new obligational authority herein to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended, shall not exceed an annual rate of $2,200,000,000.

Provided further, That none of the activities contained in this paragraph should be funded at a rate exceeding one quarter of the annual rate as provided by this joint resolution.

Amendment No. 4: Inserts language, as proposed by the Senate, providing a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate for assistance to Cuban refugees in the United States.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language, as proposed by the Senate, to include provision for the migrant programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes language proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect that funds for the Job Corps will be made available at the rate of obligation for fiscal year 1973, which is the amount specified in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Deletes both the language proposed by the House and that proposed by the Senate and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia."

Amendment No. 11: Inserts new section, as proposed by the Senate, validating appropriations and obligations under the resolution from July 1, 1973.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment providing that no funds herein or heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for the reconstruction or rehabilitation of North Vietnam unless specifically authorized by Congress.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts language as follows: "Any provision of law which requires unexpended funds to return to the general fund of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year shall not be held to affect the status of any lawsuit or right of action involving the right to those funds."

Amendment No. 14: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing that "Nothing contained in this joint resolution appropriating sums of money shall be interpreted by any person or court as authority for ratification or approval of any impoundment 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 and shall not be held to affect the status of any law suit or right of action involving the right to those funds."

The conferees agree to delete amendment number 14 without prejudice. In doing so, the conferees are in no way ratifying or giving approval to any impoundment of budget authority by the President or any other federal official.

The conferees are in agreement that if the courts sustain pending or future lawsuits brought by States, the funds to which such states are entitled shall subsequently be considered in a supplemental appropriation measure.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
JOHN J. RHODES,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
LAWTON CHILES,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report and of the Senate amendments reported from conference in disagreement on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to discuss this with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I shall be glad to discuss it with the gentleman.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, does the conference report now include the same language as that passed in the fiscal year Second Supplemental Appropriation Act relative to the cessation of bombing in Southeast Asia with the August 15 date?

Mr. MAHON. It is worded to comport with the joint resolution rather than the second supplemental bill. The language is very similar and the intent is identical, and I shall be glad to read it. The language is as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States military forces in or over or from off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

This is the language which was in substance adopted by the House and Senate yesterday and sent to the President in the second supplemental appropriation bill. It is the language that was agreed to in the conference with the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the way the conference report is being filed, will the House have an opportunity to vote on this particular question this afternoon on a separate vote?

Mr. MAHON. It would be included in the vote on the conference report.

Mr. ADDABBO. But not on this particular section?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the conference report. I still do not support this language. In view of the fact that we will not be able to obtain a separate vote on this, I wish to continue my objection to this point, but I notify the House I will support the conference report. For it covers other vital programs which can only take effect if this conference report is adopted.

I wish to thank all the Members who have supported us in our long fight to end the war in Southeast Asia. We thank the committee for having included North and South Vietnam. We will give the President a chance to live up to the word that he has given this House on yesterday. We still believe this is a stamp of approval technically, as far as this section is concerned, but in view of the fact that this does cover many other provisions, and it is a compromise, I will support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in connection with the conference report now pending before the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about the conference report on the continuing resolution before yielding for questions.

Mr. Speaker, there are several items in the conference report in which Members have been interested. One of the major things the other body did was to cut off certain foreign aid under certain conditions. In conference the House language was restored with a proviso putting the level of economic and military assistance at an annual rate of $2.2 billion. There is another provision that obligations cannot be made in excess of one-quarter of the funds available. The agency will not have the opportunity to put all the funds for foreign aid in the pipeline during the first quarter of the fiscal year.

There was considerable interest expressed in the Job Corps. The Job Corps is in the judgment of many Members an excellent program which is achieving good results. The other body specified in the resolution that $183 million would be available for the Job Corps. But this is the amount of money that is available under the continuing resolution as passed by the House. The conferees hesitated to earmark programs for the Job Corps in the resolution. If we earmark specific amounts for one activity we have to earmark funds for perhaps hundreds of other programs. So we inserted language saying that the conferees expect—and I read from the report—"that funds for the Job Corps will be made available at the rate of obligation for fiscal year 1973, which is the amount specified in the Senate amendment."

The members of the conference were in complete accord with the gentlemen who are expressing interest in this and I make reference to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE), and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY). There were also others who expressed interest in the Job Corps programs.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first let me state that I compliment the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) for an outstanding job.

As I understand the statement of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations with respect to the Job Corps, it is to the effect that it is the intention of the conferees that the same level of spending be continued in fiscal year 1974 under this continuing resolution.

That is, so long as this continuing resolution remains in effect, the rate of spending will be the same as the rate during the fiscal year 1973.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in other words, the gentleman is stating that where they are spending at the rate of $183 million during fiscal 1973 for the Job Corps, it is the intention that this same rate be continued under this continuing resolution.

Mr. MAHON. The same rate of operation of the Job Corps is intended in fiscal year 1974.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD).

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Breckenridge Job Corps Center is located in my district and I want to ask if it is the intention of the conference that this center shall be operated at the same level under this resolution as it operated last year. I want to make certain there is no reduction.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the program will be operated at the same level as it operated during the current fiscal year which expires at midnight tonight. The conferees expect these programs will not be abolished or abandoned, but will carry on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, for his interest and support in this matter.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY).

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the previous gentleman, who indicated that this is one of the redeeming projects and does a great job with people who need rehabilitation.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the largest Job Corps Center in the United States is located in my district. The Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Manpower Division, has cut the operation of the Gary Job Corps Center 50 percent. This means that during the month of July we will lose some 400 to 500 staff positions. It is a cruel cut, not

only against the staff, but against some 1,500 to 3,000 trainees.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the people down the street get the word that they cannot use this brutal meat ax approach on these good projects and ought not to commit this kind of drastic reduction. It is not fair and it is not right.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to raise objection to this procedure.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has one of the largest and most effective job corps operations in the country. I know of his great interest and his efforts in connection with this matter. The conferees sought to be helpful.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make reference to what was done about Southeast Asia.

The House will recall that on yesterday we passed the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973. It was approved without change by the other body and went to the President. It provides $3.3 billion for various purposes of Government. It also provides certain restrictions with respect to the continuation of combat activities by American forces in Southeast Asia.

The conferees attempted to enact in this conference report the same language which we had in the second supplemental bill which was before us yesterday. That language, as approved yesterday and which is in the conference report, is as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after August 15, 1973, no funds herein or heretofore appropriated may be obligated or expended to finance directly or indirectly combat activities by United States Military forces in or over or from off the shores of the North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia.

The Senate had put in substitute language different from the language which was provided in the second supplemental on yesterday and which was approved by both the House and Senate. The House insisted that we use the same type language. The language that was agreed to in conference is the language which I have just read to the Members.

Mr. Speaker, I see no point in having an extended debate on this issue today. We had it yesterday, the day before, the week before, and the month before that. Therefore, I would hope that in the interest of time, we would not have an extensive debate on this matter today.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I had promised earlier to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, so I will yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only because there are many Members who have discussed with me the matter of whether they felt it would be correct to vote yes or no on the conference report. I, myself, shall vote for this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this: that because of the actions of this body and the other body for the past month and a half, Congress has indicated its determination that this war end, and it has brought this very clearly to the attention of the White House.

Now, by these votes in the past, we have been able to work out an agreement, with the assurance of many Members in this body and the other body, working with the administration, the minority leader here in the House, and the minority leader in the Senate, and we do have at long last an agreement that the President will after August 15 work with Congress and seek the approval of Congress if he wants to conduct any further operations in Southeast Asia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are opposed to the war as of now, for those of us who feel that we do not want to ratify the war for 1 additional minute, let me remind the Members of the legislative realities. The war is in effect; the war is going on. We are not ratifying the war. We have not been able to stop the war immediately, but we have been able to get a very great concession, in my opinion, from the President of the United States that will take place in 45 days. We have no choice; it is either this or nothing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we put this one into effect, although it does not give us everything we ask for.

Starting right now, it will take effect in 45 days, and once and for all we will have a termination of hostilities in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I gathered that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, feels that this is a victory for the antiwar forces, although not an immediate one.

However, there are several questions which I hope we can get clarified at this moment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, let me say first that I am not interested in a victory for the antiwar forces. I am interested in a victory for the United States.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there are several questions which it seems to me need clarifying for the legislative history.

No. 1, I gather that this will not cover military or economic aid to Cambodia, Laos, or South Vietnam. I gather this will not cover economic or military aid, but only action by uniformed military forces.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Maryland is correct.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Yes. Secondly, what will happen during recess if, while we are in recess, the time should come when the President might decide that he wants to ask Congress for more money? Will we be called back into session?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the plans of the Speaker or the President in this regard.

Does the gentleman mean next week?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. No, August 15. I understand we will be in recess during August. Will Congress be called back from recess in August to deal with this question?

Mr. MAHON. I am not able to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The next question is this: Of course, we have the word of the President, or we feel that we do, although these things are subject to interpretation.

Let me ask this: If the President should not somehow ask Congress for authorization, what would happen? We have been informed yesterday that this is, nevertheless, the law, and that the appropriations bill applies, notwithstanding what the President does.

Now, what I would like to know is: How is this enforced? Does the Treasury refuse to write checks? Who is it that enforces the language of this bill for this Appropriation Act?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Congress with this provision, will have enacted an ironclad cut-off of combat activity by American military forces in Southeast Asia after August 15, 1973. That will be the law of the land.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman this:

Does that mean we will have to go to the courts, or does it mean that the Treasury would refuse to write checks?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be not profitable to pursue that aspect of this question further.

Does the gentleman have another question?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the whole question of enforcement here is obscure.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report.

I offered my amendment yesterday; I fought for it as hard as I could; the House worked its will.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment was defeated, and I support the action of the House and of the conference committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan feels this matter has been discussed at great length for a long time. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. ABZUG. Thank you very much. I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

Some of us feel very strongly that there is a difference of opinion and that there is a will which has not been expressed, and that is the will of the American people who I believe, Mr. Chairman, now represent a majority. I think Mr. LONG referred to the antiwar forces and in that reference was speaking of the majority of the people who have stated over and over that they want an end to this war in Cambodia and an end of the bombing immediately. I am sure that my colleagues all understand if some of us continue to express that view and in our votes today continue to oppose any extension of the war and death for people, both our own and others, and I am sure you will understand we have to vote against this continuing resolution, because we feel we

have violated the will of the American people.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it is the intention of the House today to make a clear and decisive commitment to move away from the days of death and destruction. I sense that my colleagues want to chart a new and fresh and bright course for the Nation.

With all due respect for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit that a vote for this amendment is clearly a vote for 45 more dark days of destruction—45 days more of weakening of the American economy, 45 more days of obliterating villages and killing and injuring civilians in Cambodia, 45 more days of bombardment that has cost as much as $4.5 million a day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, how many schools could we build with these funds? How many families could we help recover from natural disasters which damage and destroy their homes? How many health centers could be built? How many veterans could be trained for jobs?

Mr. Speaker, I ask, does the House now want to vote approval of actions which hitherto have had neither legal nor constitutional justification?

My colleagues, I can not vote to approve of spending for another single day of this bombing in Southeast Asia, this waste of resources and human life. I vote to end it yesterday. I vote for peace with honor, therefore I must vote against this continuing appropriation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker. I cannot support this conference report. The legislation legalizes the bombing of Southeast Asia until August 15, 1973.

In my judgment, the bombing of Southeast Asia is illegal, conducted without the authority of the Congress. It has been held that appropriations by the Congress constitute approval of executive action.

I cannot vote to legalize or make right an action which I believe is being carried on illegally. I cannot support this abuse of executive authority, I cannot approve the cruel and immoral destruction, the loss and maiming of American military personnel and the destruction of the people and the countryside designated as the target area.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the compromise which the Congress has reached with the President to terminate bombing in North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos after August 15. I deeply regret that the Congress has, even to this degree, acceded to the President's position. In essence we have placed the Congress on record as agreeing to continue a war to which a vast majority in Congress, and of the public, want an immediate end. This is a suspension of the Constitution for 6 weeks of bombing and destruction, a 6-week Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. As a result of Congress' action, many innocent lives will be lost over the next 6 weeks, and I will not be party to the legalization of this outrage.

The President now, having gained congressional approval, can increase the bombing effort over the next 6 weeks to create as much destruction as possible, to make up for his inability to bomb thereafter. Although he has apparently promised otherwise, I will be surprised if that does not become his course of action.

I realize that the President's agreement to halt all bombing after August 15 is a significant concession by him and represents a great change from his previously stated long-range plans. But this compromise was forced upon him by the actions of Congress earlier this week, just as increasing anti-war feelings in Congress have forced him into every significant concession he made previously.

But I am at a loss to see what possible benefit can accrue from 6 more weeks of bombing. Having agreed to quit bombing August 15, the President gives up the bargaining chip he has so jeolously guarded which is the threat to bomb unless the other side agrees to the American compromise position.

The only possible reasons for seeking 6 weeks of bombing approval are to save political face for the President and to buy 6 weeks time for the governments of Cambodia and South Vietnam. And those benefits can, in no way, under no theory, justify continued U.S. bombing atrocities. Congress has rejected the President's war plans and he has capitulated.

But why, in the face of this action, is Congress willing to give him 6 weeks of bombing as a graceful way out? It will not be a graceful "way out" for the thousands of Asians who will die under American bombs.

The price is too high. We made the decision to stop funding and could have insisted that the bombing be stopped now. The tool was available to us—the continuing funding resolution. I am willing to stop normal government operations, if need be, to force an end now to this destruction, and am willing to spend the holiday here in this Chamber. We have agreed to a dishonorable compromise. Our action is morally wrong and will not accomplish one worthwhile objective.

The course of the vote today is clear. The significant votes in both Houses occurred yesterday, so my remarks now cannot affect what happens. But I want to go on record opposing the compromise the President reached with the Congress. History will note that we had the power to force an immediate end to the bombing, and we let the opportunity pass by.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in support of the proposal that $367 million be appropriated for use by the Economic Development Administration and the title V regional commissions.

These agencies have primarily benefited the nonmetropolitan areas where aid such as they can provide is critically needed for small- and medium-sized communities which are valiantly attempting to upgrade their community development and strengthen their economies.

There are three regional planning and development districts which serve one or more of the 21 counties in the First District of Arkansas which I represent. Their work has been valuable in these counties' efforts to grow in an orderly fashion.

Since it began its operations—through December 31, 1972—EDA had made $56,034,000 available for use on 225 projects in Arkansas. Forty-two of the projects have been located in 16 of the counties of the First Congressional District.

These projects have included water and sewer system development, industrial development, vocational and technical education facility development, community centers, medical facilities, port feasibility studies, and the preservation of an historic building. The assistance has been provided in the form of grants, loans, planning and technical assistance.

As an illustration of the kind of impact that this aid has had, let me discuss just one of the three regional planning districts serving the counties I represent. A total of $3,736,974 has been allocated to the 12 counties in the East Arkansas Planning and Development District. These funds have generated, or are expected to generate 7,700 new jobs.

This means that each new job in these counties, resulting from the EDA investment, cost less than $500 in EDA funds to create. The people who hold these jobs are taxpaying citizens. The taxes which they have paid on earned income is more than the amount the Federal Government invested in EDA funds to create these jobs. And, not one of these jobholders has migrated to our over-crowded cities to become an anonymous name on a welfare role.

EDA has been making a valuable contribution to our national effort to achieve the balanced national growth policy adopted by the Congress in 1970.

In addition to the work of EDA, the title V regional commissions, such as the Ozark Regional Commission, have been a valuable tool in this comprehensive community and regional development effort. Ozark Regional Commission includes five States—Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

Since 1967, the Ozarks Regional Commission has spent approximately $37 million on economic development efforts in the region it serves. Twenty-four million was in public facility grants, primarily for vocational education centers, industrial sights, tourist facilities and health centers. The Commission's funds have been largely supplemental grants to basic grants from other Federal agencies. These supplements are usually at a rate of 30 percent of the total project cost, including non-Federal money.

Thus the regional commission's funds have actually levered about $100 million in total Federal funding which would have been most difficult, if not impossible, to come by without the commission's participation.

Of the total Ozark funding, Arkansas has received approximately 30 percent, or $11 million. This money has stimulated $30 million in new development.

The facts are clear on this point. The economic development efforts which are fostered under the Economic Develop-

ment Administration and the regional commissions have provided the stimulation and lift needed by small and medium-sized communities in the Nation's countryside. The community development which is resulting is helping this Nation's move toward its goal of insuring that all our people have safe, healthy, attractive places to live and work.

In view of the need which exists and the beneficial effects of the work of these agencies, I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in voting for these funds for the Economic Development Administration and title V regional commissions.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy decision to support the conference report on the continuing resolution with the August 15 bombing date. Although I am reluctant to make it possible to continue the bombing for any period of time, I recognize the obligation to keep the Government operating. Every Member of this House has a responsibility and an obligation to continue all the important activities or operations of the broad and farflung Federal Government.

Yesterday I voted against the supplemental appropriation. In the final analysis that was simply to supplement some accounts that were out of balance or had been overdrawn in several scattered subdivisions of Government. But today, as we consider the continuing resolution, we all must bear in mind that this is the last day of fiscal year 1973. Not a single department of our entire Federal structure could continue opeartions after midnight tonight.

Of course, it would be easy to cast a vote to stop all bombing immediately and to hope you are in the minority in order that the Government may continue to function. But should those who vote not turn out to be a majority, they would have to take the full responsibility for grinding the wheels of our Government to a halt at midnight tonight. It is a grave responsibility which rises to the level of an obligation to see that such an awful result does not happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whose fault is it that we are engaging in such brinkmanship? I submit that it is as much the fault of the Congress as that of the Chief Executive at this particular moment. We should have had this resolution before us 2 or 3 weeks ago with ample time to enact a provision which would call for an absolute end to the bombing and then for ample time also for a veto and then time to attempt to override the veto.

But the Congress indulged in brinkmanship in the last few days of the fiscal year and for us time has run out.

Now on the very last day of fiscal year 1973, those of us who would stop the bombing have gone about as far as we can go. We have done everything that can be done without interrupting vital governmental services.

When we return after the 4th of July recess, the Congress should immediately turn its attention to the Warpowers Act. Perhaps we should have avoided the distraction to lay it aside before the recess. For my part, I had hoped that there would be some clear-cut vehicle that the House and the other body could vote up or down on the termination of all military activities in Southeast Asia. It would have been the clear and easy way to terminate the bombing. Instead the issue has been attached to and commingled with, in recent days, first the supplemental appropriation, then for awhile, the debt ceiling, and of course, the continuing resolution. This is hardly the way to run a railroad. These are the reasons that call for a quick enactment of a strong warpowers measure.

Someone has said that one's viewpoint is influenced from where he happens to be standing at any given time. Last week or the week before we could have fought the battle of the bombing on just about any legislative vehicle that appeared on the legislative calendar. It is true that our body has rules of germaneness and the other body seems to have none but at that point in time we would have been standing at a safe distance from the very end of the fiscal year. Today we are on the brink and must decide whether or not all the wheels of Government grind to a screeching halt at midnight, Saturday night of June the 30th. It is to avoid such awful consequences that I have decided to support the continuing resolution notwithstanding a most unpalatable provision.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. 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 266, nays 75, present 1, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—266

Abdnor	Byron	Evans, Colo.
Addabbo	Camp	Fascell
Alexander	Carney, Ohio	Fish
Anderson, Ill.	Carter	Flood
Andrews, N.C.	Casey, Tex.	Flynt
Annunzio	Cederberg	Foley
Archer	Chamberlain	Ford, Gerald R.
Arends	Clausen, Don H.	Forsythe
Armstrong	Cleveland	Fountain
Ashley	Cochran	Fraser
Bafalis	Cohen	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Collier	Frenzel
Barrett	Collins, Ill.	Gaydos
Bennett	Collins, Tex.	Gettys
Bergland	Conable	Giaimo
Bevill	Conlan	Gilman
Biaggi	Coughlin	Ginn
Biester	Cronin	Goldwater
Bingham	Daniel, Dan	Gonzalez
Blackburn	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Goodling
Boggs	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Boland	Davis, S.C.	Gross
Bolling	Davis, Wis.	Gunter
Bowen	de la Garza	Guyer
Brademas	Dellenback	Haley
Brasco	Dennis	Hamilton
Bray	Devine	Hammer-schmidt
Breckinridge	Donohue	Hanley
Brinkley	Dorn	Hanna
Broomfield	Downing	Hanrahan
Brotzman	Dulski	Hansen, Idaho
Brown, Calif.	Duncan	Harsha
Brown, Mich.	du Pont	Harvey
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	Hastings
Broyhill, Va.	Eilberg	Hawkins
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Heinz
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Henderson
Burleson, Tex.	Eshleman	Hinshaw
Burlison, Mo.	Evins, Tenn.	Hogan
Butler	Fisher	Holifield
Byron	Flowers	Holt
Camp	Flynt	Horton
Carney, Ohio	Foley	Hudnut
Carter	Ford, Gerald R.	Hutchinson
Casey, Tex.	Forsythe	Ichord
Cederberg	Fountain	Jarman
Chamberlain	Fraser	Johnson, Calif.
Clausen, Don H.	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Pa.
Cleveland	Frenzel	Jones, N.C.
Cochran	Gaydos	Jones, Okla.
Cohen	Gettys	Jones, Tenn.
Collier	Giaimo	Jordan
Collins, Ill.	Gilman	Kazen
Collins, Tex.	Ginn	Kemp
Conable	Goldwater	Ketchum
Conlan	Gonzalez	Kluczynski
Coughlin	Goodling	Kuykendall
Cronin	Gray	Kyros
Daniel, Dan	Gross	Landgrebe
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Gunter	Latta
Davis, Ga.	Guyer	Leggett
Davis, S.C.	Haley	Long, La.
Davis, Wis.	Hamilton	Long, Md.
de la Garza	Hammer-schmidt	Lott
Dellenback	Hanley	McClory
Dennis	Hanna	McCloskey
Devine	Hanrahan	McCollister
Donohue	Hansen, Idaho	McDade
Dorn	Harsha	McEwen
Downing	Harvey	McKay
Dulski	Hastings	McKinney
Duncan	Hawkins	Macdonald
du Pont	Heinz	Madigan
Edwards, Ala.	Henderson	Mahon
Eilberg	Hinshaw	Mallary
Erlenborn	Hogan	Maraziti
Esch	Holifield	Martin, N.C.
Eshleman	Holt	Mathias, Calif.
Evans, Colo.	Horton	Mayne
Fascell	Hudnut	Mazzoli
Fish	Hutchinson	Metcalfe
Flood	Ichord	Michel
Flynt	Jarman	Milford
Foley	Johnson, Calif.	Miller
Ford, Gerald R.	Johnson, Pa.	Mills, Ark.
Forsythe	Jones, N.C.	Minish
Fountain	Jones, Okla.	Minshall, Ohio
Fraser	Jones, Tenn.	Mitchell, Md.
Frelinghuysen	Jordan	Mitchell, N.Y.
Frenzel	Kazen	Mizell
Gaydos	Kemp	Mollohan
Gettys	Ketchum	Montgomery
Giaimo	Kluczynski	Moorhead, Calif.
Gilman	Kuykendall	Moorhead, Pa.
Ginn	Kyros	Mosher
Goldwater	Landgrebe	Murphy, Ill.
Gonzalez	Latta	Murphy, N.Y.
Goodling	Leggett	Myers
Gray	Long, La.	Natcher
Gross	Long, Md.	Nelsen
Gunter	Lott	Nix
Guyer	McClory	Obey
Haley	McCloskey	O'Brien
Hamilton	McCollister	O'Neill
Hammer-schmidt	McDade	Parris
Hanley	McEwen	Passman
Hanna	McKay	Patten
Hanrahan	McKinney	Pepper
Hansen, Idaho	Macdonald	Perkins
Harsha	Madigan	Peyser
Harvey	Mahon	Pickle
Hastings	Mallary	Poage
Hawkins	Maraziti	Preyer
Heinz	Martin, N.C.	Price, Ill.
Henderson	Mathias, Calif.	Price, Tex.
Hinshaw	Mayne	Railsback
Hogan	Mazzoli	Randall
Holifield	Metcalfe	Regula
Holt	Michel	Rhodes
Horton	Milford	Rinaldo
Hudnut	Miller	Roberts
Hutchinson	Mills, Ark.	Robinson, Va.
Ichord	Minish	Robison, N.Y.
Jarman	Minshall, Ohio	Rodino
Johnson, Calif.	Mitchell, Md.	Rogers
Johnson, Pa.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Jones, N.C.	Mizell	Roncallo, N.Y.
Jones, Okla.	Mollohan	Rooney, Pa.
Jones, Tenn.	Montgomery	Rose
Jordan	Moorhead, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Kazen	Moorhead, Pa.	Ruth
Kemp	Mosher	Sarasin
Ketchum	Murphy, Ill.	Satterfield
Kluczynski	Murphy, N.Y.	Saylor
Kuykendall	Myers	Scherle
Kyros	Natcher	Schneebeli
Landgrebe	Nelsen	Sebelius
Latta	Nix	Shipley
Leggett	Obey	Shoup
Long, La.	O'Brien	Shriver
Long, Md.	O'Neill	Shuster
Lott	Parris	Sikes
McClory	Passman	Sisk
McCloskey	Patten	Slack
McCollister	Pepper	Smith, Iowa
McDade	Perkins	Smith, N.Y.
McEwen	Peyser	Snyder
McKay	Pickle	Spence
McKinney	Poage	Staggers
Macdonald	Preyer	Stanton, J. William
Madigan	Price, Ill.	Steed
Mahon	Price, Tex.	Steele
Mallary	Railsback	Steelman
Maraziti	Randall	Steiger, Wis.
Martin, N.C.	Regula	Stephens
Mathias, Calif.	Rhodes	Stubblefield
Mayne	Rinaldo	Stuckey
Mazzoli	Roberts	Symington
Metcalfe	Robinson, Va.	Talcott
Michel	Robison, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.
Milford	Rodino	Taylor, N.C.
Miller	Rogers	Teague, Tex.
Mills, Ark.	Roncalio, Wyo.	Thomson, Wis.
Minish	Roncallo, N.Y.	Thone
Minshall, Ohio	Rooney, Pa.	Thornton
Mitchell, Md.	Rose	Towell, Nev.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rostenkowski	Treen
Mizell	Ruth	Ullman
	Sarasin	Van Deerlin
	Satterfield	Vander Jagt
	Saylor	Waggonner
	Scherle	Walsh
	Schneebeli	Wampler
	Sebelius	Ware
	Shipley	Whitehurst
	Shoup	Whitten
	Shriver	Widnall
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Winn
		Wyman
		Yatron
		Young, Alaska
		Young, Fla.
		Young, S.C.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zwach

NAYS—75

Abzug	Heckler, Mass.	Reid
Adams	Helstoski	Reuss
Anderson, Calif.	Hicks	Riegle
Burton	Holtzman	Roe
Carey, N.Y.	Howard	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Johnson, Colo.	Roybal
Conyers	Karth	St Germain
Corman	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Cotter	Koch	Schroeder
Crane	Lehman	Seiberling
Culver	Litton	Stanton, James V.
Dellums	McCormack	Stark
Denholm	Mathis, Ga.	Stokes
Diggs	Matsunaga	Studds
Dingell	Meeds	Symms
Drinan	Mezvinsky	Vanik
Eckhardt	Mink	Vigorito
Edwards, Calif.	Moakley	Waldie
Findley	Moss	Whalen
Ford, William D.	Nedzi	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Froehlich	Owens	Wolff
Grasso	Pike	Yates
Green, Pa.	Podell	Young, Ga.
Gude	Pritchard	
Hechler, W. Va.	Rangel	
	Rarick	
	Rees	

PRESENT—1

Hosmer

NOT VOTING—91

Andrews, N. Dak.	Daniels, Dominick V.	Hays
Ashbrook	Danielson	Hébert
Aspin	Delaney	Hillis
Badillo	Dent	Huber
Beard	Derwinski	Hungate
Bell	Dickinson	Hunt
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.
Breaux	Fisher	Keating
Brooks	Flowers	King
Brown, Ohio	Frey	Landrum
Burgener	Fulton	Lent
Burke, Calif.	Fuqua	Lujan
Burke, Fla.	Gibbons	McFall
Chappell	Green, Oreg.	McSpadden
Clancy	Griffiths	Madden
Clark	Grover	Mailliard
Clawson, Del	Gubser	Mann
Clay	Hansen, Wash.	Martin, Nebr.
Conte	Harrington	Melcher
		Morgan

Nichols	Ruppe	White
O'Hara	Ryan	Wiggins
Patman	Sandman	Wilson,
Pettis	Skubitz	Charles, Tex.
Powell, Ohio	Steiger, Ariz.	Wright
Quie	Stratton	Wyatt
Quillen	Sullivan	Wydler
Rooney, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.	Wylie
Roush	Thompson, N.J.	Young, Ill.
Rousselot	Tiernan	Zion
Roy	Udall	
Runnels	Veysey	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Harrington against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Badillo against.

Mr. Dominick V. Daniels for, with Mr. Melcher against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Danielson against.

Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Ryan against.

Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Clay against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Teague of California.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Rousselot.

Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Lent.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Huber.

Mr. Roy with Mr. Hillis.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Beard.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. White with Mr. Keating.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Powell of Ohio.

Mr. Flowers with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Aspin with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Burke of Florida.

Mr. Runnels with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Clancy.

Mrs. Griffith with Mr. King.

Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Young of Illinois with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Zion with Mr. Wydler.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12. Page 11, after line 23, insert:

SEC. 110. Unless specifically hereafter authorized by Congress, none of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated under this joint resolution or heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for the purpose of providing assistance in the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 110. Unless specifically authorized by Congress, none of the funds herein appropriated under this joint resolution or heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for the purpose of providing assistance in the reconstruction or rehabilitation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 12, after line 4, insert:

SEC. 111. Any provision of law requires unexpended funds to return to the general fund of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year shall not be held to affect the status of any lawsuit or right of action involving the right to those funds.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 262) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 262

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Saturday, June 30, 1973, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, July 10, 1973.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 10, 1973, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, July 10, 1973, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, July 11, 1973, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7445, EXTENDING RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7445) to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the act for 2 years:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-365)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the Act for two years, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: This amendment is reported in disagreement.

Amend the title so to read: "An Act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for one year, and for other purposes."

W. D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
JAMES A. BURKE,
MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
H. T. SCHNEEBELI,
H. R. COLLIER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
H. E. TALMADGE,
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the dis-

agreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the Act for two years, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The bill as passed by the House extended the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for two years until June 30, 1975. Senate amendment No. 1 provides a one-year extension until June 30, 1974.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment added a provision to the bill which directed the President to exempt certain agricultural commodities from the current price freeze upon certification of the existence of certain conditions by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the supply of such commodities as a result of the price freeze.

The Senate recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
AL ULLMAN,
JAMES A. BURKE,
MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
H. T. SCHNEEBELI,
H. R. COLLIER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
H. E. TALMADGE,
ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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. 7445) to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the act for 2 years.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the opportunity momentarily to advise the Members of what is reported in the conference report, if the gentleman will withhold his reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments involved in this bill as it was considered by the Senate. The first amendment had to do with what is in the conference report itself. The House passed the renegotiation program for another 2 years, extending the act for 2 years. The Senators wanted to extend it for 1 year so that they could take another look at the operation of the Renegotiation Board for the next year.

Mr. Speaker, as is always the case, the conferees on the part of the House like to accommodate a request like that. So we have accepted the Senate amendment which is in the conference report extending the act for 1 year.

Now, that is all that is involved in the conference report. On the amendment in disagreement, I will offer a motion, and I will discuss that subsequent to the agreement to accept the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, there was a third amendment which the Senate receded on, so there is only one other matter left to consider after the adoption of the conference report itself.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield?

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, what is the matter in disagreement to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the matter in disagreement is what was involved in the matter in disagreement last night, except for the three items that have been heretofore approved by the House as a part of the debt ceiling: In other words, social security, the welfare amendments, and the Medicaid amendments, plus the social services amendment.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, will I have appropriate time to ask the gentleman something about the social security amendments at that point so that it will not be necessary to do it at this time?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Absolutely. The gentleman will have that opportunity. Following the motion I will make in connection with the amendment in disagreement, I expect to take the necessary time to answer any questions.

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

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any opinion as to the reaction of the administration to this rather drastically reduced version of that which we voted on last night?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the bill is acceptable to the President.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask, is the gentleman satisfied that the source of his information in terms of the Executive is one upon which the gentleman and all of us can place reliance?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is the source that I would always look to if I were seeking information, short of talking to the President himself.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would seek an appropriate answer to my question from the distinguished ranking member of the committee or from the majority leader, if they should wish to respond to that question.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the distinguished minority leader.

First, I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI).

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, at the conference this morning a very high official, a Cabinet member, indicated that to his knowledge he would recommend approval of the conference report that is about to be presented.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I will agree with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said.

I have also consulted with others, and I think that bolsters my feeling that the pledge of the President would be approved.

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

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

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

Would the chairman of the committee be willing to answer a question on the social service regulations?

It is my understanding that the proposal now before the House in effect includes a description of prohibition against the new regulation going into effect for up to 4 months, and any new regulations that might be proposed by HEW would be subject to the standards eligibility and service requirements described by the two committees mentioned; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct. It is more of a solution of the problem than the amendment last night provided, because the amendment last night merely held in abeyance the new proposed regulations for a period of 6 months, but offered no real solution.

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, may I ask one further question?

Would this proposal which the gentleman says moves in the direction of a solution be clear as to the fact that the States will be able to spend the $2.5 billion and provide the flexibility and provide services presently provided or permitted, and would HEW in any consideration by the committing of new regulations be prohibited from restricting eligibility standards and services in a way that would preclude, in my judgment, the standards that are presently in effect in the old regulations?

In other words, would we maintain the eligibility that the services and standards presently provide for?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the gentleman's question either way, because I have no idea what the Department and the membership of the two committees would finally agree would be satisfactory regulations. But let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if the new regulations never went into effect, and the old regulations, if any, remained in effect, the States altogether would not find it possible to spend the $2.5 billion.

That is because the formula that is in the law, and the situations in some of the States, make it impossible for some of them ever to spend all that we thought they would be entitled to, perhaps, under the $2.5 billion ceiling. I think a more realistic figure is $2.1 billion but the gentleman's State of New

York can utilize its money and will to the full extent, I understand, receive and spend that money.

Mr. REID. One final question. I understand that point the gentleman is making, but may I add further there is no intention to restrict the eligibility standards for services presently in effect in the old regulation in any new consideration by the committee?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. To the best of my recollection, what we are striving to do, by giving examples, is to manifest our own feeling as to the importance of certain of these services, because we have mentioned mental retardation and mental health, family planning, child support, alcohol and drug abuse, and some of the services which have been mandatory for the aged, particularly for those who might otherwise be institutionalized.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding. I have one question I would like to ask before we vote on the conference report.

As the gentleman knows, I attempted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania here a while ago a question, and he suggested the appropriate time would be on this bill, but it seems to me the appropriate time has probably arrived, if there is one.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is right.

Mr. DENNIS. As I understand it, in the amendment which we have here in this conference report there is the social security increase which we eliminated from the other bill last night. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. There is a social security increase. I intended to discuss all of this in connection with my motion, but I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

Last night the House had before it an amendment that would have provided for those eligible for social security benefits to receive this estimated 5.6-percent increase across the board beginning April 1, 1974. That meant there would have been two payments, the May and June payments, that would have had an impact on the 1974 budget.

The conferees accepted the suggestion that I made yesterday that the benefit begin with the month of June. The payment for the month of June is made on July 3, 1974, so it is not in the fiscal year 1974. That is the change we made there.

If the gentleman wants me to, I will be glad to discuss another change or two.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. DENNIS. What I want is, we raised the social security 20 percent last year and we have also put in a cost-of-living automatic escalator increase, which, as I understood it at the time, was designed to a considerable extent to avoid the necessity of survivor increases, and so forth. What I want to ask the distinguished chairman is, that being true, what is the rationale and the reason for the present increase?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The answer is easy. Under the law the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would not have authority to provide an increase in social security equal to the increase in cost of living until January 1, 1975. We are here moving that decision for him forward by 7 months, because we believe that these people are feeling too much the effects of inflation to allow their increase to be delayed until the first of the year 1975.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In listening to the reading of the statement on the part of the managers, am I clear in my understanding that this report of the managers comes to us as a conference report rather than the situation in which we found ourselves last night?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. No, it does not, because as long as I can I am going to adhere to the rules of the House. If we do not like the rules of the House, then let us change them, but the rules say that anything that is not germane under the rules to the subject matter of the text of the bill itself as passed by the House should be reported to the House in disagreement, and that is what we are doing here.

The one amendment that is germane, the change in the extension of the act itself from 2 years to 1 year, is in the conference report.

The conference report pointed out that the conferees were in disagreement with respect to amendment No. 2. The Senate withdrew from its amendment No. 3.

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.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read Senate amendment No. 2.

[For the Senate amendment, see proceedings of the House of June 29, 1973.]

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

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill (H.R. 7445) and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

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 May 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 May 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 Secretary in connection with the provision of such increase in benefits shall be made, in the manner prescribed in section 215(i) 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(i) of the Social Security Act, and

(2) not (except for purposes of section 203(a)(2) of such Act, as in effect after May 1974) be considered to be a "general benefit increase under this title" (as such term is defined in section 215(i)(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(q) 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)(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)(II) 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 June 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(1)(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".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to payments for months after June 1974.

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 ($780 in the case of any period prior to July 1974) 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 action 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 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, 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 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)(1)(A), (2), or (3), 1611(f), or 1615(c) 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 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 supplement 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)(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, at 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 assistance payable to each such individual and the amounts 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, 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 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."

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 November 1, 1973, 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, unless such regulation or modification has been approved, prior to its being proposed, by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(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 ap-

proved 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 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)(i) 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). 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 225 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 GUILD'S SOCIAL SECURITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

BENEFITS FOR ADOPTED CHILDREN

SEC. 240. (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.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MILLS or Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat our discussion under the reservation of the changes with respect to social security payments. I should like to point out that we did make a change in the effective date of the $10 increase from $130 to $140, for the adult public assistance cases, and from $195 to $210 for the couple. The Members will remember we discussed that last night. Last night we had that become effective with the takeover on January 1, 1974, by the Federal Government through the Social Security Administration of the Adult Welfare programs. We had delayed the date of the increase in the amendment from January 1, 1974, to July 1, 1974. In this instance we say July 1 because, different from social security, those who receive welfare payments are paid in advance.

If a person is eligible for welfare for the month of July, that person receives his payment on July 3. If a person under social security is eligible for payment for the month of July, he does not get the payment until after the month, or August 3. So we are making the two conform, so far as the date of receipt of payment is concerned. That is why one is the first of July and one is the first of June.

There is another matter that I do want to call to the attention of the House because there was a great deal of confusion or feeling or misundertanding on it, I thought, with respect to the effect of the increase in social security on the pension benefits made available by my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina's Committee on Veterans. We asked last night that the Senate Committee on Finance, through its Committee on Veterans' Affairs, provide an answer to what we thought the membership wanted done, namely, to guarantee that no veteran pensioner would suffer a loss in income because of the 5.6 percent social security benefit increase.

I came to the floor today to tell my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, that we had accommodated what I thought they wanted, and also my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) and my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT). They asked that we delete that from the conference report, so when the conferees met officially, we did delete that provision from this amendment to the Senate amendment.

The gentleman from South Carolina's committee is working hard at this time to try to overhaul the entire veterans' benefit structure. And I have never been one who wants to trespass upon the jurisdiction of another committee. I thought in the process of this action that we were accommodating the wishes of the committee and the House, but then today I find out that my friend would prefer that we not include it. I want all the Members to know that it does not mean veterans will be unduly affected in any way because this benefit increased will not be paid to any veteran until the month of July 1974 and the gentleman's committee has a long time in which to work out an answer from its point of view.

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

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my distinguished friend, the chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means, that he has always respected the jurisdiction of other committees and particularly of the Veterans

Committee with whom he has dealt so closely and effectively in the past. I want to commend the gentleman and assure the House that what the gentleman says is absolutely correct.

The Committee on Veterans Affairs is conducting hearings at the present time and will consider not only the possibility of being of assistance to veterans because of the 5-percent increase and because of the 20-percent increase but also I can assure the distinguished chairman and the Members of the House that our committee is working diligently and faithfully to solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, there has been interest and concern expressed by Members about the impact of the 5-percent social security raise under consideration on the veterans non-service-connected pension program. There are some facts which should be emphasized in this discussion.

The 5-percent social security increase would not become effective until June 1, 1974. Under title 38, the veterans' law, no veteran or widow would be affected until January 1975. Even though the social security recipients would begin to receive the 5-percent increase on July 3, 1974. We have an end-of-the-year rule and no pensioner under Veterans Administration programs would bequired to report or count the additional 5 percent increase until January 1975, and effect would not come until the check he receives on January 30, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, the problem which is and should be concerning the Congress is not the 5-percent increase which would not affect veterans until January 1975, but the problem is the 20-percent social security increase that became effective September of last year and is having an effect on VA pensions this year. Our committee is holding hearings now on this subject.

The subcommittee is headed by our distinguished colleague, "TIGER TEAGUE," and JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT is the ranking minority Member. We have over 100 bills pending, sponsored by more than 230 Members of Congress. As we seek a solution to this problem, certain facts must be considered. First, we must recognize the pension program for what it is. It is an income supplementing program based on need. Those most in need get the most pension. As their income increases, the pension is reduced. There are income limits that cut off all pension. The single veteran with other income less than $300 per year receives the maximum of $130 per month. The married veteran with less than $500 a year receives $140 per month. It may seem incredible, but there are more than 165,000 veterans and 130,000 widows in these low income categories of less than $500 per year other income, and, of course, they are the ones getting the highest rates and needing help the most.

The upper income limit for single veterans is $2,600 other income and $3,800 other income for the married veterans. As income rises, pension is decreased and when the income limits are exceeded, the pensioner goes off the rolls. For example, a single veteran near the limit of $2,600 gets only $22 a month pension, and a married veteran near the $3,800 limit gets only $33 per month. Those in between the bottom and the top get corresponding amounts. For instance, a married veteran with $2,000 other income receives $99 a month pension. A single veteran with $1,400 a year other income gets $93 a month pension. Let me emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, it is a needs program that helps those in need the most.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very important point that must be emphasized. The income and pension scale is devised so that a pensioner will not lose more pension than he gains in other income. The average social security—under the 20 percent raise—increase to a pensioner was approximately $26.50 per month. The average decrease in Veterans' Administration pension was approximately $7 per month, so that pensioners did receive a net increase in income as a result of the 20 percent social security increase. Now, there is one exception. About 20,000 exceeded the maximum income limits of $2,600 for single veterans and $3,800 for married veterans and went off the rolls. Let me emphasize that 50,000 to 60,000 pensioners go off the rolls every year because of excessive income and that will always be the case in any income limit program. Also, there are cases where veterans have their pensions cut because both the veteran and his wife are covered separately by social security, each in their own right, and, of course, we feel no obligation in these cases because the wife has her own separate income and also enjoys a $1,200 exemption before any of her income is counted against the veteran.

Mr. Speaker, Members ask constantly why not exempt social security from being counted. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has had proposals before it for the last 20 years to do this, and has steadfastly refused because it would be unfair and a gross injustice.

It would be absolutely unfair to single out one class of income such as social security and give it preferential treatment. Mr. Speaker, if the Members think they are getting mail, they have not seen anything compared to the mail they would get if we singled social security income and exempted it from being counted. A clamor would immediately arise from retired civil servants, railroad retirees, State, county and city retirees, schoolteachers, policemen, firemen, union members, and other people on annuities, demanding that they also receive preferential treatment as accorded social security recipients. They would have a good case. The point is, Mr. Speaker, in an income limit and needs program, dollars count, and one dollar is no different from the next.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that our committee is holding hearings now. We want to do something, but we have problems. I do not desire to be partisan, and our committee is never partisan in its approach. But it is a fact that the administration has budgeted a $233 million a year cut in the pension program and has budgeted no money for increases. If the committee recommended legislation that would completely offset the impact of the 20-percent social security increase, it would cost $420 million first year cost. To also offset the 5-percent proposed raise would cost another $150 million. With the administration budgeted to save $223 million, we are talking about a three quarters of a billion dollar budget increase, and certainly I have no assurances from the administration that such a bill would be signed.

One approach we are considering is an 8-percent cost-of-living increase, based on the cost-of-living advances, and this would cost $220 million. Even here we have no assurances the President would sign the bill. The Administration has actually come before us asking us to consider substantial reduction on the pension program.

If we are successful in enacting an 8-percent cost-of-living increase, this would have a substantial impact in offsetting the 20-percent social security increase.

Let me remind Members that while we are preoccupied with a 5-percent social security, that a 6.1-percent increase in Civil Service retirement takes place day after tomorrow. Congress is working on a Railroad Retirement increase. Hundreds of thousands of widows drawing Veterans Administration pensions will be affected next January 1 by the very substantial revision in widow benefits under social security that went into effect this year, I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, to remind Members that the 5-percent social security increase under discussion here today is only one of many increases that will affect veterans' pensions and must be considered by our committee.

I support the 5-percent increase. I appreciate the courteous consideration accorded us by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of not invading our jurisdiction, and I wish to assure members that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is working on this problem and will deal with veterans and their dependents in our usual sympathetic way. The problem as it relates to veterans should not prevent this body from considering the 5-percent social security increase. If the increase is enacted, it will result in a net increase in income to most pensioners except a very few that might exceed upper income limits as a result of the 5-percent increase.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman the Committee on Ways and Means for this action.

I think it would enable the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. TEAGUE of Texas) and the members of the committee to take into consideration the 20-percent raise and 5-percent raise as well as the last raise in railroad retirement and the general raise to retirees which takes place tomorrow as far as all those who were on the Federal payroll.

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

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish the chairman would explain to the House two issues with respect to social security. The first is how this law changes the wage base under existing law and at what time. The second is I wish he would explain further the fact that this increase comes out of a cost-of-living increase which otherwise would be paid January 1, 1975, and is not an additional benefit to the cost-of-living increase to be granted at that time but simply a speed up to the extent of 5.6 percent.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman from New York is eminently correct with respect to his last observation. The amendment does provide, as I said last night, for an increase in the taxable wage base from the present provision of law effective January 1, 1974, an increase from the $12,000 to $12,600 of one's earned income which will be subject to the rates of social security tax at that time. This we discussed last night. There is no change with respect to it. It is necessary because as I pointed out last night we are changing the retirement test from $2,100 to $2,400.

Mr. CONABLE. The point I hoped the chairman would make here is that the wage base is going up January 1, 1974, in any event from $10,800 to $12,000.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. CONABLE. The effect of this bill on the amount going from $10,800 is to move it to $12,600, and it is important to understand that entire increase is not necessary to finance this bill, only the initial $600.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The raise from $10,800 to $12,000 that was enacted last year was necessary to finance the 20-percent benefit increase enacted then.

Mr. CONABLE. Last year.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is right.

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

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

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, in the present law as I understand it the wage base will be $12,000 as of the first of the year. This will increase it by $600.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, we have another increase that will occur then? I believe it is $12,900.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Under the provisions of the existing law there is provision for automatic increases from time to time in the amount of one's earnings that are subject to the social security tax. That is an automatic provision and is not enacted by this amendment. The automatic provision will apply and go above the $12,600, just as it would go above the $12,000 figure under the provisions of existing law.

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the $600 increase then would apply all the way down the line. We are not just moving up an increase as we are in the social security provisions, but the $600 increase on the wage base will be permanent and will be in addition to the $12,000; in addition to the $12,900 and the $13,500, all down through the years. The $600 increase is permanent in that respect.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct. It is not just a 1-year proposition.

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

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that this becomes effective a year from tomorrow and applies on a 6-percent cost-of-living increase, is it possible that between now and next year this Congress might pass an increase of even more?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's guess is probably better than mine. I just do not know. It is getting harder for me to predict what the Congress will do, frankly.

Mr. MYERS. This for all practical purposes today is a social security increase bill.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should bear in mind that just 6 months beyond the effectiveness of this 5 percent, there is a provision in the law which would allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make an additional adjustment in social security benefits. The benefit increase provided in this legislation makes a part of that increase payable 7 months in advance.

Mr. Speaker, let me describe these provisions in 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 April 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 $2,400 a year effective January 1, 1974. The third of these modifications 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 can become entitled to benefits.

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 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 June 1974, rather than April 1974. This would increase benefits to the estimated 30 million beneficiaries then on the rolls by an estimated $1.9 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.

This provision allows the social security beneficiaries to receive a portion of the first automatic benefit increase in their benefit checks for June 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, as in the Senate amendment. This increase in the retirement test would provide for additional benefits of $200 million for calendar year 1974 for approximately 1½ million beneficiaries.

The motion would accept the amendment on adopted grandchildren under social security.

The financing for these changes in the law would be provided for 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, as modified by the proposed 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 will 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. The increase would be effective July 1, 1974. This date was chosen because it corresponds with the time that the checks containing the social security benefit increase will be received and it will have no impact on the fiscal year 1974.

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 give continuing assurance that persons on the rolls in December 1973 would not lose income as a result of the federalization of the program. The cost to the States and the Federal Government will decline as fewer and fewer of the December 1973 eligibles are on the rolls. The requirement would not apply where there was a bonafide 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 $195 a month. This payment of $195 would be increased July 1, 1974, to $210, the same amount as for an individual living with an eligible spouse. The 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 comparabe qualifications to other candidates and who would be voluntarily displaced when the new supplemental security income program goes into effect.

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.

The conferees discussed their great concern about social service regulations which are scheduled to become effective July 1, 1973. They are very much concerned that the stringency of the regulations will prevent effective social service programs in the fields of mental retardation, mental health, family planning, obtaining child support, alcohol and drug abuse, and some of the services which have been mandatory for the aged, particularly in the field of protection and avoidance of institutionalization. They believe that changes in the regulations, particularly in these areas are important if effective programs are to be maintained and dependency is to be prevented.

The Senate amendment postponed the regulations for 6 months. In order to avoid a hiatus for that period of time, the proposed amendment would make the period 4 months, but if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can come up with new regulations satisfying the concerns of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance before that time, the postponement would then cease. It is understood that the Department will submit revised regulations to the committees prior to the publication of these proposed regulations in the Federal Register. It would be highly desirable that this process be accomplished rapidly so that social service funds are used effectively and that the States will know as soon as possible exactly where they stand.

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.

MEDICAID CHANGES

The Senate amendment included several provisions which would protect people from loss of eligibility to the medicaid 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 in 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.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the Renegotiation Act which includes the additional amendment with provisions for a 5.6 percent social security increase effective July of next year, additional income guarantee for the blind and disabled medically indigent persons from $130 for an individual to $140, and $195 for a couple to $210. I also support the provision that would postpone the effective date of the regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on social service programs. I support that provision that extends the authorization for project grants under the maternal and child health care program until June 30, 1974. There is another important provision that increases the retirement test from $2,100 to $2,400 per year. This is needed action that I endorse.

Earlier in House colloquy there was expressed some concern about the effect of the 5.6-percent social security raise on veterans benefits. As ranking minority member on the Veterans Affairs Committee I am appreciative that this matter has been left to the action of our committee and I assure the Members of the House that we have been holding hearings on the subject pensions.

I know that we all share concern as to the needs of the Nation's war veterans and dependents, especially those who are now subsisting on pension benefits—disabled veterans and survivors of deceased veterans in financial need—and must live on fixed incomes. It has been the feeling of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House as well as the stated position of the administration that something must be done in the near future because the cost of living—as we all know—has been constantly increasing.

As a matter of history, the current pension system which started in the 86th Congress was an attempt to relate the pension payment to need of the veteran, and as it was enacted then, the program fell short of being sensitive to the pensioner's need. When the pensioner's income exceeded the limit of the income ceiling, he could suffer an abrupt reduction in total income.

In 1969, the program was restructured through a formula so that a small

increase in income would only bring about a small reduction in pension. And finally in 1972, we came to a formula approach whereby as outside income increases, pension is reduced in a lesser amount, resulting in an increase in total income for as long as the pensioner remained entitled to benefits.

During those years, there was a consistent tendency to increase income limitations, as well as to broaden exclusions. This is particularly evident in the broadening of the exclusions and the increasing of income limitations to meet each increase in social security. Changes of this nature have led us to the point where the entire program has inconsistencies, inequities, and anomalies which cannot be corrected within the framework of the law as now constituted.

Therefore, I believe that it is the general consensus of the committee that this is an appropriate time for an examination of the entire pension program with a view toward a basic reform such as was last achieved in 1960, which will look toward better serving both the veteran population and the general taxpayer. In the meantime we may have to have interim legislation to adjust benefits to the current cost of living. Ultimately, we are hopeful that we can formulate legislation to restore the basic philosophy of the program, which is providing a proportionate measure of assistance to those who need it.

I take this time so that those Members might be brought up to date on activities before our committee under the leadership of our great chairman, WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN and chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions, Mr. OLIN TEAGUE.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. 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 327, nays 9, present 1, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

YEAS—327

Abdnor	Breckinridge	Conable
Abzug	Brinkley	Conlan
Adams	Broomfield	Conyers
Addabbo	Brotzman	Corman
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Calif.	Cotter
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Mich.	Coughlin
Andrews, N.C.	Broyhill, N.C.	Cronin
Annunzio	Broyhill, Va.	Culver
Archer	Buchanan	Daniel, Dan
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Armstrong	Burleson, Tex.	Davis, Ga.
Ashley	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, S.C.
Bafalis	Burton	Davis, Wis.
Baker	Butler	de la Garza
Barrett	Byron	Dellenback
Bennett	Camp	Dellums
Bergland	Carey, N.Y.	Denholm
Bevill	Carter	Diggs
Biaggi	Casey, Tex.	Dingell
Biester	Cederberg	Donohue
Bingham	Chamberlain	Dorn
Boggs	Chisholm	Downing
Boland	Clausen, Don H.	Drinan
Bolling	Cleveland	Dulski
Bowen	Cochran	Duncan
Brademas	Cohen	du Pont
Brasco	Collier	Eckhardt
Bray	Collins, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.	Lott	Rosenthal
Eilberg	McClory	Rostenkowski
Erlenborn	McCloskey	Roybal
Esch	McCollister	Ruth
Eshleman	McCormack	St Germain
Evans, Colo.	McDade	Sarasin
Fascell	McEwen	Sarbanes
Findley	McKay	Saylor
Fish	McKinney	Scherle
Flood	Macdonald	Schneebeli
Flynt	Madigan	Schroeder
Foley	Mahon	Sebelius
Ford, Gerald R.	Mallary	Seiberling
Ford, William D.	Maraziti	Shipley
Forsythe	Martin, N.C.	Shoup
Fountain	Mathias, Calif.	Shriver
Fraser	Mathis, Ga.	Shuster
Frelinghuysen	Matsunaga	Sikes
Frenzel	Mayne	Sisk
Froehlich	Mazzoli	Slack
Gaydos	Meeds	Smith, Iowa
Giaimo	Metcalfe	Smith, N.Y.
Gilman	Mezvinsky	Snyder
Ginn	Michel	Spence
Goldwater	Milford	Staggers
Gonzalez	Miller	Stanton, J. William
Grasso	Mills, Ark.	Stanton, James V.
Gray	Minish	Stark
Green, Pa.	Mink	Steed
Gude	Minshall, Ohio	Steele
Gunter	Mitchell, Md.	Steelman
Guyer	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Haley	Mizell	Stephens
Hamilton	Moakley	Stokes
Hammer-schmidt	Montgomery	Stubblefield
Hanley	Moorhead, Calif.	Stuckey
Hanna	Moorhead, Pa.	Studds
Hanrahan	Mosher	Symington
Hansen, Idaho	Moss	Symms
Harsha	Murphy, Ill.	Talcott
Harvey	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor, Mo.
Hastings	Myers	Taylor, N.C.
Hawkins	Natcher	Teague, Tex.
Hechler, W. Va.	Nedzi	Thomson, Wis.
Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen	Thone
Heinz	Nix	Thornton
Helstoski	Obey	Towell, Nev.
Henderson	O'Brien	Treen
Hicks	O'Neill	Ullman
Hinshaw	Owens	Van Deerlin
Hogan	Parris	Vander Jagt
Holifield	Passman	Vanik
Holt	Patten	Vigorito
Holtzman	Pepper	Waggonner
Horton	Perkins	Waldie
Hosmer	Peyser	Walsh
Howard	Pickle	Wampler
Hudnut	Poage	Ware
Ichord	Podell	Whalen
Jarman	Preyer	Whitehurst
Johnson, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Johnson, Colo.	Price, Tex.	Widnall
Johnson, Pa.	Pritchard	Williams
Jones, N.C.	Railsback	Wilson, Bob
Jones, Okla.	Randall	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Jones, Tenn.	Rangel	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Jordan	Rees	Winn
Karth	Regula	Wolff
Kastenmeier	Reid	Wyman
Kazen	Reuss	Yates
Kemp	Rhodes	Yatron
Ketchum	Riegle	Young, Alaska
Kluczynski	Rinaldo	Young, Fla.
Koch	Roberts	Young, Ga.
Kuykendall	Robinson, Va.	Young, S.C.
Kyros	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Latta	Rodino	Zablocki
Leggett	Roe	Zwach
Lehman	Rogers	
Litton	Roncalio, Wyo.	
Long, La.	Roncallo, N.Y.	
Long, Md.	Rooney, Pa.	
	Rose	

NAYS—9

Blackburn	Dennis	Landgrebe
Collins, Tex.	Gross	Rarick
Crane	Hutchinson	Satterfield

PRESENT—1

Goodling

NOT VOTING—96

Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Daniels, Dominick V.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burgener	Danielson
Ashbrook	Burke, Calif.	Delaney
Aspin	Burke, Fla.	Dent
Badillo	Carney, Ohio	Derwinski
Beard	Chappell	Devine
Bell	Clancy	Dickinson
Blatnik	Clark	Evins, Tenn.
Breaux	Clawson, Del	Fisher
Brooks	Clay	Flowers
Conte	Frey	Lujan
Fulton	McFall	Runnels
Fuqua	McSpadden	Ruppe
Gettys	Madden	Ryan
Gibbons	Mailliard	Sandman
Green, Oreg.	Mann	Skubitz
Griffiths	Martin, Nebr.	Steiger, Ariz.
Grover	Melcher	Stratton
Gubser	Mollohan	Sullivan
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Teague, Calif.
Harrington	Nichols	Thompson, N.J.
Hays	O'Hara	Tiernan
Hébert	Patman	Udall
Hillis	Pettis	Veysey
Huber	Pike	White
Hungate	Powell, Ohio	Wiggins
Hunt	Quie	Wright
Jones, Ala.	Quillen	Wyatt
Keating	Rooney, N.Y.	Wydler
King	Roush	Wylie
Landrum	Rousselot	Young, Ill.
Lent	Roy	Zion

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. King.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Dominick V. Daniels with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Keating.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Badillo.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Hillis.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Powell of Ohio.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Beard.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Bell.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Roy with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Wylie.
Mr. Runnels with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Young of Illinois.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Carney of Ohio.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Patman.
Mr. White with Mr. Wright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report and the motion just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the work for the remainder of the week and the program for the week when we reconvene.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. I will be glad to respond to the gentleman.

If my information is correct, it would be about an hour to an hour and a half before the Senate would send over to us the resolution that we sent to them concerning the recess.

Consequently, because of that and also the fact that they will have to act on the conference report on the Renegotiation Act, which we have just acted on, and they have to act on the conference report on the continuing appropriation resolution, the Senate will take at least an hour and a half before they send the recess resolution to us.

I make this statement for the reason that we must have a quorum in the event anything should happen. So consequently we have informed the people on our side of the aisle to stand by until the five bells ring.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I just heard a few seconds ago that the other body has passed the continuing resolution conference report, and they are waiting for the renegotiation conference report, and I am now informed they have passed the adjournment resolution.

Mr. O'NEILL. As I got up from the telephone to come down to talk to the gentleman from Michigan, I gave him the information I had received, and I am more than pleased to hear that they are moving forward in haste.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of July 9, 1973, is as follows:

Monday the House will be in recess.

On Tuesday there will be considered H.R. 8860, Agricultural Act extension, open rule, with 2 hours of debate.

On Wednesday and Thursday there will be considered:

H.R. 8547, Export Administration Act amendment, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 8538, Public Broadcasting Corporation Act, open rule, with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 2990, U.S. Postal Service authorization, open rule, with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 8606, Small Business Act amendment, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

As the gentleman is aware, according to the agreement, that is not one of the Fridays that we work.

THE GREATEST THREAT TO CIVIL AND ECONOMIC LIBERTIES LIES IN THE PROLIFERATION OF BIG GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress I have endeavored to reverse the trend of growth in the size, jurisdiction, and cost of the Federal Government. Although it often has been a lonely struggle, I think the first indications of a change in the sentiment of the body politic are becoming evident. Increasing numbers of people from all walks of life are beginning to realize that the greatest threat to their civil and economic liberties lies in the proliferation of big government.

Edmund Burke once said, "People never give up their liberty but under some delusion." Mr. Speaker, the American people have turned over much of their precious liberty to government and they have done so under the delusion that government could somehow perform better with its unlimited bankroll and unchallenged power than free individuals acting privately.

The David Brinkley Report on NBC News of June 5, 1973, is an important contribution in the battle to dispel this delusion. I commend Mr. Brinkley and place his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

BRINKLEY REPORT, JUNE 5, 1973

There is some similarity between politicians always looking for more taxes and alcoholics always looking for a drink. Any little excuse—however feeble—is all they need, because they just can't leave it alone.

We have another example now:

Some of the anti-pollution devices on new cars cause them to burn more gas per mile. For this and other reasons, gasoline is not as plentiful as it was.

The solution now proposed is, predictably, higher taxes on gasoline. It is a clear case of the political mind at work—any feeble excuse to gouge more money out of the American people. Raising the tax will not produce one more pint of gasoline, and so will do nothing to help the shortage.

People with money will still buy all they want. People with less money will still have to drive to work, to school, to stores . . . and will still have to buy the gasoline, but will be forced to pay more. So there is no reason to believe the tax would reduce air pollution.

Another excuse offered by the Teasury is that it would reduce inflation by taking some money out of circulation. But Washington would not put the money in a shoe box in the attic. It would spend it as fast, if not faster, than the people it was taken from.

Government spending is just as inflationary as private spending. Possibly more so.

What it would do is give the Washington establishment more money to throw around. Money, and the power that goes with it. It already has about 250 billion dollars a year and if they can't get along on that they can't get along on anything.

So it would not produce any more gasoline . . . would not reduce pollution . . . would not hurt the rich and would hurt those who are not rich . . . would have no effect on inflation . . . and would simply bring in more money to a Federal establishment unable effectively to handle what it already has.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WHITEHURST AT THE ARMED FORCES STAFF COLLEGE IN NORFOLK, VA.

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

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker on Friday, June 29, 1973, my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman WHITEHURST, spoke to the 52d graduating class at the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Va.

The Staff College is a multiservice institution providing a 4-month course for the middle-grade officers of the U.S. Armed Forces. Also in the classes are civilians from various agencies, as well as allied officers from abroad.

In a time when we are experiencing difficulties in retaining military manpower and our military traditions are suffering, Congressman WHITEHURST'S remarks deserve particular attention. He has struck an inspirational note, and it is with pleasure that I insert his remarks in the RECORD:

"It is always a pleasure for me to speak to career military officials who are completing another phase of their career. Unlike high school or college commencement exercises, which mark a turning point in the life of each graduate, exercises of this kind record the completion of a specialized part of your training designed to prepare you for more effective command.

And so the thoughts you have today are not those of speculation on where your degree will take you, or the new commission that is the pride of every young officer. No, I would suspect that the thoughts of many of you are on your next assignment, and perhaps some reflection on the military life you have chosen.

My field was History. I taught it to college students for 18 years before striking out on the sea of politics. I've gotten pretty close to the armed services in the past four and a half years, far closer than I did when I was in the halls of ivy. I know the peculiar challenge of being a career soldier, sailor, or airman, especially in a time of shifting social mores and indistinct goals for many in this generation.

Americans have fought their share of wars, perhaps more than their share, in this century, but we are not by nature militaristic. Quite the contrary. We customarily suffer a hangover of sorts after each of our wars, as if to compensate for the heady patriotic spirit of the crusade we've just gone through. Listen to what Robert Ardrey wrote in his book, the Territorial Imperative:

"I entered the Time of Disbelief. From that moment on, when we sang the national anthem at school, we forced our voices to break on the high notes and inserted ribald phrases in the lyrics. Marching bands and martial music vanished from our streets; if you liked brass bands, you went to football games. The flag, making an occasional appearance, passed unnoticed. George Washington, we discovered, may have been the Father of our Country, but he was a mediocre sort of man blessed with a few bright lieutenants and uniformly dim-witted opponents. It was a bad time for heroes.

"Generals in the time of my growing up were something to be hidden under history's bed, along with the chamber pots. Anyone who chose the army for a career was a fool or a failure. At my high school there was something called R.O.T.C., a training course for reserve officers.

"If you wanted to sink out of sight in the estimate of your contemporaries, if you wanted to be checked off as someone whose pimples would prove to be permanent, you had only to appear at school in a khaki uniform. I doubt that among the 3500 students who were my fellows at this giant Chicago high school there was one who chose to be a professional soldier."

And one last quotation:

"Certain words almost vanished from the American vocabulary . . . Honor was one, glory another. A man of honor was a hypocrite. He who achieved glory had undoubtedly a hollow leg, he who desired it a hollow head. Patriotism, naturally, was the last refuge of the scoundrel."

The Time of Disbelief of which Ardrey wrote was not of this generation. You have to go back 50 years, to the period following the First World War. That was the time of Ardrey's youth, yet somehow we survived that era filled with cynicism and self-doubt. A few young men, and probably some from that very high school in Chicago that Ardrey attended, went to our military academies in the 1920's and manfully stuck it out through the long drought of promotion in the decade that followed. When World War II came with a suddenness that is all but forgotten now, those officers provided the nation with some of its ablest commanders.

A curious paradox exists today, one that presents a unique challenge to anyone considering a military career. The circumstances are such that I think an officer is placed with more complex problems now than at any time in our past.

On the one hand, the draft has been abolished, ended in the wake of the decline of American participation in the Vietnam war and in an atmosphere of disillusionment and anti-military sentiment. Volunteerism, on the scale the armed forces are now practicing it, is a new thing. It is still largely an experiment. Against this backdrop, our armed forces must contend with the same social factors that confront the nation at large. The country itself is undergoing one of those periodic metamorphoses that occur from time to time in the life of a people. We are trying to achieve a new definition of equality for all of our citizens. We will eventually succeed, but it is painful, as most major social changes are. Authority in all forms has eroded, whether it be the restraint of parental influence or what we normally call the duly constituted authority of the law. Add to this, unprecedented affluence and the new, almost incomprehensible, drug culture, and the result is predictable. This generation is not lost like Scott Fitzgerald's but it does manifest characteristics that have no parallel in our history.

On the other hand, we are getting more applications for the service academies than ever before.

Last year, 67 young men in my Congressional District applied for the Naval Academy alone. This is truly a paradox. The records of these young men were a source of great interest to me. They had not only excelled in their studies, they were active in many areas of school and community life. They show the strongest possible potential and could well emerge as the finest officers ever to command American military forces, if you inspire them.

You are here because of your recognized abilities. All of you have the potential for responsible command. But it's tougher than ever these days. Young officers leaving the service tell me that they are disgusted because they are not backed up by those senior to them. Does that sound familiar to any of you? Others say that the civilian world hasn't solved the problem of racial differences, so how can the service? The same rhetorical question is raised about the use of drugs by servicemen. "What percentage of your soldiers use drugs?" is a question I raised when I last visited military units in Germany; "What are you doing about it?" was my second question.

Is it unfair for me, a politician, to ask these questions? "Congressman," you will say, "the Army or Navy or Air Force isn't an island. We can't isolate ourselves from the influences that you mention."

Do you fall into the category of so many of my colleagues, who say, "Don't rock the boat"? But remember what I said about the future careers of those young men who are to follow you. Inspiration comes from example, not from dodging the issue, not by denigrating duty, and surely not by trying to win a popularity contest.

For example, what kind of inspiration would we have drawn from past patriots if we had preserved statements like these:

Nathan Hale: "Me spy on those British? Are you trying to be funny? Do you know what they do with the spies they catch? I'll give you a news flash, chum: they Hang them!"

Paul Revere: "What do you mean, me ride through every Middlesex village and town, and in the middle of the night, too? Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?"

Patrick Henry: "Sure, I'm for liberty. First, last, and always, I'm for liberty. But we have to be realistic. We're a pretty small outfit. If we start pushing the British around, somebody is likely to get hurt."

George Washington: "Gentlemen, I'm honored and appreciative of your confidence, but I just have to get things in shape out at Mount Vernon."

Yes, there's a certain humor in such statements, but only because we know that those words were never uttered. There's also the knowledge that the odds are extremely long that you will ever be put in the position to act the way any of those men were. And maybe that's the crux of it: the single act of courage is not what I'm asking of you.

My plea is that each of you be the very best professional possible, that you conduct yourself on a daily basis in such a way that we mold a military force that is different from the civilian world around it. I don't want today's Army "joining anybody." And not just anybody ought to be allowed to join today's Army.

Im a Member of the House Armed Services Committee. I have voted billions of dollars for the defense of the Republic. I have examined in detail the capability of sophisticated weapons, and I have supported appropriations and programs that would make service life more attractive. But I cannot legislate the right kind of man to fill the ranks or the right kind of man to command them; that is the job of you who wear the uniform.

Both you and I swore an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all of its enemies. I must renew mine every two years, provided the people of my District see fit to reelect me to office. But yours lasts until you take off that uniform for good.

Your dedication to the high ideals that are the tradition of American arms will measure the success of our endurance as a nation. As you leave for your new assignments, remember these words: tyranny, oppression, cruelty, deprivation, repression, and servitude forever wait in the wings. Your fortitude, your determination, your dedication, and your courage are our bulwark against these misfortunes. God bless you, go with you, and keep you strong."

SPECIAL PROVISIONS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assert my implacable opposition to special provisions in appropriations bills creating special funds for matters "of a confidential nature" which may be expended by a department head to be accounted for solely on his certificate. Normally such provisions are subject to the point of order that they provide for substantive changes in the law in an appropriations bill and are thus in violation of the second clause of rule XXI. But recently the Rules Committee has been granting rules waiving points of order against the bill based upon this rule. Mr. BOLLING says that the committee does not intend to continue such practice of sweeping exemptions from clause 2 of rule XXI. Such would be most salutary.

Examples of the unwholesome exemption are found in three bills considered within the last 2 weeks. The first was the appropriation bill for the Department of Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 8760). In that bill it was provided that "not to exceed $15,000 shall be available for investigative expenses of a confidential character, to be expended on the approval and authority of the commandant and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officer of the government." The committee could not explain what this $15,000 was for, and I was able to take it out by amendment. It would also have been subject to a point of order.

But the next week—probably because Mr. DINGELL and I had raised points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI during that week—considering the heavy and urgent schedule for the week, the Rules Committee waived points of order under clause 2, rule XXI, generally, on the appropriations bills that came up. These were the Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations (H.R. 8947) and the Department of State, Justice, and judiciary appropriations (H.R. 8916). Both of these bills contained provisions for funds for confidential matters to be expended by a department head solely on his certificate.

These provisions call for a deviation from the general methods of vouchering funds, and settlement of accounts as provided for in title 31, sections 72, 74, and 75, United States Code, which provide generally that such actions shall be under the scrutiny of the General Accounting Office, and shall be done in accordance with its rules; so, if that deviation may not be found authorized somewhere in existing law, it is banned from an appropriations bill by clause 2 of rule XXI unless that rule is waived.

H.R. 8947, containing the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, contained the following language:

That of such amount $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended . . ."

I sought to strike this language by amendment—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, H5612, June 28, 1973—because I interpreted the language as permitting the expenditure of money by the agency solely upon the basis of the Commission's statement that the subject matter of the expenditure was of a confidential nature. Upon the assurance of the managers of the bill on both sides, that this does not prevent the Comptroller General from looking into the subject matter and determining whether or not the expenditure was subject to confidential treatment, I asked and was given unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. The result was, I think, a proper restraint on expending the money.

The very next appropriations bill contained the objectionable language in several places. H.R. 8916, containing the Justice Department appropriations, provided for: First, at page 17, a sum for the FBI "not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, and to be accounted for solely on his certificate"; second, at page 17–18, a sum for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, "not to exceed $50,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for solely on his certificate"; and third, at pages 20–21 a sum for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs "not to exceed $70,000 for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized or approved by the Attorney General and to be accounted for solely on his certificate."

In line with the process which had been agreed upon the day before on the Atomic Energy appropriation, I sought to add language which would give assurance that the Comptroller General could scrutinize the Attorney General's alleged confidential and other special expenditures to determine their nature and whether or not they were of such confidential or other special nature as to be justified under the special clauses referred to above. But the managers of the bill objected on grounds that the amendment would impose additional duties on Federal officials and is therefore legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Though I do not wish to belabor the point of order, it is anomolous that the waiver of clause 2 of rule XXI is the only basis upon which the so-called additional duties on Federal officials—that is, the duty of the Comptroller General to examine the Attorney General's vouchers and accounts—actually an existing duty, could be circumvented. But, because waiver by the Rules Committee of clause 2 of rule XXI went only to the bill, and not to amendments to it, I was not permitted to restore this salutary oversight by the General Accounting Office.

But I shall not let the unfortunately obfuscatory nature of the parliamentary situation that existed yesterday deter me from seeking correction of a very bad situation. If some $190,000 can be used in secretive missions by the Attorney General, what assurance do we have that someone in that office may conceivably overreach, might burglarize and exercise electronic surveillance and wiretapping, for purposes which, if revealed to the Comptroller General, would not appear legitimate—might indeed appear illegal. It is at least plausibly argued that we have had an Attorney General who was not above such tactics.

Be that as it may, no bureaucrat should be above the law, nor should he have special law written for him in an appropriations bill—law that would make him immune in certain areas from the ordinary accounting process applied to other civil servants. After the recess, I shall introduce a bill which permits Congress to hold him, and others like him, accountable.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, along with 20 of my colleagues on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee I introduced yesterday a new bill to clear the way for construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline and to direct negotiations for an additional line from the North Slope across Canada.

Our Public Lands Subcommittee has held 13 days of public hearings on the pipeline issue. Our hearing record is substantial and I am pleased to see that we appear to have a consensus for this approach among more than half the members of both the subcommittee and the full committee.

This legislation is geared to getting the needed crude oil into the lower 48 States from Alaska's North Slope the quickest way possible. That way is the trans-Alaskan line which would bring the oil down to Valdez in a 48-inch pipeline and then transport it via tanker to west coast ports. It can be completed several years sooner than the Canadian route which some have suggested but for which no company has ever requested a permit.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, would direct issuance of the right-of-way permit for the Alaskan line by the Secretary of Interior on the basis of his already completed environmental impact statement. And, there would be no further judicial review of this statement.

The 1920 Mineral Leasing Act would be amended under this bill to provide for all oil and gas pipeline rights-of-way which are wider than 50 feet at points where installations require. The Secretary of Interior would be required to make a finding that the wider interval of right-of-way is reasonably necessary for operation and maintenance after construction or to protect the environment or public safety. This action is necessary because of a U.S. court of appeals decision which is blocking construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

Other provisions of the bill, Mr. Speaker, include:

Authority for the President, accompanied by a request that he do so, to enter negotiations with the Canadian Government over a pipeline through Canada. A report is called for within 1 year.

Language designed to make clear that the trans-Alaska as well as other pipeline rights-of-way will require careful consideration be given to environmental problems, curtailment of erosion, restoration and revegetation of the land surface and protection of fish and wildlife and their habitat.

A ban on the export of any crude oil from the trans-Alaska and other pipelines unless the President makes and publishes an express finding that such exports are in the national interest.

I should state for the record that before the Public Lands Subcommittee considering this measure takes final action on it, consideration will be given to conditioning right-of-way permits on the pipelines acting as bona fide common carriers, transporting the oil of independent producers as well as their own on an equitable basis.

We are aware that the House Small Business Committee held hearings last year on the anticompetitive impact of oil company ownership of petroleum products pipelines and found "significant evidence of anticompetitive practices" by joint venture lines, such as refusal to provide terminal facilities for independent shippers either for input or delivery of their oil through their pipelines.

We do not want the Alaska or any other pipeline crossing public lands to become an instrumentality used to establish monopoly control of petroleum resources, nor do we want to be confronted with granting unnecessary duplicating rights-of-way so independents can get their oil to market.

It is certainly reasonable to condition all permits for rights-of-way across Federal public lands on bona fide operation as a carrier accessible to all oil producers, big or little.

In the case of Alaska, we know there are independents operating there, who will be closed out if they do not have access to transportation for crude, and that the State is interested in seeing that they are served.

Mr. Speaker, I also should point out that on June 1 I wrote Secretary of State William P. Rogers posing a series of questions about the route across Canada which had been raised during our hearings. I have received two letters from the Department. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am including the two State Department replies in the RECORD at this point.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1973.

Hon. JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN:

As requested in your letter of June 1, we have discussed with responsible Canadian officials those questions raised by you concerning the possible construction of an oil

pipeline from Northern Alaska through Canada. These discussions have confirmed our earlier assessment that there is no alternative to the proposed Alaskan pipeline at this time. Even if the Canadian Government should move expeditiously to approve such a pipeline, which is unlikely, an Alaskan pipeline could be in operation at least 3–5 years, and perhaps 7–10 years earlier than a Canadian pipeline.

Negotiation by the United States of a pipeline agreement with Canada does not appear possible at this time. The Canadian Government has consistently taken the position that it is not prepared to negotiate with the U.S. Government on the matter of pipelines from the Arctic. We know of no change in this position. The Canadian Minister for Energy, Mines and Resources said in May, 1972, that the Government would be ready to examine applications by commercial firms for pipeline construction by the end of that year. The Canadian Government now indicates that it will not be ready to examine applications until the end of this year. This date could slip further.

Definitive guidelines have not yet been published for companies desiring to undertake pipeline construction. On May 16 the Northwest Territories Supreme Court put a freeze on all land transactions in the area to be transited by a pipeline until certain issues related to native claims are determined. Our most recent inquiries and remarks by Canadian officials give no cause to change our view that the Canadian Government has no strong current interest in the construction of a Mackenzie Valley oil pipeline. Insufficient oil has been found in the Canadian Arctic up to this time to justify early approval for construction in the face of political, environmental and economic arguments against approval. The seeming ambiguity of Canadian policy on an oil pipeline through Canada, in our judgment, partly is a reflection of the Canadian Government's desire to make sure that Canadian concern over a possible tanker route to Cherry Point is fully appreciated by the United States.

Most members of the Gas/Arctic consortium and Canadian Government officials believe that 1980 is a realistic year to expect the completion of a gas pipeline from Alaska down the Mackenzie Valley—provided that an application is filed this year and a minimum of delay is experienced in obtaining its approval and beginning construction activities. All agree that approval and construction of an oil pipeline would take an appreciably longer time. At least 12–18 months of intensive work would be required to prepare an application for an oil pipeline based on the preliminary feasibility study prepared by Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Research Ltd. The line would be over twice as long and twice as costly as the proposed Alaskan pipeline. The time required for construction would inevitably be longer. While both an oil and gas pipeline application might be examined at the same time, few in the industry or the Canadian Government believe it will be possible to initiate work on both projects at the same time. Financing, including currency transfer problems, and the availability of labor, specialized equipment and pipe are contributing factors.

Canada has consistently maintained that it must retain operational control of the Canadian portion of any pipeline. Canadian officials also have stated that a basic requirement of any pipeline project would be to give opportunity to Canadians to acquire 51 percent ownership. All of these factors and the current political environment in Canada strongly argue that a decision to permit the construction of an Arctic oil pipeline through Canada is likely to be long delayed.

I hope the above is responsive to your request for information. We would be happy to send knowledgeable officials to meet with you or others in the House to provide more detailed information.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1973.

Hon. JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: To supplement my letter of June 22 and as requested in your conversation of yesterday with Under Secretary Casey, there are outlined below the views of Canadian officials consulted recently concerning native claims which might have a bearing on the construction of an oil pipeline from Alaska through Canada. The current status of these claims is described, together with Canadian estimates concerning the time required for their settlement. Finally, I have included our assessment of these views as of interest to you and your colleagues.

Canadian officials consulted state they believe that native claims will constitute no serious barrier to the construction of pipelines through Arctic areas. They do estimate that negotiations with non-treaty Indians in the Yukon, now getting underway, will take about two years. They maintain, however, that these negotiations will be limited to compensation and will, in their judgment, constitute no impediments to granting right-of-way for pipelines. Indians along the Mackenzie Valley, with rights under Treaties 8 and 11, are entitled to land settlement but have yet to select land. Canadian officials maintain that, even if these Indians should select land along the right-of-way, treaties permit the Canadian Government to take land for projects in the public interest on provision of substitute acreage and compensation for any improvements.

Other Canadian opinion, however, holds that existing and expected future native claims could delay Government consideration of pipeline applications or pipeline construction for many years. The May 16 ruling of the Northwest Territories Supreme Court, which put a freeze on all land transactions in the area which would be transited by a pipeline until certain issues related to native claims are determined, appears to challenge government assumptions that legal precedent will uphold its alleged rights under Treaties 8 and 11. It is also known that other legal challenges are contemplated by Indian groups or parties acting in their behalf. The bases for these challenges are not known to the Department.

In these circumstances, the Department of State believes that it would be imprudent to accept at face value flat assertions that native claims will not significantly delay consideration of Arctic pipeline applications or actually delay construction of pipelines through areas where native rights exist, either through treaty obligations or under Canadian law. In our judgment, we must assume that native claims could raise serious problems and cause considerable delay to the early construction of an oil pipeline from Alaska through Canada.

I hope that the above information is of use to you.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SECTION 1. Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 449), as amended (30 U.S.C. 185), is further amended by striking out the following: ", to the extent of the ground occupied by the said pipeline and twenty-five feet on each side of the same under such regulations and conditions as to survey, location, application, and use as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and upon," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That: (a) The width of a right-of-way shall not exceed fifty feet plus the ground occupied by the pipeline (i.e., the pipe and its related facilities) unless the Secretary finds, and records the reasons for his finding, that in limited areas a wider right-of-way is reasonably necessary for operation and maintenance after construction, or to protect the environment or public safety. Related facilities include but are not limited to valves, pump stations, supporting structures, bridges, monitoring and communication devices, surge and storage tanks, terminals, roads, airports, and campsites, and they need not necessarily be connected or contiguous to the pipe and may be the subjects of separate rights-of-way;

(b) a right-of-way may be supplemented by such temporary permits for the use of public lands in the vicinity of the pipeline as the Secretary deems are reasonably necessary in connection with construction, modification, repair, or termination of the pipeline;

(c) rights-of-way and permits shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe regarding duration, survey, location, construction, operation, maintenance, use, and termination; the Secretary shall consider the environmental impact of the pipeline as required "by the National Environmental Policy Act, and impose requirements that will minimize to the extent practical any adverse environmental impact, including but not limited to requirements for curtailment of erosion, restoration and revegetation of the surface of the land, and protection of fish and wildlife and their habitat;

(d) permits and rights-of-way shall be limited to the shortest term practical;

(e) each right-of-way shall reserve to the Secretary the right to grant additional rights-of-way or permits for compatible uses;

(f) the grantee of a right-of-way shall pay annually in advance the fair market rental value of the right-of-way, as determined by the Secretary, and shall reimburse the United States for administrative and other costs incurred in processing the grantee's application and in authorizing and monitoring the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of the pipeline;

(g) the Secretary shall notify the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs promptly upon receipt of an application for a right-of-way for a pipeline twenty-four inches or more in diameter, and no right-of-way for such pipeline shall be granted until sixty days (not counting days on which the House of Representatives or the Senate has adjourned for more than three days) after a notice of intention to grant the right-of-way, together with explanatory information, has been submitted to such Committees, unless each Committee by resolution waives the waiting period.

(h) such rights-of-way shall contain".

SEC. 2. Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is further amended by striking out

": *Provided further,* That no" and inserting "; (1) no".

TITLE II

SEC. 201. This Title may be cited as the "Trans-Alaskan Pipeline Authorization Act."

SEC. 202. The Congress finds and declares that:

(a) The early delivery of oil and gas from Alaska's North Slope to domestic markets is in the national interest.

(b) Transportation of oil by pipeline from the North Slope to Valdez, and by tanker from Valdez to domestic markets, will best serve the immediate national interest.

(c) A supplemental pipeline to connect the North Slope with a Trans-Canadian pipeline may be needed later, and it should be studied now, but it should not be regarded as a substitute for a Trans-Alaskan pipeline that does not traverse a foreign country.

(d) The actions of the Secretary of the Interior heretofore taken with respect to the proposed Trans-Alaskan oil pipeline shall be regarded as satisfactory compliance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to grant, in accordance with the provisions of section 28 (excluding subsection (g)) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended by title I of this Act, without further action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and notwithstanding the provisions of any law other than said section 28 and this title II, such rights-of-way and permits as he deems necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a Trans-Alaskan oil pipeline.

(b) The route of the Trans-Alaskan oil pipeline shall follow generally the route described in applications pending before the Secretary of the Interior on the date of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall include in rights-of-way and permits granted pursuant to this title II terms and conditions that will in his judgment mitigate any adverse environmental impact.

(d) No right-of-way or permit which may be granted by the Secretary of the Interior under this title II, and no permit or other form of authorization which may be granted by any other Federal agency with respect to construction of the Trans-Alaskan oil pipeline system, and no public land order or other Federal authorization with respect to the construction of a public highway between the south bank of the Yukon River and Prudhoe Bay and generally parallel to the pipeline, and no lease or permit granted by the Secretary of the Interior for an airfield or airstrip associated in any way with the pipeline, shall be subject to judicial review on the basis of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

SEC. 204. A right-of-way or permit granted under this title II for a road or airport as a related facility of the Trans-Alaskan pipeline system may provide for the construction of a public road or airport.

SEC. 205. The grant of a right-of-way or permit pursuant to the title II shall grant no immunity from the operation of the Federal anti-trust laws.

SEC. 206. Any crude oil transported over rights-of-way granted pursuant to section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 shall be subject to all of the limitations and licensing requirements, and penalty and enforcement provisions, of the Export Administration Act of 1969 (Act of December 30, 1960; 83 Stat. 841) and, in addition, before any crude oil subject to this section may be exported under the limitations and licensing requirements of the Export Administration Act of 1969 the President must make and publish an express finding that such exports are in the national interest.

SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to investigate the feasibility of one or more oil or gas pipelines from the North Slope of Alaska to connect with a pipeline through Canada that will deliver oil or gas to the United States markets. The cost of making the investigation shall be charged to any future applicant who is granted a right-of-way for one of the routes studied. The statement shall be completed and submitted to the Congress within two years from the date of this Act.

(b) The President is authorized and requested to enter into negotiations with the Government of Canada to determine the terms and conditions under which pipelines or other transportation systems could be constructed across Canadian territory for the transport of oil and gas from Alaska's North Slope to markets in the United States. The President shall, within one year from the date of this Act, report to the Congress the actions taken and the progress achieved, together with his recommendations for further action.

END THE CONTROLS ON FREE ENTERPRISE AND START CONTROLLING GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the Persident immediately put an end to the phase 3½ freeze which has caused such dire results in the marketplace by increasing demand while adversely affecting supply.

I believe the freeze and the forthcoming controls of phase 4 are a tragic mistake. Controls cannot cure inflation. The end result of rigidly held price controls would be a completely regimented economy with an accompanying loss of freedom and prosperity. We need to control spending and monetary policy, not the free market economy.

The rise of nearly all prices is clearly the result of the fiscal monetary policies of Government itself. When Government indulges in excessive spending—which causes chronic deficits; expands credit and prints more money, prices climb and the value of the dollar falls. Soaring prices are a result of inflation, not the cause of inflation.

We are faced with the choice of continuing the present course of continuing controls—which temporarily suppress inflationary pressures but leave the economy in a state of perpetual imbalance—or forthrightly dealing with the consequences of policy mistakes and restoring the economy to a sound monetary and fiscal basis.

Inflation is created by Government permitting, encouraging, or forcing an increase in the supply of money when it wants to spend more than it has the courage or ability to collect in taxes. I am strongly opposed to new taxes because I feel the taxpayer should not have to bear the burden of Government's irresponsible monetary and fiscal policies. Government's share of wealth taken in taxes must never interfere with the production of wealth so necessary to meet the social goals of our Nation.

I am in favor of controlling Federal spending and putting controls on the Federal Reserve's ability to expand the dollar supply beyond a reasonable increase per year. The dollar supply has been growing at an annual rate of over 8 percent and the more dollars printed, in relation to the volume of production, the less each dollar can buy, and the higher prices will rise. As I have said, and it bears repeating, continuing budget deficits and the expansionist monetary policies of the Federal Reserve used to pay for these deficits have caused the continual high rate of inflation which we are seeking to curb.

We must face up to the fact that any effective policy to stop inflation will be painful. Once inflation gets a foothold the only way to stop it is a slowdown in the economy. Each time we have taken the cure and the cure has begun to work—in 1960–61, 1966–67, 1969–70—those who make policy became impatient before the cure was complete and once again inflation ran rampant. This time policymakers want to have their cake and eat it too by only giving the appearance of doing something about inflation through the imposition of controls.

In 1971, controls appeared to work for a while, but at that time earlier monetary restraint had slowly been cooling off inflationary impulses anyway. Also, 1971 was the public's first contemporary experience with controls. Today the public is more aware and will not settle for less than solid results in stemming the tide of inflation.

Our Nation is in great financial trouble and if we are to cure the rampaging inflation which is so drastically affecting the American people, we must act now. One of our major anti-inflationary weapons is cutting Federal spending. When a family or a business is in financial trouble it goes over its expenses and needs and it ranks them in order of priority. We in government must be willing to do no less. We must be willing to make hard choices, to cut down, postpone or give up those programs which are low on our fiscal and social priority list.

Several things can and need to be done:

First, the President must immediately end the phase 3½ freeze.

Second, the Federal Reserve Board must take action, as it has in the past, to help control matters through its control over monetary policy. It should immediately raise the discount rate.

Third, the President and the Congress must cooperate in achieving significant cuts in spending and a fiscally responsible budget.

In April, I voted against the extension of the Economic Stabilization Act because they do not work, they are incompatible with a free society, they delude the people and because our Government can no longer afford to deal just with the effects of inflation, we must deal with the causes. It is unbelievable to me that the administration can really think that price controls can stem inflation. Only responsible fiscal and monetary policies, such as those which I have outlined, can stem inflation.

Are we returning to controls because experience demonstrates their effectiveness in halting inflation? In Milton Friedman's words:

Hardly. Consumer prices rose at annual rates of 5.5 percent in 1970; 3.8 percent in the eights months of 1971 preceding the freeze of Aug. 15; 3.4 per cent in the whole seventeen months of the freeze and phase two; and 4.1 per cent in the final six months

of phase two. Wholesale prices rose at rates of 2.3 percent, 5.3 per cent, 5.9 per cent and 8.9 per cent in the same periods. The price explosion since the end of phase two has been greatest in foods, never controlled under phase two. For the rest, it mostly continues a trend that started during phase two or unveils price increases concealed by phase two.

Holding the price of any commodity below its market level first increases the demand for the commodity because it is cheaper and people are tempted to buy, and can afford to buy, more of it. The second inevitable result is a reduction in the supply of the commodity. Because the people have bought more, the merchants' accumulated stocks are quickly swept from the shelves.

But along with these consequences, production of the commodity is discouraged because profit margins are reduced or wiped out. In addition, marginal producers are driven out of business adding to unemployment and scarcities of supply.

Price controls may appear for a short time to be working, but the longer they are in effect the more the difficulties will increase. Chronic shortages are always the consequence of prices arbitrarily held down by Government compulsion.

As shortages develop in one commodity, consumers would turn to others. The law of supply and demand would cause more rising prices, controls would have to spread and the entire cycle would begin all over again.

The end result of rigidly held price controls at all levels of production, as I have said, would be a completely regimented economy with an accompanying loss of freedom. To hold down the retail price of meats, for example, ultimately the wholesale price of beef would have to be fixed, the slaughterhouse price of beef, the price of live cattle, the price of feed, and the wages of farmworkers.

As recent as March 15 of this year the President disavowed any plan to put a ceiling on food prices. He correctly warned that "rigid price controls" on meat and other foods might stop price increases "momentarily, but as a result of discouraging increased production, and we would reap the consequences of great upward pressure on prices later."

Let us look at the results of the President's repudiation of his own words and submission to another round of economic controls. As the Wall Street Journal described the effect of the freeze in a June 18 article:

> The dollar sank. The stock market fell out of bed. The business community howled. The farmers and food industry were outraged. Even John Connally, one of the architects of the 1971 freeze, has had it.

Farmers are destroying new born chicks and hatching eggs because the combination of frozen retail prices and uncontrolled feed prices prevent them from receiving a market price above the cost of producing their stock. According to a news report, Texas chicken producer, Madison Clement, drowned 42,000 5-day-old chicks a few days after the freeze rather than face a loss of 20 to 30 cents per chick from feeding them until they were broilers. Pregnant cattle, another source of future food production, are being slaughtered for the same reason.

These food production cutbacks will result in severe shortages in the future, along with even higher prices for the consumer.

Oakley Ray, president of the American Feed Manufacturers Association, has warned:

> If these price-freeze rules continue for the full 60 days, the nation's supplies of meat, milk and eggs are going to be scarce for a long time to come.

C. J. Tempas, president of Green Giant Co., says:

> For the first time in our history, there might be great, gaping blank spaces on our supermarket shelves.

Dale D. Wolf, sales manager of Joan of Arc Food Company in Peoria, Ill., which last week stopped selling its canned pork and beans, has added:

> If consumers were complaining before about high food prices, they're going to complain even more now because they won't be able to get things. Price becomes secondary when you can't get the product.

The administration's response to the livestock and poultry crisis has been an embargo on exports of soybean and cottonseed products, both worldwide staples of livestock feed.

The consequence of this action is that holders of dollars overseas can no longer use them to buy these two commodities; so the dollar is less convertible for something of value than it was before the embargo, leading to new lows in world currency markets. This policy will lead to the dollar buying less and less in the world markets, ultimately adding to the very inflationary pressures the administration is trying to stem. Unbelievably, the Cost of Living Council is considering adding corn to the embargo.

It has been said that those who will not learn from history are bound to repeat it. Presidential economists would do well to restudy the long history of failure which has always accompanied controls. Price controls are no more than a cosmetic attempt to mask or suppress the consequences of inflation and they nearly always end up being more harmful than the inflation they try to control. Since the Emperor Diocletian imposed wage and price controls until today controls have never worked.

Our ancestors learned a hard lesson concerning price controls which unfortunately seems to have been forgotten. In the beginning years of our Nation, price controls almost succeeded in destroying our country's independence.

With an uncontrolled supply of Continental paper dollars in circulation, consumers kept bidding up prices. Pork doubled in price from 4 cents to 8 cents a pound and beef soared from about 4 cents to 10 cents a pound. As a contemporary historian reported:

> By November, 1777, commodity prices were 480% above the prewar average.

The situation in Pennsylvania became so desperate that the people and legislature decided to try "a period of price controls limited to domestic commodities essential for the use of the Army."

Like today, farmers refused to sell their goods at the prescribed prices and few would take the paper Continental dollars. Meanwhile, the price of uncontrolled imported goods went sky high.

On December 5, 1777, the Army's Quartermaster General, after refusing to pay more than the Government-set prices, issued this statement:

> If the farmers do not like the prices allowed them for their produce let them choose men of more learning and understanding the next election.

I remind my colleagues—and the administration—that this option is also available to present day producers now suffering the consequences of price controls.

The lack of supplies at Valley Forge was one tragic result of the price controls with their resultant shortage and still the severity of the situation increased. February 1778, the Pennsylvania Assembly "passed a law appointing commissioners in every city of the State with full power to purchase or to seize, at stated prices, all provisions necessary for the Army." But all appeals, force, and threats of more force, still failed to bring out the needed provisions. Farmers of that time, again as today, simply would not trade the fruit of their hard labors for less than it cost them to produce.

George Washington and the advocates of price controls had learned a costly lesson. Instead of plenty at low prices, they received scarcity and indescribable misery. Anne Bezanaon's book "Prices and Inflation During the American Revolution" tells us:

> By June 1, 1778, the act of regulating the several articles on the price lists was wholly suspended.

Price controls had failed.

After this date the commissary agents were instructed "to give the current price—let it be what it may, rather than the Army should suffer which you have to supply and the intended expedition be retarded for want of it." Reverting to a free market procured the needed winter supplies which had been nearly unobtainable the year before under price controls.

In January, 1780, Pelatiah Webster wrote:

> As experiment is the surest proof of the natural effects of all speculations of this kind . . . it is strange, it is marvelous to me that any person of common discernment, who has been acquainted with all the abovementioned trials and effects, should entertain any idea of the expediency of trying any such methods again . . . Trade, if let alone, will ever make its own way best, and like an irresistible river, will ever run safest, do least mischief and most good, suffered to run without obstruction in its own natural channel.

During the French Revolution the "Law of the Maximum" was declared, setting forth a system of price and wage controls. But, as Andrew Dickson White states in his book "Fiat Money Inflation in France":

> It could not be made to work well—even by the shrewdest devices. In the greater part of France it could not be enforced.

These controls proved to be as unworkable and disastrous as our Nation's

early attempts during the American Revolution and in late 1794 were abandoned.

Looking at more recent history, Henry Hazlitt has described President Truman's unsuccessful attempts to control meat prices:

Our politicians seem to have a mania for controlling meat prices, and have apparently learned nothing from experience. President Truman restored war-time meat ceilings in September 1946. The federally inspected production of beef, which had been 594 million pounds in August that year, fell to 186 million in September (only 28 per cent of production in the preceding September). Truman removed the ceilings on October 14, and in November beef production was back to 605 million pounds.

Yet in 1951 the Truman Administration was at it again. It raided hundreds of slaughtering plants and soon succeeded in bringing about another beef shortage. In the four-month period of June through September that year, the 95 leading beef-producing plants were able to buy only 65 per cent of the number of cattle they bought in the corresponding period in 1950. At the ceiling prices they were legally allowed to bid, they weren't being offered any more. Yet in the same four months the receipt of cattle at the 12 leading livestock markets were down only 12 per cent compared with the corresponding 1950 period.

What became of the cattle that were not bought by the 95 leading beef-producing plants? It's a fair assumption that they went through black-market processors.

It is impossible to point out a single sustained success with a price control program in the entire postwar quarter of a century. And as Milton Friedman has noted:

The Johnson Administration tried wage-price guidelines. The guidelines failed and were abandoned. The British tried a wage-price board. It failed and has been abolished. The Canadians tried voluntary wage-price controls. Their Prices and Incomes Commission recently announced the program was unworkable and would be abandoned January 1." (1971)

As I have continually stressed, only one thing causes inflation, high prices, and the spiraling cost of food about which consumers have been justly complaining and that is unsound fiscal and monetary policy. Inflation has been caused by the Government's own policy of running huge budget deficits and continuously increasing the supply of paper money and credit. Only one thing can cure inflation and bring prices under control. And that is to stop increasing the supply of paper money and credit and cut unsound deficit spending across the board wherever there is fiscal fat and low priority spending.

Controlled spending to stop the deficits and a controlled supply of money and credit are the only controls which are going to work—and these are the controls which I strongly urge the President and my colleagues in the Congress to work together to use.

As I have tried to point out, Mr. Speaker, and as Milton Friedman has so eloquently stated:

The temptation will be strong to try to make the retreaded controls work by piling one intervention on another—the scheduling of production, the allocation of raw materials, the rationing of consumer goods. The proposed export controls are a first portent. If the U.S. ever succumbs to collectivism, to government control over every facet of our lives, it will not be because the socialists win any arguments. It will be through the indirect route of wage and price controls.

Is there no way to prevent this act of monumental folly?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us end phase 3½.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Wall Street Journal printed an excellent article which outlines many of the reasons why the phase 3½ freeze should be immediately stopped. I include the editorial at this time and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 1973]

PILING UP ABSURDITIES

The administration froze prices to stop inflation, which caused the crisis of livestock and poultry feeders stopping production because their prices are frozen while their costs are not. The administration responds with an embargo on exports of soybean and cottonseed products, staples of livestock feed throughout the world.

That means: All those overseas holders of dollars can no longer use them to buy two valuable products; thus, the dollar is less convertible for something of value than it was Wednesday, before the embargo; accordingly, it was hammered down to new lows in world currency markets Thursday; it follows that the dollar will buy less and less in world markets, which in turn adds to those very inflation pressures the administration is trying to contain.

If the freeze-embargo thus sounds like a silly policy, that's because it is. Real chickens—the kind people like to eat—are threatening to become extinct because of the freeze. And the figurative kind—which people don't like to cope with—are coming home to roost as a result of two years of inane economic interventionism employed by the administration with the eager prodding of congressional Democrats and manipulative-minded economists.

It is no wonder that Arthur Burns is trying to talk some life back into the dollar and at the same time proposing yet more economic nostrums. His latest idea, suggested Wednesday to a congressional committee, is a sort of ever-normal granary for corporate profits. Profits would be skimmed off when things were going well, locked up in the Federal Reserve and released when there is an economic downturn.

We're not sure how this is supposed to help with the problems immediately at hand but we were happy that in the same testimony Mr. Burns hoped that the freeze would not run its full 60-day term.

We can go further than that: The freeze and the consequent export embargo should be discontinued forthwith before the economy gets deeper into the mess that is developing as a result of these ill-considered policies. Such a quick policy reversal might suggest that the administration has been playing politics at the expense of economics, but the alternatives are even less palatable.

The consequences in the food industry less than two weeks after the freeze give a hint to how unpalatable they are. The lead paragraph in an article by Mr. Prestbo in this newspaper yesterday said that, "The nation's food-production machinery is starting to grind to a halt under Phase 3½." The article cites a string of food processors who have either shut down or are threatening to shut down production because of the freeze. Their prices are frozen, but not their costs, which means they face big losses otherwise.

Why not roll back their costs by extending intervention all the way to the farm level, a berserk interventionist might ask? The answers are various: The costs of producing food products are inherently variable, dependent upon wind, weather, insect and disease cycles and other factors. Frozen prices coupled with adverse growing conditions could bankrupt farmers. Moreover, the market for agricultural commodities is world-wide. Freezing or rolling back prices at home creates the need for export embargoes to prevent foreign buyers from flocking here to snap up food bargains.

The embargo that we already have, on soybean and cottonseed products, does not begin to cope with the full range of problems that are developing in the food industry. An Illinois packer has stopped selling canned pork and beans, for example. A Green Giant executive sees a prospect of empty supermarket shelves, which will bring few "Ho, ho ho's" from housewives.

Yesterday, the Cost of Living Council threatened to add corn to the embargo; that is, creating yet another commodity into which foreigners cannot convert their dollars. The French, who a few months ago were doing everything they could to keep U.S. farm products out of the Common Market, suddenly are screaming about the new damage to the dollar's convertibility. Unfortunately, foreigners do more than complain. They also sell dollars, which adds to the instability of the U.S. economy and the world monetary system in general.

Nothing will do much to cope with the instability until fundamental factors of U.S. domestic economic management are brought back under control. More immediately, though, the freeze was a miscalculated step that can only lead to other stumbling, faltering, emergency-dictated steps and eventually to an impossible quandary. There is only one solution and that is to get out, now, while there still is time, and stop piling new absurdities on top of old ones.

INSURING EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the assurance we have received today from the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. DORN, I wish to commend those of my colleagues who held out for fair treatment for veterans who receive social security benefits by voting against the motion to recede to the Senate amendments last night and insisting that the bill be sent back to conference to insure that our veterans be treated like other senior citizens.

There is no group that is more in need of assistance than the elderly. Today, there are some 20 million Americans age 65 and older. Inflation—including rising housing, food, and health care costs—is particularly devastating to these individuals, most of whom must live on fixed incomes. Each and every one of them needs and deserves meaningful legislation to help them combat the soaring cost of living. Yet the bill presented to us by the Senate last night totally ignored a group of the most deserving of senior citizens—our veterans.

Perhaps that should not be surprising given the manner in which that bill was thrown together. Several weeks ago, the

House passed the debt ceiling bill and sent it to the Senate. That body—without public hearings; in fact, without any real consideration—added some 20 hastily drawn nongermane amendments. Moreover, it bundled them together in such a manner that they could not be amended by the House, nor could we even vote on each one separately. We had to take them as they stood or defeat the bill. And we had to do it virtually sight unseen, without a conference report, with extremely limited debate, and very little time, for the debt ceiling bill had to be passed by this evening.

There was no question that we must provide older Americans with meaningful cost-of-living raises in social security benefits. As Members of this House are well aware, I have consistently supported such increases in the past and I am working for them now. We do need at least a 5.6-percent social security hike. But the sloppily drawn proposal before us last night would not have brought that about for all social security recipients. For many it would have been nothing more than a cruel hoax.

Under the provisions of last night's bill and without the assurances that we were able to get from the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee today, tens of thousands of veterans now receiving social security payments would actually have had their veterans' benefits cut as a result of this supposed increase. This kind of inequity cannot be countenanced, particularly when the same bill contained provisions insuring that welfare recipients would not lose any of their benefits.

For over a year and a half I have been working to bring meaningful Federal benefits to our veterans. At no time will I sit back and watch them get the short end of the stick.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see those who supported this measure in the Senate come into my district and explain to the more than 1,000 veterans who would have been affected by the provision why they would have lost their benefits.

By voting against the motion to recede, the House was able to send the bill back to conference and to work out assurances that veterans will get their fair share of any cost-of-living increase.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to stop playing politics with the lives of our senior citizens. They have had enough of campaign rhetoric and empty promises like that contained in the version of the debt ceiling bill we considered last night. What is needed is carefully drafted, thorough legislation which will make each and every recipient's life more liveable. I commend my colleagues for having voted against the Senate amendments by opposing the motion to recede and thus having sent the bill back to conference, where we were able to obtain assurances that our veterans are to be treated like all other senior citizens.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the House fully advised as to the activities of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I would at this time like to provide a summary of the activities of the Judiciary Committee so far in the 93d Congress and recent developments relating to the structure of this committee.

Immediately upon assuming the chairmanship of this committee, one of my first objectives was to reevaluate the organization of the committee and the jurisdictions of the various subcommittees. In order to refer more appropriately the vast number of bills which would be assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary, I increased the number of standing subcommittees from the five which had existed for many Congresses to six and also established a Special Subcommittee on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. Furthermore, recognizing the need to have an objective appraisal of the jurisdiction of these seven subcommittees, I appointed a special ad hoc subcommittee on Committee Reorganization with instructions to make specific recommendations as to how the workload of the committee could be better distributed in order to promote the efficient and expeditious consideration of legislation referred to the committee. Representative ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER was appointed to serve as chairman of its special subcommittee which also included Representative JAMES R. MANN and three freshman Members of Congress: Representatives BARBARA JORDAN, ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, and WAYNE OWENS. The emphasis in selecting new Members to serve on this committee was designed to insure the effective participation and fresh perspectives of younger Members of Congress.

The recommendations of this ad hoc subcommittee were recently considered by the House Committee on the Judiciary and some of them have already been adopted and implemented. For example, the prior designation of each subcommittee by numbers has been changed and the subcommittees have been retitled as follows:

Subcommittee No. 1: Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and International Law.

Subcommittee No. 2: Subcommittee on Claims and Governmental Relations.

Subcommittee No. 3: Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice.

Subcommittee No. 4: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights.

Subcommittee No. 5: Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law.

Subcommittee No. 6: Subcommittee on Crime.

Special Subcommittee on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice.

In addition, consideration is being given to jurisdictional guidelines of each of these subcommittees to assist the chairman in referring legislation while at the same time preserving a certain amount of discretion in the chairman to obtain a needed degree of flexibility.

As my colleagues are aware, the Select Committee on Crime will become inoperative next month and it will be incumbent upon this committee to assume the responsibilities of, and the functions performed by, the Crime Committee in the 91st, 92d, and 93d Congresses. In this regard, I wish to advise the House that these functions which properly belong with this committee will be assumed by the Subcommittee on Crime and the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice which have primary jurisdiction over criminal justice matters. Furthermore, in order to assimilate the activities of the Crime Committee into the Judiciary Committee and to insure an orderly transition, we have added to the Judiciary Committee staff the former chief counsel of the Select Committee on Crime.

Other major recent developments include efforts by this committee to fully implement the legislative review—oversight—function mandated by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. It is the intent of this committee periodically to evaluate programs authorized by this committee and to closely scrutinize the activities and operations of the Department of Justice over which this committee has exclusive legislative jurisdiction.

I intend to effectuate fully clause 28 of rule XI of the House of Representatives which requires "each standing committee [to] review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, and execution of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that committee."

At the same time, it is quite evident that in fulfilling these legislative duties and responsibilities, it will be necessary to expand the personnel of this committee staff and concomitantly it will be necessary to significantly increase the size of this committee's budget.

The need for an increase in manpower and budget is also supported by the expansive scope of the activities which are and will be engaged in during this session of Congress.

First of all, in this session of Congress, my committee has already presented to the House of Representatives several major legislative proposals. Just this month the Judiciary Committee reported to the House on H.R. 8152, to provide an extension of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This legislation was a result of numerous days of hearings by my Judiciary Subcommittee. The bill passed the House on June 18, 1973.

Second, the Judiciary Committee also reported on H.R. 982, a bill which would impose civil and criminal penalties on those who knowingly employ illegal aliens. This bill was the product of a 2-year investigation into the illegal alien problem by my former Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. This legislation passed the House on May 3, 1973.

Another major proposal considered by my committee and presented to the

floor was H.R. 7446, to restructure the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. This bill passed the House on June 7, 1973.

Another legislative proposal which was approved by the Judiciary Committee was S. 583 which revised the procedures for congressional consideration of the Rules of Evidence. This bill passed the House on March 14, 1973, and was signed into law on March 30, 1973 (Public Law 93–12). As a result of this legislation, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice is presently engaged in redrafting the rules of evidence which were submitted to the Congress by the judicial conference.

In addition to the aforementioned bills which successfully passed the House of Representatives, each of the judiciary subcommittees is presently engaged in comprehensive projects which presumably will be completed in this session of Congress.

FULL LIQUIDATION IS PENNSY THREAT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the front page of today's New York Times warns the citizens of the Northeast that the trustees of the bankrupt Penn Central Transportation Co. are threatening liquidation of all service unless the Congress acts to subsidize, what would be for them, a profitmaking reorganization plan. This plan would in no way guarantee that the interests of the Northeast riding public would be adequately considered, let alone served. Yet, by the trustees' own estimates, Federal subsidies for a satisfyingly profitable plan might run as high as $750 million. I feel that it is time for the Congress of the United States to put the railroads on notice that we will not be intimidated by their public threats.

Passenger rail service in the Northeast is not a luxury but a public utility which is necessary to the well-being of our economy. The Northeast railroads have long been a victim of gross mismanagement. Any plan to grant Federal money for the operation of these railroads must not have bailing out the trustees as its primary motive.

At this very moment, there are several bills pending before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, which would attempt to resolve the problems caused by the bankrupt railroads in the Northeast. I, myself, have introduced a bill, H.R. 7373, which would create a Federal Railroad Transportation Authority—"Federal"—to take over the bankrupt railroads and their subsidiaries by purchasing them from the trustees. The advantage of this bill is that it would place the public's needs and interests as the prime criterion for railroad operation and reorganization.

The Congress of the United States cannot allow itself to be blackmailed by dire threats of liquidation. Although we must face up to the need for Federal funding of the Northeast railroads, we must also insure that the health of the Northeast economy will take precedence over any private profit considerations. I am confident that this body will soon take progressive action to resolve this dilemma.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of the aforementioned article from the New York Times:

FULL LIQUIDATION IS PENNSY THREAT—TRUSTEES WOULD DROP ALL SERVICES IF NOT ASSURED OF AID BY OCT. 1

(By Ernest Holsendolph)

The trustees of the bankrupt Penn Central Transportation Company proposed yesterday to end all freight and passenger service over a 10-week period begining Oct. 31 unless the company receives assurances of aid from the Government or other outside sources prior to Oct. 1.

The railroad, largest in the United States, said its liquidation schedule, which could put it out of the transportation business by the end of the year, was made necessary by the prospect of a "complete exhaustion of working capital."

SPOKESMAN COMMENTS

A hearing is scheduled in Federal District Court in Philadelphia Monday before Judge John P. Fullam, who has been overseeing reorganization of the nation's largest carrier. Monday was the deadline set last March by Judge Fullam for presenting a "feasible" plan for reorganization or a proposal for liquidation.

A spokesman for the Metropolitan Transit Authority said here yesterday that the three New York commuter lines run by the Penn Central would continue to operate even if the company went out of business.

Trustees said their 22-page plan was based on their conclusion that "Penn Central cannot be reorganized as originally contemplated by a traditional recapitalization of railroad earnings."

The plan indicated there had been no major progress in attaining the four conditions that they believed necessary to reorganizing the road on the basis of earnings. The conditions included streamlining of the vast rail network, gaining public funding, elimination of unneeded employees and increasing traffic.

As the trustees' plan was being made final, they reported that the railroad lost $18.6 million during May, 1973, and $90.5 million for the first five months of this year.

Insisting for some time that time is running out, the trustees said that there was a need for massive Government aid from Congress that could run as high as $750 million.

The Senate Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, headed by Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana is working on legislation to bail out the ailing railroad systems. Senator Hartke has asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to submit a budget for a reorganized Northeast system, and expects the budget to be released within a week.

Meanwhile, a bill to reorganize the Penn Central and five other bankrupt eastern railroads has been introduced by Representative Brock Adams, Democrat of Washington, a member of the House Commerce Committee and specialist in railroad issues.

His bill would set up a Northeast Railroad Corporation to take over the operation of the lines, a Federal National Railway Association to see Government-guaranteed bonds to finance the operation of the lines, and a New England Transportation Commission to establish the basic route structure of the corporation.

VIEW OF TRUSTEES

The Penn Central trustees said the "present regulatory system does not permit a timely streamlining . . . to eliminate unprofitable excess mileage." Further, public assistance, they said, has been inadequate to subsidize passenger service.

Compensation from Amtrak, the national passenger rail service owned by the Government and the railroads, was termed "very encouraging" but not enough to dent the $90.5-million in losses incurred this year.

The trustees' plan sets forth procedures for disposing of the railroad's rail assets, preferably for continuing rail use if practicable or, if not, for nonrail purposes. Offers for acquisition of the rail assets will be received by the trustees during a period of six months from the date of approval of the plan by the I.C.C.

The plan also provides in general terms for creation of a holding company that will own, through new or existing subsidiaries, the remaining Penn Central assets.

Securities of the new holding company or assets would be distributed in satisfaction of claims and interests on such terms as may be determined by the I.C.C. and the court. * * *

EXECUTIVE PRESSURE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress is once again abdicating its constitutional responsibilities and giving the President another "honorable" way out. In so doing, Congress is giving its seal of approval to any military action that the President may choose to take in Indochina until August 15.

I cannot endorse this congressional retreat. I deplore the response of this Congress to Executive pressure. I, for one, have not and will not vote to give the President a blank check to continue his war policies for any length of time. We know all too well what the President is likely to do with that blank check.

The 45-day compromise reached by the Congress and the President has no justification. I see no reason why we could not give back to the President, time and time again, legislation reflecting our conviction that war in Southeast Asia must come to an end. I do not feel intimidated by a veto or by a threat of veto. I am willing to risk tieing up the mechanisms of Government in favor of ending the war immediately. It is only with the deepest disappointment that I observe the forfeiture of Congress of its role within our system.

In the last few days, my hopes were raised by majority votes in both the House and Senate to end the war immediately. I disagree with those of my colleagues who believe that our capacity

to end the war is founded in our capacity to override a veto. Our ability to end the war immediately rests only on our capacity to achieve a majority, and to continue to send back to the President as many times as is necessary, legislation which will end the war immediately. I, for one, was and am prepared to keep sending that legislation back to the President until we end the war.

My colleagues have viewed our present alternatives as either capitulating to the President's desire to bomb Cambodia and Cambodians until August 15 or disrupt the functioning of Government by failing to enact the appropriations and debt ceiling bills which must be passed before midnight tonight, the end of the fiscal year. I believe that if the President had been faced with a choice of either bombing Cambodia or permitting the Government to function, he would have chosen the latter.

The world will long remember what we do here today. In the next 45 days, the United States will continue to rain bombs in Cambodia. We will continue to scorch the Earth. We will continue the killing.

We are asked here to ratify this bombing. I will not cast my vote yielding to the President the power to bomb and kill for 6 more weeks. The President is acting without authority from the Congress. I fear that he will interpret a 45-day cutoff date as congressional authorization for warmaking.

I cannot support a 45-day cutoff period. The futility of the compromise, the cloaking of the President with the authority to bomb, and the high cost of life and blood of Americans and Cambodians run counter to the basic principles for which this country stands.

Congress has finally mustered a majority of Members in favor of ending the automated, anonymous, and secret war in Indochina immediately. And yet, in the face of Nixon administration pressure, history will record that Congress permitted this opportunity to slip through its fingers.

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE BAHAMAS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues a significant event in the history of human political freedom which will take place in the Caribbean on July 10. On that date the people of the Bahamas will achieve their full independence from the United Kingdom.

This event should be heralded by our Government and our people. We achieved our independence nearly two centuries ago and we have been the defenders and supports of self-determination and political freedom for other peoples throughout our history.

I am pleased that this advent of a new sovereign nation in the Caribbean has been heralded by a memorial adopted by our Florida House of Representatives under the sponsorship of the Honorable Gwendolyn S. Cherry, a member of the State legislature from my congressional district.

I would like to call this memorial to the attention of the House and include the text of the memorial and representative Cherry's letter to me in the RECORD:

JUNE 20, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Federal Building,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: The Florida House of Representatives passed the attached memorial to join in the celebration of the Bahamas Islands Independence on July 10, 1973. There are many meritorious reasons for our country to join in such a celebration. One would be to cement the relationships between the two countries and another would be to show our appreciation to the number of Bahamians who have settled here in Florida permanently and became United States Citizens. They are our neighbors and we should share their joy.

There will be a festive and elaborate occasion. Britian's Prince Charles is scheduled to attend. Seven hundred islands and thousands of Cays will become one sovereign nation. For these and other reasons, I urge Congress to observe and participate in the Independence Celebration coming up shortly.

Let us wish the Bahamians well and much success as they journey down the road to Independence that America took in 1776.

Peace and Faith,

GWENDOLYN S. CHERRY,
Florida State Representative, District 106.

A MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES URGING CELEBRATION OF THE BAHAMA ISLANDS INDEPENDENCE DAY, JULY 10, 1973

Whereas, on October 12, 1492, Christopher Columbus landed in the Bahamas on an island he christened San Salvador, now known as Watling Island, and

Whereas, in 1629 the English King Charles I granted Sir Robert Heath, attorney general of England, territories in America, including "Bahama and all other Isles and Islands lying southerly there or neare upon the foresayd continent . . .", and

Whereas, Captain William Sayle landed on the abandoned islands in July of 1647 with seventy prospective English settlers, but the colony did not prosper, and

Whereas, John Wentworth was appointed the first governor of the Bahamas in 1671, and Captain Woodes Rogers was appointed the first Royal Governor in 1718, and

Whereas, the United Kingdom Emancipation Act came into force in the islands in 1834, the first step toward freedom and equal rights for the inhabitants of the islands, and

Whereas, the colony achieved full internal self-government in January 1964, and

Whereas, the Bahamas make notable contributions to the economic life of the Caribbean area through the production of wood products and salt, and through the fishing and tourist industries, and

Whereas, the Bahamas will enjoy full independence on July 10, 1973, free from foreign rule to chart her own course in world affairs, Now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to extend by appropriate means to the government and people of the Bahama Islands official congratulations upon the celebration of Independence Day in the Bahamas, July 10, 1973, and that necessary steps be taken that the people of the United States may officially partake in the observance of said day.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the Bahamian government, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

THE "SYSTEM" IS WORKING ON THIS FOURTH OF JULY

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, what has happened to American morality?

What has happened to American faith?

What has happened to American patriotism?

Questions like these have surfaced often in recent months.

These questions cannot go unanswered on this Fourth of July, therefore, I would like to spend a moment or two explaining why I think America can and is responding to the crises which confront her now in terms of morality, faith, and patriotism.

There can be no morality, there can be no faith, and there can be no patriotism where there is a sense of alienation from the very institutions which are making decisions affecting each and everyone of us. This is particularly true of a nation, such as ours, which, through tradition and faith, maintains its dedication to democratic principles.

Contrary to what many feel, I believe that the events of the past few months have demonstrated the strength of our Government. The system is working to expose those who took advantage of what they felt was the tenor of the times to use a highly centralized and secret bureaucracy to try to uncover some dirt and to try to cover up other dirt.

There are many "criers of doom" who say that all politics is dishonest. In no way can I agree with this. Our Constitution, in providing for the separation of powers, provided the people with a system of checks and balances itself. Deviousness, illegality, or lack of veracity in one branch of government cannot long persist; if the people will only exert their constitutional prerogative, through the other two branches, to check the deviousness and balance the system.

Our system, our Constitution, and, most of all, our people, the bulwark of our democracy, have responded, once again, to a crisis. In doing so, the people have once again declared their unwavering intent to play the integral part in their political system.

On this Fourth of July, I can think of no greater tribute to our system than that it has once again proved itself in the face of crisis. Our Founding Fathers were courageous in trying the impossible, a representative democracy, and many generations of courageous Americans have followed in their footsteps. I honestly believe that the vast majority of Ameri-

cans living today have once again confirmed our Founding Fathers' belief or faith in the morality of the common man and in his patriotic fortitude. I command you, the American people, for your fortitude in demanding that our system check and balance itself. Further, I commend my colleagues in all branches of government, for their willingness to prosecute this, the will of the American people.

On this Fourth of July, I can proudly say that the American system has responded once again to the crises confronting her. In face of technological complexity and all that it implies in terms of morality, faith, and patriotism, the American system has, through its sovereign people, proved itself desirous of morality and, therefore, worthy of faith and patriotism. Thank you America.

CHARLES HODEL: MOUNTAINEER

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago today, West Virginia lost a great mountaineer, an outstanding journalist, and a tower of integrity and independence in the passing of Charles Hodel at the age of 84.

It was my honor to attend the opening of the 13th annual season of the West Virginia historical drama presentations at majestic Grandview Park on June 23. The presence of Charles Hodel was felt very strongly at the opening night ceremonies, because it was his vision and determination which had realized the dream of the park, the amphitheater and the production of the dramas themselves. It was very fitting that the new president of the West Virginia Historical Drama Association, Emile Hodel, son of Charles Hodel, presided at the dinner and opening night ceremonies which preceded the production of "Hatfields and McCoys."

There were so many civic and cultural activities to which Charles Hodel lent his inspiration and leadership that a mere catalog of them would not bring forth the real zestful spirit he added to every activity. Although serious illness hospitalized him for the last 8 years of his life, the depth of his influence became clearer to me during a brief conversation I had with his son, John Hodel, now the editor of the Raleigh Register, last week.

All the planning and leadership involved in West Virginia's centennial celebration in 1963 was brought to a pinnacle of success by Charles Hodel, who headed West Virginia's Centennial Commission. I can see him now, standing with his crutches at the corner of the Rose Garden of the White House, as President John F. Kennedy emerged from his Oval Office to accept an invitation to speak at the State capitol in Charleston, W. Va., on the 100th birthday of the Mountain State. There he stood, proud, independent, chin uplifted, as the President of the United States strolled to the edge of the Rose Garden to grasp Charles Hodel's hand and commend him on his leadership.

The publisher of the two Beckley newspapers, the Beckley Post-Herald, now edited by Emil Hodel, and the Raleigh Register, edited by John Hodel, Charles Hodel set a high level of integrity, independence, and influence.

The memorial service for Charles Hodel was appropriately held in Grandview Park, in the Cliffside Amphitheater which Mr. Hodel worked so hard to establish. In the beautiful words of Charles Hodel's brother-in-law, Rev. Matthew Warren of New Hampton, N.H., we can appreciate the deep love of the land which he cherished. Under unanimous consent, there follows the preliminary description and text of the Charles Hodel memorial service, as well as the resolution passed by the West Virginia Legislature memorializing Charles Hodel's career, accomplishments, and service:

CHARLES HODEL MEMORIAL SERVICE HELD IN AMPHITHEATER AT GRANDVIEW PARK

A memorial service was held Tuesday morning at the Cliffside Amphitheatre in memorium of Charles Hodel, the late publisher of the Raleigh Register and the Beckley Post-Herald.

Hodel died June 16 in a local hospital following an extended illness at the age of 84.

The family has requested that those wishing to memorialize Hodel on a personal basis make memorial gifts in his name to either the West Virginia Historical Drama Association, which he headed in its early years, or to the building fund of the Beckley-Raleigh County YMCA, of which he was a founding father.

The following remarks were made at the service by a brother-in-law of Hodel, Rev. Matthew Warren of New Hampton, N.H., former rector of St. Paul's School in Concord, N.H.

Our objective today is to honor, with gratitude, the life and work of Charles Hodel. His experience in life was not an easy one, nor was it a simple success story. Rather, it was an arduous life, lived to the fullest, amid pain and happiness, struggle serenity, frequent defeats and ultimate achievement.

At the sensitive age of twelve he entered into a period of years fraught with trouble, frustration and suffering. Three times he endured amputation of his leg, all the while his life was dispaired of, and on recovery he was denied the usual pursuits and vigorous activity common to the adolescent male. In over sixty years I knew and loved him, I never heard him complain, show any sign of self-pity in any form, nor was there a shade of resentment, nor did he expect to be shown any special treatment or consideration because of what others may have considered his disability.

Charles Hodel often said that the experience had been a stimulus, a source of strength and ultimately a blessing to him. Frankly, he could outwalk all of us, and frequently did. I doubt that anyone in this gathering would or could accept the self-imposed discipline of walking from the top of Maxwell Hill to the Beckley Newspaper's offices, and return, as frequently and rapidly as he did. One might say he was the earliest of the joggers and the only one to do it on crutches.

Born into a poor, immigrant family of Swiss origin, enduring the early death of his young father, spending several years in a children's home, receiving little formal education, casting about for a vocation for a number of years (though always drawn to printer's ink, the smell of the lead pot and the charm of print) he never seems to have felt "put upon" by outrageous circumstances, never felt sorry for himself, never yielded to cynicism and had an accompanying sense of compassion for those who could not face life's frequent and often threatening demands. He was never merely sentimental about life, but he did have strong and worthy sentiments. He rose above hardship by hard work; he overcame limitations by patient care of what was manageable, by thoughtful evaluation and finally willing acceptance of his own and others' imperfections. Be it said, he never surrendered out of weakness and folly.

Charles Hodel's early life on a farm, however impoverished, instilled in him a love of the out-of-doors, a profound concern for conserving unspoiled nature, woodlands and good soil. For years he spaded his own extensive vegetable garden (not trusting plowmen to turn the soil uphill on his sharply graded downhill back yard). He planted a full garden and he alone cultivated it, and joyfully gathered his crops. All of this was done by hopping, unassisted by crutches, occasionally using a rake or hoe to stabilize his balance, and so far as I know, he never took a fall—and if he did fall, I doubt that he ever mentioned it. He never thought all of this "farming" unusual.

I was six years old when Charles Hodel married my sister Katherine and their home became my home on many occasions, certainly I was there daily as a small boy. When I ran into trouble with parental authority, I escaped to the Hodels. When I became a nuisance at the Hodels, I returned to my parents. Today's jargon would call that " a good game plan." On Sunday afternoon Charles Hodel took his very young brother-in-law in a ramble in the nearby woods. We would set forth, often in snow, in the vague direction of Sprague, and after a few miles he chose a spot where I gathered twigs and some heavier wood and we built a fire, sat on a log and talked about the world and all that was in it.

When we started on these walks, he gave me a small paper bag containing two good-sized potatoes. These we cast into the ashes and, turning them with sticks, awaited their readiness for eating. They were delicious. But Charles always provided the one thing essential to full enjoyment of those baked potatoes, and that was salt. How characteristic of Charles Hodel to provide salt!

All of these experiences often come to my mind and have nourished my spirit for years. Charles Hodel was a good man—but a salty man, too. He gave salt to more than food. He was a salty influence in this state and certainly in Raleigh County. He loved these hills and dales, and their cold running springs of fresh clear water; he loved the then verdant fields and, of course, the lovely views so abundant in this mountainous state. But, he never lost sight of our greater asset, the wonderful people who came under the spell of his publications, who felt the spirit and inspiration of his superb capacity to write strongly, firmly and imaginatively, and bring results. That takes salt.

He never ran for public political office. He never sought to be popular for the sake of popularity. He chose, rather, to remain independent, free to think and articulate his concerns and to publish without fear, without favor and to seek to let the people know what was going on in high places, and in low places, too.

Charles Hodel was not able to give himself to institutional religion. He did try to, he made the effort, but it never came clear to him, did not nourish the deep recesses of his makeup, and he was above pretending about so serious a matter. He was never scornful of organized religion and I know well he was sympathetic to us who have de-

voted our lives to the churches and temples of this land.

I have no doubt that he observed how poorly adherents of the churches and temples put into practice their profession, but he was not a trivial man who rejoiced in belittling and passing judgments on the hypocrisy and self-serving activities of others. He knew that life was tough enough and that the church and temple of the Judean and Christian religions were vital forces in western culture and he restrained himself from being archly critical of the shortcomings of his fellow man. That he felt deeply the importance of religion, felt morally responsible for his own conduct and the conduct of his family and his business, no one can doubt.

He wanted no funeral and he would want no pretense or uncharacteristic interpretation of that. After over forty years in the Christian ministry, I can share his distrust of the frequently barbarous and pagan way in which funerals are conducted and interpreted. Contemporary churches and temples might serve their Master more nobly and truthfully by sterner self-criticism in this area of religious faith and practice.

The newspapers have told you of this man's life and work. I have undertaken to tell you of some very human events dear to me, and of some things you may have wondered about this quiet and unassuming man. Let me now add one further thing: He was a loving and faithful husband to my sister; he was remarkably gentle, soft-spoken and totally devoid of the quarrelsome spirit. If he agreed, you knew it. If he did not agree, you knew it. But he was not given to acrimony or repetitious complaint. Honorable, peaceable, decent and fair, he has left to his deeply loved children an heritage of independence in thinking, of community responsibility in conduct, and a personal history of fearless struggle for integrity and just dealings among human beings, wherever they are.

If I know anything about the state of our nation and world, we could well use his strength, his courage and integrity today.

A century ago Josiah Gilbert Holland (1819–1881) wrote the following verse. I hope Charles Hodel knew it. He would have loved it and would have taken inward nourishment from it.

"God give us men! A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;

"Men whom the lust of office does not kill;

"Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;

"Men who possess opinions and a will;

"Men who have honor; men who will not lie;

"Men who can stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;

"Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking."

Rev. Warren then quoted Psalm 24:1-6:

"The earth is the Lord's and all that is in it, the world and those who dwell therein. For it was he who founded it upon the seas and planted it firm upon the waters beneath.

"Who may go up the mountain of the Lord? And who may stand in his holy place? He who had clean hands and a pure heart, who has not set his mind on falsehood, and has not committed perjury.

"He shall receive a blessing from the Lord, and justice from God his saviour. Such is the fortune of those who seek him, who seek the face of the God of Jacob."

The service ended with the following prayer:

"O Lord, support us all the day long, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes, and the busy world is hushed, and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. Then in thy mercy grant us a safe lodging, and a holy rest, and peace at the last.

"Oh God of peace, who has taught us that in returning and rest we shall be saved, in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength; By the might of thy Spirit lift us, we pray thee, to thy presence, where we may be still and know that thou art God.

"Oh Heavenly Father, who hast filled the world with beauty; open, we beseech thee, our eyes to behold thy gracious hand in all they works; that rejoicing in thy whole creation, we may learn to serve three with gladness."

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZES PUBLISHER

A House Concurrent Resolution memorializing the career, accomplishments and service of the late Charles Hodel was expected to be passed today by the West Virginia House of delegates.

The resolution was to be introduced shortly after the House convened at noon by Speaker of the House Lewis McManus, who said that the Senate is expected to concur in the resolution Wednesday.

Hodel died June 16 following more than eight years of hospitalization.

Calling the late publisher and president of the Beckley Newspapers Corp. an "eminent newspaperman, successful businessman and useful and public-spirited citizen," the House resolution noted at length the myriad civic activities in which Hodel was involved.

"To this 'Horatio Alger on crutches' goes much of the credit for the Raleigh County coal-rich area's development," the resolution states in part: "His was truly a full life, a continuing achievement and vast service to his state and mankind in general."

"The members of this 61st legislature hereby recognize and applaud the outstanding achievements, phenomenal success, singular contributions to the state and this area, and useful and productive life of Charles Hodel. We sincerely regret the passing of this able and devoted citizen who was a dear and industrious friend of many West Virginians, and extend to his sons and daughter sincere regrets on the loss of a faithful and worthy father."

RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM ARBOGAST

(Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, nearly 32 years ago, William Arbogast was assigned by the Associated Press to cover the House of Representatives. Today, after a 42-year career with the AP, he will retire, leaving behind an outstanding record of journalistic accomplishments and a large group of friends unsurpassed by any newsman or Member of the House.

I am going to miss Bill Arbogast greatly. He is one of the finest reporters I have ever known. More than that, he is one of the finest persons I have ever known. Since I met Bill more than 26 years ago, I have found him to be an extremely trustworthy, fair, and truthful person who strongly believes that an objective, thorough accounting of the facts is the hallmark of a good reporter. Bill's professional excellence, combined with his warm, easy going manner, have earned him the respect of every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I want to wish Bill and his wife, Eleanor, the best life has to offer and a long and wonderful retirement.

Bill recently prepared for AP publication a fascinating article highlighting his career in the House Press Gallery. Under the unanimous consent agreement, I include that article at this point in the RECORD.

HIS CAREER IN HOUSE PRESS GALLERY

Things have changed a lot since I came to Washington in 1938.

In that year, Congress appropriated about $10 billion to run the government, and was accused of being reckless with the taxpayers' money. Last year it appropriated $180 billion, and the interest on the national debt was more than twice as much as the 1938 appropriations.

It didn't take me long after arriving in Washington from Frankfort, Ky., to decide that the best beat in town was the House of Representatives. Members of the House and habitues of its press gallery seemed more relaxed and carefree than their counterparts in "the other body." Furthermore, the card games in the House gallery offered more diversified relaxation.

I badgered Brian Bell, then the bureau chief, almost monthly for assignment to the next House staff vacancy. One day he called me into his office and said there was an opening on the Senate staff and I could have it. It was a hell of a spot to put me on and I was greatly relieved when he told me he was only kidding and I was assigned to the House staff late in 1941. On June 2, 1942, I figured I really had arrived—I was allowed to write the bulletins saying the House had declared a state of war to exist between the United States and Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania.

Five speakers have presided over the House since I came to Washington—William Bankhead of Alabama, Sam Rayburn of Texas, Joe Martin of Massachusetts, John W. McCormack of Massachusetts and Carl Albert of Oklahoma. Only four members who were in the House in 1938 are still there. Three former members, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon became Presidents.

There have been some serious and light moments during those years.

I was sitting in the House gallery on March 1, 1954, working a crossword puzzle during a dull debate, when a band of Puerto Rican fanatics fired several dozen rounds of bullets into the ceiling, the walls, and the woodwork and into the bodies of five Representatives, all of whom recovered. That was a day to remember. I recall that our teletype operator put a terse note on the machine saying "they're shooting in the House chamber." Don Kovacic, then the news editor, later told me he got some gray hairs waiting to see what was coming next.

One of the saddest assignments I ever had was to go to Dallas when Sam Rayburn went into a hospital for terminal cancer. With some good fortune and some good contacts, the AP had a solid beat on Rayburn's death.

It was Sam Rayburn, a really great man, who invited me to become a regular member of what was known as the Board of Education. The Board met almost daily at the close of each House session and the old political pros who operated out of that little room in the Capitol made some weighty legislative decisions. Some of the regular members were Lyndon B. Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate, and Charlie Halleck,

then minority floor leader. I learned many things in that Board room, including how to keep pace with some experienced drinkers. A book could be written about the Board of Education if the sessions hadn't been off the record.

I well remember the day that Adolph Sabath of Chicago, New Deal chairman of the Rules Committee, feinted a heart attack to block a committee vote on an issue he knew he would lose. After Sabath was carried into an adjoining room and placed gently on a sofa, he opened one eye and remarked "they didn't vote, did they?" They didn't.

I well remember the 1947 and 1948 probes of communism by the House Un-American Activities Committee. They resulted in oblivion for some famous Hollywood movie figures and the jailing of Alger Hiss, a State Department official. It was the Hiss-Whitaker Chambers case and its "pumpkin papers" that catapulted Richard M. Nixon, then a Representative, into national prominence.

Sam Rayburn once said "I love the House of Representatives." Without meaning to sound corny, I do too. I have personally known more than 1,000 members and I don't recall having met a mean one or one I disliked. I have seen the House rise above politics to the realm of statesmanship when the occasion required. On fewer occasions I have enjoyed watching it perform like the Katzenjammer Kids.

I have enjoyed working for the AP and my associations with its newsmen and bosses. It has been a good and interesting life. The AP was Number One when I joined it in 1931. It still is and I think it always will be.

GIVE WITH THE RIGHT HAND TAKE AWAY WITH THE LEFT HAND

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has long been concerned about the needs of our Nation's veterans, I welcome this opportunity to present my views on pension legislation now pending before your distinguished subcommittee. In particular, I would like to express my support for H.R. 3851, a bill I am proud to sponsor along with over 125 of my colleagues who have introduced identical or similar legislation. H.R. 3851 is companion legislation to H.R. 100. Both bills are designed to make certain that recipients of veterans' pensions will not have their pensions reduced because of increases in social security benefits.

We should all be aware of the need for this legislation. As a result of the enactment of Public Law 92–336 last year, approximately 1.2 million veterans experienced a reduction in their VA pensions. Worse still, an estimated 20,000 were dropped from the VA pension rolls altogether. This tragic situation resulted because of the method used to compute VA pensions for veterans of World War I and others. Pension benefits for these individuals vary according to the amount of countable annual income other than the VA pension, with all pensions denied and completely cut off when income exceeds a specified level. Because social security benefits are taken into account when calculating countable income, the 20-percent increase in social security benefits provided under Public Law 92–336 effectively reduced VA pensions for about 77 percent of all veterans receiving pensions.

In other words, enactment of H.R. 3851 or similar legislation is not simply desirable but essential or absolutely necessary to confirm and restate Congress good faith in enacting the 20-percent increase in social security benefits. I have no doubt that when Congress passed the social security increase, its intent was to raise the aggregate income of social security beneficiaries by 20 percent. If Congress wishes to follow through with its clear intention and fulfill its implied pledge to millions of social security beneficiaries, then we have no remaining choice but to enact this veterans legislation at the very earliest possible date.

Already, passage of H.R. 3851 or similar legislation is long overdue. As early as September of last year, we recognized that reductions in VA pension benefits would result on January 1, 1973, because of enactment of Public Law 92–336. At that time, I enthusiastically joined with a number of colleagues in cosponsoring H.R. 16661, a bill which would have corrected the anticipated inequities outlined above. A number of similar bills were also introduced. One piece of legislation was actually approved by the other body. However, no action was taken in the House. Unfortunately all these bills died at the adjournment of the 92d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there is little need for extended debate on the objectives of this legislation. It merely corrects what was an admitted oversight on the part of Congress. Enactment of H.R. 3851 or similar legislation is very simply a self-confession of carelessness or negligence on the part of the legislative branch. I am not aware of one Member of Congress who intended that his vote for the 20 percent social security increase would result in a reduction of veterans' pensions. The way things turned out, Congress was put in the position of giving with the right hand and taking away with the left hand. In reality, the effect of our action was what we Missourians would call "Indian giving." Remedial legislation should have been enacted months ago. Action is long overdue.

It is my understanding this legislation has encountered some opposition on the basis that only 15,000 of the 1.8 billion veteran pensioners affected by the 20-percent social security increase will actually sustain a loss in total aggregate income. The opponents further point out that these 15,000 pensioners are those in the highest income brackets and that the average loss will be only $9 monthly. In addition, it is stated the Office of Management and Budget has set aside no funds to cover the cost of this legislation, and that its passage will lead to unnecessary increases in Government spending.

I submit that these arguments in no way undercut the necessity for enacting this legislation. Moreover, they do not even address themselves to the primary issue involved. The point in question is congressional credibility. Is the Congress of the United States going to follow through with its unambiguous intent to increase social security benefits, or is it going to back down on its pledge? When we enacted Public Law 92–336, our purpose was not to raise the aggregate income of social security beneficiaries by varying amounts. We intended to pass an across-the-board 20-percent increase.

Those who argue that the overwhelming majority of veterans pensioners have realized a gain in aggregate income as a result of the social security increase, and that, therefore, enactment fo H.R. 3851 or similar legislation is open to discussion, completely miss the point. Over 1.2 million veterans pensioners have not received the 20-percent increase in aggregate income which Congress intended that they should receive. There is one thing that is nonnegotiable: the credibility of the legislative branch of our Government. If Congress wishes to preserve its credibility, passage of H.R. 1753, H.R. 3851 or similar legislation is long overdue.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 26, I answered the first quorum call of the day, rollcall No. 281, at page 21305. On that page are listed those Members who failed to respond. The fact that our name does not appear on that list should be proof that I was present as late as about 1 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26.

However, Mr. Speaker, I had no choice but to face the very serious dilemma which confronts many of my colleagues. I had accepted a speaking engagement for that evening in our congressional district before a confederation of several chambers of commerce and business and professional clubs.

I had first scheduled this appearance in April. On that date I asked to be excused. The appearance was rescheduled for the fourth Tuesday in May. Again the pressure of business on the floor of the House was so great that I canceled for the second time and asked for the date of June 26, thinking that surely the House would not have a heavy calendar due to the contemplated Fourth of July recess.

Mr. Speaker, as I faced the choice, whether to be present for the important votes on the continuing resolution, and on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations. The decision involved whether the principle or proposition that one's word is as good as one's bond measured up in importance to missing some votes on the House floor. I finally decided that having given my word on two previous instances, and then having assured an important group of our constituents that without failure, any excuses notwithstanding, I would be present on the evening of the 26th. The decision boiled down to a matter of personal integrity. It was this reasoning that finally tipped the scales to make the choice to honor a commitment rescheduled for the third time, even though it meant missing some important votes on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I submit a personal explanation of how I would have voted had I been present:

On House Joint Resolution 536, the continuing resolution, had I been present: On the Addabbo amendment to prohibit funds from being utilized to support combat activities in Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 282 which was a procedural matter to limit debate to 20 minutes, I would have voted "no."

On the Mahon substitute for the Addabbo amendment, which would have extended authority to use funds for combat activities over Cambodia and Laos to September 1, 1973, I would have voted "no." On rollcall No. 283, at page 21318, being the Long amendment to the Mahon substitute to delete the words "September 1, 1973" and add the words "heretofore appropriated," I would have voted "aye." On rollcall No. 284 at page 21319, being the vote to substitute the Mahon-Long substitute for the Addabbo amendment which, in effect, mandated the termination of hostilities in Cambodia and Laos and eliminated delaying and deferring the prohibition against bombing until September 1, I would have voted "aye." Finally, on rollcall No. 285, at page 21320, being the vote on the Addabbo amendment, as amended, which was the final vote on the continuing resolution, as amended, and which contained a strict prohibition against further bombing, either from funds appropriated by this resolution, or funds from any act heretofore appropriating funds, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 286, on page 21320, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, it was also unfortunate that by my decision to keep my word to those in our district, I had to miss some important votes on H.R. 8877, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. On rollcall No. 287, at page 21322, being the rule on H.R. 8877, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 290, at page 21385, being the Baker amendment to cut our $100 million of appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity I would have voted "no." While I have not supported all of the poverty programs over the past years. I am convinced that in our congressional district, OEO has done a good job among our senior citizens and in its work for the neighborhood youth corps.

On rollcall No. 291, at page 21386, being the Michel substitute, which as I understand abolished no programs and which was a compromise between the budget recommendation and the increases provided in the committee bill, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 292, at page 21390, being the Roybal amendment providing for educational aid for bilingual children, if present I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 293, being the Quie amendment to allow the shifting of funds for disadvantaged students from State-to-State in accordance with the shift in population, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 294, at page 21385, being the motion of Mr. Michel to recommit, I would have voted "aye" which meant that I was for the compromise package of amendments which I am advised was midway between the budget recommendation and the committee's bill which exceeded the budget by $1.2 billion. I would have voted for the motion to recommit because, with a veto almost certain and with not enough strength in the House to override a veto, in my judgment it would be far better to send the President a bill which would be signed than to have no bill at all, and without the strength to override a veto.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 295 at page 21395, being the vote on final passage, I would have voted "aye."

NORTHEAST OHIO CONGRESSIONAL COUNCIL HEARINGS ON 1974 BUDGET

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1973, in a remarkable show of unity and concern, the citizens of northeast Ohio came forward to testify about what the cuts in the 1974 Federal budget would do to people and programs in our area. For an entire day, the members of the Northeast Ohio Congressional Council held hearings on the President's budget for fiscal year 1974. The members of the council are Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Congressman CHARLES A. MOSHER, Congressman JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Congressman J. WILLIAM STANTON, Congressman JAMES V. STANTON, Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK, and myself.

Mr. Speaker, there has been an abundance of commentary in this Chamber about the disastrous effects of the budget cuts on a national scale. But one receives a different perspective when examining these problems at home. There we are dealing in terms of dozens or hundreds or thousands of people—instead of millions. There we are talking about people we know personally who are going to suffer—instead of talking about dry statistics. That was the significance of the April 6 hearings and it is this local perspective that the administration never addressed itself to when it cut back or terminated programs for the people of this Nation.

I would like to share the record of these hearings with my colleagues today. I do so at this time because as we consider the President's budget, we must do what the administration failed to do—look at the budget cuts in terms of what those cuts will do to hinder one individual's hopes for an equal chance in this society.

A summary of the April 6 Cleveland hearings follows:

NORTHEAST OHIO CONGRESSIONAL COUNCIL HEARINGS ON ADMINISTRATIVE IMPOUNDMENTS, SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING AND BUDGET CUTBACKS

INTRODUCTION

The Northeast Ohio Congressional Council was formed in 1971 by Congressmen J. William Stanton (R–11), Charles A. Mosher (R–13), John F. Seiberling (D–14), James V. Stanton (D–20), Louis Stokes (D–21), Charles A. Vanik (D-22), and William E. Minshall (R–23). Our first chairmen were Mr. Charles A. Vanik and Mr. J. William Stanton. The Council was formed in order to unitedly work to solve the problems common to northeastern Ohio through the legislative process. Congressional hearings held by the Council prior to April 6, 1973 dealt with a wide range of matters from Social Security to Lake Shore erosion.

The administration impoundments, special revenue sharing and budget cutbacks have created a crisis of extreme import. The Council decided in the April 6th hearings to deal solely with testimony devoted to the administration impoundments, special revenue sharing and budget cutbacks. The 1973 Co-Chairmen are William E. Minshall and John F. Seiberling.

Testimony was submitted by eighty groups and/or individuals. The groups represent a wide spectrum of political and socio-economical philosophy. However, the theme is basically the same throughout the text: the national priorities of spending for capitalization, police "hardware" and military programs should be reduced while spending for people oriented programs in housing, education, economic development, health, safety and social services should be increased.

The synopses have been prepared by Congressman Louis Stokes.

SCHEDULE

10:00: Social Services; Frederick M. Coleman, President, Federation for Community Planning.

10:20: Social Services; Mrs. Alice O. Martin, PhD, Member Executive Board of 22nd District Caucus; Mrs. Norma Ringler, Co-Chairman Coalition to Support Human Services.

10:40: Housing; Charles R. Pinzone, Executive Secretary, Cleveland Building and Construction Trades Council; Roger S. Shoup, Acting Director Neighbors Organized for Action in Housing, Inc.

11:00: Education, Higher; John B. Turner, Dean School of Applied Sciences, Case Western Reserve University; James Lee Scott, Student, Cleveland State University.

11:20: Education, Higher; Walter B. Waetjen, President, Cleveland State University; Dr. Jannetta MacPhail, Dean, Frances Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University.

11:40: Safety; Russell T. Adrine, Attorney; Volodymyr Bazarko, Attorney; Ms. Carole King, Citizens Alliance for a Safer Community.

1:00: Social Services; Mr. A. A. Sommer, Jr., Vice President of United Torch Services; Mrs. Doris Geist, President, League of Women Voters of Cleveland.

1:20: Education; Mrs. Mildred R. Madison, Member, Ohio State Board of Education; Mrs. Theresa Cranford, President PTA, City of Cleveland.

1:40: Dr. Wilbur Lewis, Associate Superintendent, Parma City School District; Mr. Peter Carlin, Assistant Superintendent, Cleveland Board of Education (for Superintendent Paul Briggs).

2:00: Education (Libraries); Mr. Christopher Devan, Cuyahoga County Public Library, Ohio Library Association; Mrs. Judith K. Meyers, Ohio Association of school Librarian, Education Media Council.

2:20: Community Action Program; Ralph W. Findley, Executive Director, Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland; Paul Walters, Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association.

2:40: Housing; John E. Rupert, Cleveland Interfaith Housing Corporation; Mrs. Mary Warren, Lakewood Action Committee for

Housing, Inc. Lakewood League of Women Voters.

3:00: Health; Ralph Fee, Comprehensive Community Mental Health Center Programs; Rev. Paul A. Woelfl, Cuyahoga County Health Consumers Coalition.

3:20: Manpower; Bert W. Korte, President, Ohio Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors; George R. Ross, Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps.

3:40: Social Services; Samuel P. Bauer, Director Cuyahoga County Welfare Department; Herbert E. Strawbridge, President Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services.

4:00: Economic Development; George Qua, Buckeye Area Development Corporation; Charles A. Beard, PATH (Plan of Action for Tomorrow's Housing).

4:20: Social Services; Ethel Stephens, Personal Assistance Aid to the Senior Citizens of Ohio; Maurice Saltzman, President Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland.

4:40: Social Services; Mrs. Evelyn Marolt, Homer D. Webb, Jr. Center for Human Services; Sheldon Clark, Cleveland Chapter of Clergy and Laity Concerned, 23rd District Caucus.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Council For Economic Opportunities Of Greater Cleveland—Reverend Emanuel S. Branch, Jr.—First Vice Chairman:

The loss of Community Action Programs will mean "a rebirth of frustration compounded by anger" and a loss of faith in the American work ethic by the poor. Without the opportunities and services provided by CEO programs the poor will suffer irreparable damage and "we can look forward to at least a very volatile future."

The National OEO and CEO programs have not been provided with the funds necessary to give the poor a chance "to become a part of the mainstream of our society." Though the programs are not perfect we all have a great deal riding on their future.

A letter of concern for Community Action Programs, specifically at the Glenville Opportunity Center was received from Mrs. Harriet Walker, a recipient of the Center's services.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Association of Community Development Corporations—Stafford R. Williams:

The Association of Community Development Corporations serves as: a vehicle through which members can plan together, a distributor of equity and loan capital for housing and economic development projects, a resource of technical assistance and training for corporations, an obtainer of funds for projects, a reporter of accounting obligations of funding sources and member corporations, and a monitor of projects and programs of importance to its members. Because of cutbacks, housing and economic development could run into the millions, and two corporations are having to re-evaluate and to rehabilitate housing plans. A plan for inner-city shopping facilities may have to be cancelled. The results of the cutbacks often have a damaging impact upon the people.

Buckeye Area Development Corporation, George F. Qua:

For the past few years, the Economic Development Administration has been funding an organization known as the Buckeye Area Development Corporation which is a nonprofit group ". . . dedicated to keeping Buckeye Road between East 93rd and Van Aken Boulevard and the areas North and South of it from becoming another casualty of urban blight. The funds are used to underwrite the cost of a volunteer police force, an outreach station for the Cleveland Police Department, community activities, and for a paid staff." This Corporation was designed to hold the area intact until the proposed Cleveland Land Bank could be set up west of 93rd Street. This area on Buckeye would be a bridge between the suburb of Shaker Heights and the Land Bank. Proposed cuts in the E.D.A. funds ". . . would not only do away with any chance of setting up the Land Bank but would also seriously affect the operation of the Buckeye Development Corporation."

East End Community Development Foundation, Leroy McCreary:

The East End Community Development Foundation assists families in finding adequate housing for the community, aids businessmen in finding adequate security protection which keeps them in the community, works with councilmen to demolish vacant and vandalized houses, and tries to aid in rebuilding the community. Because of proposed cuts, the EECDF will have to curtail many of its efforts, and threatening the continued operation of the Foundation.

National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Theodore M. Berry, Mayor, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The President has initiated "crippling" budget cuts which will affect the funding levels of existing programs for at least another fifteen months. Also on January 5, the President "unilaterally terminated all new commitments for three congressionally supported programs." The Model Cities Programs in 147 cities had to "absorb" immediate cuts of about 45 percent. This all means that if Congress approves the President's budget there will be no new program commitments for community development activities in Fiscal Year 1974. "Presumably cuts will be expected to shelve the expectations of its citizenry, too—expectations which have been raised and nutured with encouragement from the Federal Government."

In response to this, we have heard from Secretary Lynn that on July 1, there will be $5.7 billion of unspent money for the Urban Renewal Program. Secretary Lynn failed to say that this money is only for projects already underway and is not available for new commitments. He also failed to mention that much of this money has already been committed locally.

Cincinnati has been a major user of Urban Renewal Programs. Our Neighborhood Development Program is highly involved in providing low and moderate income housing and supporting neighborhood improvements through loan and grant programs. These programs must now be curtailed. The freeze has reduced Cincinnati funding from $15 million to $11 million and only $6 million of this will be spent, because of crippling new HUD regulations. The President's budget suggests that "all programs have been bad" and we must find new direction. This is incorrect. In Cincinnati we have defined our direction and know our needs. We do not need "a transition period" in which little or no money is available to plan (our) future directions.

EDUCATION

Case Western Reserve University—Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing Jannetta MacPhall, dean:

In 1972, nursing received $145 million. The President's Budget for 1974 Fiscal Year totals $53 million, even though $313 million had been authorized by law. Zero dollars are allocated for the following items: capitation, financial, distress, startup grants to new schools, construction grants, traineeships to support graduate education, recruitment, and contracts which support research and research training.

Those funds which have been allocated are minimal, especially in the area of direct loans and scholarships for students. Many will be forced to go on part-time status and many others will have to drop out entirely. New students, primarily those from minority groups, will have to reconsider their plans if financial assistance cannot be offered.

Four institutions offering baccalaureate degrees in nursing are located in Northeastern Ohio: Case Western Reserve University, St. John College, Kent State University and Akron University. All will be drastically affected by the proposed cutbacks.

A fundamental question to be addressed is who should pay for nursing education. The patient has paid heavily from the beginning of hospital-based schools. Studies in the past 50 years have pointed out that the cost should not be borne by the patient—he should pay for care, not for the education of the care-givers. Nursing has made a concerted effort to move in this direction by phasing out, in an orderly fashion, hospital-based diploma programs and moving nursing education programs into educational institutions.

Nursing has the potential for making a very significant contribution to improving the delivery of health care now and in the future. The task will not be accomplished, however, without adequate support of an educational system that is separate from patient care cost. Even more severely affected will be the graduate program at Case Western Reserve University which prepares greatly needed teachers for schools of nursing and nurse administrators to direct nursing services.

Case Western Reserve University—School of Applied Social Sciences, John B. Turner, dean:

Contrary to the opinion of some, "social workers are not hustlers making a living off the poor." Instead, they assist "people to develop and maintain a competence and capacity to deal with their life situations in a positive and reasonably independent and productive manner." If the proposed budget of the Administration is approved for the next year, the School of Applied Social Sciences will lose in excess of $190,000, or ten percent of its current budget.

At the end of three years the annual reductions will total more than $600,000, or thirty percent of its annual budget.

If the projected social work cuts proposed by the Administration are passed by the Congress, the School will lose an accumulated total of nearly two million dollars over the next four years.

The cuts will most drastically affect tuition and stipend grants to students and, consequently, support for faculty positions. Minority students who currently receive forty percent of federal grants will be most seriously affected.

Statements have been made to the effect that a surplus of social work personnel exists. However, no manpower projection studies have been made public to support this contention. Furthermore, as we all know, the need for more qualified and committed personnel in the social services area far exceeds the present availability of such personnel.

Cleveland Public Schools, Paul W. Briggs, Superintendent:

In the Cleveland Public Schools, we have concentrated services provided with Title I funds on reading and mathematics skills. In fact, 94.4 percent of our present Title I funds are spent on teaching and reinforcing basic skills; the remaining 5.6 percent is spent for administration. Of the expenditures for basic skills, 48.6 percent is spent on reading; 34.5 percent is spent on mathematics; and 11.3 percent is spent on services such as health care, counselors, parent advisors, and speech therapists, which support the teaching of these basic skills.

Looking at the effect of Title I reading programs in grades 1 through 3, where we concentrate our efforts and money, we find that the program pupils in each grade made greater gains than those who were not en-

rolled in the programs. It is important to note that both groups of pupils started at the same level at the beginning of each school year.

We find similar results if we consider math achievement among third, fourth, and fifth graders.

Title II of ESEA has been instrumental in our efforts in Cleveland to see that every one of our 185 schools has an up-to-date library facility with quality materials.

In a large metropolitan area such as Cleveland, adult education is a critical need. Along with our Adult Day High School, one of the new facilities of its type in the country, we offer adult classes in 57 locations throughout the city.

Another area of continuing and increasing importance in the Cleveland Public Schools is technical-vocational education. In 1964, we had only 52 vocational classes. Presently, in two exclusively vocational high schools and in all 15 comprehensive high schools, we offer 409 vocational classes.

Education of the handicapped is particularly important to us in Cleveland. We have a new school for the deaf. We have a special school for the physically handicapped, and special classes for the blind and partially sighted are offered throughout the system.

Another area of special concern to us in Cleveland is nutrition. A hungry child does not learn as well as a well-fed child. Each morning breakfast is served to nearly 25,000 elementary children. We serve hot lunches in 84 elementary and 44 secondary and special schools participating in the National School Lunch Program.

As a superintendent, I have to be pragmatic. I have to be for the things that work best for our children. In Cleveland, the Title I program has been most effective in delivering the kinds of categorical money that cannot be dissipated and cannot be used elsewhere.

I am comfortable with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other existing legislation relative to education. I must say that we would like to see more federal dollars earmarked for our pupils. I urge your serious consideration and strong support in extending the present federal legislation which provides a direct delivery system to the special educational needs of children.

Cleveland State University, Dr. Walter B. Waetjen, President:

In 1972 Cleveland State University was awarded a five year Special Improvement Grant to provide start-up monies for a program in the allied health sciences. Subsequently baccalaureate programs in Environmental Health, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy were announced. A Physician's Assistant Program is in the planning stages. All were planned to become self-supporting after the initial grant expired.

"The effect of the proposed federal budget reductions is to cancel the five year Special Improvement Grant and to replace it with a much reduced three year program. The funds tentatively projected for the program will not meet minimum needs for equipment, modification of buildings and laboratories, nor for personnel to teach initial classes." Consequently, it will be impossible to provide enough qualified people in the allied health fields to improve health services and to make them less expensive.

Letters of support for this program at Cleveland State University were received from:

William H. Lippitt, Chairman, Northeast District, Ohio Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association, Inc.

C. Wayne Rice, Executive Director, Greater Cleveland Hospital Association.

Charles E. Chapman, President, Cuyahoga Community College.

Ms. Barrie E. Galvin, Chairman, Cleveland District, Ohio Occupational Therapy Association, Inc.

Boyd T. Marsh, President, Ohio Environmental Health Association.

Cleveland State University, James Lee Scott, Student:

By eliminating training grants for social work, many schools, minority and economically disadvantaged students will be seriously affected. General student stipends will not equal to the cost of graduate education. Many students are completely dependent upon training stipends. Since social work is a low-paying profession, "seeking loans which must be repaid after completion of training is not a feasible alternative."

Letters of support were submitted by:

Mrs. Mary B. Harvey, President, Church Women United in Greater Cleveland.

Naomi Fackler, 4374 West Anderson, South Euclid, Ohio 44121.

Mrs. Mildred R. Jaquay, Volunteer, Head Start and Day Care, Inc.

Mrs. Glen Smith, 11910 Phillips Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Ruth M. Luquatis, Educational Chairman, South-West Civic Council.

East Cleveland City School District, Leonard A. Visci, Superintendent:

Categorical funding under ESEA especially to schools where disadvantaged children are enrolled has worked effectively in attempts to achieve specified educational objectives. If general rather than categorical funding is instituted, the monies will be dissipated throughout the system instead of being used to solve specific problems.

Strategies for improving the quality of education for disadvantaged systems should be directed by the following guidelines:

1. The awarding of funding conditioned upon the establishment of programs geared to the objectives of the legislation referred to above.

2. The monies accruing to a school system as the result of federal legislation is not included as monies available to supplement general revenues.

3. That the intent of programmed development in these systems constitute an essential alteration in either school organization or instruction; thereby, providing for maximum impact.

Greater Cleveland Nurses Association, Judith A. Wood, President:

In 1972 6.5 million dollars were allocated for special projects to prepare primary care nurse practitioners. In 1973 and 1974, the request was and is zero dollars, yet, in the 1974 proposed budget the administration requests $39 million dollars for Allied Health Special Educational Programs, which includes training programs for Physicians Assistants. This type of assistant takes a short-term course which ranges from eight weeks to two years or more and entrance requirements range from less than a high school education to a college degree. Although AMA has approved guidelines for the use of Physician Assistants, in a 1972 study by Ohio Health Careers, 51.8% (1789) of 3,472 physicians said they would prefer Registered Nurses with additional training to work with them to provide primary health care.

My point is, why should millions of dollars be spent to train less qualified health workers when licensed professional nurses, who have already had 2–7 years of education can be prepared for a primary health care role with additional short-term education and in basic baccalaureate nursing programs? The 1974 federal budget will destroy nursing's potential contribution to primary health care and lower the quality of health care delivered to the people.

Ohio Association of School Librarians and Educational Media Council of Ohio, Judith K. Meyers:

ESEA, Title II and NDEA, Title III have been very instrumental in establishing libraries, "media centers," in schools throughout Ohio. In 1972 more than $3 million came into Northeastern Ohio from these two sources, and many more local dollars were generated because of the matching fund requirements.

Studies have shown that these programs have been among the best administered of all Federal Educational Aid Programs, and by their very nature have touched all children and teachers in every school. Utilization patterns and demands have reached a peak, and suddenly most of the funding has come to a screeching halt. Loss of ESEA, Title II and NDEA, Title III represents a direct, nearly fatal blow to school library and media programs.

Ohio Library Association, Christopher Devan:

The elimination of funding under the Library Services and Construction Act will drastically reduce the monies available for special services programs aimed at special groups of patrons, library constructions, scholarships for graduate study in library science, and programs of continuing education for libraries. Initial attempts to obtain a portion of the revenue sharing funds have been unsuccessful and indicate that this is not a readily available alternative source of monies for libraries.

Revenue sharing is designed to provide for local solutions to local problems. The interdependence of libraries and cooperation between libraries which Federal support has achieved, will collapse completely.

Pace Association, Henry Doll, Executive Director:

The proposed budget cuts and alterations ignore the human element almost entirely and seem to indicate that social service programs are unimportant.

Categorical grants, especially under ESEA, have contributed considerably to "assisting the disadvantaged and have encouraged the development of new educational ideas and techniques."

There are still too many unanswered questions about the new funding mechanism; specifically, whether school systems will experience a net gain or a net loss from the revenue sharing plan.

Ohio State Board of Education, Mildred R. Madison:

Congress appropriated $43 million to strengthen State Departments of Education under ESEA, Title V for Fiscal Year 1973. Over one-tenth, $5 million, has been impounded. Moreover, in the fiscal 1974 budget, no funds have been appropriated for this program. Federal Aid has shifted to general and specific revenue sharing which allows the state political control of these funds. In the past when money has been allocated for local school board programs by the state government, the State Department of Education has often been unable to hire or train a staff because it had not received appropriate funds. All Vocational Education programs have been cut for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973. Funds will be given to the state for use in Vocational Education.

In order to assure students a fair education, the following is necessary:

1. Retain categorical funding as in the present Vocational Educational Act.

2. Continue processing education funds through state educational agencies.

3. Defeat revenue sharing education.

4. Vote for the passage of the Perkin's Bill.

Parma Public Schools, Dr. William H. Lewis, Associate Superintendent:

The continuation of federal funding for education is essential and cannot be considered inflationary since it has been available for several years. Recent voter patterns indicate that the likelihood of state and local taxes being increased to support education is very slim.

Studies indicate that the NDEA and the ESEA have contributed significantly to educational opportunity and achievement. The loss of funds from these sources will have a catastrophic effect on most local school districts in the country.

A letter supporting this testimony and that given by Judith Meyer for the Ohio Association of School Librarians came from James J. Miller, Director of Special Projects for the Parma City School District.

HEALTH

Community Guidance & Human Services Planning Committee, Barbara Brown, Planning Director:

We have had many problems with funding since the President announced that he is no longer concerned with community mental health. It appears that the fight to get the per capita allocation for Cuyahoga County for mental health raised from $1.00 to $2.23 for fiscal 1974 might succeed because of the support from the office of Representative Louis Stokes.

Because Cleveland State Hospital is being phased out we will lose a facility that primarily serves the inner city. We need our per capita raised because something must be done to boost community programs to care for the mentally ill.

Cuyahoga County Health Consumers Coalition, Paul A. Woelfl, President:

The exorbitant costs of health care and of health insurance have already gone far beyond the reach of all but the very wealthy. Many people now believe getting sick means ending up in debt. This has caused dissatisfaction with greedy professionals, exploitive insurance companies and insensitive hospitals. It is evident that most people know that the $70 billion a year health business doesn't meet our present needs.

In view of the crisis, it is hard to understand why the administration has treated the problem with "silence and unconcern." "If I understand the Budget . . . the health services planning and development programs will be cut in half next year." The National Institutes of Health funds are being reduced to $33 millions. The benefits of Medicare were increased 20% last year; apart from the effects that inflation has had on these gains, the new $26 million costs proposed to add to Medicare beneficiaries will eliminate remaining gains and leave the consumer worse off than before. Proposals of this nature are not solutions. We urge the Congress to deal realistically with these overwhelming problems.

Federation for Community Planning, Health Planning and Development Commission, Mildred C. Barry, Director:

In Federal programs dollars should be carefully spent and responsive to people's needs. There is a problem however, when ". . . programs are arbitrarily cut without due assessment or when interests in dollar savings override concerns for people."

We are specifically referring to:

1. Medicare. The proposed changes in Part A would require the individual to pay the hospital cost of the first day and 10% of the cost for following days. A proposed change in Part B would increase the deductible medical coverage from $60.00 to $85.00.

2. Medicaid. "It would be unfortunate if payments for dental problems were terminated."

3. Alcoholism. The Administration has proposed to continue formula grants to states to fight alcoholism, but there would be no new project grants awarded. This would ruin several newly developed proposals.

4. Community Mental Health Centers. The end of Federal support for new mental health centers and special impact programs would end development of mental health services.

5. OEO. Though health programs formerly under OEO were transferred to HEW there are uncertainties about continued support.

6. Title IV–A, Social Services. The proposed restrictions would seriously curtail health services to persons in their own homes.

7. Rehabilitation. The President's veto of the Vocational Rehabilitation Bill will eliminate support of programs that help people become self-sufficient.

8. Education of Health Manpower. Federal cutbacks will adversely affect medical, nursing and dental schools.

Metropolitan Health Planning Corporation, Lee J. Podolin, Executive Director:

I am concerned with what appears to be efforts at economies at the expense of needed health services and the general lessening of Federal commitment to health programs. The major changes proposed by the Administration concerning Medicare would require beneficiaries, under Part A, to pay a hospital deductible of one day's room and board plus coinsurance of 10% of the charges for each day, and under Part B, to pay a deductible increased from $60.00 to $85.00 and coinsurance of 25% of the subsequent cost. The financial burden of the increased deductibles and coinsurance will cause the elderly great financial hardship. Another change would discontinue Medicaid reimbursement of dental care for adults, thereby denying to the poor the care they need. Other changes adversely affecting health services include proposed restrictions on Title IV–A Social Services Programs and the phasing out of the Hill-Burton programs, without assuring a funding mechanism to upgrade older urban hospitals and alternative facilities to keep people out of hospitals.

I would urge your consideration of these issues and encourage that "Federal priority be given to making comprehensive health services available to all our nation's citizens."

HOUSING

American Institute of Architects, Wallace G. Teare, Government Programs Subcommittee Chairman:

We believe that the Administration's moratorium is indefensible, and unless it is lifted immediately, it will continue to do irreparable harm to the cause of good housing. The Housing Act of 1968 established a goal of 26 million housing units over 10 years, with 6 million of these to require some form of federal subsidy for low and moderate income families and the elderly. This goal has never been reached. The average of assisted units has been about 50,000 per year. In 1972 the number of units reached 430,000 but this was still below the average annual goal of 600,000 units.

Though housing programs in effect need evaluation and improvement, there is no reason why work under these programs should not be continued during this period. Programs that have proven successful, such as the direct loan program for the elderly under Section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 should be encouraged to continue. Federal, state and local machinery for new programs should begin operation before the old programs are ended, with no toleration of Administration impoundment of funds.

C.A.R.I.N.G., Inc., Hugh L. Gaines, Chairman:

The 70,000 inhabitants of the North Glenville community are faced with overcrowding, inadequate schools, lack of adequate health facilities, excessive crime, substandard housing and insufficient public assistance to care for basic family needs. "Homeowners cannot receive federal assistance because Glenville has not been designated as an Urban Renewal or Neighborhood Development area." The blame must be placed on the banks for ". . . their failure to implement the Title I programs."

In July, 1970 C.A.R.I.N.G., Inc. secured a loan from the P.E.D.C.O. office of the United Presbyterian Church; this money has been used for housing rehabilitation. The moratorium on housing has "completely paralyzed the functioning of C.A.R.I.N.G., Inc. since the organization was basing its rehabilitation program on the F.H.A. 235 provisions. Furthermore, the United Presbyterian Church loan was "predicated" on being able to use the F.H.A. programs. We request that Congress end the moratorium so that we may continue our housing rehabilitation program.

Cleveland Building and Construction Trades Council, Charles R. Pinzone, Executive Secretary:

The Administration's curtailment of Federal aid to housing and community development not only ignores the needs of the poor and disadvantaged, but also threatens to have a serious adverse impact on employment and the economy. Many Greater Cleveland families that lack sufficient income must depend on Federal assistance. Construction workers also face greater unemployment over the time of construction recession that has already meant 40% unemployment over the past two years.

We urge the President and Congress to discontinue the moratorium on federally assisted subsidized housing until a viable alternative may be found.

Cleveland Interfaith Housing Corporation, John E. Rupert, President:

The Cleveland Interfaith Housing Corporation feels there has been ". . . some progress made toward achieving the much publicized goal of the federal government as set forth four or five years ago: 'the opportunity for decent housing for every citizen.' The immediate problems of the federal cutbacks are those of construction dollar loss, investment dollar loss, and tax revenue loss. However, the most important loss is felt by the people involved. The Cleveland Interfaith Housing Corporation has been able to construct 88 townhouse units. The land on which it builds has the potential to hold 2500 to 3000 units. Some active programs may have to be phased out. The Corporation may be forced to go out of business because of the budget proposals.

Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, Robert J. Fitzgerald, Director:

In 1973 we find almost one-third of the nation living in highly unacceptable housing depending upon the standards that are applied. In 1945 the Subcommittee on Housing recommended that 500,000 public housing units be financed by the government in the next four years. Congress enacted laws in 1949 that provided for the construction of 810,000 public housing units over the next six years, but this goal was not reached until 1969, twenty years later. Between 1968 and 1972, though the annual nationwide housing was about 1.8 million, the number of subsidized housing units was only 33,000. Though the problems are "clear and present" the freeze is destroying the very foundation on which practically all housing programs are based.

Programs designed to provide homes in "suitable environments" and "bring back life and decency" to the American cities must continue without any delay.

Emergency Resolution No. 362–73, Councilman John Barnes:

In the City of Cleveland there is a substantial number of people who live in substandard housing. There is also a shortage of available housing for low-income people and the private housing industry has said that they cannot construct houses without some form of federal subsidies. Whereas, the success of housing rehabilitation and construction depends on federal assistance, the Council of the City of Cleveland objects to the President's 18 month moratorium on federally assisted subsidized housing. We urge the President and Congress to continue the programs until "suitable alternatives have been developed."

Lakewood Action Committee for Housing, Inc., Mary Warren, Vice President:

Although the Lakewood community is doing much to meet the needs of moderate-income elderly, we are not meeting the needs of our low-income citizens. A limited survey found that at least 200 persons would qualify for rent supplements under the H.U.D. 236 rental programs. Fourteen and seven-tenths of Lakewood's population of 70,000 are over 65; of these 43.9% are under the poverty level of $1,757. The cancellation of the program has meant the end to a new proposed project for Lakewood that would provide housing for our ideas.

We suggest the following ideas:

1. The percentage of those to receive the supplement should not be a set figure, but based on the needs of all applicants for residency.

2. Land costs and lack of available land for new development in Lakewood make a program of direct housing allowance more feasible.

3. If revenue sharing funds will replace direct federal programs then specific funds should be designated for housing needs.

Neighbors Organized for Action in Housing, Roger S. Shoup, Acting Director:

Despite national awareness of the shortage of decent housing for low-income families, the President has put into effect an "arbitrary, brutal, ill-advised moratorium on federal programs designed to promote low and middle-income housing construction." One of the most significant results of the Housing Act of 1968 was the large scale private, non-profit housing delivery system. The moratorium will have a "crippling effect" on this system.

N.O.A.H. will be signing contracts with CMHA to construct twenty-one single houses on scattered sites. This program represents $7,595,000 in mortgage construction funds. This money along with N.O.A.H.'s working capital of over $400,000 was placed in great danger by the moratorium.

The delay will cost time, energy and money; therefore, we urge the following:

1. Begin evaluation of all federal housing programs recommending changes that will improve them without destroying the non-profit housing delivery systems.

2. "Develop federal legislation that deals adequately with commercial area development."

3. Develop a perspective that will not only include providing houses but also rebuilding the inner-city.

4. Re-examine the federal government's policy regarding land acquisition.

5. The federal government must develop a natural strategy that will encourage cities to develop plans to rebuild a total community in the central city.

6. A "building-retirement" procedure must be established as national policy.

The Orlean Company, Arthur Orlean:

We believe that it can be said that the BMIR program and the 221 d–3 rent supplement and 235 and 236 programs provided homes and living conditions that every American is entitled to have. "For the federal government to have terminated these programs as abruptly as it did appears to me to be an action of irresponsibility . . . It would appear to be far more significant to have wound down programs of this kind if in fact it should be determined that they are not worth while and have no significant value, than to have arbitrarily terminated the programs, leaving those dependent on them in a state of 'limbo' and 'disaster'."

Plan of Action for Tomorrow's Housing, Charles A. Beard, Executive Director:

The PATH Association is an organization which is geared to help Cleveland improve the quality and availability of housing. A freeze of subsidized housing bears closely upon the city's ability to survive. The federal government has terminated housing subsidies for the poor, yet it provides a subsidy of $57 billion to middle and upper-income homeowners. Without equivalent subsidies to the poor, Cleveland faces hastened inner-city decay. Public subsidy is the only practical and economical way to provide housing for the poor and near poor. If the moratorium lasts 18 months, it will create a housing shortage. The Association urges that Congress "end the housing freeze and restore the impounded community, social and economic development funds."

MANPOWER PROGRAM

Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps, George R. Ross:

Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps is a federally funded project sponsored by the City of Cleveland. The duty of sponsor presents the possibility of entanglement with politics. With each new city administration comes a new emphasis for the program. It has been recommended that ". . . youth programs such as CNYC not be placed under the sponsorship of city, county or state government, but that they be administered by non-profit organizations that will hire experienced professional personnel sensitive to the needs of the agencies' clientele."

Ohio Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors, Bert W. Korte, President.

The goals of the Neighborhood Youth Corps include: assisting youth to remain in school, providing meaningful part-time work, providing on-the-job training, providing placement in advance training, and placement in non-subsidized employment. "The Ohio Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors is extremely concerned with the President's recent decisions on the future of NYC. The program would be affected through the discontinuation of categorical aid in preference of block grants revenue sharing." It has been recommended: that special provisions under the proposal Revenue Sharing Plan guarantee the youth training programs, that opportunities improve for youth to participate in these programs, and that prevention be emphasized in youth work training programs.

SAFETY

Citizens' Alliance for a Safer Community, Russell Adrine, Co-Chairman:

The Citizens' Alliance for a Safer Community, which is associated with the National Alliance for Safer Cities, is a grass-roots organization of groups and individuals who recognize the need for immediate change in the criminal justice system. Their most immediate concern is that meaningful citizen participation is not being incorporated into the planning for spending LEAA monies. This lack of citizen participation leads to programs which do not reflect the real needs of the community, especially the allocation of large sums of money for additional surveys, more hardware and bricks and mortar.

Ohio Youth Commission, William Avery, Regional Administrator:

"The Youth Commission is directly affected by federal funding in three primary areas. These are—Title I of the Education Act, LEAA . . . and Title IV–A of the Social Security Act. To a lesser extent, we are affected by Titles II and IV of the Education Act, local mental health funding, vocational rehabilitation funding and health services."

Cuts in funds from the Education Act will drastically affect the educational program of the Commission and could jeopardize their Ohio Department of Education accreditation. Hiring teaching specialists, buying special equipment for remedial classes and maintaining adequate library facilities will become increasingly difficult if not impossible with the federal cut-backs.

Ninety percent of the Youth Commission prevention program at the community level utilizes Title IV–A of the Social Security Act funds. Cut-backs will virtually eliminate any hope of decreasing delinquency rates. Other supportive services (health, vocational, rehabilitation) for youth, both those in institutions and those on parole, will be adversely affected by the current Administration plans.

SOCIAL SERVICES

The American Friends Service Committee, Inc., John Looney:

The American Friends Committee, Inc. feels that Congress should establish a total spending ceiling which should be equal to or less than the President's ceiling. For 1974, military spending will exceed 1973 by $6.9 billion. "Congress should place a much lower ceiling on the military budget than the President has requested . . . Congress should eliminate some of the special subsidies and unfair tax advantages granted to a very small minority." These proposals are needed to solve critical domestic problems.

Concerned Citizen, Ms. Jean L. Caldwell:

"Inflation is running rampant. Even President Nixon's staunchest supporters are hard put to deny that fact. It is affecting the housewife at the most basic level—the grocery bill.

"On the other hand we are spending $5 million per day to bomb Cambodia . . . The defense budget is now at $83 billion. These expenditures reflect only the will of the Nixon Administration and not the will of the people. American housewives would rather feed children than kill them."

Cleveland Area Chapter, National Association of Social Workers, Inc., Paul Abels:

The welfare implications of the cuts reflected in the fiscal 1974 budget have gravely concerned the Cleveland Area Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. The budget reduces and then stops support for social worker education. The base of people potentially e'igible for social services is greatly reduced. As welfare has never been a popular issue, Revenue Sharing will further harm welfare funding. Many services will be eliminated—residential treatment of children, community mental health centers, and scholarships for needy students, to mention a few. The professional norms of social work have been ". . . to minimize salary and maximize services;" the N.A.S.W. hopes to work with Congress to reverse the harm the budget cuts will make.

The Coalition to Support Human Services in Ohio, Norma Ringler:

The Coalition to Support Human Services in Ohio is concerned with families ". . . living on grant levels below human decency where they go hungry before the month is out. The current trend seems aimed toward ending hunger programs rather than ending hunger in America." The Coalition finds the proposed ". . . budget on welfare and restrictions on eligibility and shift of a national problem to state and local government a most questionable approach to caring for the needs of the citizens of our country who are trapped in poverty . . . The Coalition asks for the withdrawal of these regulations which will only cause greater hardships."

Common Cause, Mike Arrajj:

Common Cause feels there is an imbalance of federal transportation spending on highways in relation to spending for mass transit. The Highway Trust Fund should be radically altered. Common Cause asks for the support of the amendment introduced by Representatives Anderson and Grover. The proposed amendment would greatly improve the planning process for investment in new transportation facilities. It would return responsibility for solving an increasing difficult urban problem to local officials who can better decide what is best for their community.

Statistics show that the automobile is the major source of air pollution in the country. The automobile is also "the most wasteful common means of surface transportation." Highway construction continues to displace housing units. Broadening the Highway Trust

Fund is a necessary step which is in the best interest of the public.

Community Volunteer, Evelyn Marolt:

Evelyn Marolt represents two groups, the West District Committee of the Center for Human Services and the Cleveland Council of PTA's. "Eliminating financial help" to social services to improve family life "has put these services on a level for which there is no mandated federal financial help. These services, (they) feel, are essential to keep our community healthier, safer and more productive." The Weinberger resolutions would harm the well-being of the community. "(They) ask you to reassess and re-evaluate the regulation issued . . . as a mandated service of HEW department with appropriate money spent to maintain family counseling and other help. . . ."

Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Samuel P. Bauer, Director:

The density of population in Cuyahoga County makes the administration of social service programs very difficult. The federal government wishes that welfare agencies operate at a 0% error rate. Such 100% performance is a desirable but unattainable goal.

Under existing state regulations, there are seventeen mandatory services for families, children and adults. What remains under the proposed federal regulations are Family Planning, Foster Care and Protective Services for children, and a long list of optional adult services. The elimination of group eligibility makes Group Service virtually impossible. An excessive demand is placed on staff and clients by requiring too frequent reevaluations of each person's eligibility. Social Rehabilitation Service (SRS) regulations should be revised with human needs in mind.

Concerned Citizen, Carolyn Edgerson: The President's recently unveiled new budget "slashed or obliterated" 113 social programs including health, aid to education, job programs, Urban Renewal Programs, OEO, and more. These cuts will save about $6.5 billion. The largest cuts were proposed for the agricultural programs which adversely affects the school milk program, conservation programs, rural housing subsidies and price support. No new programs will be approved for urban renewal. Model Cities, open space, neighborhood, water and sewer programs and public low-rent housing projects will be scrapped. Health care for the aged got major slashes.

The President's proposed budget will wipe out many of the Depression-originated programs. Though the programs had flaws they were "advanced for many working people and the poor." Nixon's budget will cause more poverty, frustration, crime, disease, ill health, run-down housing and unemployment.

Private Citizen, Anna Crook: Anna Crook is the mother of a nineteen month old child. She is a student at Cuyahoga Community College and a welfare recipient. She is a resident tutor for the Cleveland Board of Education. The Social Service Rehabilitation Regulation will affect Ms. Crook, her child, and many like them. Because she earns $10.00 over one-third of her welfare check, she may have to give up welfare altogether. This loss, the cutting of federal funds for college students, and no day-care centers for her child would leave Ms. Crook destitute. She hopes that Congress will amend the Social Service Rehabilitation Regulation.

Friendly Inn Settlement, Gloria Hawkins:

The Friendly Inn Settlement has taken the following position in behalf of its community:

1. We strongly regret the deletion from the 1974 budget of the Family Assistance Plan and the absence of any guaranteed income program.

2. We support the Ogden Reid Bill.

3. We strongly oppose the "voluntary" price controls of Phase III, particularly in the area of food and rents.

4. We strongly oppose the 10% cut in Medicare.

5. We oppose the abolition of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

6. We oppose the current freeze on HUD housing expenditures and the abolition of the Model Cities program.

7. We strongly oppose the proposed abolition by termination of funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

8. We oppose the funding cutbacks of the Federal Manpower Programs, particularly the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Friendly Inn Settlement Golden Age Club, Mrs. Lula Mae Garvin & Mrs. Essie Peavie:

The members of the Friendly Inn Settlement Golden Age Club feel the need for money for special shoes and eyeglasses for the elderly. Rent in federal housing has increased as have Social Security and Aid for the Aged. Money is not available to these people to meet the cost of living.

Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association, Clay Mock:

The GCNCA provides services to aid the community such as Head Start, Community Mental Health Centers and Teen Centers. "If the proposed budget cuts and the impounding of funds continues, approximately 2,000 neighbors of the GCNCA agencies will lose services through the Community Mental Health Center, juvenile delinquency programs, and possible day-care programs.

"If the Head Start Program is jeopardized, approximately 250 children and 75 women who were formerly welfare recipients will go back on welfare because they would lose their jobs . . . If the proposed changes in Title IV–A Regulations of the Social Security Act are put into effect, it will not be possible for our agency to serve close to 3900 people in preventative programs dealing with family life education."

Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association, Paul W. Walters:

The summer camp program planned by the Federation for Community Planning is administered by United Torch Services.

"The mandatory services required under AFDC which the state must provide to meet guidelines to obtain federal matching funds are reduced to only three-family planning, protective services for children, and foster services for children. Many services now mandatory would become optional at the state's discretion. Optional services would include day-care for children, educational services, unemployment services, health-related services, homemaker services . . . and transportation services. Camping is not mentioned.

"It is our belief that elimination of a program, such as the one that has been so effective in Greater Cleveland, would bring about tragic results this summer."

The Health and Welfare Coalition for Peace, James T. Peterson:

"We ask our congressmen to explain why the budget for Fiscal Year 1974 contains proposals for 'savings' by phasing out such programs as Legal Aid to the poor, Mental Health Centers, Federal Housing subsidy, and the Emergency Employment Assistance Program. We also ask our congressmen to explain how heavy expenditures in the military are helping us to 'save'.

"We conclude by suggesting that a much bigger 'savings' can be obtained by cutting the military budget and by *increasing* spending for human needs. The $23 billion for military operations, if applied to health and welfare needs, would eliminate all needs for budget cuts and would help restore already phased out programs."

Jewish Community Center, Harold Klarreich:

The Board of Trustees of the Jewish Community Center endorsed the National Jewish Welfare Board resolution that ". . . the National Administration is turning its back on decades of social welfare advancement." The budget cuts ". . . run counter to meeting the human needs of the country." As yet, revenue sharing has proven disappointing in its use for human services. In Ohio, only 3% of the first revenue sharing allotment is predicted to be used for such services. "General revenue sharing is being used by cities and states for capital cost, not to replace money from the categorical federal programs." It is necessary to end all cuts and suspension of programs until it can be done in an organized fashion so that ". . . vitally needed services will not be discontinued."

Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, Morton Mandel:

The Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland is concerned by the Administration's budget cuts and impoundments. The Federation feels that ". . . the shortage of adequate housing and patterns of racial segregation have precipitated crises in this nation's urban centers." The Community Relations Committee of the J.C.F. noted that the abuses that have occurred dealing with federally funded housing are not sufficient grounds to totally abandon the programs. The Jewish homes for the aged in Cleveland were authorized to develop semi-independent housing facilities on the grounds of their institutions. It will be difficult to continue the program with the 18 month freeze. The Federation finds the proposed prohibition on the use of donated funds for local matching purposes particularly indefensible. ". . . The establishment of eligibility requirements for recipients of social services . . . will severely restrict the delivery of social services to the poor. Many of the J.F.C. agencies will also be affected by the HEW regulations—Jewish Community Center, Family Service Association, and Bellefaire . . . The Federation places great priority upon the delivery of valuable human services and believes the Administration's actions will prove to be an obstacle to such a goal."

Jewish Family Service Association, Burton S. Rubin:

The Jewish Family Service Association feels that the proposed Regulations on social services would be harmful. "The prohibition on donated funds and the extreme, rigid eligibility requirements would not only reduce the availability of many social service programs, but would make ineligible many 'near poor' who are entitled under present regulations . . . The elimination of all mandatory services in adult categories and the inclusion of only three mandatory services for children communicates to us a major error in determining basic services for family life."

Concerned Citizen, Sidney D. Josephs:

People using public assistance are in dire need of continuing social services. The dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity will cause the complete elimination of some of the OEO's former programs. "Equally devastating to the future availability of human service programs are the provisions contained in the new federal regulations on social services published in the *Federal Register* February 16. . . . There will be a drastic reduction of mandatory and optional services relative to AFDC and elimination of mandatory services for adults. . . ." Mr. Josephs feels the budget proposals should be reconsidered, the programs the government is considering disbanding should not be discontinued as they are desperately needed. He urges that "the regulations be rescinded which would prohibit the use of donating matched private funds and which have more rigid eligibility requirements."

Lake County Welfare Department, Michael H. Mehlman:

Under the Weinberger resolutions of February 16, 1973 there exists a ". . . limiting of contracting potential. Local agencies that could aid welfare clients cannot do so, and the clients continue to remain in poor straits.

. . . Although child protective services would be a mandated service, there would be poor service delivery due to the limitations under the Weinberger resolutions, regarding eligibility and also contracting for service. If these resolutions become effective, who shall care for at least 300 abused children who will have to be returned to abusive homes?"

League of Women Voters, Doris Geist:

The League of Women Voters believes that the ". . . federal government shares with other levels of government responsibility for providing equality opportunity for education, employment, and housing for all persons in the United States. . . . The League has supported the Elementary and Secondary Education Act since its inception." The idea of revenue sharing is not contrary to the League's principles, yet the members maintain a skeptical viewpoint of the plan as the federal government can have a more objective viewpoint about different regions. The League is also concerned with the housing moratorium because of the need for housing in Cleveland. The members hope that the moratorium will be lifted and that housing will be improved.

The League of Women Voters of Cuyahoga County, Shirley Linkow:

We are concerned about the proposed new regulations on social services because of the effects it may have on our "neediest citizens." We are specifically concerned about . . . "the unrealistic tightening of eligibility, which limits services to individuals only, virtually eliminates services for past and potential recipients and sets an all too low income eligibility ceiling." Primarily, through this regulation HEW expects to save $100 million in social service matching funds. This could force many onto welfare and it would also . . ."deny self-help services to those people."

"We are concerned about the retreat from requiring Federal inter-agency child care standards in day care centers. . . . We are concerned about the arbitrary choice of services made mandatory for AFDC recipients, such as family planning, foster care services and protective services for abused, neglected or exploited children. Finally, we are concerned that the April 1 effective date of the proposed regulations will only result in hardship and administrative chaos."

Quality of Metropolitan Life Task Force, Charles Pinkney, Chairman:

The President's preoccupation with "balancing the budget at the expense of people's very real human needs severely curtails the quality of life for thousands of United States citizens, especially those who are black and poor. . . . Careful evaluation of the poverty programs has not been done and no alternatives to the present system have been proposed."

Our highest priority should be to improve the quality of life for all poor people. This can be done by providing: relevant public education, readily available health care, guaranteed annual income, equal employment opportunities, decent housing and equal justice under the law.

Concerned Citizen, Mrs. Willa Mae Singleton:

"I feel, and I am sure a lot of other people in my position feel, that Mr. Nixon is letting us down. Programs that benefit the poor are being phased out. There is not one program for which he has held up funds that has not hit the poor people.

"We are not begging. We are only asking to be helped. . . . I am not too proud to beg, I am begging you to please stop this attack on the people that is going on now. Use the power that Congress is supposed to have to stop it."

Socialist Workers Party 1973 Campaign, Roberta Scherr:

The Socialist Workers Party platform ". . . for combating inflation and guaranteeing a decent standard of living for all people" is as follows: an immediate end to federal military spending; free public transportation; an end to the federal budget cutbacks in social service spending; escalator clauses in all union contracts; disability, retirement and Social Security payments to be paid at union wages; reduced work week with no reduction in pay; free health care; crash housing construction program; taxation of wealthy corporations and banks; no state sales or city wage tax; all personnel income under $15,000 should be tax-free, all income over $30,000 should be taxed 100%.

Testimony on Military Expenditures, Vivian Wilson:

The United States is the top military power in the world, yet it is only eighth in doctor-patient ratio, fourteenth in literacy, fourteenth in infant mortality, and twenty-fifth in life expectancy. Most of the federal income taxes, 59%, are used for military spending. Only 19% is spent for human resources, 10% for physical resources, and 12% for other purposes such as international affairs, finance, and space. The figures show the United States' budget to be out of proportion to its needs.

Twenty-Second District Caucus, Alice Martin, Executive Committee:

The Nixon budget shows that "human investment is minimized in favor of military increases and business subsidies. . . . Our senior citizens must now pay for Medicare costs. Our Headstart programs . . . will be gone. The promise of community mental health centers which are needed for the entire district shows no sign of being fulfilled; in fact, existing ones such as Marymount Hospital have been closed. "Drastic cuts in training funds for the medical profession means abrupt termination . . . of graduate training and significant decreases in faculty." The tax structure, too, is a thorn in the side of America.

The Twenty-Second District Caucus requests that: each congressman prepare an alternative budget; each congressman prepare an analysis of the budget with regard to his/her district; there be an organized hearing by administrative officials such as Lynn and Weinberger, and that each congressman continue to press for tax reform.

United Torch Services, A. A. Sommers:

United Torch Services provide vital human services in Cuyahoga County. The money collected each year in their drive does not begin to meet human services needs. "Recently new proposed regulations under Title IV greatly limits the possibility of expanding services.

"First, the new Regulations reduce the time period of those eligible for services from two years to three months for those who were former applicants/recipients, and they reduce the period for potentially eligible from five years to six months . . . Moreover, under the proposed Regulations, people are disqualified for service if their earnings exceed 133% of the state's assistance level . . .

"Second, we are concerned that the new Regulations limit services available to people. Third, the elimination of group eligibility services means that group service programs such as Teenage Pregnancy Prevention Program, Consumer Protection Association either may have to be severely curtailed, or may not even get underway. We, therefore, urge our congressmen to do everything possible to eliminate new restrictions in the proposed Regulations."

Urban League of Cleveland, William K. Wolfe:

"The Administration compares the relative rise in national defense expenditures to those for 'human resources' within an expanding total national budget." The black community has benefited greatly from the programs of the Great Society. Their dissolution would be acceptable if they were to be replaced by a flow of money into the community through efficiently operating programs which could include a guarantee of some community control. "The treatment of the elderly is a national issue;" about one-third of Cleveland's senior citizens live under the poverty line. The tax situation should be readjusted to uplift the economy. "Another high priority for Congress this year should be the clean-up of the American environment." These areas are just a few of the social problems the country faces.

Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services, Herbert E. Strawbridge, President:

Vocational Guidance and Rehabilitation Services serves approximately 3,500 physically, emotionally, and socially disabled clients within the Greater Cleveland area, with a high percentage coming from its surrounding "ghetto" area. Programs enable the handicapped individual to learn new skills or to regain lost skills, and to determine his physical and emotional potential for return to employment after a serious physical or mental illness. VGRS's Industry Training Programs, for example, have successfully located training and employment for over two hundred clients. Another VGRS program, "Workshop Supervisor Training Program," is a five week program designed to develop badly needed technical competence among workshop supervisors and provide entry career opportunities for handicapped and other minority individuals. While the judicious expenditure of training monies is important, the blanket phasing out of all direct training is counter productive insofar as such basic and inexpensive programs are threatened.

Women Speak Out For Peace and Justice, Antoinette Graham:

It is the position of Women Speak Out For Peace and Justice "that domestic policies are the Number One priority, and that the money we need for these programs can come largely from the inflated military budget. . . . The budget eliminates funds for the Emergency Employment Assistance Program. This will save $690 million in 1974, but will increase welfare and unemployment compensation costs, and deprive 280,000 people of the dignity of earning a living. . . . Mr. Nixon has cut $616 million phasing out 515 mental health centers, lead poisoning and rat control programs, and medical research except for heart and cancer."

This organization strongly urges that 1) military expenditures be cut in half, 2) cost overruns be disallowed, 3) corporations be removed from welfare rolls, 4) executive impounding of funds voted by Congress be vigorously contested, 5) cuts in domestic programs be restored, 6) prices be rolled back and 7) Congress let the Economic Stability Act die.

Older Persons Program—Senior Citizens of Ohio, Sam Kralik, Sr., Louise Kadleck, Frank Simecek (Verbal Testimony presented by Mrs. Ethel Stephens):

"Some services provided by Older Persons Programs are transportation, cashing checks, receiving food stamps, securing necessary information on Social Security, Welfare, Veterans' Pension, Public Housing and saving money through the Homestead Act. Because of this aid, many elderly people are able to stay in their own homes rather than having to go to a costly Nursing Home. There are monthly meetings to inform the group members of any new benefits or to solve any new problem. This program is in danger of being cancelled."

Letters of support came from the following participants in the Older Persons Program:

Irene Mencke, Mrs. Janetta M. Crowe, Mary Truppo, Frances M. Schmidt, Joe Prinez, J. M. Forbes, Selma Grabowski, Mrs. Anna Schwalm, Mrs. T. Arnold, Mrs. M. Parsons, Mrs. Evelyn Square, Mrs. Madeline Mack, President—Cleveland Chapter, Seniors of Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DANIELSON (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness in family.

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 16, on account of official business.

Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today through July 16, on account of official business.

Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through July 16, on account of official business.

Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ICHORD, for 60 minutes, on July 10.

Mr. ROGERS, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOTT), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STEELE, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEGGETT, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. STOKES, to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,097.25.

Mr. RANDALL in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LOTT), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. HEINZ in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. STEELE in three instances.

Mr. ABDNOR.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. FRENZEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER), and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. LEGGETT in three instances.

Mr. LEHMAN in two instances.

Mr. CAREY of New York in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. OWENS in two instances.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

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;

S. 1759. An act 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; and

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6187. An act to amend section 502(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

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

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; and

H.R. 9055. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will sound 15 minutes before the recess will expire.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2261. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle; and

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives from June 30, 1973 to July 10, 1973.

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

H.R. 8410. An act to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit through November 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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 amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 636) entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to the above-entitled resolution.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7445) entitled "An act to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to extend the Act for 2 years."

ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES OVER THE FOURTH OF JULY HOLIDAY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 262) providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives from June 30, 1973, to July 10, 1973, together with the Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1973." and insert: "1973, and that when the Senate adjourns on Saturday, June 30, 1973, it stand adjourned until 10 o'clock antemeridian, Monday, July 9, 1973."

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses over the Fourth of July Holiday, 1973."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BRADEMAS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRADEMAS moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 262, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on July 10 next.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 262, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 10, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1094. A letter from the Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the annual report on the Federal Plan for Meteorological Services and Supporting Research, pursuant to section 304 Public Law 87–843; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1095. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting an interim report of a survey on the unmet needs for equipment in schools eligible for assistance under section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act, with notice that final report will be filed at a later date, pursuant to section 6(e) of Public Law 92–433; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1096. A letter from the Deputy Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed amendment to a concession contract authorizing the continued sale of antiques and quality handmade reproductions of the colonial period at Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va. for a 3 year term from January 1, 1973, through December 31, 1975, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1097. A letter from the Acting Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the third annual report on the development of systems necessary to implement the motor vehicle emission standards for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, pursuant to section 202(b)(4) of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1098. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of May 31, 1973, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1099. A letter from the Chairman, National Tourism Resources Review Commission, transmitting the comprehensive report of the Commission's activities and its study of tourism pursuant to section 6(b) Public Law 91–477; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1100. A letter from the General Counsel to the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement, transmitting a report on examination of Accounts of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 14(b) of Public Law 88–376; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1101. A letter from the Counsel to the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the report of audit for the Corporation for the period from January 1, 1972 through December 31, 1973, pursuant to section 10(b) of Public Law 88–449; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1102. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on certain marine mammal species and population stocks, pursuant to section 103(f) of Public Law 92–522; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1103. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on how progress in meeting important objectives of the Grant Plains Conservation Program could be improved; Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; 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. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee of Conference. Conference report on HR 8410 (Rept. No. 93–362). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.J. Res. 636 (Rept. No. 93–364). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 7445 (Rept. No. 93–365). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6791. A bill to provide equity in the 1973 feed grain set-aside program by increasing the payment rate for participants in plan B; with an amendment (Rept. No. 93–363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9143. A bill to provide for paper money of the United States to carry a designation in braille indicating the denomination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9144. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include guards, special policemen, and other personnel of the General Services Administration engaged in protective services for Federal buildings within the provisions of such title providing civil service retirement for Government employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY of New York, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 9145. 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. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 9146. A bill to define the war powers of Congress and the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 653. Joint resolution concerning the war powers of Congress and the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H. Res. 481. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

268. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the legislature of the State of California, relative to fund for flood protection for the town of Isleton, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

248. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Frank W. Goree, Menard, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, no greater tribute can be paid to the late President Harry S. Truman than to acknowledge that he was a man of the people and that he did all he could for them. Knowing that he was serving the people to the best of his ability was his greatest source of strength and pride.

We can all certainly agree that while he was among us he was a man of action who sought peace with his own conscience rather than with the popularity polls. How refreshing is the memory of the sign on his White House desk, "The Buck Stops Here."

Besides his very individual style, which will always be an important part of the folklore of the politics of this country, the substance of his public career has also left an important mark.

He rose swiftly up the political ladder to the Senate where he achieved national prominence as chairman of a special committee investigating waste in military spending. Although he fought to stay off the Democratic ticket in 1944 he finally agreed to leave the Senate for the Vice Presidency, although he felt he could no longer be a man of action in that office. As fate would have it, however, Harry S. Truman was to be President within 3 months of Inauguration Day.

Although he was always a controversial figure, there was never any question that he had the courage to make some monumental decisions. During the years of his Presidency were formulated the foreign policy programs which have shaped the whole postwar world—the Truman doctrine, massive foreign aid in the form of the Marshall Plan, the ratification of the United Nations Charter, and the signing of the NATO and other mutual security treaties.

On the domestic front, although Congress was not as responsive to his initiatives as it was to those on the foreign scene, he laid the groundwork for later legislation in the field of civil rights, housing, health, education, and social welfare. In fact, his forthright stand on civil rights was one of the factors which led to the confident predictions of the pollsters that Dewey would defeat him in a landslide in 1948. Although he left the Presidency in the shadow of a much more popular successor, historians have already ranked him as a near-great President—honest, courageous, and effective.

President Truman had a full and rewarding life. May his wife and daughter be sustained by the knowledge that he served his country with exceptional effectiveness at a time of great crisis.