QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, September 5, 1973. At the conclusion of remarks by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader under the standing order, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of the transaction of routine morning business the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9590, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office for fiscal year 1974. There is a time limitation on that bill of 2 hours, with 1 hour on any amendment and ½ hour on any amendment to an amendment, debatable motion for appeal. There may be some controversy about the bill—I do not know—but in any event the yeas and nays have been ordered on final passage of the bill.

On final passage of H.R. 9590, the Senate will go into executive session to consider Ex. L, 93d Congress, 1st Session, an amendment to article LXI of the Charter of the United Nations, and will vote immediately on the adoption of that measure. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Upon the return to legislative session the Senate will take up, under a time limitation, S. 1914, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and for other purposes.

I expect yea-and-nay votes on amendments thereto and on final passage of that bill.

In summation, the leadership would anticipate, at the very least, three yea-and-nay votes on the first day after the Senate reconvenes following the August recess, and I have a feeling there will be more than three votes.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon, Wednesday, September 5, 1973.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 7:28 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, September 5, 1973, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 3, 1973:

OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY

John Eger, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, vice George Frank Mansur, Jr., resigned.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for terms expiring April 28, 1977:

David Walbridge Kendall, of Michigan, reappointment.

Rose M. Fanucchi, of California, vice Catherine May Bedell.

Claude S. Brinegar, Secretary of Transportation, vice John A. Volpe.

CONFIRMATIONS—AUGUST 3, 1973

The Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 3, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

William Keith Brehm, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Karl E. Bakke, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

James B. Gregory, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Ralph F. Keil, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years.

William F. Clayton, of South Dakota, to be U.S. Attorney for the District of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

Donald J. Stohr, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 14 years.

Harold M. Fong, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years.

George K. McKinney, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years.

Harold M. Grindle, of Iowa, to be U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Iowa for the term of 4 years.

Victor Cardosi, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. Marshal for the District of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years.

Thomas K. Kaulukukui, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years.

Edward J. Michaels, of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years.

Doroteo R. Baca, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years.

Walter J. Link, of North Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of North Dakota for the term of 4 years.

George L. Tennyson, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

Royal K. Buttars, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years.

Doyle W. James, of Colorado, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years.

Charles E. Robinson, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years.

Bill Carnes Murray, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

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

THE JUDICIARY

Leonard I. Garth, of New Jersey, to be a U.S. circuit judge, third circuit.

Joseph T. Sneed, of California, to be a U.S. circuit judge, ninth circuit.

John A. Reed, Jr., of Florida, to be a U.S. district judge for the middle district of Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, August 3, 1973*

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

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

We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him.—Romans 8: 28.

O Thou who art the light of all that is true and the life of all that is good, lay Thy hand in blessing upon us as we wait upon Thee and as we prepare ourselves for our August recess. Grant that we may so use these days that we may return renewed in body, mind, and spirit, and may those who travel, travel safely.

Keep us all, standing on this floor and in the gallaries, mindful of our duty to our country, to love her, to support her Constitution, to obey her laws, to respect her flag and to defend her against all enemies. May we also remember that Thou art ever with us always working for our good.

The Lord bless you and keep you in his love. 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 bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4083. An act to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6713. An act to amend the District of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Columbia Election Act regarding the times for filing certain petitions, regulating the primary election for Delegate from the District of Columbia and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 8250. An act to authorize certain programs and activities of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8917. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9474. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the monthly rates of disability and death pensions, and dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8917) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CHILES, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8152) entitled "An act to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice, and for other purposes."

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

S. 1980. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

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 Wednesday, September 5, 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.

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 September 5, 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.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, September 5, 1973.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE POLICE FORCE

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, 1973, at 10 a.m., more than 250 men of the Federal Protective Service held a rally on the west front of the Capitol to protest the inequities they experience.

The Federal Protective Service Police Force, unlike other law enforcement agents, do not receive:

A. Full law enforcement training . . .

B. Do not have clear-cut jurisdictional authority . . .

C. Do not receive grossly low salaries . . .

D. Do not enjoy benefits that other law enforcement agents receive . . .

The situation for FPS officers is patently unjust and lacking in equity.

I have introduced H.R. 7266, a bill to establish the Federal Protective Service Police Force within the General Services Administration and to provide minimum training, pay and other benefits for such a police force. Subcommittee hearings on my bill have been delayed because GSA has not yet submitted certain reports and documents which the subcommittee needs.

I alert my colleagues to this situation because I believe you will share my feeling that these men who protect us daily are clearly entitled to more equitable treatment and that entitlement should not be delayed by GSA procrastinations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON FOOD PRICE RISE

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

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I address a matter of vital importance to each of our constituents. The price of food, and present food shortages, reflect much more than a temporary, superficial problem.

Food prices are rising faster overnight than paychecks are in an entire year. Those on fixed incomes, especially the elderly, face incredible hardship.

Too many Americans feel the Federal Government has turned a deaf ear to this problem. I urge each Member of the House, as the closest link between the citizen and his Federal Government, to hold public hearings during the August recess on the fundamental question of food prices and food supplies.

I have great faith in listening to the people of this country. From hearings conducted by Members of this body perhaps will come new ideas for Congress to take the initiative in altering the present disastrous economic game plan.

When hospitals cannot purchase beef, when eggs are priced beyond the consumer, and when milk becomes a luxury, then we must reexamine our direction and purpose.

The Secretary of Agriculture merely brushes all of this aside, calling it a "rationing" of goods, but what he thoughtlessly forgets is that this is economic rationing, with decreasing amounts available to the poor and working families and unlimited quantities available to the wealthy.

I believe it is high time for the Members of Congress to begin concerted, organized efforts to bring the outrage of the citizenry to Washington. Public hearings during August seem an ideal way for us to allow individuals to express themselves on this serious matter, and to let the people make their ideas available for our consideration. We must let the people know that we will listen and we share their deep concern over this most fundamental issue.

SENATE HEARING ROOM IN TV COMMERCIAL

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

Mr. BURGENER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand last evening's edition of the Washington Star-News. On page C–1 there is a feature story with pictures of a most unusual occurrence. The Senate Watergate Committee is pictured during the filming of a commercial television entertainment show. The Senate hearing room is used for the setting of this rather incredible performance. Being new in the Congress, I do not know all the rules and regulations, but I am moved to ask at least the following questions:

First. Is it customary to transfer a quasi-judicial hearing, or at least the principal interrogators of such a hearing, into what appears to be an entertainment vehicle?

Second. Will the U.S. Government receive any of the revenues developed from the sale of commercials during the public showing?

Third. Why was the show billed as open to the public, and then priority given to the staff persons of the Senators who appeared, while between 500 and 1,000 people were turned away?

These are but a few questions that immediately come to mind, but I am certain that my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and the public at large will have many, many more.

Let me state for the record, and only speaking for myself, that I deeply resent these important hearings being taken in such a light vein. When does a serious legislative matter become entertainment? When does the vitally important quest for truth take on an almost sideshow atmosphere? When does audience participation move from the entertainment world to the Halls of the U.S. Congress?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I point out that I do not know the answers to these questions, but I hope that countless Americans will but ask the same ones. I only know that I am angered and saddened that this event made it necessary for me to even ask.

PRICE CEILING ON BEEF SHOULD BE LIFTED

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

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows what is happening today as regards the meat supply in this country. But who is doing anything about it? I think the senior Senator from Texas yesterday took a determined step in the right direction. He offered an amendment this Wednesday to H.R. 5777—the Hobby Protection Act, which passed the Senate yesterday by a vote of 84 to 5. This amends the Economic Stabilization Act to the extent that the price ceiling on beef would be lifted. My strong hope is that this amendment will be approved by the conferees.

It reads as follows:

SEC. 15. Section 203 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) In exercising the authority conferred by this section prior to September 12, 1973, with respect to the price level of beef, the President or his delegate shall permit the passthrough of increases in raw agricultural product costs incurred since June 8, 1973, on a dollar-for-dollar basis in the same manner and to the same extent as a passthrough of such increases is permitted in the case of meat and food products other than beef."

The House should strongly support this action. We cannot permit beef simply to disappear from our menu. Something should be done now and this is a constructive step, in my view. It is ironic indeed when we are offering food to the whole world, and in particular, the Communist part of the world, that at the same time, we are neglecting to provide for our own people. It is high time to reverse this misbegotten policy.

LEGISLATION TO ASSIST OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing seven bills to assist our senior citizens.

The seven bills are aimed at easing the financial burden on senior citizens, to allow them to remain self-supporting, rather than become additions to State welfare rolls. The bills would accomplish the following:

Include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, hearing aids, and prescription drugs under medicare coverage;

Permit a married couple to receive social security benefits computed on their combined earnings record;

Establish an annual congressional senior citizen intern program, with funds for each Congressman to hire two interns for 2 weeks;

Allow a tax credit or refund of up to $300 on payments for local property taxes;

Allow disabled persons to qualify for social security benefits if they have ever worked 10 years under social security;

Authorize grants and loans to nonprofit groups to set up transportation services, like minibuses, to meet the special needs of the elderly and handicapped;

Establish a Select Committee on Aging in Congress to devote fuller attention to the special problems of the elderly.

The proposals were worked out with the recommendations and guidance of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Perdice of Anderson, Ind., who served as senior citizen interns for a week in my Washington office.

I am confident this legislation would be a big help in relieving the financial burden on all senior citizens. They were developed with the cooperation of two fine people who should know just what problems they and their elderly friends face.

Most important was their insistence that senior citizens do not want a handout—just a decent standard of living in a frightening age of inflation—I think we should provide the assistance they need through reasonable programs as those outlined in my bills.

MAKE FORT MIFFLIN A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Mifflin National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania. A number of my colleagues from Pennsylvania have joined me in cosponsoring this measure, namely: Mr. NIX, Mr. GREEN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. COUGHLIN. The bill would make the fort a part of the national park system.

Fort Mifflin may not be a known household name but those who have studied the Revolutionary War are aware of its importance to our efforts to gain independence. In this regard it is the hope of the sponsors of the bill that it can be acted on in this Congress so that Fort Mifflin can take its rightful place and part in our Nation's activities celebrating its 200 years of independence.

Dating back to pre-Revolutionary War times, Fort Mifflin, or originally Fort Mud, was built on the west bank of the Delaware River below the mouth of the Schuylkill for the protection of Philadelphia from attack by water. Actual work began in 1772, but it was unfinished until the revolution when Brig. Gen. Thomas Mifflin, for whom it was renamed, completed it for the Pennsylvania Council of Safety.

The fort was the scene of a siege from September to November in 1777, when a small garrison of 400, of whom only 40 survived, held at bay an army of 12,000 British and a fleet of vessels for 7 weeks. This stand was credited by General Washington with a considerable share of the ultimate success of the American cause. The fort was bombarded by 250 guns and virtually blown to bits.

In 1798 Fort Mifflin was rebuilt. It was manned during the War of 1812, and used as a prison for Union deserters and Confederates during the Civil War. At the time of the Spanish-American War, it was remodeled and put into service as a magazine for the Philadelphia Naval Base. In 1959 the fort, covering 49.1 acres, was turned over by the United States to the city. It is being restored by the Shackamaxon Society, a Philadelphia group. The old fort was made a National Historic Landmark in September 1970.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON MANGANESE ORE

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6676) to continue until July 1, 1976, the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out line 5, and insert: "the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States".

Page 1, after line 10, insert:

SEC. 2. (a) Item 903.90 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "9/5/72" and inserting in lieu thereof "9/5/75".

(b) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(A) which was made after September 5, 1972, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendment made by the first section of this amendment applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or relinquished as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to continue until July 1, 1976, the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore, and for other purposes".

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I take this time to ask the gentleman from Oregon to explain this legislation.

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

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that on June 27, 1973, the House unanimously approved H.R. 6676, which would extend to July 1, 1976, the suspension of duty on imports of manganese ore. In approving H.R. 6676, the Senate has added the provisions regarding the suspension of duty on imports of processed istle fiber, contained in H.R. 2261, which was also unanimously approved by the House on June 27. The Senate amendment would extend the duty suspension on processed istle fiber to September 5, 1975.

In addition, an amendment to the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee correcting a typographical error which occurred in the printing of the House bill was approved by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the substantive Senate amendment to H.R. 6676 is meritorious, having been approved by the House previously, and I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 6676.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this legislation on this side, and I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN DYEING AND TANNING PRODUCTS

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3630) to extend for 3 years the period during which certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That item 907.80 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Canaigre," and inserting in lieu thereof "Logwood, canaigre,";

(2) by inserting "470.15," immediately before "470.23,"; and

(3) by striking out "9/30/72" and inserting in lieu thereof "9/30/75".

SEC. 2. (a) The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after September 30, 1972, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which there would have been no duty if the amendments made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal.

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend until September 30, 1975, the suspension of duty on certain dyeing and tanning products and to include logwood among such products."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I take this time to ask the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), if he will explain this legislation.

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

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

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that H.R. 3630, as unanimously approved by the House on June 27 of this year, would suspend the duty on certain dyeing and tanning materials from the date of enactment to September 30, 1975. In approving H.R. 3630, as passed by the House, the Senate amended the bill in two respects, both of which are germane to the House passed bill.

The first Senate amendment would add logwood extract to those dyeing and tanning materials on which the duty would be suspended to September 30, 1975. The extension of the duty suspension to logwood extracts is an action to which the Committee on Ways and Means agreed to in the last Congress in favorably reporting H.R. 15795. That bill which was not acted upon prior to adjournment of the 92d Congress would have extended the duty suspension on the tanning and dyeing materials and would have added logwood extracts to the list of dyeing and tanning materials on which the duty was being suspended. As noted in the report of the Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 15795, of the 92d Congress, and in the Senate Report No. 93–322 on H.R. 3630, there is no domestic source of crude logwood and consumers of logwood extracts are dependent on imports to meet their needs.

The second Senate amendment would provide the retroactive suspension of duties on the tanning and dyeing materials covered by the legislation from September 30, 1972, and would, therefore, provide the liquidation or reliquidation of entries on the basis of duty-free treatment from that day to the day of enactment. I believe that such duty-free treatment is warranted in view of the history of duty suspension on imports of dyeing and tanning materials. Only a very few importers are involved and in terms of the duties paid such duty suspension would not constitute a windfall profit on entries liquidated between September 30, 1972, and the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Senate amendment to H.R. 3630 are meritorious and I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3630.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman, I take it the amendments are germane to the bill?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the amendments are germane to the bill, and, in our judgment, beneficial to the consumers of this country.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the changes made.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8214) to amend sections 112, 692, 6013, and 7508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States returning from the Vietnam conflict combat zone, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I take this time to ask the gentleman from Oregon to explain the bill.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon for that purpose.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8214 as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide certain relief for military and civilian personnel returning from the Vietnam conflict, and the families of those individuals who were listed as missing in action and are subsequently determined to have died at an earlier time.

First, the bill extends the provision under present law, which permits military personnel who are hospitalized as a result of service in a combat zone to exclude military pay they receive during the period of hospitalization, to cover for a period of time the pay they receive while hospitalized after all combatant activities have terminated. Since the exclusion under present law only applies during the period in which there are

combatant activities in a combat zone, the bill extends this exclusion for a period of time to cover a member of the Armed Forces who was hospitalized for an injury incurred in a combat zone in the waning days of the Vietnam conflict.

Second, the bill extends the provision which forgives Federal income taxes on income other than combat pay, which is presently excludable under another provision, in the case of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while serving in a combat zone—or as a result of an injury incurred while serving in a combat zone—to cover the period he is in a missing status even though it is subsequently determined that he actually died at an earlier time. Present law forgives income taxes through the year of a serviceman's actual death. The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that it is appropriate to prevent any additional hardship to his family which could result from the collection of taxes for years following his actual death and, therefore, extends this forgiveness to cover the years a serviceman is in a missing status until his status is changed.

With respect to these first two changes, the bill provides that these benefits, in general, are not to apply for more than 2 years after the termination of combatant activities; however, in the case of the Vietnam conflict, the benefits would be available, in general, for a 2-year period after the bill is enacted.

Third, the bill deals with the question of when the special tax rates available to a surviving spouse should be available for a spouse whose husband was reported in missing status and is subsequently determined to have died at an earlier time. The bill provides that the widow is to be eligible for surviving spouse tax treatment for the 2 years following the year in which her husband's missing status is changed rather than the 2 years following the year of actual death.

H.R. 8214 as reported also clarifies existing law in two respects. First, present law provides an extension of time for performing various acts such as filing tax returns, paying taxes, or filing a claim for credit or refund of tax in the case of an individual serving in the Armed Forces of the United States—or serving in support of the Armed Forces in a combat zone. Since it is common for these individuals and their spouses to file joint returns, the question has arisen as to whether the spouse is entitled to the benefit of these extensions. The bill would clarify this by providing that the spouse of a serviceman—or the spouse of an individual serving in support of the Armed Forces—in a combat zone is to have the same extension benefits as are available to her husband. Second, the bill also makes it clear that the spouse of an individual in missing status may file a joint return during the period he is in missing status even if it is subsequently determined that he had been killed in action in a prior year. In each of these two changes, the bill provides a similar 2-year limitation after the termination of combatant activities and with respect to the Vietnam conflict as described above.

Additionally, the bill deals with the tax treatment of certain individuals who were illegally detained when the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was seized in 1968 by North Korea. In this regard, H.R. 8214 would provide an exclusion from income with respect to compensation received by the members of the crew to conform to the treatment available for prisoners of war in a combat zone.

Finally, H.R. 8214 as reported to the House would remove the requirement that a serviceman must be serving during an "induction period" in order to be eligible for certain benefits otherwise accorded. This change is necessary since the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 has expired and there is no longer an induction period.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and its enactment is supported by the Executive branch. I urge its passage by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8214, which will clarify the tax treatment of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees who have been or are now either prisoners of war or missing in action. In my opinion, it is the least we can do for those who have sacrificed so much for us.

In addition to clarifying the law relative to the tax treatment afforded POW's and MIA's, the measure contains other provisions which will equalize the tax treatment of civilian and military personnel who were captured by North Korea from the U.S.S. *Pueblo* with the treatment extended to POW's in Vietnam and amend certain other provisions of the tax law relative to benefits granted military personnel which are now inoperative as a result of the expiration of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967.

H.R. 8214, as reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, contains the basic recommendations made by the administration on February 21, 1973, as well as proposals contained in H.R. 8115, which I introduced on May 24, 1973. The committee made some technical changes and placed appropriate time limitations on the provisions recommended by the administration. These minor alterations are supported by the administration.

In the past, Congress has extended special tax treatment to members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees to cover hardships which they and their families have experienced with respect to the filing of income tax returns and the payment of tax during the periods they were in a combat zone and for certain periods subsequent to their presence in a combat zone. This legislation is designed to assure continuation of fair tax treatment in this regard and is occasioned by certain problems which have arisen as a result of the Vietnam conflict. The bill makes a number of changes which I will briefly describe.

First, it would permit hospitalized servicemen to continue to exclude their military pay up to the month hospitalization ceases, even if all combatant activities have terminated. This merely will equalize the tax treatment extended to servicemen injured during the waning days of the Vietnam conflict, but not fully recovered prior to the cessation of combat activities with those whose hospitalization as a result of injuries incurred in the conflict concluded prior to the cessation of the combat.

Second, it would extend current law to forgive any income tax liability until the date the serviceman's missing status is terminated where that date occurs later than the date of death. Since present law forgives income taxes only through the year of the serviceman's actual death, this change is needed to prevent hardship on the families who learn after an extended period of time that the serviceman, in fact, died earlier.

Third, it provides that a widow of a serviceman who was reported in missing status and later is determined to have died at an earlier time is to be eligible for surviving spouse tax treatment for the 2 years following the year in which her husband's missing status is changed rather than the 2 years following the date of actual death.

Fourth, the bill would permit the wife of a deceased serviceman to claim the benefits of tax forgiveness for the years when the serviceman was, in fact, although unknown to be, deceased despite the expiration of the statute of limitations.

Fifth, it would permit the filing of joint returns by the spouse of a serviceman during the period he is missing in action, even though it is later determined that he died at an earlier date. This provision is necessary in order to prevent hardship in those cases where the spouse learned at a subsequent date that her husband had, in fact, died in an earlier period.

Sixth, the bill permits the wife of a serviceman or the representative of his estate to defer filing any tax returns—either income or estate—until after the serviceman returns or his missing status is terminated.

For each of the above provisions, the bill provides generally for a 2-year limitation on the availability of the tax benefits after the termination of combatant activities in a combat zone. In the case of the Vietnam conflict, however, the benefits will be generally available for 2 years after date of enactment of the legislation.

In addition, H.R. 8214, as reported, extends to the civilian and military personnel who were captured from the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, the same tax benefits which in recent years have been granted to prisoners of war and missing in action persons serving in the Vietnam conflict.

Finally, the measure removes the requirement that a serviceman must be serving during an "induction period" in order to be eligible for certain tax benefits historically extended to military personnel. This change is required as a result of the expiration on June 30, 1973, of the draft law. Without the existence of that law, there is no longer an induction period. These changes were requested and are supported by the Departments of Defense and Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill for the servicemen who were POW's and for the families of those servicemen who either were or are listed as missing in action. I urge its approval.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 8214.

On May 25, 1973, I wrote the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and asked that he give prompt consideration to the problems which a quirk in the language of the Internal Revenue Code would have upon the families of servicemen who are listed as missing, recuperating from combat injuries or who are declared to be dead or presumed dead. I commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) for the expeditious manner in which he and his committee have brought this relief legislation to the floor.

H.R. 8214 creates no new entitlements or benefits for the families of missing or injured servicemen. It merely extends certain tax benefits which the Congress, in its wisdom, has previously provided. The justification for these is obvious and has been thoroughly considered earlier.

Mr. Speaker, a war is a dreadful trying time for the families of our military personnel. There is constant fear that the soldier-father, son, brother or loved one will not return. There is the anxiety that, even if he does return, he may not be whole. What we have before us today is a series of financial relief measures which are directed at reducing the burdens placed by the whims of fate upon the families whose worst fears have come to pass.

While the Nation rejoices at the homecoming of former prisoners of war, at the return of our men from the Southeast Asian war, and at the prospect of some sort of peace in that area of the world, it cannot overlook the needs of those families who have received the bad news or, perhaps even more terrible, have received no news at all.

There is no rhyme or reason for that terrible burden to be increased. There is a very real and compassionate reason for that burden to be lightened.

We know of the efforts underway to obtain a full accounting for our MIA's—they are not forgotten and will not be forgotten. But neither shall we forget the families of those 1,249 men. And neither shall we forget those, somewhat more fortunate, who lie in hospital beds across our country, trying to rebuild the shattered bodies they offered in our defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous passage of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8214

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(a) CERTAIN COMBAT PAY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES. Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces) is amended by revising subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2), respectively, by striking out the words: "; but this paragraph shall not apply for any month during any part of which there are no combatant activities in any combat zone as determined under section (c)(3) of this section".

(b) INCOME TAXES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON DEATH.

(1) Section 692(1) of such Code (relating to income taxes of members of Armed Forces on death) is amended by striking out the word "death," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "death (or, if later, in which falls the last date in which he is in missing status within the meaning on section 112(d)),".

(2) If refund or credit of any overpayment for any taxable year resulting from the application of section 692 of such Code (as amended by paragraph (1)) is prevented at any time before the date 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act by the operation of any law or rule of law, but would not have been so prevented if claim for refund or credit therefor were made on the due date for the return for the taxable year of his death (or any later year), such refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) JOINT RETURNS.—Section 6013 of such Code (relating to joint returns of income tax by husband and wife) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) MISSING IN ACTION, ETC.—For purposes of this section and subtitle A—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—The spouse of a serviceman or civilian who is missing as a result of service in a combat zone may elect in accordance with this subsection to file a joint return for any taxable year in which he is in a missing status, if such spouse is otherwise eligible to file a joint return. Such election shall be valid even if the missing serviceman or civilian was deceased prior to such taxable year, and in such event, except for purposes of section 692 (relating to income taxes of members of Armed Forces on death), the income tax liability of the missing serviceman or civilian, his spouse, and his estate shall be determined as if he were alive for such year so long as the election remains unrevoked.

"(2) MISSING.—For purposes of this subsection a serviceman or civilian to which this subsection applies includes any individual referred to in section 558 of title 37, United States Code, and section 5568 of title 5, United States Code, and the term 'missing status' has the same meaning as contained in section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code, and section 5561 of title 5, United States Code, respectively, except that the period of missing status shall not include a period with respect to which it is officially determined under section 552(c) of title 37, United States Code, that such a person is officially absent from his post of duty without authority.

"(3) ELECTION.—The election referred to in paragraph (1) may be made with respect to each taxable year by filing a joint return in accordance with subsection (a) and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The election may be revoked by either spouse on or before the due date (including extensions) for such taxable year, and in the case of an executor or administrator, in accordance with subsection (a)(3)."

(d) TIME FOR PERFORMING CERTAIN ACTS POSTPONED BY REASON OF WAR.—

(1) Section 7508(a) of such Code (relating to time for performing acts postponed by reason of war) is amended by striking out the words "of such individual—" which appear immediately before paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "of such individual or the spouse of such individual—".

(2) Subsection (b) of section 7508 of such Code is redesignated subsection (d) and there are inserted immediately after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) EXTENSION OF BENEFITS.—With respect to any tax liability of any person or his estate entitled to the benefits of subsection (a), the provisions of this section shall apply to the executor, administrator, or conservator of the estate of such person.

"(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The period of service in the area referred to in subsection (a) shall include the period during which an individual entitled to benefits under subsection (a) is in a missing status, within the meaning of section 112(d)."

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) shall apply for taxable years ending on or after February 28, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, whenever an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 2. CERTAIN COMBAT PAY OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTIONS (a) AND (b) OF SECTION 112.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 112 (relating to certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces) are each amended—

(1) by striking out "during an induction period" in paragraph (1),

(2) by striking out "during an induction period; but this paragraph shall not apply for any month during any part of which there are no combatant activities in any combat zone as determined under subsection (c)(3) of this section" in paragraph (2), inserting in lieu thereof "; but this paragraph shall not apply for any month beginning more than 2 years after the date of the termination of combatant activities in such zone", and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"With respect to service in the combat zone designated for purposes of the Vietnam conflict, paragraph (2) shall not apply to any month beginning more than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this sentence."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 112 is amended by striking out paragraph (5).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 1973.

SEC. 3. JOINT RETURNS; SURVIVING SPOUSE.

(a) JOINT RETURNS.—Section 6013 (relating to joint returns of income tax by husband and wife) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) JOINT RETURN WHERE INDIVIDUAL IS IN MISSING STATUS.—For purposes of this section and subtitle A—

"(1) ELECTION BY SPOUSE.—If—

"(A) an individual is in a missing status (within the meaning of paragraph (3)) as a result of service in a combat zone (as determined for purposes of section 112), and

"(B) the spouse of such individual is otherwise entitled to file a joint return for any taxable year which begins on or before the day which is 2 years after the date designated under section 112 as the date of termination of combatant activities in such zone,

then such spouse may elect under subsection (a) to file a joint return for such taxable year. With respect to service in the combat zone designated for purposes of the Vietnam conflict, no such election may be made for any taxable year beginning more than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this sentence.

"(2) EFFECT OF ELECTION.—If the spouse of an individual described in paragraph (1)(A) elects to file a joint return under sub-

section (a) for a taxable year, then, until such election is revoked—

"(A) such election shall be valid even if such individual died before the beginning of such year, and

"(B) except for purposes of section 692 (relating to income taxes of members of the Armed Forces on death), the income tax liability of such individual, his spouse, and his estate shall be determined as if he were alive throughout the taxable year.

"(3) MISSING STATUS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) UNIFORMED SERVICES.—A member of a uniformed service (within the meaning of section 101(3) of title 37 of the United States Code) is in a missing status for any period for which he is entitled to pay and allowances under section 552 of such title 37.

"(B) CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.—An employee (within the meaning of section 5561(2) of title 5 of the United States Code) is in a missing status for any period for which he is entitled to pay and allowances under section 5562 of such title 5.

"(4) MAKING OF ELECTION; REVOCATION.—An election described in this subsection with respect to any taxable year may be made by filing a joint return in accordance with subsection (a) and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such an election may be revoked by either spouse on or before the due date (including extensions) for such taxable year, and, in the case of an executor or administrator, may be revoked by disaffirming as provided in the last sentence of subsection (a)(3)."

(b) SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Section 2(a) (defining surviving spouse) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) SPECIAL RULE WHERE DECEASED SPOUSE WAS IN MISSING STATUS.—If an individual was in missing status (within the meaning of section 6013(f)(3)) as a result of service in a combat zone (as determined for purposes of section 112) and if such individual remains in such status until the date referred to in subparagraph (A) or (B), then, for purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the date on which such individual died shall be treated as the earlier of the date determined under subparagraph (A) or the date determined under subparagraph (B):

"(A) the date on which the determination is made under section 556 of title 37 of the United States Code or under section 5566 of title 5 of such Code (whichever is applicable) that such individual died while in such missing status, or

"(B) the date which is 2 years after—

"(i) the date of the enactment of this paragraph, in the case of service in the combat zone designated for purposes of the Vietnam conflict, or

"(ii) the date designated under section 112 as the date of termination of combatant activities in that zone, in the case of any combat zone other than that referred to in clause (i)."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending on or after February 28, 1961.

SEC. 4. INCOME TAXES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON DEATH.

(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 692.—Section 692 (relating to income taxes of members of Armed Forces on death) is amended—

(1) by striking out "In the case" and inserting in lieu thereof

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case";

(2) by striking out "during an induction period (as defined in section 112(c)(5))"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) INDIVIDUALS IN MISSING STATUS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an individual who was in a missing status within the meaning of section 6013(f)(3)(A), the date of his death shall be treated as being not earlier than the date on which a determination of his death is made under section 556 of title 37 of the United States Code. The preceding sentence shall not cause subsection (a)(1) to apply for any taxable year beginning more than 2 years after—

"(1) the date of the enactment of this subsection, in the case of service in the combat zone designated for purposes of the Vietnam conflict, or

"(2) the date designated under section 112 as the date of termination of combatant activities in that zone, in the case of any combat zone other than that referred to in paragraph (1)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending on or after February 28, 1961.

(c) REFUNDS AND CREDITS RESULTING FROM SECTION 692 OF CODE.—If the refund or credit of any overpayment for any taxable year ending on or after February 28, 1961, resulting from the application of section 692 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) is prevented at any time before the expiration of one year after the date of the enactment of this Act by the operation of any law or rule of law, but would not have been so prevented if claim for refund or credit therefor were made on the due date for the return for the taxable year of his death (or any later year), refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of such one-year period.

SEC. 5. TIME FOR PERFORMING CERTAIN ACTS POSTPONED BY REASON OF WAR.

(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7508.—Section 7508 (relating to time for performing acts postponed by reason of war) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

"(b) APPLICATION TO SPOUSE.—The provisions of this section shall apply to the spouse of any individual entitled to the benefits of subsection (a). The preceding sentence shall not cause this section to apply to any spouse for any taxable year beginning more than 2 years after—

"(1) the date of the enactment of this subsection, in the case of service in the combat zone designated for purposes of the Vietnam conflict, or

"(2) the date designated under section 112 as the date of termination of combatant activities in that zone, in the case of any combat zone other than that referred to in paragraph (1).

"(c) MISSING STATUS.—The period of service in the area referred to in subsection (a) shall include the period during which an individual entitled to benefits under subsection (a) is in a missing status, within the meaning of section 6013(f)(3)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending on or after February 28, 1961.

SEC. 6. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS SO THAT CERTAIN PROVISIONS WILL APPLY WITHOUT REGARD TO WHETHER OR NOT AN INDUCTION PERIOD EXISTS.

(a) SALE OF RESIDENCE.—Section 1034(h) (relating to sale or exchange of residence by members of the Armed Forces) is amended by striking out "and during an induction period (as defined in section 112(c)(5)".

(b) NONAPPLICATION OF ADDITIONAL ESTATE TAX.—

(1) Section 2210 (relating to members of the Armed Forces dying during induction period) is amended by striking out "during an induction period (as defined in section 112(c)(5)),".

(2) The heading for such section 2201 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2201. MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES DYING IN COMBAT ZONE OR BY REASON OF COMBAT-ZONE-INCURRED WOUNDS, ETC.".

(3) The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 11 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 2201 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2201. Members of the Armed Forces dying in combat zone or by reason of combat-zone-incurred wounds, etc.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 1, 1973.

SEC. 7. EXTENSION OF SECTION 112(d) OF CODE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIANS ILLEGALLY DETAINED IN 1968.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of the Act of April 24, 1970, entitled "An Act to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone" (Public Law 91-235) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of section 112(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the period during which any member of the Armed Forces of the United States or any employee was so detained shall be treated as a period in which such member or employee is in a missing status during the Vietnam conflict as a result of such conflict."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to compensation received for periods of active service after December 31, 1967, in taxable years ending after such date. If refund or credit of any overpayment for any taxable year resulting from the application of the amendment made by subsection (a) is prevented at any time before the expiration of one year after the date of the enactment of this Act by the operation of any law or rule of law, refund or credit of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be made or allowed if claim therefor is filed before the expiration of such one-year period.

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

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to modify the tax treatment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian employees who are prisoners of war or missing in action, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1636, AMENDING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY ACT OF 1972

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1636) to amend the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 23, 1973.)

Mr. ASHLEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us was adopted in the House on June 28 by a recorded vote of 322 ayes to 62 nays, and is, I think, familiar to all of us. Let me address myself, then, to the items in disagreement between the version of the House and that of the Senate.

There were seven items in disagreement in the conference. The House receded to the Senate in one instance, in which the Senate bill allowed the President to appoint the Chairman of the Council on International Economic Policy from among the statutory members of the Council or any other person the President named as a Council member. The House amendment allowed the President to appoint a chairman from among the statutory members.

The second item in disagreement was one in which the Senate bill provided, with exceptions, that employees of the Council may be appointed without regard to civil service provisions governing appointment in competitive service. There was no comparable provision in the House amendment. The Senate receded to the House.

The third item in disagreement was one in which the Senate bill repealed the provision for an expiration date of the International Economic Policy Act, thereby making the Council on International Economic Policy a permanent organization. The House amendment extended the act to June 30, 1975. The Senate receded to the House with an amendment extending the Act until June 30, 1977.

The fourth item in disagreement was one in which the House amendment made appointment of any future Executive Director of the Council subject to Senate confirmation. The Senate bill would require Senate confirmation of the Executive Director, including the incumbent. The House position prevailed.

The fifth item in disagreement was one in which the Senate bill authorized $3 million to be appropriated each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, envisioning the merger of the Council on International Economic Policy and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. The House amendment authorized $1.4 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 1974, solely for the Council on International Economic Policy. The conferees accepted the House provision.

The sixth item in disagreement was one in which the House amendment added the Secretary of Transportation to the Council. No comparable provision was included in the Senate bill. The House provision was accepted.

The seventh and final item in disagreement was one in which the House amendment required that the annual International Economic Report of the President to be transmitted to Congress under section 207 of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 included a comparative description and analysis of certain activities, policies and programs of the United States, the European communities, Japan and, whenever applicable, the U.S.S.R. The amendment also requires that the report include an analysis concerning the relationship between the U.S. Government and American business and recommendations for programs and policies to insure that American business is competitive in international commerce. No comparable provision was included in the Senate bill. The Senate receded to the House.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that this legislation was hotly debated here on the floor. It is a rare privilege to report to you the bill you enacted has been brought back from conference virtually intact.

There were seven points of difference to be resolved in conference. Your conferees receded on one minor point regarding which members of the Council would be eligible for appointment as chairman. On all other points the other body receded except that on one point it was necessary to amend the House version slightly to reach agreement.

I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) is to be complimented for his accomplishments as spokesman for the House position. I recommend your prompt acceptance of this report.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) such time as he may consume.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I was on the conference committee, and I might point out several potential problems. I signed the conference report. I think it is generally a good report. One of the problems though was that the Senate had asked for Senate confirmation of the now incumbent head of CIEP. Our version said that there would not have to be Senate confirmation of the present holder of that office, but that the future holder of that office would be confirmed.

This is a rather difficult concept to understand presently, but the problem is that the Office of the Special Trade Representative is supposedly scheduled to be folded into the office of CIEP, and the ambassadors of the Special Trade Representative's Office now have to be confirmed by the Senate, and this causes a problem because the present chairman of CIEP is not confirmed by the Senate, but the STR ambassadors are. I know there is a problem now in the Senate on the conference report because of this problem.

I should also like to point out that in our discussion on the floor on the bill we also discussed the problem of the special trade representative's office. Because of the technical nature of its work and because the STR is presently gearing up for the GATT hearings in Tokyo in September, it was the feeling of many of us that the STR not be folded into the Council on International Economic Policy until after Congress passes a trade bill and the trade bill is signed by the President. It is my understanding that there is an agreement between CIEP and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that there will not be this folding in of the special trade representative into the Office of International Economic Policy until after the trade bill is agreed upon.

I would hope that at a later time—because the issue of trade policy in this country—is extremely important—that this House might look more closely into the actual mechanics of a negotiation of trade agreements and the relationship of this function in the entire context of the President's Council on International Economic Policy. I wish to bring up these points because there was some disagreement in the conference because the Senate conferees did not support the position of the Senate.

I would urge, though, that this House approve the conference report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the conference extends the life of this brain trust to 1977?

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio who is the manager of the bill.

Mr. ASHLEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Senate bill had an indefinite life for the Council. The House bill, after an amendment was adopted that was offered by Mr. ROUSSELOT, had a life that extended through June 30, 1975. So the compromise was the present date that is in the conference report of June 30, 1977.

Mr. GROSS. So it is 1977, and it is an extension of 4 years, approximately.

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes. It is 4 years. It is not indefinite. It is not permanent as was called for in the Senate bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman refresh my recollection as to the accomplishments, if any, of this outfit. What is the record?

Mr. ASHLEY. I referred previously to the report that is issued annually from the Council on Economic Policy, and would do so again. I think it will speak for itself.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my amendment to the International Economic Policy Act of 1972 requiring the Council on International Economic Policy—CIEP—to review the present relationship between the U.S. Government and the private business sector, and then make recommendations to insure that American business remains competitive in international commerce, will bear fruit.

Although there has for the past several years been much discussion in both U.S. businesss and Government circles

about redefining and restructuring business-Government cooperation, no one has ever attempted to review the multitude of policy and program aspects in a single, comprehensive, oversight study. Instead, we continue to approach this issue on an ad hoc basis—looking at each component separately—rather than trying, to develop a balanced mix of constructive assistance to the U.S. business community.

Since CIEP is charged with coordinating domestic and international economic policy, I believe the Council is a forum to begin developing the outline of what should be the Government-business relationship in terms of today's international economic realities. In addition to whatever areas of information the Council feels to be appropriate, it has been specifically instructed to study research and development policy; investment patterns; industrial manpower and training programs; tax incentives; financial assistance; export promotion programs; export market potentials; antitrust practices; and the need for long-range governmental economic planning. My second amendment added environmental practices to this list since environmental controls influence the international competitiveness of many industries and can in a real sense be considered part of the larger and long standing set of problems associated with nontariff barriers.

Historically, although perhaps not always in real practice, the private sector and the Government have preferred to operate at arms length. Where we have seen the Government respond to business interests it has, in many instances, been with regard to situations where special narrow private interests rather than broader public purposes have been served. We can surely give constructive thought to ways in which a more progressive and enlightened relationship of mutual benefit can be forged between Government and business, and I am hopeful that the CIEP report would provide an important and essential step in this direction.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. 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.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 335, nays 71, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—335

Abdnor	Eshleman	Mallary
Abzug	Evans, Colo.	Mann
Adams	Fascell	Martin, Nebr.
Addabbo	Findley	Martin, N.C.
Alexander	Fish	Mathias, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Flood	Matsunaga
Andrews, N.C.	Flowers	Mayne
Andrews, N. Dak.	Flynt	Mazzoli
Annunzio	Foley	Meeds
Archer	Ford, Gerald R.	Melcher
Arends	Ford, William D.	Metcalfe
Armstrong	Forsythe	Mezvinsky
Ashley	Fountain	Michel
Aspin	Frelinghuysen	Milford
Badillo	Frenzel	Miller
Barrett	Frey	Minish
Bell	Froehlich	Mink
Bergland	Fulton	Minshall, Ohio
Biaggi	Fuqua	Mitchell, Md.
Biester	Gaydos	Mitchell, N.Y.
Bingham	Gettys	Moakley
Blackburn	Giaimo	Mollohan
Boggs	Gibbons	Montgomery
Boland	Gilman	Moorhead, Calif.
Bolling	Ginn	Moorhead, Pa.
Bowen	Goldwater	Morgan
Brademas	Grasso	Mosher
Brasco	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.
Bray	Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Breaux	Griffiths	Natcher
Breckinridge	Grover	Nedzi
Brinkley	Gubser	Nelsen
Brooks	Gude	Nichols
Broomfield	Guyer	Nix
Brotzman	Haley	O'Hara
Brown, Calif.	Hamilton	O'Neill
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-schmidt	Parris
Broyhill, N.C.		Passman
Broyhill, Va.	Hanley	Patman
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Patten
Burgener	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Burke, Calif.	Harrington	Perkins
Burke, Mass.	Harsha	Pettis
Burlison, Mo.	Harvey	Peyser
Burton	Hastings	Pickle
Butler	Hawkins	Pike
Byron	Hays	Podell
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Preyer
Carney, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Ill.
Casey, Tex.	Heckler, Mass.	Price, Tex.
Cederberg	Heinz	Pritchard
Chamberlain	Helstoski	Quie
Clark	Hillis	Railsback
Clausen, Don H.	Hinshaw	Randall
	Hogan	Rangel
Clawson, Del	Holifield	Rees
Clay	Holtzman	Regula
Cleveland	Horton	Reuss
Cochran	Hosmer	Riegle
Cohen	Howard	Rinaldo
Collier	Huber	Robinson, Va.
Collins, Ill.	Hudnut	Robison, N.Y.
Conable	Hungate	Rodino
Conlan	Hunt	Roe
Conte	Hutchinson	Roncalio, Wyo.
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Corman	Johnson, Colo.	Rooney, Pa.
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Rose
Cronin	Jones, Ala.	Rosenthal
Culver	Jordan	Rostenkowski
Daniel, Dan	Karth	Roush
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Kastenmeier	Roy
	Keating	Roybal
Daniels, Dominick V.	Kemp	Ruppe
	Kluczynski	Ryan
Danielson	Koch	St Germain
Davis, S.C.	Kuykendall	Sandman
Delaney	Kyros	Sarasin
Dellenback	Landrum	Sarbanes
Dellums	Latta	Saylor
Denholm	Leggett	Scherle
Dennis	Lehman	Schneebeli
Dent	Litton	Schroeder
Derwinski	Long, La.	Shipley
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Shoup
Diggs	Lott	Shriver
Dingell	McClory	Sikes
Donohue	McCloskey	Sisk
Downing	McCollister	Skubitz
Drinan	McCormack	Slack
Dulski	McDade	Smith, N.Y.
Duncan	McEwen	Staggers
du Pont	McFall	Stanton, J. William
Edwards, Ala.	McKinney	
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald	Stanton, James V.
Eilberg	Madden	
Erlenborn	Madigan	Stark
Esch	Mailliard	Steed
Steele	Udall	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Steelman	Ullman	
Steiger, Ariz.	Van Deerlin	
Steiger, Wis.	Vander Jagt	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Stephens	Veysey	
Stokes	Vigorito	Winn
Stratton	Waldie	Wolff
Stubblefield	Walsh	Wright
Stuckey	Wampler	Wyatt
Studds	Ware	Wydler
Sullivan	Whalen	Yatron
Talcott	White	Young, Alaska
Teague, Calif.	Whitehurst	Young, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.	Widnall	Young, Ill.
Thone	Williams	Young, Tex.
Thornton	Wilson, Bob	Zablocki
Tiernan		Zion

NAYS—71

Anderson, Calif.	Hanrahan	Roberts
	Henderson	Rogers
Ashbrook	Hicks	Rousselot
Bafalis	Holt	Runnels
Baker	Ichord	Ruth
Beard	Jones, N.C.	Satterfield
Bennett	Jones, Okla.	Sebelius
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Tenn.	Seiberling
Burleson, Tex.	Kazen	Shuster
Camp	Ketchum	Snyder
Carter	Lujan	Spence
Chappell	McKay	Symms
Clancy	Mahon	Taylor, Mo.
Collins, Tex.	Maraziti	Taylor, N.C.
Crane	Mathis, Ga.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Wis.	Mizell	Towell, Nev.
de la Garza	Moss	Treen
Devine	Myers	Vanik
Dorn	Obey	Waggonner
Eckhardt	Owens	Whitten
Gonzalez	Poage	Wylie
Goodling	Powell, Ohio	Yates
Gross	Quillen	Young, Fla.
Gunter	Rarick	Young, S.C.

NOT VOTING—27

Bevill	Gray	Reid
Blatnik	Hanna	Rhodes
Brown, Mich.	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	King	Smith, Iowa
Cotter	Landgrebe	Symington
Davis, Ga.	Lent	Teague, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	McSpadden	Wiggins
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Wyman
Fraser	O'Brien	Zwach

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Gray with Mr. King.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Symington with Mr. McSpadden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELCOME TO THE PRESIDENT OF GABON, H.E., THE HONORABLE ALBERT-BERNARD BONGO

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

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House, I appreciate having been granted this opportunity by the Speaker to speak for just a few moments concerning a very great honor that the House is receiving at this very moment.

Because it is against the rules of the

House, I do not intend to point out the fact nor do I ask my colleagues to recognize the fact that at this very moment we are being visited by an illustrious head of state.

However, it is certainly not against the rules of the House, and I am sure my colleagues would like to know, President Bongo of the Republic of Gabon, is here on a 3-day State visit visiting Washington. He is accompanied by the Vice President, the President of the Supreme Court, and many distinguished cabinet ministers of Gabon.

The Republic of Gabon, as you know, enjoys the third largest per capita income of any of the African nations, has vast natural resources, and is very close in its friendship with the United States of America.

President Bongo is here to visit with President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers, but at his specific request he is visiting the legislative branch of our Government. I think it is to our honor he is visiting the people's House, the U.S. House of Representatives.

I know my colleagues join with me in welcoming President Albert-Bernard Bongo of Gabon.

BUFFET TO BE SERVED AT 6

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this will only take 10 seconds. Because it is anticipated we will be in late tonight, there will be a buffet served in the Members' dining room starting at 6 o'clock.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 424 last night, the record indicates I was not recorded. I voted "aye," but the machine failed to record the vote. I know there is no way in the procedure of the House to make a change in the vote, but I do want it to appear in today's RECORD.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6370, FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6370) to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividend is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 31, 1973.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation which passed the House on May 9, 1973, deals, as the Members know, primarily with the authority of the Federal financial regulatory agencies to establish flexible ceilings on rates paid on time and savings deposits and the troublesome question of NOW accounts, negotiable orders of withdrawal. As a result of not being able to reach agreement on NOW accounts, Senate Joint Resolution 128 was approved on July 6, 1973 (Public Law 93–63) extending this temporary authority for a 60-day period, retroactive from June 1 until August 1. The House bill extended until September 30, 1975 this authority, the Senate amendment (S. 1798) extended the same authority until June 1, 1974. The conferees accepted the compromise date of December 31, 1974. The resolution of the NOW account issue required 5 separate days of conferences with final agreement being reached on July 30. As the Members will recall, the House, by a rollcall vote of 264 to 98, prohibited NOW accounts in all 50 States. Inasmuch as NOW accounts have been in existence in Massachusetts since June of 1972 following a favorable opinion by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts and since September, 1972 in New Hampshire, the problem of a prohibition involving those two States understandably deadlocked the conference.

The compromise result, I believe, is a most satisfactory one. The House conferees insisted that all depository institutions except credit unions be permitted to offer NOW accounts in the two States, not just mutual savings banks as is now the case, to insure as much competitive equality as possible and of prime importance insisted upon full Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation supervisory regulatory control as provided for by section 3 of H.R. 6370. By prohibiting NOW accounts at this time in 48 states, the "experiment" should be confined to the two States where they now exist permitting regulatory supervision and meaningful evaluation for our future deliberations.

I will in a moment recognize the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance who will expand on my remarks and will explain in some detail the other significant provisions of the conference report. Let me just say, however, that I believe this to be a good conference report representing the best of both bills. A true spirit of compromise was involved throughout. All sessions were long and arduous, with full participation by each conferee. I believe the result closely conforms with the position of the House and consequently I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I support the conference report and wish to endorse the chairman's description of the report as a good report and one that follows as closely as possible the instructions of the House by its passage of H.R. 6370 on May 9.

The compromise date of December 31, 1974, (section 1 of the reported bill) for the extension of flexible interest rate control, known as Regulation Q authority, should allow adequate time for the committee to examine whether this device is adequate to insure a steady flow of home mortgage funds for the borrowing consumer at reasonable rates. Additional legislative and regulatory remedies clearly appear to be urgently required in view of the critical nature of the current credit crunch. Actions by the regulatory agencies since July 5 to restore stability to the current situation may well prove to be too little and too late as many deeply believe. The entire interrelated question of credit availability and the adequacy of our existing financial institutions, their basic structure and regulatory authorities, must be faced by the Congress to insure that the credit needs of our people are being met by these institutions. The further extension of regulation Q at this time serves notive that Congress fully expects the administration, the regulatory agencies and the Federal Reserve Board to face up to this Nation's housing crisis and that by necessity must and will become increasingly conscious of our oversight responsibilities for the administration of regulation Q.

As the gentleman from Texas stated, the most troublesome problem in the conference involved the status of NOW accounts, in existence since June, 1972, in Massachusetts and September, 1972, in New Hampshire. By the end of February, 56 of the 167 mutual savings banks in Massachusetts and 12 of the 30 mutual savings banks in New Hampshire were offering the NOW account service to their depositors. Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance on March 13, 14 and 15. We were understandably concerned about the potential effect upon competitive relationships since only one class of institution—mutual savings banks—could offer this new service. Of equal concern was the lack of adequate regulatory constraints. The House, on May 9, upheld the position of the subcommittee after extensive debate, by a rollcall vote of 264 to 98, prohibiting NOW accounts in all 50 States.

Conferences were held on May 30, May 31, June 11, June 26, and July 30. Agreement was reached rapidly on all other points in dispute, but it was not until July 30 that a compromise was reached on the treatment of NOW accounts in Massachusetts and New Hampshire (section 2 of the reported bill). The compromise does prohibit such accounts in 48 States, making an exception for such withdrawals from depository institutions in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

The House conferees insisted, however, that all financial institutions in these two States be permitted to offer NOW accounts and repealed the Massachusetts exception to Regulation Q enacted into law by Congress in 1969 for state-chartered banks from FDIC regulation. Thus all activities of these institutions, including NOW accounts, will be under full

FDIC supervisory regulatory control as provided for by section 3 of H.R. 6370 (section 3 of the reported bill). Competitive inequalities, as a consequence, have been narrowed and the so-called experiment will be confined to Massachusetts and New Hampshire providing useful data to the subcommittee for our future deliberations.

The House bill extended the authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in the same manner as it extended the authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conferees receded to the Senate position.

The remaining sections of the conference report concerning which there was very little substantive disagreement during the conference can be described briefly.

Section 4 of the reported bill deals with the subject of savings and loan conversions. The Senate amendment provided for a moratorium on conversions from the mutual to stock form by savings and loan associations, the accounts of which are or would become insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation until December 31, 1973. The House contained no comparable provision.

Our subcommittee did, however, hold hearings on May 15, 17, and 21 on H.R. 2419 which, if enacted, would have provided for a 2-year moratorium from the date of enactment. The testimony of virtually all witnesses supported the desirability of a further moratorium differing only in the length of such a moratorium. The House conferees accepted the Senate provision with an amendment extending the moratorium date until June 30, 1974, permitting adequate time for Congress to review the public policy aspects of pending conversion proposals. A limited exception for approval after December 31, 1973, was adopted for those few applications filed with the corporation before Senate passage of S. 1798 on May 22, 1973.

Section 5 of the reported bill provides authority for Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to invest in State housing corporations. The Senate amendment differed from the House bill in that it: First, had no ceiling on the amount of loans and loan commitments that any such association may make to State housing corporations other than whatever ceiling the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may, by rule, prescribe; second, placed the same aggregate limitation on investments which any such association may make to State housing corporations, as does the House bill, except that in the Senate amendment the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may, by rule, set a smaller aggregate limitation; third, directed the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to regulate investment in State housing corporations; and fourth, defined the terms "insured institution," "State member insured banks," "State nonmember insured banks," "State housing corporation," and "State." The House receded to the Senate provision.

Section 6 of the reported bill relates to premium payments by insured savings and loan associations to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The Senate amendment amended section 404 of title IV of the National Housing Act to establish a new procedure for payment by insured savings and loan associations of premiums into the reserve fund of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The House bill had no comparable provision. The conferees accepted the Senate provision.

Section 7 of the reported bill relates to the "doing business" tax by States of federally insured financial institutions.

The Senate amendment directed the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to make a study with respect to the application by the States of "doing business" taxes on out-of-State commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations and to report the results of such study together with its recommendations to Congress not later than December 31, 1974. The House bill had no comparable provision. The House accepted the Senate provision amending it significantly, however, by eliminating the list of permissible State taxes and in lieu thereof explicitly stated that no State or political subdivision may impose any tax measured by income or receipts or any other "doing business" tax on any insured depository not having its principal office within such State. The date of January 1, 1976, was a part of the House amendment to insure that the prohibition would not affect a State or political subdivision in the middle of a taxable year or period.

Section 8 of the reported bill relates to the enactment clause.

The House bill and the amendments made by it took effect 30 days after enactment, except the regulation Q extension amendment and the State housing corporation amendment took effect on enactment. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision, and, therefore, it took effect on enactment. The Senate receded to the House provision.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope the Members of the House will agree with the conferees and adopt the conference report.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance (Mr. ST GERMAIN) for the leadership which he has demonstrated in recent months with regard to H.R. 6370. This piece of legislation contains many significant and complicated provisions dealing with financial institutions generally; however, the most controversial provision involves the so-called NOW account.

Mutual savings banks in Massachusetts began offering these accounts approximately 1 year ago and thereby set in motion events which culminated in Monday night's conference decision. The NOW account involved an encroachment by mutual savings banks into the commercial checking account domain long dominated by commercial banks. Thus, mutual savings bank savers could issue checks on their savings accounts which would transform the traditional savings account into a hybrid checking and savings account. At the same time, Federal law prohibited commercial banks and savings and loan associations from engaging in similar practices.

Lengthy hearings were held in both the Senate and House; and spirited debates took place on the floors of both chambers. Under the leadership of Mr. ST GERMAIN, the House voted overwhelmingly, 264 to 98, to prohibit NOW accounts in all 50 States. The Senate, on the other hand, voted to ban the controversial accounts in 48 States, while leaving their fate undetermined in the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

The conferees voted Monday night to adopt a position advocated by Mr. ST GERMAIN whereby the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would have plenary powers over mutual savings banks in Massachusetts. Thus, the so-called Massachusetts exception to regulation Q was eliminated from the law. In addition, it was decided that NOW accounts will be allowed to continue in the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire on an experimental basis, even though they will be banned in the other 48 States until Congress believes that a successful experiment has been concluded in these two States.

Under the compromise reached by the conferees, the Federal bank supervisory agencies are empowered to regulate and structure these new accounts. Accordingly, the Federal Reserve Board, the FDIC and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would be charged with the responsibility of prescribing such limitations on the use of NOW accounts as they deem necessary, including: uniform interest rates; limits on the number of checks which could be drawn in a given month; service charges; and usage limited to natural persons.

It is my understanding that the Federal Reserve Board has confirmed that the Federal bank supervisory agencies have adequate authority to accomplish the aforementioned purposes. It is my hope that the Federal agencies will exercise this authority in such a way as to foster competition, while preserving the distinction between commercial bank checking accounts and a convenient means of withdrawal from savings accounts at the depository institutions involved. Congress has clearly recognized that a watchful eye must be kept on this experiment and I am confident that the agencies will exercise their responsibilities in a manner compatible with congressional intent.

Thus, by broadening Federal bank supervisory authority over mutual savings banks in Massachusetts and by delegating the task of structuring and regulating these new accounts to these agencies, Congress has underwritten an experiment which may serve a useful purpose and point the way toward the expansion of NOW accounts beyond Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

It is my hope that a uniform interest rate might be established at a rate not more than 3 percent; that a limitation on the number of checks drawn in any given month might be instituted not

exceeding five times; and that a mandatory service charge and such other restrictions might be prescribed as shall be necessary to insure the experimental nature of such accounts and to avoid unnecessary disruptions in the two States involved.

Again, let me commend the gentleman from Rhode Island for his leadership on this issue. He has carried the House position successfully through the conference and has fashioned a solution which serves the best interests of the financial institutions and consumers involved: I am happy to lend my support to the adoption of this conference report.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman in yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure we have this clarification in the RECORD on the moratorium. It is declared a continuation of the moratorium which now exists relating to conversion of savings and loan diversions will continue to June 1974.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Until June 1974.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, for complete clarity let me point out that the Senate version of the rate control bill included a moratorium on the conversion of mutual savings and loan's to the stock form of organization until December 31, 1973. The House version contained no such provision.

However, the House conferees insisted on extending the moratorium until June 30, 1974.

The Senate conferees agreed to this provision on the condition that as to "study applications" filed prior to May 22, 1973, (the date of passage of the Senate bill) the statutory moratorium would extend only until December 31, 1973, after which applications may be approved on their merit.

The term "study applications" is intended by the conference committee to mean applications submitted to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board during the period when the administrative moratorium of the Board was in effect.

The conference committee was aware of the fact that between July 26 and September 22, 1972, the Board announced that applications would be accepted and that during that period applications were accepted from five associations. The conferees considered limiting the short-term moratorium to those five applications, but specifically decided not to do so and that is the reason why the date of May 22, 1973, was chosen instead of the period between July 26 and September 22, 1972. It was known to the conferees that other applications had been submitted and it was not our desire to exclude them.

There are law suits now pending in the courts challenging the legality of the administrative moratorium. It has been our position that this legislation should not be determinative of that litigation.

Finally, the staff, in writing the language of the amendment and the conference report explaining it, considered and rejected a suggestion that the short-term moratorium be applied to "study applications accepted for filing," in favor of the language "study applications filed." This action of the staff was in accord with the intent of the conferees. We did not intend to pass judgment on the question of the right of applicants to submit applications or the right of the bank board to refuse to accept them during the period prior to Senate passage of the bill on May 22, 1973. After that time, of course, parties were on notice that a statutory moratorium was at least a probability.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The agreement in the conference is in the legislation we recommend for adoption. It contains a grandfather clause. The date of the grandfather clause is May 22, 1973 the date of the passage of the Senate bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman.

DEAN OF HOUSE CELEBRATES 80TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield so that I might announce to the House that on next Monday, August 6, while we are in adjournment, a significant event will be commemorated. On that day, next Monday, the dean of our House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will celebrate his 80th birthday. I think it appropriate that we take note of that fact. The dean is as agile as a squirrel and as sharp and alert as any man 30 years his junior. He will be 80 years young next Monday, and I know we all join in wishing for him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, might I say to the House I was very happy to yield for that purpose, but I ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) if when he revises his remarks he will say the dean is 80 years young, instead of 80 years old.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the time to present this conference report on H.R. 6370 for the minority. I shall not take long to do so as there is such a great deal of work left to accomplish before we can adjourn.

As my colleagues well know, the extension of the authority for regulation Q and the corollary provisions on various sectors of the financial community have been discussed at great length and in great detail as this bill has proceeded through the legislative process.

For my part, I am well satisfied that the bill reported by the conference committee adequately and justly reflects the will of the House. Those provisions which were in the House-passed bill have been modified only enough to gain the concurrence of the Senate conferees. Those provisions which were not in the House-passed bill have all been the subject of recent hearings or action by this body and I am certain fit in well with the sentiments of its Members. I ask that the House not delay in taking favorable action on this conference report.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the bill H.R. 6370, to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, and for other purposes.

The conference committee meetings on this conference report were lengthy, controversial, and complex. Most of the issues, though, involved in the conference were ones that could be readily agreed upon. The basic issue that held the conferees up was one involving the so-called NOW accounts which would permit depository institutions to withdraw from a time deposit by negotiable or transferable instruments for the purpose of making payments to third parties.

I strongly supported the use of NOW accounts and the authority to permit them to continue from the Banking Committee's consideration of this matter right up until the final agreement within the conference. I think that the use of such a financial instrument is indeed a healthy new tool for financial institutions, both commercial banks, and savings institutions. I am pleased that we have been able to extend regulation Q until December 31, 1974. I feel that we must continue the use of regulation Q well beyond the December 1974 expiration date.

Today, we all see the beginning of a massive credit crunch which has already encouraged the process known as disintermediation by which people remove their savings from savings institutions to invest them in higher yielding investment opportunities. Since most of the savings that the American public hold are in our savings institutions, such as savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, any large movement of funds from these institutions cause disastrous effects on our housing industry. Most savings institutions cannot afford to pay high rates of interest that commercial banks and other financial institutions can afford to pay. These mortgage lending institutions have invested the public's savings in long-term mortgages which have a relatively lower yield than those investments of commercial banks. In short, they have borrowed short and lent long.

If the system that we have today of financing our housing industry is to be maintained on an even keel, then the strict applications of the provisions of regulation Q must be applied. The current situation with regard to regulation Q is, as we have seen in many areas of the country, causing disastrous effects on our mortgage lending institutions and the housing industry. The action by the Federal Reserve in permitting commercial banks to resort to such schemes as "wild card certificates" yielding in some cases over eight percent on a $1,000 certificate for 4 years is causing a massive flow of funds from the mortgage lending institutions. I have written Dr. Arthur Burns, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, requesting an end to such practices, but his reply to me was one of "stand by and watch further developments."

I am sorry that the conferees on this

conference report could not have taken some action to stem this incipient credit crunch. I am pleased that the Chairman of the full Committee has announced that the Committee will hold hearings immediately after the August recess on this whole question.

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

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

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding to me.

As the gentleman knows, the interest rate has been going up at an alarming rate for the last few months. I think short-term Government paper is over 8 percent. Federal funds have gone up. So has the prime rate which is now 8¾ percent, and it is predicted that there might be a chance of the prime rate going up to even 9, 9.5, or 10 percent.

In my own community in California we find that there are net withdrawals of money from savings and loan associations so that there is no long-term mortgage money available, and home building has almost ground to a halt.

One of the problems, of course, is competition of short-term governments and competition of corporate paper, and also the competition of what we call the "wild card certificate of deposit," which is a large certificate of deposit for 4 years. Much of the money now in savings and loan associations is going into this type of account.

I was wondering if the chairman might not let us know what the Committee on Banking and Currency is contemplating in future action, in September or October, to try to bring some order to the money market.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman received the other day, and all the other members of the committee, a statement from the chairman outlining proposals submitted by the staff after their consideration of the major issues that are involved in the statement the gentleman has made including directly the specific subject the gentleman raises.

We are calling a meeting soon after the recess to have some oversight hearings. I, too, am greatly concerned about the increase in rates. Of course, the increase in interest rates before this caused the inflation we have. If we raise interest rates, we raise the price of everything that is offered for sale in the Nation, including the goods in the shelves. Today a person buying a $20,000 home must obligate himself to pay $40,000 at interest, or pay the equivalent of three $20,000 homes in order to get title to one such home.

The gentleman has brought out something that injures not only the economy, but the economic well-being of the 200 million people in this country. Something must be done about it.

May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the American Banker for August 1, the front page, it said that the Federal Reserve Board had given out a statement to the effect that although Federal funds are 13 percent now, and will probably go to 15 percent, the Board is not concerned about it so long as it does not interfere with an orderly market.

That is an alarming statement to make; that regardless of the interest rates, so long as the stock market is going along all right and people are investing in stocks, they have no concern about the rate of interest. I think that is very alarming, and we expect to go into such statements and we expect to do something that we believe will cause a reduction in these excessive and exorbitant interest rates. No one complains about paying reasonable rates of interest. They expect to do that, but whenever they put on excessive and exorbitant and usurious interest, that cannot be justified.

It is a challenge to the Congress to stop it, and stop it quickly.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, then it is the gentleman's belief that the Committee on Banking and Currency in September or early October can come up with specific legislation which will help to stabilize interest rates in this country?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. I thank the gentleman for raising the question, because we have a job to do on this subject. We can do a good job, and we will do it before this session s over.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman. May I ask a question of the able chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. ST GERMAIN. I notice in the conference committee report that there is a moratorium on conversion from Federal Savings and Loans to stock associations. Was that the Senate version?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The Senate had a moratorium to December of 1973. The legislation before the subcommittee was December of 1974. We compromised on the date, to June 30, 1974.

Mr. REES. Was there a moratorium in the House bill?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. No, there was not.

Mr. REES. Is the Senate amendment germane under our rules?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Yes, it is. Everything is in order and checked out with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman's subcommittee be having hearings on conversion?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Yes, we shall. We have had some. We will have further hearings.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the minority wants to yield time?

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

It has been said here this morning that the House bent the Senate to its will in this conference. Is it not true that the House receded on seven Senate amendments and the Senate accepted two House amendments?

Mr. WIDNALL. There were a number of Senate provisions which were not passed on by the House. There was a case of receding on the part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. The scorecard is about seven to two in favor of the Senate, in this instance, for whatever it is worth. I do not believe the House bent the Senate to its will.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the minority does not wish to use any more time, we shall not use any more time.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I must say that my own feeling is that these are developments that we should watch closely. I can appreciate the administration's attempts to put more money into savings, even though I have serious doubts that tight money policies alone can cure our present inflationary problems. On the other hand, hiking the interest rates on savings could lead to severe financial strain for savings and loan institutions, as their costs go up and more savings are directed toward banks. This could mean less available money for housing construction, and the housing situation is already very restricted.

In view of this, I would hope that the Federal Reserve Board will keep a close eye on this situation, and I would hope that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee will maintain their usual diligence in overseeing these developments. I am glad to hear that the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings in September to examine again this very complex matter. Proper balance of interest rates between banks and savings and loan institutions must be maintained. I have had many of the savings and loan institutions in my district complain strongly that deposits to their institutions have literally dried up. This affects not only the savings and loan institutions, but drastically affects the home building industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FEDERAL COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1969—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 511(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, Public Law 91–173, the Secretary of the Interior annually prepares a report to the Congress on progress made in administering the law.

It is my pleasure to transmit to you the report for calendar year 1972 and to commend it to the attention of the Congress.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1973.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 23, 1973:

H.R. 7528. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1973:

H.R. 8949. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code relating to basic provisions of the loan guaranty program for veterans.

On July 30, 1973:

H.R. 2323. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1974, the suspension of duties on certain forms of copper;

H.R. 2324. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1975, the existing suspension of duties for metal scraps; and

H.R. 6394. An act to suspend the duty on caprolactam monomer in water solution until the close of December 31, 1973.

On August 1, 1973:

H.R. 6717. An act to amend certain provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 relating to the collection of fees in connection with the use of Federal areas for outdoor recreation purposes; and

H.R. 9172. An act to provide for emergency allotment lease and transfer of tobacco allotments or quotas for 1973 in certain disaster areas in Georgia and South Carolina.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE RAILROAD SAFETY ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the second annual report on administration of the Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 971, 45 U.S.C. 421 et seq.) This report has been prepared in accordance with section 211 of the act, and covers the period January 1, 1972 through December 31, 1972.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1973.*

REPORT ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN AND REVITALIZE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93–138)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union; and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our country depends on a strong, efficient and flexible financial system to promote sound economic growth, including the provision of adequate funds for housing. Such a system is one which allows financial institutions to adapt to the changing needs of borrowers and lenders, large and small, and is free to make full use of technological innovations.

Events during the last decade, however, have revealed significant defects in the operations of our financial institutions. On two recent occasions when the Federal Reserve System moved to restrain the economy, it was found that the inadequacies of our financial structures created unnecessarily severe burdens for the business community and the consuming public. The consumer-saver was denied a fair market return on his savings, while the consumer and small businessman, as borrowers, often could not obtain adequate funds to meet their requirements.

The inflexibility of our financial system can be directly attributed to the methods used by the Government to direct credit flows—methods designed to meet the depressed economic conditions of the 1930's but poorly suited to cope with the expansionary conditions of the past decade. In recent years, government regulations have limited the efficency and flexibility of our financial system. Ironically, those regulations that were designed in part to keep a steady flow of funds moving into housing loans actually served to diminish that flow, severely penalizing both the borrower, who could not find funds, and the saver who received an unfairly low return on his savings.

As the Government tries to play its proper role in building a better financial system, we must proceed with one basic assumption: the public interest is generally better served by the free play of competitive forces than by the imposition of rigid and unnecessary regulation.

By law, thrift institutions—a category primarily composed of savings and loan associations but also including mutual savings banks—were created to provide funds for housing by maintaining large holdings of residential mortgages. However, earnings on holdings of previously acquired mortgages do not respond to changes in market interest rates. When market rates rise, the ability of thrift institutions to attract funds is limited and their ability to lend additional mortgage money is diminished.

Attempts to alleviate this problem by restrictive laws and regulations have achieved very little at great cost. The main technique has been to impose ceilings on the interest rates that financial institutions could pay savers for funds. The result, however, has often been a reduction in the flow of deposits to financial institutions. In many cases, in fact, deposits have been withdrawn so that they could be invested in higher yielding securities. Thus interest ceilings that were intended as a protective shield for the housing market turned out instead to be an additional burden.

Interest rate ceilings proved harmful to Americans both as savers and as borrowers in the late 1960's. Because the interest rate ceilings for deposits were often below market interest rates, small savers, who depended on banks and other saving institutions, were denied a fair rate of return on their money. On the borrowing side, smaller increases in savings deposits resulted in a sharp drop in loan funds available to consumers and small business firms.

Since financial institutions were prohibited from paying better interest rates, they were forced to compete for customers in other ways. Much of the public had to settle for so-called free services or even offers of consumer goods when in fact they may have preferred to receive higher interest on their deposits. In addition, such competition often led to increases in operating costs which prevented lending rates from declining when credit conditions later eased.

Finally, because of reduced inflows of savings, thrift institutions cut back on their mortgage lending or borrowed from Federal Home Loan Banks which had to pay market rates for their funds. Although the Federal Government stepped in and picked up some of the slack, mortgage flows were still disrupted.

Recognizing the need for action on all these problems, I appointed a Presidential Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation during my second year as President to study this entire matter and to make recommendations for reforming our financial institutions. The Commission's report identified quite precisely the causes of rigidity and instability in our financial institutions. Its recommendations were of major assistance in our further deliberations concerning the best ways to correct the weaknesses in our financial system.

The time to correct those weaknesses has come. Our current efforts to fight inflation and preserve the value of the dollar at home and abroad require strong financial markets. Without strong markets, the American public will be forced once again to bear excessive burdens.

If we do not act promptly, there is every reason to believe that those burdens will be even greater in the 1970's than they were in the 1960's. Educated by the last two credit crunches and by constant advertisements about interest rates, even the small saver will shift his funds to places offering higher yields. As market rates rise above passbook ceilings and the saver shifts his funds to obtain the higher interest rates, the result may be that little loan money is available from financial institutions.

In keeping wth that analysis, I will propose to the Congress legislation designed to strengthen and revitalize our financial institutions. These proposals may be divided into seven major areas:

(1) Interest ceilings on time and savings deposits should be removed over a 5½ year period.

(2) Expanded deposit services for consumers by federally chartered thrift institutions and banks should be allowed.

(3) Investment and lending alterna-

tives for federally chartered thrift institutions and banks should be expanded.

(4) Federal charters for stock savings and loan institutions and mutual savings banks should be permitted.

(5) Credit unions should be provided with greater access to funds.

(6) FHA and VA interest ceilings should be removed.

(7) The tax structure of banks and thrift institutions should be modified.

These recommendations would achieve the basic reforms our financial system requires. They represent the best suggestions from many different sources—from the Presidential Commission and from business, Government, consumer and academic communities.

The first five of these recommendations are designed to provide increased competition among banks and thrift institutions. Such competition would help to eliminate the inequities now imposed upon the small saver and borrower. My recommendations, and the increased competition that would follow, should reduce the cost of the entire package of financial services for the consumer. Furthermore, the saver would be assured a fair return on his money. In addition, thrift institutions would be strengthened, so they would no longer need the Government support required in the past.

Recommendations 6 and 7, along with the other recommendations, are designed to promote adequate funds for consumer needs, including housing finance. It is clear that interest ceilings on FHA and VA mortgage loans have failed to keep costs down, as evidenced in part by the widespread use of discount "points." At the same time, these ceilings have restricted the flow of private funds into mortgage markets. I will urge that individual States follow our lead and remove similar barriers to housing finance wherever such barriers exist.

The final recommendation would substantially broaden the base of housing finance. Although the final details have yet to be worked out, active consideration is being given to the creation of an income tax credit tied to investments in housing mortgages. Such a credit would be available to all lenders and could vary in direct proportion to the percentage of invested funds held in the form of such mortgages.

These recommendations are not the only steps being taken to strengthen the housing finance market. In my State of the Union Message on Community Development of March 8, 1973, I pledged that this Administration would undertake a comprehensive evaluation of our housing policies and programs and would recommend new policies to eliminate waste and better serve the needy. An interagency task force, under the leadership of Secretary Lynn, is now completing that task, and my recommendations will be presented to the Congress in the near future.

My recommendations on restructuring financial institutions represent a coordinated approach to this challenge, and I urge that they be considered as a package. For example, removing interest ceilings will not make a positive contribution unless banks and thrift institutions can expand their deposit and lending services. Flexibility and efficiency will be enhanced by placing competing institutions on a roughly equal footing with regard to three essential considerations: deposit powers, lending powers, and tax burdens. Finally, the tax recommendation and the removal of FHA and VA interest ceilings will help ensure more adequate funds for housing. The need for reform of our financial institutions is pressing. I urge the Congress to give these proposals its prompt and favorable consideration.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1973.*

REPORT ON FEDERAL YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

The enclosed report by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, describing the administration of the Youth Conservation Corps program during the summer of 1972, is submitted in compliance with Public Law 91–378.

The Federal Youth Conservation Corps program will continue during the summers of 1973 and 1974 under current authorizing legislation. I look forward to a thorough evaluation of the results of that program as a basis for recommending a future course of action.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1973.*

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1264, EISENHOWER COLLEGE MEMORIAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 518 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 518

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1264) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College, in Seneca Falls, New York, out of proceeds from the sale of silver dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 518 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on S. 1264, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College, in Seneca Falls, N.Y., out of proceeds from the sale of silver dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

The grants to Eisenhower College may be made in an aggregate amount equal to $1 for each proof silver $1 coin which has been or is hereafter minted and issued bearing the likeness of the late President Eisenhower. The Eisenhower College has entered into a contractual agreement with the directors of the Samuel Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex., to share academic resources in providing to students of political science, the collection of books and manuscripts housed in the Rayburn Library and the teaching faculty and library collections of Eisenhower College. The agreement provides for a sharing with the Rayburn Library of 10 percent of the funds received by the Eisenhower College as a consequence of the enactment of S. 1264.

The Committee on Banking and Currency estimates the cost to be $4,256,001 representing $1 for each proof dollar coin minted and issued at $10 each in 1971, and $1,778,112 for such dollars sold in 1972. Future allocations would depend upon the number of proof silver dollars purchased this year and annually thereafter from the Bureau of the Mint. The Treasury Department anticipates producing and selling 20 million such proof coins.

I urge adoption of House Resolution 518 in order that we may discuss and debate S. 1264.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with the statement just made by the gentleman from Louisiana. He has made a very full and comprehensive review not only of the rule but of the bill.

This is a noncontroversial open rule with 1 hour of debate. The bill, however, is opposed by many primarily due to its open-ended feature which would not require appropriation.

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse a rule that would bring to the floor of the House this legislation which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to the Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y., out of proceeds from the sale of silver dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

This legislation, in my judgment, deserves our support. I feel that the legislation, from everything I know, is the memorial that the Eisenhower family wants for the late President.

I know there is some opposition based

on what they say will be a precedent. I know there may be some opposition for other reasons.

I do believe, however, when we look at what we have done for other Presidents and when we know that this project is what the Eisenhower family wants, that we ought to approve not only the rule but the legislation.

I should like to say on the record, however—I have said this to the president of Eisenhower College; I have said it to members of the board of trustees—that this legislation from the Federal Government's point of view will be the last Federal contribution. The president of the university and one of his staff members have said to me they will never come back and ask for additional funding. General Norstad and the others on the board of trustees have also assured me that this is the last request.

I told the president of the university that in light of that commitment, they must fit their plans to come within the resources that are expected and anticipated from this legislation.

On the basis of those firm, unequivocal commitments that are now on the record, plus the request from the Eisenhower family, and plus the belief that I think this is an appropriate memorial, a living memorial, to the late President, I favor both the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I appreciate our good minority leader's yielding to me. I appreciate his comments about the motives of the contribution to the Eisenhower College, but has the gentleman from Michigan been able to assure himself in his own mind that the commitment by the president of the college not to come for any further contribution will be any better this time than it was last time before congressional committees?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think I have firmer assurance.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am very grateful to hear that, because I know the gentleman realizes—and this is a difficult thing to talk about, because it is like speaking against motherhood to oppose this rule—that there were very, very firm commitments given the last time a $5 million appropriation was given to this college by the Congress.

It is very understandable; it is a living memorial to a past President; but I am very much concerned that this is another way to receive money from the Federal Government without going through the normal process of the Committee on Education or the Committees on Appropriations.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I understand the gentleman's concern, but I hasten to point out—and I do it only to indicate that I think we do treat living memorials to Presidents differently than we treat other programs and projects.

I have supported the Kennedy Center. On the other hand, we directly support other fine arts facilities and programs out of other Federal programs, and I think the record shows we have far more generously contributed to the Kennedy Center than we have to any other local community fine arts building or program. We do it because it is a living memorial to a deceased President, and that is the justification, I think, here for the Eisenhower College being treated differently from any other institution of higher learning as far as Federal funds are concerned.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Is it not also disturbing to the gentleman from Michigan that as a part of this agreement the college itself entered into an agreement with the Rayburn Library so that all these funds will not go to the Eisenhower College itself?

Ten percent of the funds are going to go to the Rayburn Library. I want to make it clear I have no complaint about the Rayburn Library receiving Federal funds except that the political method to try to help this bill through the Banking and Currency Committee has become an obvious leverage technique. Obviously our chairman is from Texas and it is understandable how all the fine Members of the Texas delegation feel very friendly toward the Rayburn Library, but is this not a strange way to bring this kind of funding to the Rayburn Library? Does that disturb the gentleman?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question raised by the gentleman from California I think we have to go back and understand the very close personal relationship between former President Eisenhower and our former Speaker Sam Rayburn. They occupied two very high positions, about as high posts as can be achieved in our Government, simultaneously. Their working relationship was a very close one, so I can understand a relationship between the Eisenhower College and the Rayburn Library.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But if the gentleman will yield further, we have a very complete memorial to Sam Rayburn right next door to us in the Capitol, the Rayburn Office Building, fully funded and now completed. The Rayburn Library is basically funded by other means and not in desperate need of funds. It disturbs me somewhat that included in this concept in order to receive bipartisan support, I am sure, we have a dissipation of the funds to the Eisenhower College. Does that not bother the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Not knowing as I do the very close relationship, both political and governmental, that President Eisenhower had with Speaker Rayburn.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding.

I am concerned about the way this $5 million has been upped to a possibility of $150 million because under a Senate provision in the Bank Holding Company Act amendment there was a provision to require the use of some silver and calling for the minting of 150 million silver $1 coins. As I understand it—nearly all of the 150 million silver dollars could be proof dollars.

Beyond that, I am also concerned because when the subcommittee I was presiding over held hearings on the original $5 million we did it on the assurance from the family and from the political leaders here in the Congress and the president of Eisenhower College that this would be the only time they would come to the Congress requesting special funds. The distinguished gentleman who represents that district in which this college is located—and believe me—he represents that district extremely well—he also said they would not ask Congress for more funds. I asked him in 1968—when we were considering the $5 million appropriation for Eisenhower College—"Do you see this as a one-time-only approach?"

He assured us this would be the only time the Congress would be asked for funds for the Eisenhower College. Then President Rosenkranz of the Eisenhower College appeared before the committee. I directed the question to him as follows:

> I am not talking about the eligibility of Eisenhower College to participate in all the other Federal programs for higher education but (Mr. Rosenkranz) do you see this $5 million as the only special contribution Congress would be called upon to make or do you see this as the first of many continuing contributions?
>
> Dr. ROSENKRANZ. No, I would see this as the only contribution that they would be asked to make.

This was promised not only to the Committee on Education and Labor but this was promised to the Congress, that they would never come back and ask for more funds.

It seems to me in terms of keeping their word that now when they come back and ask for $1 out of every Eisenhower proof dollar that is sold we could be giving them up to close to $150 million—150 million minus the 6 or 9 million uncirculated silver dollars already minted. It is just incredible to me we would do this.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me respond to my friend, the gentlewoman from Oregon. I was one who joined with the gentleman from New York in assuring several on that committee that this would be the one and last request for any additional funds.

I made that commitment in good faith. I do not hesitate to say on the floor of the House that I am embarrassed to say that in this instance they need more money, and that I have been able to rationalize in my own mind that for reasons of precedent, or emotion, we have to make the exception.

I do not mean this critically. I am simply saying that we do treat living memorials for Presidents differently than we do others. I can recall the people who had control and jurisdiction over the authorization and funding for the Kennedy Center, and I cannot tell the

Members how many times our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in good faith had promised the House and the Congress that "this is the last time."

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that, despite good-faith assurances by people on both sides of the aisle in this case, and good-faith assurances in the case of the Kennedy Center, when it involves a living memorial for a President, apparently we have to weigh emotion and feeling on the scales, and perhaps our judgment is outweighed by friendship and allegiance. What I am saying is that under these circumstances, as I have with the Kennedy Center, I think we have to be more generous. In this case, let me reiterate what I said at the outset, that this is the last time, and I want it clearly understood—clearly understood.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that legislation that could—that could amount to up to 100 million or 150 million for one small college, when all the other colleges across the country are desperate for funds and some are closing their doors, is questionable legislation at best. This House this year refused to appropriate $100 million for 2,600 colleges and universities for institutional aid. I really do not see how any Member of Congress can go back to his or her district and face the students, the faculty members, and presidents of their colleges who are facing a real financial crisis and say that we refuse to appropriate $100 million for 2,600 colleges, but we will make it possible for one small college to receive up to $10 million or even $150 million.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me make a comment on the statement made by the gentlewoman from Oregon.

I am told that it is not $150 million, but rather a total of approximately $20 million, because it relates only to proof sets.

If it were beyond that, it would be $150 million, but people here more knowledgeable than I am in this area, tell me that it is limited to the proof sets. It would be approximately $20 million.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, because as he knows, I was the author of the original 1968 legislation providing funds to Eisenhower College.

I would like to clear up one thing. The gentlewoman from Oregon has been talking about how, under this bill, we would be denying equal treatment to other colleges, and we have seen an article in the Wall Street Journal a week ago and an editorial in the New York Times, all to the same effect. All of them overlook the fact that Eisenhower College is not just another college which happened to get named after a President and so was lucky enough to pick up a few bucks from Congress. Perhaps Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt Colleges will all be in on us for funds too, the gentlewoman suggests.

This college was designated by Congress, as the gentleman from Michigan will recall, back in 1968 in Public Law 90–563 as the sole national memorial to President Eisenhower, just as the Kennedy Center had been designated earlier as the sole national memorial to President Kennedy.

I think the unique thing we ought not lose sight of in this House today is that President Eisenhower, who was a man of action and a great combat general, specifically expressed his desire that he did not want any monument of concrete or marble; he wanted a living memorial in this college. And that is precisely what Congress gave him in 1968 in Public Law 90–563, and for that purpose we appropriated $5 million to Eisenhower College.

The $5 million we appropriated, when one compares it with some of the other grants we have made for Presidential memorials, was a relatively paltry sum. I assured the committee at that time, as the gentleman from Michigan did too, that this was all that the college wanted. But we all know about overruns. We had one with the Kennedy Center, for example. And the bruising inflation which we are in now has put this particular Presidential memorial, Eisenhower College, in a bind just as it has done with other colleges.

But these other colleges are not officially designated memorials to a former President by act of Congress. We do have a responsibility, it seems to me, to do what we can today to help this one college survive. Let us also point out that the money that is being asked here is not coming out of the taxpayers; it is coming out of the sale of Eisenhower proof coins, which have been selling much more rapidly and extensively than anybody imagined, because of the love and affection in which President Eisenhower is still held by the people of the United States. Well if Ike's image, even after he is dead, can produce that kind of a financial return, do we not have a responsibility to use a small portion of these funds to keep alive the living memorial he wanted and that Congress in 1968 designated in his memory? I hope the rule will be adopted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, when this 5 minutes allocated to me is up I will relinquish the floor, and others can proceed.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. (WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) made the point that this bill provides in fact an open-ended grant. We cannot tell, really, how much money will need to be made available to Eisenhower College.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) said that we are only talking about 10 percent of the proceeds of the sale of Eisenhower dollar proof sets, and no money comes from the taxpayers. Well, where does it come from? Already more than $65 million of Eisenhower proof sets have been sold, and if this bill is enacted into law the Treasury will have to come up immediately with $6.5 million, and I mean like today, from money already in the hands of the Treasury.

The likeness of General Eisenhower will also be on the Bicentennial coin, and I have the feeling that we will sell considerable of those proof sets.

In this bill we are not just talking about 10 percent of the proceeds from the Eisenhower coins. The bill reads:

in an aggregate amount equal to $1 multiplied by the total number of $1 proof coins which have been and are hereafter minted and issued . . .

So a friendly Treasurer of the United States could say, "Sales are lagging on the Eisenhower proof set; instead of selling them for $10 we will sell them for $5." Then 20 percent of the proceeds of the sale, or $1 from each sale would go to Eisenhower College.

The purpose is laudable. In its present form this is a bad bill, a bad precedent, and I do not believe it should be passed.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I believe this is a pretty good deal for the taxpayers of the United States.

These proof sets of the Eisenhower dollar sell for $10. The Federal Treasury is going to get $9 out of every one of those proof sets sold, while $1 will go to Eisenhower College.

If we can make $9 on every coin sold of the likeness of a former President, perhaps we should consider the minting of other coins.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill. Every Member of the House should be aware of the fact that the bill is related specifically to the sale of special proof coins which sell at $10 a set to collectors. Projections of unlimited sales are unreasonable both because of the current economic situation, and because of past performance, making it very apparent that the "150" projection is really far from accurate.

Should the bill pass, $6.5 million would be forwarded to Eisenhower College.

I believe this is a unique and inspired method of financing a living memorial to a beloved and great President.

I have voted for appropriations for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. After the first appropriaton, we were told very little more would be required, yet when another $15 million bill was presented to the Congress, I supported that, too, because President Kennedy also was a beloved President of the United States.

This is a fitting memorial to President Eisenhower because it is a living memorial. We are providing for the education of more young people, at an institution which has already established a reputation for academic excellence. It is also important for us to remember that President Eisenhower expressed his own wish that the college be considered the memorial to him. Mrs. Eisenhower indicated to the committee that this proposal was very close to the hearts of the Eisenhower family.

This is a better tribute to the memory of a late beloved President than bricks and mortar, however great the edfice might be.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

(By unanimous consent Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska was allowed to speak out of order.)

ACTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES ON YESTERDAY

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is vitally important to the House to know what transpired in the Committee on Rules last evening when we considered the granting of a rule for legislation which originally passed the House; went to the other body; and the other body added two amendments to that legislation.

One of these amendments concerned beef, and provided that the freeze currently in effect on beef was to be immediately rescinded.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note that this was a partisan issue in the Rules Committee, and on motion of the gentleman from Nebraska to report this legislation to the floor of the House with the other body's amendments, on a party-line vote of 10 Democrats opposing reporting that rule, the House was not given any opportunity to rescind the current beef freeze.

It is interesting to note that the majority leader in the well of the House only yesterday decried the fact that our restaurants are running very, very short of beef, and do not have sufficient beef to feed their customers; the housewives are not buying beef in the marketplace; and it is rapidly declining to the point where there is none at all on the shelves of our stores.

It is also very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note some of the remarks that were made by the Democratic members of the Committee on Rules that they were not going to take the President off the hook in this regard; and they would let him stay on the hook.

Thus it is clear that the Democrats must bear the responsibility for the continuing lack of beef in the marketplace, the unemployment in the packing plants, and the shortages in the restaurants.

Politics should not be played with unemployment and with the serious beef shortage which is depriving the housewife of red meat with which to feed her family.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reply to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) who just spoke, and point out that there is really no reason for the House to vote on this.

All the President has to do is to sign his name, and the controls will come off of beef. It is just that simple; nothing more is needed. He put them on by signing his name; he can take them off the same way.

Mr. Speaker, he has the authority both ways, so the gentleman really ought to be making his speech down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue if he can get in to make it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. REES).

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, this bill disturbs me a great deal. I would like to honor General Eisenhower, who was my general in World War II, and who was my President for 8 years, but I really do not believe this is the best method to honor Dwight D. Eisenhower.

When we honored John Kennedy with the Kennedy Center, we built the Center. The funds were appropriated through the normal appropriations process, and the subsequent appropriations have been through the normal appropriations process. I would be delighted to coauthor any bill that might be introduced on this floor—and I believe all of us would—to give $6 million to the Eisenhower College if this could be a living memorial to a very fine President and a very great American.

If the Members will look at the bill, they will see in the bill that there is no limitation, that for every proof coin that is sold $1 would go to the Eisenhower College. And then there is the 10 percent going to the Rayburn Library.

In 1971 they sold 4.25 million proof dollars and in 1972 2.33 million. That is, $6.58 million, that would make, just in 2 years to go to Eisenhower College. It does not include 1973, 1974, 1975, or 1976 or every other year we might have this dollar minted. So we really do not know how much money we are giving to Eisenhower College; it could be $6 or $10 or $30 million.

I think really this is an irresponsible way of trying to build a memorial which I think all of us are in favor of. I would hope we could vote down the rule on this bill and I would hope we could then introduce specific legislation for a specific appropriation to Eisenhower College to honor this great man and honor his memory.

I am all for that. To say that we are saving money by selling proof coins—let me tell you, collectors will buy them no matter where the money goes. It does not matter whether it goes to Eisenhower College or the Federal Treasury; collectors will buy proof coins.

So what we are doing here is making an open end appropriation. We have no idea how much money will go to the college.

If you look at the report, on page 7 thereof there is a letter from the General Counsel of the Treasury which explains this. I think you should read it, because as responsible Members of the House you will realize we would be setting a very dangerous precedent by not having a specific appropriation limited to a specific amount of funds and limited to a specific purpose.

I say again this is an unlimited appropriation. We have no idea when it would be turned off. I do not know how many more memorials we will start financing with the unlimited circulation of proof dollars, half dollars, quarters, dimes, nickels, or whatever it might be.

Mr. WYLIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman is making a significant and informative statement, and I would like to associate myself with his remarks

I do not object, either, to making a direct appropriation or grant to Eisenhower College. I would support such a measure. But I do object to the back door arrangement provided for in this bill where we have no idea exactly what amount we are talking about or over how long a period.

The gentleman should be commended for his statement.

Mr. WIDNALL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished minority leader of the committee.

Mr. WIDNALL. I checked on the actual figures of sales at the mint and they differ somewhat from the figures you presented. The number of proof coins sold in 1971 was 4,260,494. In 1972 it was 1,779,531. The estimate for this year is 1,000,000, and there is a similar estimate for the year 1974 and 1975 of 1,000,000.

Mr. REES. I might mention again I got my figures from the report on page 7, and that was the report from the general counsel of the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. WALDIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say with respect to the bill that I concur in the statement just made by our colleague from California (Mr. REES).

I would indeed be happy to support through the regular procedures an appropriation to the memory of President Eisenhower or former Speaker Sam Rayburn. However, I think it would serve the memory of the President more honorably to apply the proceeds of the mint set sale to reduce the Federal debt which he so thoroughly deplored in his years at the White House.

I am also concerned about the compounded loss to Treasury in the sum of $1 for each mint set sold and a charitable tax deduction to the purchaser of $1 for each mint set purchased.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

I want to assure my colleagues my opposition to this particular legislation is not based on partisan consideration.

In 1968 my subcommittee voted $5 million for Eisenhower College, that seems to me an indication that it was nonpartisan; then, we did not object to a direct appropriation, but it is this backdoor approach, which seems to me misleading to the American people.

As further evidence that it is not on a partisan basis, that same year, or the same session of Congress, we had a request from Kennedy College, which I believe is in the State of Nebraska; Kennedy College pointed to the precedent that our committee had set by appropriating $5 million for Eisenhower College. Kennedy College requested the same appropriation, and they made exactly the same plea that the president of Eisenhower College had made.

Our committee, of which I was chairman, turned down the request of Kennedy College.

I was Oregon chairman for John Kennedy's campaign in 1960 in Oregon. I was very fond of the Kennedy family.

In turning down Kennedy College, it seems to me it ought to be another indication that our opposition is based on something else than partisan considerations. The two things that finally led our committee to that $5 million appropriation were, one, that it was to be a living memorial. I am in complete agreement with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I am in favor of living memorials more than I am in favor of monuments to stone and mortar.

The second argument that was persuasive was the assurance from the president of the college, from the trustees, from political leaders in this House, from the Representative of that district in which the Eisenhower College is located, that this would be the one-time-only approach. Had there been any indication to us that they would have come back and up the figure many times over, I say to the Members we never would have appropriated that original $5 million.

I should like to clear up the amount of money that might be involved in this, and I should like to yield, if I may, to the very distinguished lady, the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation for an answer in regard to the number of Eisenhower dollars, the number of dollars that had been authorized by the Congress, and what could be the total amount that this one college could obtain over the next 5 or 25 years? I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) for an answer to that question.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I am happy to answer the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Under a Senate provision in the Bank Holding Company Act Amendments of 1970 there was a provision to require the use of some silver in coins, calling for the minting of 150 million silver one-dollar coins, using silver transferred from the defense stockpile. There is nothing in the 1970 law to say how many of these 150 million coins should be proof coins. They mint the proof coins according to the number of orders they receive each year. The Treasury said in 1970 that it intended to make 20 million proof coins and 130 million uncirculated silver dollars out of the silver from the stockpile, but under the law the Secretary of the Treasury has complete discretion in this regard. S. 1264 authorizes grants to Eisenhower College in an aggregate amount equal to $1 multiplied by the total number of $1 proof silver dollar coins which have been and are hereafter minted, and so forth. Under the 1970 act, nearly all of the 150 million silver dollars could be proof dollars.

Proof coins are minted every year, and as long as President Eisenhower's image is on that dollar, every silver proof coin bearing his image would involve a $1 contribution to Eisenhower College under this bill. This could go on forever until they change the design on the front of the coin.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have a second question. This also includes the Bicentennial commemorative?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Right, this would include the silver proof dollars which will be struck to be sold after July 4, 1975, under H.R. 8789, a bill now pending before the House to strike special Bicentennial dollars, half-dollars, and quarters. President Eisenhower's likeness would remain on the dollar Bicentennial coin. Only the reverse side could be changed under H.R. 8789.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So that the Eisenhower College, under the bill for debate today, could get $1 for every Bicentennial commemorative that is also sold?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. As long as President Eisenhower's image is on one side of the dollar coin, yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then would not the gentlewoman from Missouri agree that this total might go up to $150 million over a period of years?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Not quite that high. About 9 million of the uncirculated coins have been sold, so the limit would be a little less than $150 million. As I said, proof silver dollar coins are minted every year.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I would like to clarify that this is certainly no partisan opposition to this rule or bill. I think this rule should be defeated. Five years ago the gentlewoman agreed reluctantly and I and other members of the subcommittee agreed reluctantly to bring out this bill for special treatment for the Eisenhower College and it was done only with the firm assurance they would not be coming back with additional requests. Now they are, and I think this should be defeated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will serve one of the finest, noblest objectives of this Republic—to aid, foster, and promote the education of our youth in the principles of democracy and the processes of government. In serving that objective, it will also honor two of the finest men this country has produced in nearly 200 years of national existence—Dwight D. Eisenhower and Sam Rayburn. And it will honor President Eisenhower and Speaker Rayburn in a manner which would have pleased them more than anything we could do—by providing support to the educational institutions they selected their lifetimes as their living memorials.

The bulk of the financial support contained in this legislation will go to Eisenhower College, at Seneca Falls, N.Y., but a substantial share will also go to the Sam Rayburn Library of Bonham, Tex., which contains all of the official papers of the greatest legislator to have served in the Congress of the United States, one who served longer as Speaker of the House than any man in our history.

It is particularly fitting that President Eisenhower and Speaker Rayburn are jointly remembered and honored in this legislation.

General Eisenhower was born in Dennison, Tex. Speaker Rayburn lived from infancy in Fannin County, Tex., which is near where President Eisenhower was born. These two great men, with their roots firmly in the small towns of America, grew up to lead this country as contemporaries through some of its greatest crises and most glorious achievements—through World War II and then through most of the years of the Eisenhower Presidency when Mr. Sam was Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Rayburn leadership and legislative genius provided the funds and legislative authority which made possible the Eisenhower victories as Supreme Allied Commander in the European Theater of World War II, were instrumental in creating and strengthening NATO after the war. Mr. Sam then gave President Eisenhower dedicated and nonpartisan support in every cause in which the wellbeing of the Nation and the cause of freedom and peace were at stake.

I think all of us know of that background and recognize the importance of the rolls these two sons of Texas played in the national and international achievements of this country.

So what we are proposing here is simply to take a small portion of the tremendous profits realized by the Government from the sale of the proof Eisenhower silver dollars and return some of those funds as seed money toward the flowering and nourishment of learning in this country in the principles of democracy and the process of government. No better use could be found for these funds than to inspire youth in the study of the ideals to which President Eisenhower and Speaker Rayburn dedicated themselves as public officials.

I am mindful of the objections which have been raised to this legislation on the grounds that it would perhaps set some precedent for the future diversion of coinage receipts. It must be pointed out, however, that many of the Americans who have purchased proof Eisenhower silver dollars at $10 each did so, and are doing so, primarily because of their respect and admiration for the great American honored in these special and beau-

tiful examples of coinage art. The profits on the sale of the proof dollars have been tremendous. No other individual coin in our history, I believe, has been sold by the Treasury at a price exceeding its face value. People have been willing to pay 10 times the face value of the proof dollar, not as part of a numismatic set, but as a single piece. It is unique. As long as this House remains dedicated to its trust in considering legislation carefully and on its merits, we do not have to fear the consequences of this bill as establishing a precedent which would have any unfortunate results.

Congress has already recognized the status of Eisenhower College as the official memorial to the late general and President and provided funds to help establish the college. In a few short years, this new college in New York State has made its mark as an outstanding educational institution, winning academic accreditation in remarkably short time. It has attracted a student body of earnest young men and women who already constitute one-half of the college's planned future total enrollment of 1,500 students. Its growth has been carefully planned to assure quality education for all who attend this institution.

The Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex., which will share in a portion of the proceeds of this legislation through a contractual relationship with Eisenhower College, will provide political science students of Eisenhower College, and those of other colleges as well, a most unusual opportunity to learn about the legislative process through the work and life and heritage of our greatest speaker. [A Dwight D. Eisenhower study center will be established at the library to aid in this educational work, and a Sam Rayburn chair will be established at the Eisenhower College to keep alive the legislative genius of Mr. Sam. This is a most unusual cooperative relationship between two fine institutions, both of which serve as the living memorials to the great leaders they memorialize.]

I am deeply impressed by the support Eisenhower College has received from members of the late President's family—his widow, the much-loved Mamie Dowd Eisenhower; his son, the Honorable John Eisenhower, our former Ambassador to Belgium; and his brother, Doctor Milton Eisenhower, president-emeritus of Johns Hopkins University, who also served this Nation with such distinction as a public servant.

Mrs. Eisenhower probably expressed better than any one has done or could do what the college meant to her husband, and what this legislation means to those who loved him, when she wrote to this committee:

> Last summer, I had the opportunity to personally see Eisenhower College. I was deeply impressed. It has already proven to be a college of character, a quality which my husband hoped for as he watched its start and early growth.
>
> He felt so honored to have it carry his name. He admired everything about it, the courage of its founders, and the generosity of thousands across the country who helped finance its start.
>
> I have seen the truly wonderful progress of the college. I feel very much a part of it, and honored in having the main academic hall named for me. I want to do everything I can to help it serve those students who, in years to come, will follow the able young people I have talked to on campus.
>
> This is not only a memorial, it is an institution of great importance to this country. The funds to complete it will constitute an investment which will produce each year graduates who will take a responsible position in society. Can we ask for more?
>
> As so many know, for long years my husband treasured the thought of being an active part of a small college following his retirement. History now records how that dream was not realized, so I know he saw Eisenhower College, in part anyway, as his way of being closely associated with young people, thoughts which I admired so much and shared with him.
>
> The decision of Congress, earlier, to issue a new silver coin in his honor is a magnificent tribute, principally because it provided a way for all who wished so to have a lasting and valued keepsake of him. Knowing how his fellow citizens expressed their good thoughts about him over the years, I can't help but think they would be happy to find that in acquiring this keepsake that they were also helping to build his college.
>
> With enthusiasm and very deep gratitude, I welcome this proposal which will assure and hasten the completion of Eisenhower College.—Mamie Dowd Eisenhower.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. THORNTON).

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, as I have looked about this city I have discovered the many monuments we have here with varied shapes and forms but I think few are as fitting or as functional as the Seneca Falls Institution which has perpetuated the memory of the Nation's 34th President.

This memorial is a memorial which not only honors our President's contribution to this country but also reflects his deep commitment to the cause of higher education. I am concerned that we now may be deciding whether an educational institution may serve as a national memorial.

In an address at Boston University more than 20 years ago, President Eisenhower stated, and I quote:

> I see no hope for the world, except through education, but I am most optimistic for the world because I believe in education.

A decade later, before this Congress, he said:

> Education is first and foremost an instrument for serving the aspirations of each person. It is not only the means for earning a living, but for enlarging life—for maintaining and improving liberty of the mind, for exercising both the rights and obligations of freedom, for understanding the world in which we live.

In 1965, he participated in the groundbreaking ceremonies for this small, liberal arts college in Seneca Falls. He said:

> I can think of no greater monument to any man than a college bearing his name.

Today, like other educational institutions across the land, this college needs money. That is not unusual. However, unlike other colleges, it does not have a large alumni body to form a source of income for it. I think that this Presidential memorial is seeking an appropriate source of funds. A schoolhouse is certainly as appropriate a memorial as an opera house or a monument of stone.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arkansas who just spoke made a very important point. This is a Presidential memorial for the first time in the form of an educational institution.

And so, as the gentleman has said, this vote is also a test as to whether this body is willing to see a memorial in that unique form survive. We had no trouble at all a year or so ago, as I recall, when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) came in with a proposed memorial for President Eisenhower to build a sports stadium down town here. I think that was to cost $12 or $15 million, and the Members fell all over each other in the rush to get on the bandwagon and spend that kind of money, even though the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and I pointed out that we already had a National Memorial to President Eisenhower.

Therefore, I do not believe that all of this concern for funds being expressed at this moment is really quite as sincere as it may appear to be. Let us remember that Eisenhower College has been made by law the National Memorial for President Eisenhower, under Public Law 90–563. We are forgetting that when we start talking about Kennedy College or Roosevelt College. Congress made this determination back in 1968. The gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) who has always been interested in education, had these words to say at the time:

> Memorials to men who have led great nations have often been hewn of stone. This legislation to provide Eisenhower College in New York with the means to build educational facilities sets what I hope will be a pattern for future memorials to such men living, useful, vigorous elements of a nation dedicated to educational excellence for all its citizens.

So, this is on exactly the same footing as the Kennedy Center. They told us when the Kennedy Center came up here looking for money that it was only going to cost Congress $26 million; and we appropriated that sum. Then, later on, they came back and said they had had a slight overrun and needed another $15 million. I can remember the debate then: "Oh, there has been an overrun," some people complained. "You said $26 million was all you wanted."

But we appropriated the extra money anyway and just the other day the Kennedy Center, they came back here again for $5 million more to correct some of the vandalism, and we came through with that money, too.

I have listened to these remarks about how we ought to go about helping Eisenhower College some other way; and I would have no objection to trying some other way. But let us not kid ourselves. We are actually here now; we are operating on this bill. We are not nowhere else, and we do not have infinite time at our disposal. This bill came out of the other body by a unanimous vote, a bill originally offered by Senator JAVITS. There are those who say now: "Oh, I am really in favor of helping this college, but let us

go back and do it in some other way." My friends, if we go back and try to do it some other way it is just not going to get done. The money that is being made available here for this memorial is money that is carrying out an earlier commitment of Congress. I would, however, have no objection to putting some limit on what could be turned over to Eisenhower College under this bill. That is a good idea. I do not think there ought to be any open-ended commitment, and I do not believe this bill is supposed to represent such a commitment.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, did we not make a contribution of Federal funds to the Eisenhower Library in Abilene?

Mr. STRATTON. Not that I know of, no. This is the only memorial that has been officially authorized by Congress, and the only memorial for which funds have been appropriated, so far as I know.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the Congress give a special tax dispensation to Mr. Eisenhower on the income for his book, "Crusade to Europe," to the tune of pretty close to a million dollars?

Mr. STRATTON. That was done at a time when General Eisenhower was alive. That had nothing to do with any memorial.

Mr. GROSS. How much blood do they want to extract from the taxpayers of this country?

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as giving President Eisenhower some kind of a tax break on the book he wrote, I should like to point out that the identical tax break applies to all athletes and other people who have a high earning capacity for a limited number of years. This was not anything developed for President Eisenhower.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make two points.

First, we are talking about a memorial for a late President, and I cannot think of anything that would be any worse as a memorial. This, to my way of thinking, is politics at its very worst.

We start with a broken promise, compound that with a crass political deal, and throw in about as high-powered a lobbying effort as we have seen in recent years, up to and including the placing of Mamie Eisenhower in the front row of the hearings, for whatever purpose that may have had.

Second, I would call attention to the preamble of the act. That does not indicate discretionary authority. If we read the exact words, it is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury. How can we call that anything but mandatory? It would escape the attention of this particular Member.

Rather than being a fitting memorial to a late President, I happen to believe this is probably an example of politics at its very worst.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to vouch for everything the gentlewoman from Oregon said, because I was the ranking minority member of her subcommittee at the time the bill was before the subcommittee in 1968. All the assurances that she indicated were made before the subcommittee.

A number of Members have said that this does not take money from taxpayers, but that is exactly what it is. This $1 per proof coin would otherwise go to the Treasury.

Simply because it will go to the Eisenhower College or to the Rayburn Library will not increase the sale of proof coins one bit, because if a person wants to contribute to the college or to the library he would not want to contribute $10 to get $1, but he could contribute directly to them.

Also, promises are being made again that they will never come back again to Congress. They do not have to come back again. All they have to do is convince the Secretary of the Treasury to mint some more proof coins, and the amount of money from the Federal Treasury or which would otherwise go to the treasury is virtually unlimited.

I should like to point out a college in my district, Lea College. Their problem is that they named the college after a small city. If it had been named after a President, the Congress could contribute money to it. You see this small college has even more financial problems than Eisenhower College.

We should not pass this bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out two things with reference to this bill.

First, General Eisenhower was born in the Speaker's district, in the district I now represent. The Rayburn Library received all of the worldly goods the Speaker had, the man who presided over this Chamber for three times as long as anybody else in history. He did not ask for anything. He did not ask for Federal funds. He put everything he had into it. It is not enough to keep the library going.

So the Eisenhower College made an arrangement with the library to give them 10 percent of the funds. I want to talk about how much this is going to cost the Government. Let me say that for every one of those coins the Federal Government will make $9, and will give $1 to Eisenhower College, and a dime of that dollar will go to the library.

One cannot get a better return, when he is making $9 on everything they sell. The more they sell the more the Federal Government will make.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that a few Members would have this kind of apprehension concerning a bill that goes to such a good purpose. It may not be the best precedent which any of us might want, and we may want to escape that. However, the fact is that the rule before us is for a very good cause, and I believe we would not want to look at this in a narrow manner and we should, instead, approve it because it serves to honor a very fine person.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

I wish to say one other thing: The only place where a graduate student may go to find all of the reports of the Congress and the Continental Congress, other than the Library of Congress, is the Rayburn Library. This will keep it open.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will go along, and I hope they sell a lot of coins.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the nearly 11 years since the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) became chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, there have been very few occasions when I did not follow his leadership on legislation acted on in that committee. I have joined him in many battles in behalf of the public interest, and often we have stood together, in some seemingly hopeless causes, only to win out in the end. So, it is with great reluctance that I voice objection now, to a bill which I know is very, very close to my chairman's heart.

But as chairman of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over such legislation in the Banking and Currency Committee, I cannot support S. 1264. Simply stated, my reasons are these:

First. It sets a precedent, in the diversion of coinage funds, that can only lead to further raids on the half billion dollars of annual seigniorage profits, from the manufacture and distribution of coins. If we do this for one college named after a President whose likeness appears on a coin, we have no reason not to do the same thing for any other college established as a memorial to a President honored on a coin. We have never before earmarked coinage receipts for any specific purpose. As I state in my separate views in the committee report, coinage receipts are not found money—they are an important source of revenues for the general fund. This bill makes a kind of section 32 out of coinage receipts, to be tapped first for Eisenhower College and subsequently for whatever good or emotional or popular cause which comes along.

The Banking and Currency Committee will be pressured and eventually forced to supersede the other legislative committees on any proposal which uses this back-door method of financing. If Eisenhower College can qualify for $6 million, or $10 million, or $14 million, or $20 million, or even $100 million—since there is no limit in this bill as to how much it could eventually receive—why not other colleges?

Second. Eisenhower College was established as a living memorial to the late President in 1968 by legislation

which originated in the Education and Labor Committee. A top amount of $5 million was authorized, and this amount had to be matched by private contributions. The Federal funds could be used, under the 1968 act, only for construction. This bill supersedes the original act establishing the college as a memorial, and provides for an open-ended appropriation authorization to be used for any purpose the college wishes to use it for.

Approximately one-half of all of the money the college hopes and expects to receive from this legislation is tentatively earmarked for student aid—as an endowment fund of nearly $9 million. This is a purpose the Education and Labor Committee specified in 1968 that the memorial funds should not be used for, because Eisenhower College is eligible for all of the Federal student aid assistance available to all other colleges. Why give to 750 students—the present enrollment—or to a maximum of 1,500—the planned total enrollment—Federal student aid funds as a memorial to President Eisenhower? Any such funds given to the college as a memorial should be used as the Congress intended in 1968—for construction of facilities only.

Third. If we want to aid this college further, and also aid Rayburn Library as would be done indirectly by this bill, then we should amend Public Law 90–563, which established the college as a living memorial, to increase the amount of $5,000,000 authorized in 1968. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9065, to do just that. It would increase by 50 percent the amount authorized for the college in 1968, reflecting the 50-percent increase since then in the costs of constructing educational facilities. H.R. 9065 also would authorize the college to share 10 percent of that increase with Rayburn Library for the cooperative educational activities the two institutions have recently contracted to provide jointly out of any additional special funds received by the college from the Congress from coinage receipts.

Fourth: My last point is this: The proof dollars which bear President Eisenhower's likeness are purchased primarily by coin collectors, who have been willing to pay 10 times the face value of this coin for a collector item. Under other legislation now pending before the House, H.R. 8789, all proof dollars minted for issuance beginning July 4, 1975, will bear special bicentennial designs on their reverse side with President Eisenhower on the obverse. The coin collectors, and other citizens purchasing proof dollars for their bicentennial designs, would be required under S. 1264 to contribute $1 to one particular college. This is unfair. I assume they will not be able to claim a charitable deduction for this $1 contribution on their income tax.

Despite its lofty objectives to memorialize President Eisenhower and Speaker Rayburn, this bill would carry out legislative and fiscal policies which President Eisenhower and Speaker Rayburn would undoubtedly have considered wrong.

The bill should be rejected, and new legislation brought before us to amend the 1968 act to give the college and the library as much money as the appropriate committee of the House—Education and Labor—believes is justified for educational purposes as fitting memorials to two outstanding Americans.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to clear up a few of the things that have been said here today.

Eisenhower College is located in my congressional district. Founded only 5 years ago it has been voted to membership in a 15 college and university consortium, an indication of the recognition it has already won from some century old institutions of learning.

The college will never be large. It was never intended to be. Eventually it will serve about 1,500 students. At present there are 800 students. Interestingly enough 48 percent of the student body receives some type of financial assistance.

There is no other memorial in honor of Dwight Eisenhower. By approving this legislation the House can join with the Senate and pay enduring honor to his memory.

Mr. Speaker, the point I would like to clear up is that this college did not come down here and invent this idea. Actually the idea for the memorial originated in an editorial in the Syracuse Post Standard. They indicated in that editorial that this would be "a memorial gesture of lasting magnitude."

As you cast your vote here today, I ask you not only to remember that he was one of our finest Presidents but also the great leader who commanded the armies of the free world when we successfully crushed the hideous forces of fascism and nazism.

I cannot think of a more fitting memorial to a great leader than one that will help end the ignorance and prejudice which he so successfully fought against.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman for his very meaningful statement, and I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with real reluctance that I must take a position in opposition to this legislation.

I served with President Eisenhower. He was the first President I served with. I came to Congress when he was inaugurated.

I served under the speakership of the Speaker Rayburn, who was a great man. Any Member who ever served with him could not deny that. He was one of the great leaders we have had here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we would set a very serious precedent by taking action today on this legislation, and I just want the record to be very clear, as I voice my opposition, that it has nothing to do with President Eisenhower, great man that he was, or with Speaker Rayburn.

That is not the point here at all. The point is I believe as we go down this road of precedents we will live to regret it at some point in the future.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

A lot of talk has been going on here today about the amount of money we are spending. Actually, the Eisenhower proof dollar is not worth a dollar and it is being sold for $10 purely because of the use of President Eisenhower's name.

We have sold 6,932,000 of these dollars to date, which means this sum of money will go for the purposes already described to you.

I do not know how much money was spent on the Jefferson Memorial when it started to settle approximately 4 years ago and the entire front was blocked off. I do not know how much money was spent on repair and maintenance of monuments that we have in commemoration of past great Presidents, but I do know how much money is involved here for an excellent purpose, earned through the use of President Eisenhower's name.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LATTA was allowed to proceed out of order.)

H.R. 5777

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate on this rule the gentleman from Nebraska referred to the very important action of the Committee on Rules yesterday on H.R. 5777. This bill carried two very important Senate amendments.

One of them would have lifted the freeze on beef, and the other would have forced the President to invoke mandatory petroleum allocations.

I would like to say for the record that I was one of those who supported the bill with the amendments.

On a very crucial vote on the question of deferring action on this bill the vote was 9 to 6 to defer action. I think Members supporting this action will have to explain the same when they go back to the housewives out of beef and to their husbands who may be having difficulty buying gasoline.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS).

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I know you are ready to vote on this rule, and it will not be very long before we vote.

Let me point out one thing that has not been pointed out to the House in all the arguments that have been made one way or the other.

When the House authorizes a coin like

the Eisenhower silver dollar, the House is launching a private enterprise, profit-making venture. The money derived from that is not derived other than through the profit-making system.

We are not in this instance using the taxpayers' money in the sense of it being a general tax that anybody has to pay. Nobody has to buy an Eisenhower silver dollar. I think that is a very important consideration.

When you talk about making direct appropriations, which some of you have said you favor, for something of this kind, I would object to making a direct appropriation for the college out of general taxpayers' funds.

I would make that objection because it is on the same foundation that we do not allow a corporation to pay a political campaign contribution, because there may be people in the corporate structure and stockholders who would not have their money spent in that fashion. But this money is spent by the individual of his own choice.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Where is it proposed to get the $6½ million for the retroactive payments to the college?

Mr. STEPHENS. That $6½ million is from people who bought these $10 silver dollars.

Mr. GROSS. That $6½ million will have to be appropriated right out of the Treasury.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill. Let us remember one thing, and that is what we are talking about: a memorial to President Eisenhower and Sam Rayburn, and let us forget about the rest of it.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the rule so as to permit this bill to be discussed and amend on the floor. There are two amendments which I will offer or support if offered by others, and if either is rejected, I will not vote for the bill on final passage. The first amendment would strike from the bill any retroactive provision. It would be wrong to require the Treasury to turn over to the Eisenhower College $6.5 million as a result of coins heretofore sold. The second amendment would limit the amount to be received as a result of any such sales in the future to a maximum of $5 million representing the amount of the original grant to the college made by the Congress. It is my desire to provide for moneys for the Eisenhower Memorial just as I voted for moneys for the Kennedy Memorial. But I will not vote for the bill in its present form.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, S. 1264 to aid Eisenhower College and the Rayburn Library has my complete support. We need more legislation of this nature to assist our colleges in training the youth of America for the leadership roles that they will be called upon to fill in our democracy in the years ahead.

I am particularly pleased that a substantial share of the money which will be awarded to Eisenhower College under S. 1264 is intended to assist needy students from all over this country to attend an institution of higher learning dedicated to the ideals of service to the American people as exemplified by the life and the ideals of Dwight D. Eisenhower. And these students in turn will be able to spend part of their academic careers in study at the Rayburn Library where they will have access to the official papers of one of the greatest men to have served in the Congress of the United States, Speaker Sam Rayburn.

As a member of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over this legislation I am not the least bit fearful that the passage of this legislation will create any problem for that subcommittee in the future. A precedent is not being established by this legislation as long as the Members of Congress now and in the future examine every bill on its own merits.

There are few bills that could come before the House which have more social merit than S. 1264. We are helping the youth of America to have a better understanding of the functions of government and the need for honesty in government. Speaker Rayburn and President Eisenhower were men of integrity. Their integrity matched their abilities. The bill should be passed.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1264, which makes a portion of the proceeds from the sale of Eisenhower proof silver dollars available to Eisenhower College.

This bill will make Eisenhower College a living memorial to the late President Dwight David Eisenhower. The college is not merely named after him, but was named at its creation with the approval of the President being honored. It is clear that President Eisenhower wanted this college to exist and to prosper and in addition to his name, he gave it funds and friends and an indelible character.

It gave the general great pleasure as he saw it develop and grow and as he realized his name would always be associated with aspiring youth. At the dedication, Eisenhower said:

> I can think of no greater monument to any man than a college bearing his name; an institution which will be a vital, vigorous champion of freedom through proper education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill should be passed, as it provides far more than just construction of a marble statute or a building in memory of a great President. Eisenhower College is a living, growing, thriving and vital memorial. Again, to quote Eisenhower at the dedication—

> . . . Let's have the finest faculty, let's bring in the knowledgeable lecturers, but let's do it in an atmosphere and an environment where the student's standards of respect for law, his moral standards, his willingness for accommodation with his fellow students will be expanded and strengthened.

What better living memorial could the Nation have than students who graduate from Eisenhower College holding these high morals and ideals as expressed by a totally unique man who was a soldier, a statesman, and an academician.

The other body has already passed this bill, and I urge similarly favorable action here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to S. 1264 for reasons very eloquently set forth in the dissenting views filed by the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN), and stated during the debate on this resolution by a number of speakers.

However, I shall vote for House Resolution 518 because it is a normal, "open" rule providing for 1 hour of general debate and, thereafter, opportunity to amend the bill.

I realize that the Members are anxious to wind up the business of the day so that they may leave for the August recess. But to me that is not a sufficient reason for choking off further debate and the possibility of amendment.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 518.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 230, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—183

Addabbo	Collins, Tex.	Gude
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Gunter
Annunzio	Conlan	Haley
Archer	Corman	Hanley
Arends	Coughlin	Hansen, Idaho
Bafalis	Daniel, Dan	Harvey
Barrett	Davis, S.C.	Hastings
Bennett	de la Garza	Hébert
Biester	Delaney	Heckler, Mass.
Bingham	Dellenback	Heinz
Blackburn	Denholm	Hillis
Boggs	Dickinson	Horton
Bolling	Dorn	Johnson, Colo.
Brasco	Dulski	Johnson, Pa.
Bray	Duncan	Jones, Okla.
Brooks	du Pont	Jordan
Broomfield	Eckhardt	Kazen
Brotzman	Edwards, Ala.	Kemp
Brown, Calif.	Erlenborn	King
Broyhill, N.C.	Esch	Koch
Buchanan	Eshleman	Kuykendall
Burgener	Findley	Latta
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Lent
Burleson, Tex.	Flynt	Long, La.
Byron	Ford, Gerald R.	McClory
Carter	Fraser	McCollister
Casey, Tex.	Frenzel	McEwen
Clausen,	Gettys	McFall
Don H.	Ginn	McKinney
Clawson, Del	Gonzalez	McSpadden
Cleveland	Goodling	Madigan
Cohen	Grasso	Mahon
Collier	Gubser	Mailliard

Mallary	Pike	Stanton,
Mann	Poage	J. William
Maraziti	Podell	Stark
Mathias, Calif.	Price, Ill.	Steelman
Mathis, Ga.	Pritchard	Stephens
Matsunaga	Quillen	Stratton
Milford	Railsback	Talcott
Minshall, Ohio	Reid	Teague, Tex.
Mitchell, Md.	Reuss	Thomson, Wis.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rhodes	Thornton
Mizell	Rinaldo	Walsh
Moakley	Roberts	Wampler
Moorhead, Pa.	Robison, N.Y.	Ware
Morgan	Roncallo, Wyo.	White
Mosher	Roncallo, N.Y.	Widnall
Murphy, N.Y.	Rooney, Pa.	Williams
Myers	Roy	Wilson, Bob
Nedzi	Runnels	Wilson,
Nelsen	Ruppe	Charles, Tex.
Nichols	Ruth	Winn
Nix	Sandman	Wright
O'Neill	Sarasin	Wydler
Parris	Sebelius	Yatron
Passman	Shriver	Young, Alaska
Patman	Shuster	Young, Fla.
Pepper	Sisk	Young, Ga.
Perkins	Smith, N.Y.	Young, Ill.
Peyser	Spence	Young, Tex.
Pickle	Staggers	Zablocki

NOES—230

Abdnor	Ford,	Mezvinsky
Abzug	William D.	Michel
Adams	Forsythe	Miller
Alexander	Fountain	Minish
Anderson,	Frelinghuysen	Mink
Calif.	Frey	Mollohan
Andrews, N.C.	Froehlich	Montgomery
Andrews,	Fulton	Moorhead,
N. Dak.	Fuqua	Calif.
Armstrong	Gaydos	Moss
Ashbrook	Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.
Ashley	Gilman	Natcher
Aspin	Goldwater	Obey
Badillo	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara
Baker	Green, Pa.	Owens
Beard	Griffiths	Patten
Bell	Gross	Pettis
Bergland	Grover	Powell, Ohio
Bevill	Guyer	Preyer
Biaggi	Hamilton	Price, Tex.
Blatnik	Hammer-	Quie
Boland	schmidt	Randall
Bowen	Hanrahan	Rangel
Brademas	Harrington	Rarick
Breaux	Harsha	Rees
Breckinridge	Hawkins	Regula
Brinkley	Hays	Riegle
Brown, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Robinson, Va.
Broyhill, Va.	Helstoski	Rodino
Burke, Calif.	Henderson	Roe
Burke, Fla.	Hicks	Rogers
Burlison, Mo.	Hinshaw	Rose
Burton	Hogan	Rosenthal
Butler	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Camp	Holt	Roush
Carey, N.Y.	Holtzman	Rousselot
Carney, Ohio	Hosmer	Roybal
Cederberg	Howard	Ryan
Chamberlain	Huber	St Germain
Chappell	Hudnut	Sarbanes
Chisholm	Hungate	Satterfield
Clancy	Hunt	Saylor
Clark	Hutchinson	Scherle
Clay	Ichord	Schneebeli
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Schroeder
Collins, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Seiberling
Conte	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Conyers	Jones, Tenn.	Shoup
Crane	Karth	Sikes
Cronin	Kastenmeier	Skubitz
Culver	Keating	Slack
Daniel, Robert	Ketchum	Snyder
W., Jr.	Kluczynski	Stanton,
Daniels,	Kyros	James V.
Dominick V.	Landrum	Steed
Danielson	Leggett	Steele
Davis, Ga.	Lehman	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Wis.	Litton	Steiger, Wis.
Dellums	Long, Md.	Stokes
Dennis	Lott	Stubblefield
Dent	Lujan	Studds
Derwinski	McCloskey	Sullivan
Devine	McCormack	Symms
Dingell	McDade	Taylor, Mo.
Donohue	McKay	Taylor, N.C.
Downing	Macdonald	Teague, Calif.
Drinan	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Martin, Nebr.	Thone
Eilberg	Martin, N.C.	Tiernan
Evans, Colo.	Mayne	Towell, Nev.
Fascell	Mazzoli	Treen
Fish	Meeds	Udall
Flowers	Melcher	Ullman
Foley	Metcalfe	Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt	Whalen	Wolff
Vanik	Whitehurst	Wyatt
Veysey	Whitten	Wylie
Vigorito	Wilson,	Yates
Waggonner	Charles H.,	Young, S.C.
Waldie	Calif.	Zion

NOT VOTING—20

Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Smith, Iowa
Cotter	Hansen, Wash.	Stuckey
Diggs	Jarman	Symington
Evins, Tenn.	Landgrebe	Wiggins
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Wyman
Giaimo	O'Brien	Zwach
Gray	Rooney, N.Y.	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Cotter against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Stuckey.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Symington with Mr. Wyman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

END TO BOMBING IN CAMBODIA—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By legislative action the Congress has required an end to American bombing in Cambodia on August 15th. The wording of the Cambodian rider is unmistakable; its intent is clear. The Congress has expressed its will in the form of law and the Administration will obey that law.

I cannot do so, however, without stating my grave personal reservations concerning the dangerous potential consequences of this measure. I would be remiss in my constitutional responsibilities if I did not warn of the hazards that lie in the path chosen by Congress.

Since entering office in January of 1969, I have worked ceaselessly to secure an honorable peace in Southeast Asia. Thanks to the support of the American people and the gallantry of our fighting men and allies, a ceasefire agreement in Vietnam and a political settlement in Laos have already been achieved. The attainment of a settlement in Cambodia has been the unremitting effort of this Administration, and we have had every confidence of being able to achieve that goal. With the passage of the Congressional act, the incentive to negotiate a settlement in Cambodia has been undermined, and August 15 will accelerate this process.

This abandonment of a friend will have a profound impact in other countries, such as Thailand, which have relied on the constancy and determination of the United States, and I want the Congress to be fully aware of the consequences of its action. For my part, I assure America's allies that this Administration will do everything permitted by Congressional action to achieve a lasting peace in Indochina. In particular, I want the brave and beleagured Cambodian people to know that the end to the bombing in Cambodia does not signal an abdication of America's determination to work for a lasting peace in Indochina. We will continue to provide all possible support permitted under the law. We will continue to work for a durable peace with all the legal means at our disposal.

I can only hope that the North Vietnamese will not draw the erroneous conclusion from this Congressional action that they are free to launch a military offensive in other areas in Indochina. North Vietnam would be making a very dangerous error if it mistook the cessation of bombing in Cambodia for an invitation to fresh aggression or further violations of the Paris Agreements. The American people would respond to such aggression with appropriate action.

I have sent an identical letter to the Majority Leader of the Senate.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR EISENHOWER COLLEGE AND RAYBURN LIBRARY

(Mrs. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the rule was voted down on the previous bill, and the fact that so many Members have expressed a desire to help the Eisenhower College and the Rayburn Library, I have introduced, on June 28, 1973, H.R. 9065, which authorizes funds to the college and to the library through the regular congressional procedure.

This bill is before the Committee on Education and Labor, and I am certain it will have great interest if it is given consideration.

APOLOGY TO OUR FELLOW AMERICANS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY IS DEMANDED

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to put into words, the great sense of outrage that I feel concerning the recent public display of bigotry by John J. Wilson during the course of the Watergate hearings.

Wilson's racial comment is an outrage and an affront to all decent people. Its derogatory implications would be shameful in any usage, but seem even more contemptible when aimed at a distinguished U.S. Senator and a decorated hero of World War II.

John Wilson owes Senator INOUYE an apology but more paramount, he owes the American people in general—and all Americans of Japanese ancestry, in particular—an apology.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 502, FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 517 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 517

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (S. 502) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said conference report are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 517 provides that it shall be in order for the House of Representatives to consider the conference report on S. 502, a bill to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code. House Resolution 517 also provides that all points of order against the conference report are waived. There were at least 38 waivers of points of order necessary to bring the conference report up successfully.

S. 502 provides the following allocations for the Interstate Highway System: $2.6 billion for fiscal year 1974, $3 billion for each of fiscal years 1975 and 1976, and $3.25 billion annually for 1977 through 1979.

The bill also provides authority for $3 billion in contract authority for Federal grants for capital investment in mass transit facilities to be financed from the Federal Government's general revenues.

S. 502 provides for aid to noninterstate Federal highways in both rural and urban areas. The aid is allocated for both primary and secondary highways, and the appropriated funds will be drawn from the highway trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 517 in order that we may discuss and debate S. 502.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 517, provides for the consideration of S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 conference report. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report. This waiver was needed because in testimony before the Rules Committee, it was stated that there are 38 possible points of order that could be raised against the report. The possible points of order are as follows:

Sections in conference report (H. Rept. 93–410) Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 which are subject to a point of order on the ground that the conferees either exceeded the scope of their authority or that new material was added.

Section 102: *Authorization for the Interstate System*

Final conference figures above that in either bill.

Section 104: *General Highway Authorizations*

Final conference figures below that in either bill.

Section 105: *Definitions*

Definition of "urban area" expanded beyond either bill.

Section 109: *Federal-Aid Urban System*

New matter added. Designation by highway departments.

Section 110: *Removal of Designated Segments of the Interstate System*

Complete new subsection (h) added which allows an incorporated city to share the non-Federal costs that is needed to construct a segment of an Interstate System wholly within its boundaries.

Section 111: *Apportionment*

New matter added. Subsection (b) which authorizes that no state can receive less apportionment for the primary system than it received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

Section 121: *Public Transportation*

New matter added—subsection (k) which in essence says that no project shall be approved for the purchase of buses, passenger cars or rolling stock in any fiscal year where urban transportation funding or similar assured funding has been enacted to provide such funding for highway and public transportation.

Section 125: *Special Urban High Density Traffic Program*

The scope of the authorization for the use of this program has been broadened beyond that which appears in either bill.

Section 126: *Priority Primary Routes*

The limitation of 10,000 miles contained in the House bill has been removed and there is no top limit.

Section 129: *Great River Road*

The Federal share has been changed from the original House version and higher figures have been added for the last two years.

Section 133: *Study of Toll Bridge Authority*

New matter has been added under subsection (b) of this section, with the addition of the General Bridge Act of 1906.

Section 134: *National Scenic Highway System Study*

The scope of this study has been increased under subsection (b) of this section.

Section 140: *Metro Accessibility to the Handicapped*

Both bodies had 100% Federal funding for this program. This has been reduced to 80% Federal funding.

Section 145: *Donations*

New matter has been added to this section by the addition of the words "political subdivision."

Section 146: *High Speed Transportation Demonstration*

The addition of a study to this demonstration program is new material.

Section 147: *Rural Highway Public Transportation Demonstration Program*

Extended for one year beyond that contained in Senate bill.

Section 148: *Federal-Aid Systems Realignment*

Extended beyond the time period contained in either bill.

Section 149: *Toll Road Reimbursement Program*

New subsection (c) added which was not in the matter before the conferees.

Section 150: *Parkways*

New subsection (b) added.

Section 153: *Increased Federal Share—Effective Date*

Retroactivity with respect to prior obligations.

Section 155: *Highway Litter Study*

Expanded to include all systems.

Section 156: *Bridge Approach Standards*

New matter added.

Section 157: *Allocation of Urban System Funds*

New matter added.

Section 158: *Franconia Notch, New Hampshire.*

New matter added.

Section 161: *Highland Scenic Highway*

New matter added.

Section 163: *Demonstration Project—Railroad Highway Crossings*

Authorizations are general for all projects instead of specific as provided in matter in conference.

Section 164: *Financial Assistance Agreements*

New matter.

Section 165: *Bus and Other Project Standards*

New matter.

TITLE II

Section 203: *Rail-Highway Crossings*

Authorization for funding is reduced and revised.

Section 204: *Bridge Reconstruction and Replacement*

Authorization for funding is reduced and revised.

Section 205: *Pavement Marking Demonstration Program*

Authorization for funding is reduced and revised.

Section 208: *Drug Use and Driver Behavior Highway Safety Research*

Authorization for funding is reduced and revised.

Section 209. *Projects for High-Hazard Locations*

Authorizations are reduced and revised.

Section 210. *Program for the Elimination of Roadside Obstacles*

Authorizations are reduced and revised.

Section 214. *Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Study*

Expanded to include bicycles.

Section 230: *Federal-Aid Safer Roads Demonstration Program*

All new material.

Section 231: *Bicycle Safety*

All new material.

TITLE IV

Section 402: *Conforming Adjustments*

New provision.

The report contains funding authority for continued construction of the Interstate Highway System with allocations from the highway trust fund; $2.6 billion for fiscal year 1974, $3.0 billion for each of fiscal 1975 and 1976, and $3.25 billion annually for 1977 and 1979, of which $12 billion is authorized in existing law. There is also $3.0 billion in contract authority for Federal grants for capital investment in mass transit facilities to be financed from the Federal Government's general revenues.

The deadline for States to schedule the construction of their remaining interstate segments is extended in the conference report from July 1, 1973, to July 1, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule in order that the House may begin debate on the conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 502) to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement

of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1973.)

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I would simply like to explain that this is the conference committee report on the highway bill. It has been hammered out on the anvils of mutual compromise with the other body.

The bill contains the authorizations for the next 3 years for various highway construction progams, $3 billion for mass transit capital grants on an 80–20 matching formula, and an innovative new title on the subject of highway safety.

I am convinced that this bill as it now emerges in the form of this conference committee report is a good bill, a sound bill, and undoubtedly the best bill that could have been achieved under the circumstances. It is a true compromise.

We encountered in the conference committee strong feelings on the part of our conferees representing the Senate. Yet they were conciliatory and harmonious, in many instances yielding to the position of the House. I think it is impossible to say that either House predominated more than the other.

The bill addresses the problems of the States and the cities for highways, for mass transportation facilities, and for highway safety. It is structured in such a way as to permit the States and cities of our Nation to look ahead and make intelligent plans for addressing the urgent transportation problems of the next 3 years.

So I earnestly urge all Members of the House to join in giving this conference committee report a resounding vote of approval.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to yield to the chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in hearty support of the conference agreement on S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973.

The Members who represented this body in conference—headed by their distinguished chairman, JIM WRIGHT of Texas, have labored for many long, tedious and almost continuously frustrating months under the most difficult circumstances, to achieve a realistic resolution, The other conferees are—Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. STANTON of Ohio, Mr. HARSHA, of Ohio, the ranking minority member, Mr. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, Mr. DON CLAUSEN of California, and Mr. SNYDER, of Kentucky.

At this point, I think it is not only proper, but justifiable, to extend a truly earned and most earnest commendation to the House conferees. Mr. WRIGHT, who, in addition to his thorough knowledge of all the intracacies of this enormous piece of legislation, demonstrated outstanding skill in finally breaking through what—for weeks on end—appeared to be a hopeless impasse, and, in the finest sense of legislative skill, and delegation leadership, made possible the reconciliation which resulted in a realistic resolution of the many issues involved in this bill.

In so commending and congratulating Mr. WRIGHT, I also express my deepest appreciation to all of the House conferees, from both sides of the aisle, for the extraordinary achievement in terms of time and a truly concerned and deeply thoughtful effort to sustain the House position, yet make—in a prudent manner—the necessary accommodations, that had to be made, to reconcile the legitimate, although divergent, points of view on the part of a majority of the Members of the other body.

The spending authorized for our Nation's transportation systems in this conference agreement is less than the House proposed; in my judgment, it is not enough to satisfy our real highway and mass transit needs. But it represents the best achievable compromise between the President's minimal proposals and the recommendations of the House.

Despite the fiscal restraints imposed on our transportation program, this agreement embodies a great many sound provisions that amply justify its approval, notably in the area of highway safety.

Your conferees upheld the House on the need for a massive national effort to cut down the needless toll of death and injury on our highways, to eliminate dangerous grade crossings, rebuild and repair unsafe highway bridges, remove hazardous roadside obstacles, and provide improved pavement marking for the protection of both drivers and pedestrians.

This conference agreement retains the House provision for improvement of priority primary roads connecting to the Interstate System. This is one of the most important provisions of the 1973 highway legislation, because it goes directly to the heart of a problem that confronts both urban and rural areas—the deterioration of heavily traveled primary roads which have suffered from neglect during the 16 years in which our attention and our funds have been concentrated on the Interstate System.

The concept of setting aside a separate category of money under the title of "Priority Primary" has its genesis in three main principles. First, the emphasis on construction of the Interstate System has produced an obvious decrease in the funds available for our primary roads in both rural and urban areas. Second, the lack of adequate access roads to the Interstate System has, in some cases, made it difficult to use the Interstate System to its full potential, or has created traffic bottlenecks approaching parts of the Interstate System; and third, it has been found that an intermediate system of roads supplementing the Interstate System is required in many areas which although of lesser importance than the Interstate itself is of somewhat higher importance than the regular primary system.

This legislation provides additional money over and above the normal Federal-aid assistance to the States in the amounts of $100 million for fiscal year 1974, $200 million for 1975, and $300 million for 1976 for improvements on the primary system which are deemed the most important by the State highway departments and the Secretary of Transportation.

Because these routes lie in both rural and urban areas the apportionment of funds has been designated as 50 percent from the regular rural primary funds in the law and 50 percent from the formula for extensions of the primary system in urban areas.

A priority primary route may be developed to standards which range from a high-type two-lane rural road, to a controlled-access urban highway, depending on the traffic requirements of the route itself. "High traffic" is a relative term in the sense of what the composition of the traffic itself might be. A rural road carrying 3,000 vehicles a day, many of which are heavily laden trucks carrying grain, wheat, or pulpwood or timber to major shipping ports, for example, may be just as important in a priority sense as a suburban road carrying 20,000 vehicles a day most of which is composed of automobile commuter traffic. Each route may require a different type of treatment but each may be of similar relative priority.

The concept then of priority primary routes is one which is designed to face up to an immediate problem on a large portion of the most important routes connecting to or supplementary to the Interstate System. This is in keeping with a new declaration of policy contained in the bill which states that as the final phases of the Interstate System are completed increased emphasis be placed on the construction and reconstruction of the other Federal-aid systems.

This provision will be of enormous help not only to urban areas but to our rural and semirural areas whose needs have too long been neglected. And the program for economic growth center development highways, which offers a great opportunity for economic revival in countryside America, has been expanded and made a permanent part of our national highway effort.

There are many more provisions in the agreement which warrant the overwhelming support of the House, Mr. Chairman, including continued funding for the Great River Road to preserve the historic and scenic features of the Mississippi River Valley; authority for Federal aid in the construction of bicycle trails, forest highways and trails, and Indian reservation roads and bridges.

Beyond that, the agreement recognizes the transportation needs of our congested urban centers and provides the authority they seek for both mass transit and essential urban highways.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for overwhelming approval of this conference report.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the members of the conference committee for their unusually difficult chore in resolving the differences in the versions of this legislation previously approved by the two bodies. The gentleman from Texas, Representative JIM WRIGHT, did an outstanding job as chairman of the conference to see that the problems were resolved so that our Nation's great transportation program can go forward.

He was ably supported throughout the difficult negotiations by the other members of the conference committee, Chairman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Representative HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Representative JAMES V. STANTON, Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Representative GENE SNYDER, and Representative DON H. CLAUSEN. They all have performed a great service for the House Public Works Committee and for this body.

In dealing with complex and sometimes emotional issues, the conferees have displayed the patience of Job.

As careful reading of the House bill and reports will indicate, the Public Works Committee supports a transportation program that will provide the necessary balance for all the people of this country.

The conferees have done a remarkable job of maintaining a balanced approach to our Nation's transportation requirements.

The authorizations provided in the conference report will enable the States and urban areas to make their plans for the most efficient and economical engagement of the funds to be made available for various transportation needs.

The innovations and new initiatives called for in this legislation will enable the people of this country to have greater freedom of movement and will continue to provide benefits in the form of savings in time and money and prevention of needless deaths and injury through improved roads and highways.

I commend the efforts of the conference committee and I urge approval of the conference report.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND), one of the conferees.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, because of my opposition to opening up the trust fund for urban mass transit, including subways, I have not signed the conference report. My position is that there has not been adequate exploration of the rationale for rail transit diversion, much less a persuasive case for it established.

Nevertheless, I intend to vote for the bill because it does afford an opportunity to explore the matter of separate trust funding for mass transit. I hope the Public Works Committee and other committees of the House will address themselves to this promptly. The bill does contain worthwhile provisions.

One is compromise long sought by Senator NORRIS COTTON and myself to permit substantial improvement in the road passing through Franconia Notch in our home State of New Hampshire, while safeguarding the park-like atmosphere of the area adjacent to the highway.

Our compromise permits the construction of a parkway-type segment for Interstate Route 93, financed by interstate funds but with all interstate construction and design standards waived. Thus the 12-mile stretch of I93 will be built to geometric and construction standards based solely on the safety of the traveling public, the environment and the park-like character of the historic Notch. As House sponsor of this provision in the conference committee, I regarded this exception as essential in view of the scenic attractions of the area, including the rock formation known as the Old Man of the Mountains, which attracts countless tourists to the area. Such scenic attractions and magnificent skiing opportunities generate a great deal of traffic through the Notch, in addition to the vital commercial traffic for which the existing road serves as the most practicable route available.

Our selection of the term "parkway-type" highway, which has no rigid definition in law, and imposes not specific standards, has been deliberate to provide the State of New Hampshire and the Secretary of Transportation, with whom the ultimate responsibility for decision lies, the broadest possible range of options. This is to provide the maximum flexibility in designing the facility and controlling its use to achieve the economic and environmental compromise which all interested parties agree is our common objective.

Our regard for environmental values which led to rejection of interstate standards also necessitated an inherently related element of compromise.

Given the seasonal—and even hourly—fluctuation in demand for conflicting uses of this highway, the bill gives the State of New Hampshire with the concurrence of the Secretary of Transportation, the authority to vary permitted uses of this segment by specified types of vehicles during certain times of the day and of the year. For example, it would be incumbent on the State of New Hampshire not to permit the use of the Notch highway by large and slow-moving trucks during peak periods of high recreational travel during certain hours on certain weekends or holidays, but permit such use during days and during hours of low recreational use. Recreational travel is particularly heavy on the Fourth of July and Labor Day weekends, and during the first week in October when the foliage is at the peak of its splendor. It is also extremely heavy during the day while the skiing season is at its peak, even though the road would be practically unused by recreational travelers after early-evening hours and thus available to commercial traffic.

Mr. Speaker, this represents a true compromise, a balancing of environmental and economic interests. As the joint explanation of the conference report indicates, there was no House provision in the initial bill, because of a point of order. The Senate language has been substantially changed, but with the complete agreement of Senator COTTON, the original Senate sponsor.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like, for legislative history and clarification, to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) who served with distinction and patience as our chairman of the conference, a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my question is this: For legislative history and clarification, I would like to inquire of Mr. WRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of the conference.

My question is addressed to the language concerning permitted uses by specified types of vehicles during specified times of the day and of the year contained in section 158. It is my understanding that the State of New Hampshire should have the authority not to permit use of this stretch of highway by heavy commercial vehicles during peak periods of recreational and tourist travel. But given the route's historic role as a vital north-south economic and communications artery, as well as a recreational one, the State should also have the authority to permit use by heavy commercial vehicles at other times. Does the gentleman agree that this is the intent of our language in section 158?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, of course I do. If this stretch of highway through that beautiful section known as the Franconia Notch remains, as it will, a part of the Federal Interstate System or the Federal-aid-to-highways system, certainly its use by heavy-duty vehicles, such as trucks and others, at times which do not interfere with the peak recreational traffic would be proper.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has again expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire for the compromise which he worked out with us in the conference on this section. I do agree with his interpretation of the legislative intent.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to invite him during the coming recess to come up for an on-the-spot visit to that beautiful notch if he does not have other plans.

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

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have a map of what he is talking about through the notch?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I do. I have plenty of them. I would be glad to furnish the gentleman with a map, and all other Members, too. I invite them to enjoy the splendors of the Granite State during the August recess or at any other time.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve as a conferee on behalf of this body on the Federal-Aid Highway Act over the past several months. I support the conference report and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The bill being offered today is the composite result of some 3,460 legislative man-days of concentrated and almost daily effort. It has been a long, painstaking and trying experience for everyone involved, but it has also been a very constructive and productive undertaking. I want to pay the highest tribute to Chairman JIM WRIGHT, all the members of the conference and our extremely able staff members for the exceptional negotiating team efforts on behalf of the House, during this record-breaking, long, and grueling conference.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that it is absolutely essential that we pass this comprehensive legislation for the ongoing development of our highways and mass transit programs as quickly as possible so that it may be placed before the President at the earliest possible moment. The many programs embodied in this legislation are vital to the Nation and have already been delayed much too long.

While I, of course, do not fully agree with every provision in this bill, it nevertheless represents a sound and reasonable compromise that has been very carefully and laboriously worked out. As such, it is, in my judgment, the best bill attainable under the circumstances and I shall support it.

The contents of this legislation are so broad and comprehensive that it is virtually impossible to speak on every aspect of it, but I would like to comment briefly on some of its more important features. When this bill was originally before the House I spoke at some length on the issues involved. Today, however, I would like to be more specific.

The principal issue before the conferees on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 was the diversion of moneys from the highway trust fund for the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of rail mass transit facilities and for the purchase of buses and rail mass transit rolling stock. The bill as passed by the Senate would have made all funds authorized to be appropriated for the Federal-aid urban system for fiscal year 1974 and subsequent years available for the construction of fixed rail facilities and for the purchase of passenger equipment, and, in addition, would have made all sums authorized to be appropriated for the urban extension of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems for fiscal year 1974 and subsequent years available for the purchase of buses.

I joined with other House conferees in vigorously opposing these diversions from the highway trust fund; however, after numerous meetings and much debate it became apparent that the conferees representing the other body would not agree upon a highway bill unless there were provisions for the diversion of rail mass transit of some funds authorized by that bill. The compromise that was reached and which is embodied in the conference report preserves the nondiversion features of the House-passed amendment to the Senate bill with respect to all funds authorized for fiscal year 1974, not to exceed $200 million of funds authorized for the Federal-aid urban system (D funds) for fiscal year 1975 may be made available for the purchase of buses. The diversion to rail mass transit has been postponed until funds authorized for the Federal-aid urban system for fiscal year 1976 have been apportioned at which time these funds, and these funds only, will be available for the construction of rail mass transit facilities and for the purchase of buses and rail rolling stock. These projects are to be carried out in accordance with all of the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code applicable to the Federal-aid urban system, except to the extent determined inconsistent by the Secretary of Transportation.

I am opposed to the diversion of highway trust fund moneys for expenditure for nonhighway purposes so long as the present and future essential highway needs of the Nation have not been provided for and the Interstate System is some 10 years from completion. This does not mean, however, that I am opposed to providing assured adequate funding for mass transit. In fact, I have advocated for several years the creation of a third trust fund, a mass transportation trust fund, to finance the many public mass transportation systems that are needed so badly in many of the urban areas of this country. In recognition of this need for assured funding for mass transportation, and, so as to avoid, if possible, the diversion of highway trust funds for rail mass transit purposes, the conferees agreed to include in subsection (k) of section 142 of title 23, United States Code, as amended by section 121 of this bill, a provision that the Secretary of Transportation shall not approve any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of fixed rail facilities or for the purchase of buses or rail rolling stock in any fiscal year when there has been enacted an urban transportation trust fund or similar assured funding for both highway and public mass transportation. This provision was included in the conference report so as to permit the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Congress as a whole to consider the creation of a mass transportation trust fund or other assured funding for public mass transportation before the actual diversion of highway trust fund moneys to rail mass transit occurs following the apportionment of the D funds authorized for fiscal year 1976.

Thus, the House conferees have avoided the violation of section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, which limits the use of highway trust fund moneys to obligations incurred in carrying out the Federal-aid highway laws attributable to Federal-aid highways, without giving the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress an opportunity to provide other assured funding for public transportation. It is my sincere hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give early attention to this most important matter and that the Congress will enact a law to establish, and provide continuing revenues for, a mass transportation trust fund, or otherwise provide assured funding for mass transportation during the year to year and a half before the D funds authorized for fiscal year 1976 are apportioned. I pledge my full support to the Ways and Means Committee in this endeavor, for I continue to believe that the need for continuing highway improvement is so essential to the economic, communication, and transportation life of this country and to provide for the safety of persons using the highways that we will have perpetrated a great disservice to the people of this country if we ultimately permit the diversion of highway trust fund moneys to other purposes while the resources of that fund are inadequate to meet even the most essential highway and highway safety needs.

As the Members of this body are well aware, the question of diverting highway trust fund moneys for urban rail mass transit was a key and controversial issue in committee, here on the floor, and in conference, and there is no doubt in my mind that it will remain a controversial issue for years to come. In all candor, there were very strong and justifiable feelings held and expressed on both sides of this question. In the final analysis, however, the critical and urgent need to immediately enact a long-overdue highway bill prevailed and, in a sense, provided the catalyst for compromise on this and other differences in points of view held by the various conferees.

While I personally question the wisdom, the soundness, and the practicality of diverting highway trust fund moneys for nonhighway purposes, the highest legislative body of this land has now worked its will on this question and I accept and shall abide by their decision. It is my sincere hope that this arrangement and the provisions contained in this bill to implement it will do the job intended and contemplated by its advocates.

This Federal-Aid Highway Act which we present for your consideration today contains $3 billion in contract authority for Federal grants for capital investment in mass transit facilities to be financed from the Federal Government's general revenues and the agreement reached in conference sets no time limit for distribution of these grants. This $3 billion authorization is up and above the $3.1 billion already authorized for such grants under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, the bulk of which has already been obligated.

In addition, beginning in fiscal 1975, major metropolitan areas and certain

smaller urban areas would have the option of using their "urban system" allocation from the highway trust fund for either roads of passenger bus purchases, up to $200 million. Then, commencing in fiscal 1976, they could use all or any part of these allocations for buses, fixed rail transit systems, or highways—however, no trust funds could be used for mass transit operating support assistance. This identical option for 1976 would be available during fiscal 1974 except that any such mass transit grants would come from the general fund rather than the highway trust fund.

In addition, under a "transferability clause" included in the Conference agreement, urbanized areas would be per mitted to "trade" their allocations for "controversial" interstate segments for an equal dollar amount of mass transit grants from general revenues. These grants could be used to build rail lines or to buy rolling stock for any approved mode of public transportation. Moreover, highway funds for the A, B, C, D, and Interstate System may also be used for exclusive or preferential bus lanes, fringe and corridor parking areas, and other facilities to assist public mass transportation. In this regard, publicly owned transportation authorities may use, without charge, any portion of a Federal-aid highway right-of-way where sufficient land is available to accomodate needed rail or nonhighway public transit facilities.

Other important provisions of this legislation include funding authority for Interstate Highway System, the A, B, C, D system, the priority primary system, the special urban high density traffic program.

Of significant interest in this bill are the provisions for funding economic growth center development highways, the highway safety program, and bicycle transportation development.

The bill authorizes $40 million for the development of a bicycle transportation program in conjunction with the Nation's highway program. I introduced legislation with a similar intent just following the opening of the 93d Congress and I am very pleased that we were successful in including and retaining this provision in the final version of the bill.

The primary goal of this proposal is to provide for a separation of bicycles and automobiles in order to ensure the safety of both the motorist and the cyclist. At present, the bicyclist all to often finds himself competing with cars and trucks on our highways, roads and streets. For obvious reasons, the cyclist has a distinct and dangerous disadvantage in such competition and thus I believe we should consider his safety by encouraging the multiple us of our road network.

The "economic growth center concept" is converted in this bill from a demonstration program to a permanent part of our national highway system and I am of the view that it is one of the most important provisions of this legislation in that it reflects Congressional concern and consideration of the need to work toward a national policy of fiscal and institutional decentralization and a much needed revitalization of our rural areas. Unless and until we institute such a policy, we will never really be effective or successful in easing the tremendous pressures and burdens on our major metropolitan centers which are so seriously overcrowded today. This provision, in my judgment, is a positive and forward-looking step in that direction.

This bill also requires the Secretary of Transportation to report to the Congress on the feasibility of initiating a national scenic highway system to join together areas of unique natural and scenic beauty throughout the country. One such route that has been suggested is the Yellowstone to the Redwoods scenic highway route which would join Yellowstone National Park to the Redwood National Park and thereby traverse some of the most uniquely beautiful terrain to be found anywhere in America. In addition, I believe the Secretary will consider a route linking the Golden Gate National Recreation Area with the Olympic National Park in the State of Washington. Such a scenic highway would provide a coastal panorama of immense esthetic value.

Another needed and important provision included in our bill is authorization to permit the use of preferential lanes on Federal-aid highways during nonrush hours. I strongly support this provision which could lead to a redirecting of trucks from certain metropolitan area highways to exclusive truck lanes during peak commuting periods. This could result in a very desirable separation of trucks and cars in congested areas that would be safer and more functional for both. I hope this provision can be promptly implemented.

The highway safety portion of the bill is most important and essential in its own right. It is based on an in-depth and wide-ranging highway safety study by our committee. In my view, there is no question that this bill does more to make our highways safer than any previous highway legislation ever considered by the Congress.

It has been my privilege to serve on this Public Works Committee and on many of the Senate-House conferences with Congressman HARSHA.

The country and the traveling public must be deeply in the debt of this gentleman from Ohio for his outstanding and extraordinary leadership in this vital area of highway safety.

His brilliant, perceptive, and innovative talents have brought to this Congress the product of his long-time efforts in the form of title II of the Highway Act of 1973.

There were those who wanted to cut or alter the program. There were those that did not want to give it the funding priority the safety program deserved. But, BILL HARSHA stood firm in his determination to keep it intact in this conference.

Mr. HARSHA has been recognized by international safety organizations as an expert in this field. To me, he should be recognized as the "champion of highway safety" here in the Congress.

I take great pride in the fact that I have been closely associated with BILL HARSHA in advancing his highway safety ideals through the legislative process. The people of America will benefit for generations to come.

In 1972 over 56,000 lives were lost, almost 4 million people were injured and economic losses estimated in excess of $40 billion were sustained in highway mishaps. Now, preliminary figures for 1973 indicate that deaths continue to mount at over 4 percent annually, possibly yielding a toll as high as 58,000 or more traffic deaths before the year is out.

According to Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council, unless something drastic is done to reduce the carnage on our highways, between now and 1980, we can expect to lose: 18,000 under 5 years of age, 40,000 5 to 14 years of age, 188,000 15 to 24 years of age, 157,000 25 to 44 years of age, 107,000 45 to 64 years of age, and 90,000 65 years of age and over; for a grand total of 600,000 traffic deaths over the next 10 years.

The time has come to call a halt in this unnecessary killing. The time has come for an end to alarmist rhetoric about highway safety and a firm commitment to realistic programs which will reverse the escalating tide of mayhem on our highways.

It was this realization that prompted Congressman BILL HARSHA, of Ohio, to introduce what is surely the most ambitious highway safety legislation in history. The essence of his proposal has now been approved in conference.

The new programs contained in the conference report would launch five action programs on those highway-related factors which contribute most to accidents. In combination, these five programs should make a measurable dent in the accident-injury toll. Included would be programs to:

Install pavement markings on those rural highways where two-thirds of traffic fatalities now occur and where pavement highways have been demonstrated as cost-effective countermeasures.

Provide traffic control devices and improvements at the thousands of already identified high hazard locations where the expected safety and mobility benefits suggest cost-effective benefits.

Remove or ameliorate roadside obstacles, both natural and man made, that vehicles are apt to hit or incur further loss on control from, when they leave the traveled way either because of driver loss of control or as part of a collision avoidance maneuver.

Provide protection at all railroad crossings through the development and installation of new passive control signing and, where cost-effectiveness warrants it, to provide the means for yet more efficient transportation through either separation, relocation or installation or pertinent active warning devices.

Reconstruct or replace or install safety improvements on dangerously deficient bridges which threaten life and hinder mobility on the highways of our land.

Approval and vigorous implementation of these five action programs will produce dramatic results in the form of lives

saved and accidents prevented. I might add that the flexibility is built in as an integral part of these programs.

The categorical grants which comprise the five "action" programs will effect safety improvements on the Federal-aid system. For off-system improvements, the conference report establishes a Federal-aid safer roads demonstration program. It would require each State, by June 30, 1974, to identify hazards to be corrected off the Federal-aid system under this program and assign priorities for their correction. Such hazard correction projects would fall into three major categories: First, projects to improve highway marking and signing; Second, projects to eliminate roadside obstacles; and Third, projects to eliminate hazards at rail-highway grade crossings.

To carry out this demonstration program over the next 3 fiscal years, a quarter of a billion dollars in highway trust fund moneys would be provided.

The Federal share in these safety improvement projects and those authorized by the five categorical grant "action" programs would be 90 percent.

In addition to the "action" programs, the act contains funding for National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Federal Highway Administration section 403 programs at adequate levels. For State programs authorized under section 402, gradual increases over the next 3 years are proposed.

The objective here would be to provide a sufficient level of funding for Federal, State and local programs to increase and expand present efforts across-the-board, including the continued application of promising alcohol abuse highway safety countermeasures that, through continuous implementation and rigorous evaluation, may point the way to a more effective overall safety program.

Supplementing these on-going programs, are three research efforts offering great promise and potential. They are:

First. A pavement marking research and demonstration program aimed at (1) developing new devices and related delineating technology to provide motorists with cost-effective means for control and guidance under normal, as well as, adverse weather conditions and (2) advancing technology of traffic control markings by (a) analysis of application methodology and (b) continuous, significant evaluation of pavement markings with respect to both safety and capacity objectives.

Second. A new research program concentrating on drug-using and high-accident probability drivers. At the present time, very little is known about either type. If we are to successfully cope with the highway safety problem, we must learn more about the role and contribution to the accident picture that drivers in both categories play. It may be we will find that, in combination, alcoholic, drug, using and high-accident probability drivers are responsible for a major share of traffic fatalities.

Third. A driver education evaluation program—DEEP—wherein, through wide scale controlled field application training programs better understanding of various educational methods and techniques can be achieved.

Five additional studies of great promise are also included, all of which could yield handsome safety dividends. The first would explore the potential of using mass media, principally television, for alerting, educating and involving the American driving public in the cause of highway safety. Preparation of a series of educational safety films for use on TV and elsewhere would also be authorized and funded.

The second study would address itself to the question of how to involve the American people in the cause of highway safety. No safety effort can hope to succeed if people remain indifferent and uninvolved. Finding ways and means to encourage greater participation in the traffic enforcement and rescue process could save lives and go far toward converting the safety effort into a safety crusade.

The third study would explore the feasibility of establishing a National Center for Statistical Analysis of Highway Operations. One of the greatest weaknesses of the present program is the paucity of specific, up-to-date, operational data to support action programs. The trouble is that without adequate information, untold millions in safety moneys may be spent unwisely. Many States are now engaged in upgrading their accident investigation procedures. The next logical step will be to establish a national center to correlate and, where appropriate, disseminate the information gathered. With such a center in operation, we can be sure that we are putting our safety moneys where our safety problems really are.

The fourth study is most important. The Highway Safety Act of 1966 directed the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study of highway safety needs to serve as a guide for the funding and implementation of that landmark legislation. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of that report require updating. Particularly is this necessary in view of the alarming increase in traffic mishaps in recent years. An up-to-date needs study is necessary to assure that realistic highway safety goals are planned, programed, funded and successfully implemented.

A fifth and final study of pedestrian and bicycle safety would also be authorized. Approximately 10,000 pedestrians and 1,100 bicyclists died last year alone, roughly one-fifth of all traffic fatalities. Children and the elderly are the principal victims of these types of mishaps. While concerted efforts have been made to reduce the pedestrian and bicycling toll, a full and complete investigation and study is needed to develop new methods and techniques for coping more effectively with these safety problems.

Possibly, the most important safety provisions in the whole bill, however, are the two new incentive grants to be awarded to States for compliance with highway safety programs—section 219 of the conference report. The first of these expands on the recommendation of the administration for a sense of Congress resolution favoring the adoption of mandatory seatbelt legislation by the States. It authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to make substantial awards, up to 25 percent of section 402 apportionments, to those States adopting laws requiring the use of seatbelts.

Even if the controversial air bag fulfills the lifesaving promise of its proponents in a cost-effective way, not until the mid-1980's will the vehicle population of America be equipped with such devices. During the intervening period, seatbelts, which are already installed on most vehicles, offer the greatest promise of saving lives—that is if people will only use them.

Where mandatory seatbelt laws have been adopted, fatality reductions exceeding 20 percent have been achieved. At a minimum, this would effect a saving of 8,000 lives each year in this country. By providing substantial incentives, the adoption of such laws will be spurred thus leading to the saving of thousands of Americans—men, women, and children—each year.

Woven throughout the entire fabric of the Highway Safety Act of 1973 is the requirement of rigorous evaluation and reporting as an integral part of each and every program, research effort and study authorized. The Secretary of Transportation is instructed to report to the Congress annually on the status and the results achieved in each in a manner that will not only supply vitally needed information but will also provide the Congress with the input necessary to determine whether such programs, research and studies are achieving the purposes for which they were created. In this way, the best interests of the Nation and the American people can be truly served.

I believe that enactment of the foregoing recommendations, coupled with their full funding and rigorous implementation by the Department of Transportation will mark the end of the beginning of this Nation's efforts to reduce the carnage on our highways. Through these measures we can save 10,000 perhaps 15,000, and maybe more lives each year. Commensurate reductions in accidents, injuries and property damage will also occur.

The price tag for achieving these results will be high. For fiscal 1974, $461 million will be required; for fiscal 1975, $763 million; for fiscal 1976, $800 million. But if such funding is made available and vigorous leadership is provided at the Federal, State, and local levels, thousands upon thousands of Americans will live full and happy lives who might otherwise have perished in needless and senseless highway mishaps.

I am also pleased that the conference report includes a commitment in the House bill to earmark funds for the improvement of locations where highways and railways cross. These crossings are the scene of hundreds of fatal accidents each year and, to date, we have fallen behind in our efforts to modernize and safeguard them. The funds in this section will be utilized for needed protective devices as well as for the complete separation of the two.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have before us today a good bill, a desperately needed bill, a long overdue bill, and as I said at the outset, the best

possible bill under all the prevailing circumstances. Thus, I respectfully urge prompt and favorable passage.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as a result of conference, contains much needed authorizations over the next 3 years for the planning and construction of parkways throughout our Nation. I am very pleased that the amendment I had the privilege of offering in the Public Works Committee to increase the amount available for such parkways from $75,000,000 to $225,000,000 was retained with only a $15,000,000 reduction. In my own district, we have been working for my entire lifetime on the completion of the fabled Natchez Trace Parkway, a prime example of the beautiful and scenic parkways we have in this country. It is my sincere hope that, with this strong step forward, funds will soon be appropriated by this House to insure the prompt completion of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HANRAHAN).

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, after much deliberation, I wish to indicate that I will vote in favor of the Federal Highway Safety Act of 1973, as reported by the House-Senate conference committee to the House of Representatives.

I believe that this proposed act is essentially a necessary and beneficial piece of legislation, with one glaring defect. During the conference committee's extensive deliberations, language allowing the city of Chicago to proceed with construction of the Crosstown Expressway, I–94, in spite of the Governor of Illinois' strenuous objections, was added to the conference committee's report. As an opponent of the Crosstown Expressway, I wish to state my great disappointment that this step was taken without the express approval of either the Public Works Committee or the House as a whole. As matters now stand, the conference committee's report must either be accepted as a whole or totally rejected. While I fully support the many fine transportation provisions contained in the conference report, I am firmly opposed to the construction of the Crosstown Expressway.

It is thus with mixed emotions that I vote in favor of this legislation. I find it both depressing and ironic that within the same conference committee report there is now language allowing both diversion of funds from the highway trust fund for mass transportation and permission for the city of Chicago to undertake construction of an expensive, unnecessary expressway.

In my view the Crosstown Expressway should not be built for the following reasons:

First. The cost is prohibitive. It is conservatively estimated that the Crosstown Expressway will cost the taxpayers of the United States over $900 million. In addition, the taxpayers of Chicago will be assessed an additional $100 million as the local share. This would mean a minimum construction cost of over $50 million per mile of expressway.

Second. The Chicago metropolitan area is desperately in need of expanded mass transportation in order to reduce the number of automobiles used to travel from homes to jobs and back. The answer to Chicago's transportation crisis does not lie in building more concrete expressways, but in greater reliance on mass transportation.

Third. I believe construction of the Crosstown Expressway will result in higher levels of air pollution in areas near the proposed expressway route. It is readily admitted by Crosstown's proponents that the expressway will generate increased use of the private automobile as a means of transportation by people living near the expressway.

Fourth. Approximately 10,400 persons are expected to be displaced by the demolition of a 22-mile strip necessary to clear a path for the Crosstown Expressway. Although the Federal Relocation Act of 1970 provides for replacement housing, there has been no detailed specific plan prepared by the city of Chicago to provide for construction of such replacement housing prior to displacement. Until such a detailed plan is presented by the city of Chicago, it is ridiculous to consider construction of the expressway.

Fifth. The city of Chicago and specifically Crosstown Associates, the expressway's planners, have refused to reveal the specific route and key details relating to the Crosstown Expressway's construction. A full explanation of all aspects of this proposal is absolutely necessary before approval is granted to begin construction.

Sixth. There is a tremendous need for greater citizen participation in determining the final plans for any public work of the magnitude of the Crosstown Expressway. Up until now, the city of Chicago has only perfunctorily allowed citizens and businessmen to have any influence on the details of the expressway's construction.

In short, I strongly feel that it would be a great mistake for Congress or anyone else to approve the construction of the Crosstown Expressway. Although I will vote in favor of accepting the Conference Committee's Report on the Federal Highway Safety Act of 1973, I wish the record to clearly indicate that I am firmly opposed to granting the city of Chicago any authority whatsoever to begin construction of the Crosstown Expressway.

I include editorials at this print in the RECORD.

EDITORIAL—THIS IS AN EXPRESSION OF EDITORIAL OPINION BY STATION WMAQ–TV, DILLON SMITH, EDITORIAL DIRECTOR

This week Newsfive has reported on the proposed Crosstown Expressway. Now an editorial.

The best argument for the Crosstown, maybe the only valid one, is that it would take truck and auto traffic off the Kennedy and Dan Ryan Expressways.

The worst thing would be the cost—more than a billion dollars.

Mayor Daley and other supporters of the Crosstown have made a lot of claims that Newsfive has discovered are largely unsubstantiated.

It does seem logical this highway would stimulate new development on the West Side and could keep existing businesses there. But there's no proof of this.

City officials claim a study by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission shows the Crosstown would reduce air pollution. The Commission says it never made such a study.

Advocates of this highway contend it would not be difficult to relocate 4,000 families and 1,300 businesses, but secret memos prepared by Crosstown planners indicate there would be a relocation crisis.

Chicago does need an alternative to traffic congestion in the down town area. But nine million dollars have been spent designing and promoting the Crosstown and we still do not have evidence that it is the best solution.

The city should look for an alternative to the Crosstown, some solution that would not cost a billion dollars and force thousands of people out of their homes.

(This editorial was broadcast at various times on July 19, 1973.)

WGN EDITORIAL—CROSSTOWN EXPRESSWAY—NO. 1

Sorting out the pros and cons concerning the proposed Crosstown Expressway is not an easy task. We have been making the effort, however, and concluded that the Crosstown should NOT be built. Some of our reasoning is as follows:

First, there's the consideration of traffic congestion. Supporters of the Crosstown Expressway say it will provide an alternate route for those going between the far north and far south sides of the city or the suburbs in those directions . . . an alternate to the Dan Ryan-Kennedy-Edens system, which brings a lot of traffic to the downtown area. This argument continues that since much of the traffic isn't concerned with downtown, a by-pass route would reduce traffic to reason at the hub of the expressway system.

We'd like to point out that there is a route for the by-passers. It's called the tri-state tollway, and while it isn't free, as the Crosstown would be, it does the job, all the way from Wisconsin to Indiana.

Second, there seems to be another traffic congestion factor. It must be one of Greshams' Laws that each few feet of highway begets a vehicle to occupy it. There hasn't been an expressway built here that didn't carry more cars the first day it opened than its designers said it wouldn't carry for ten or twenty years. Thus, moving a traffic jam elsewhere . . . from the Kennedy-Ryan to a Crosstown, merely provides room for another traffic jam to form.

Finally, as highways seem to breed traffic, traffic breeds pollution. Whether the highway is elevated, at grade or depressed, there will be pollution, air pollution and ear pollution. While a moving car fouls the air less than one creeping or stopped in traffic, we can't accept the premise that this new expressway will unclog traffic to a point where pollution is reduced.

These are just some of our reasons for opposing the Crosstown project. There are many, many more.

WGN EDITORIAL—CROSSTOWN EXPRESSWAY—NO. 2

In a previous editorial we cited traffic considerations in opposition to the proposed Crosstown Expressway. In this editorial, we'd like to talk about the communities the proposed expressway would serve.

First, there are those who would be displaced to make room for an expressway. Although several routes have been considered, any route selected would displace *some* people. And not all of them would be pleased with their compensation, no matter how fair . . . or even inflated . . . it might be. There would be some businesses displaced, too, and along with them, jobs.

Now some proponents of the Crosstown said this project will turn the tide of businesses, particularly factories, which have been moving away from the south and south-

west sides, taking jobs to the suburbs, where the plants can be served more easily by trucks. We doubt that those jobs already lost will come back to the city to nestle in the shadow of a new expressway. And those that are lost to the bulldozers would be the least likely to return.

Then, there's Midway airport. Still underused, it could be much more valuable for everyone if there were some sure, fast link between it and O'Hare Field. Crosstown proponents say their highway is the answer. But, as we've said before, it takes too long and takes too many cars to get to and from O'Hare Field, and more expressway is just going to bring more traffic.

We've supported extending the CTA's Kennedy Rapid Transit line to O'Hare Field. Others have pointed out that existing rail trackage could be used to bring mass transit to O'Hare via other routes. This same trackage runs the other way, too, just about parallel to the portion of the Crosstown plan linking the two airports. A mass transit line connecting the two airports not only moves transferring air passengers, it also provides a reasonable transportation route to those south and southwest siders who have seen their jobs move to the northwest suburbs.

These are just some of our reasons for opposing the Crosstown Expressway. There are others.

WGN EDITORIAL—CROSSTOWN EXPRESSWAY—No. 3

We've discussed some of our objections to the proposed Crosstown Expressway in two previous editorials. Now, we'd like to present some concluding comments and a summary.

The last point we'd like to raise in opposition to the Crosstown Expressway is the cost. Right now, it's estimated that the project will cost about *one . . . billion . . .* dollars. That's about 27 and a half *million* dollars a mile. And that's just an *estimate*, based on today's costs. If the project were to be approved, how much would the estimate increase by the time construction got underway? And how much would it cost by the time it's finished? We don't know. Probably no one does, except that it will be more.

Some Crosstown proponents note, correctly, that most of the money would come from federal highway funds, and that if Chicago and Illinois don't apply for what would be a fair share, those dollars will go for roads in other states. They also point out that even the relatively small portion required from state and local governments can be spent only for transportation purposes. If the money isn't used in this manner, it can't be diverted to other worthy projects, such as education or mental health.

Spending federal money just because it's there is hardly reasonable or rational. The present system of ear-marking state funds is another story. Even so, these funds might well be available for a rapid transit project, linking the two airports, as we mentioned in a previous editorial in this series.

In this and two previous editorials, we have objected to the proposed Crosstown Expressway because of the cost, because there is a better way to move people, because of the uprooting of families and businesses to make way for the highway, and because we doubt it will really solve any traffic problems, but might instead create newer and bigger ones.

We think Chicago needs none of this.

EDITORIAL—THIS IS AN EXPRESSION OF EDITORIAL OPINION BY STATION WMAQ–TV, DILLON SMITH, EDITORIAL DIRECTOR

Chicago's Crosstown Expressway has not been built yet, and thousands of people want to make sure it never is.

The Crosstown has been designed to carry traffic around Chicago. It would run from the junction of the Kennedy and Edens Expressways south to Midway Airport. Then—and this is undecided—it would go either east to the Dan Ryan or south to Interstate 57. It would be 22 miles long and it would cost at least one billion dollars. That comes out to an almost unbelievable $50 million a mile.

The people who have been protesting against the Crosstown are not the sort of people who demonstrate because they enjoy shouting and marching and waving placards. Most of them are homeowners, middle-class Chicago residents who are afraid their homes will be taken and their neighborhoods will be destroyed.

These citizens have been having a tough time. They cannot find anyone in authority who will listen to them. No one will give them any definite information about the status of the Crosstown and how it will affect them. They must be getting the frustrated feeling they are fighting something that will not exist until they see the bulldozers rolling down their streets.

The anti-Crosstown people have been getting the royal runaround. Wherever they go to a private firm called Crosstown Associates or to various City Hall offices—there is no person who will admit any responsibility for the Crosstown planning.

This group of citizens is trying to exercise one of our constitutional rights, the right to petition government for the redress of grievances. They cannot even find out where to put the petition. Its about time the people who are making the decisions stop playing what looks to us like the old shell game.

The Crosstown Expressway is a bad idea. Our cities are supposed to be places to live, but many people in government have no reluctance to cover urban areas with concrete.

The Crosstown would be one more expressway with thousands of cars spewing pollution into the air we try to breathe.

Who wants this highway anyway? Well, the powerful trucking industry wants all the highways it can get. And highway planners in government think there's nothing nicer than a new expressway. That opinion, naturally, is shared by the big companies that build highways.

Mayor Daley talks about the importance of rebuilding the city, of making Chicago an attractive place to live. But he is in favor of the Crosstown. Does he realize a billion dollars is enough money to operate Chicago's schools' half a million pupils for almost a year and a half? How can he support the destruction of thousands of homes when there is a housing shortage? The cost of just one mile of this boondoggle—$50 million—is enough to build 2,000 new housing units.

The worshippers of concrete cannot seem to understand the meaning of human needs. They just keep repeating that the federal government will pay 90 per cent of the cost of building the Crosstown. Federal money or not, it is still our tax money and we think some people are too anxious to spend it on concrete.

(This editorial was broadcast at various times on June 24, 1972).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I intend to vote in favor of the conference report on this highway bill, even though I do it with very mixed feelings. I am gratified that two of my amendments have remained intact in the bill. I am delighted that title II of our bill related to highway safety got through the conference unscathed. I regard title II as a truly historic piece of landmark legislation, the first that makes a comprehensive attack on the problem of the terrible slaughter that is taking place on our highways now. There is much in this bill that is good and it is for those things that I am voting.

I am pleased also that the integrity of the highway trust fund has been preserved at least for this year. This is a point in favor of the people in the villages and towns across America who need those trust fund moneys to upgrade a largely obsolete, substandard and often downright dangerous road system. So-called mass transit is not going to help them very much because when you are talking about mass transit, 90 percent of the time or more, you are talking about buses, and buses are dependent on those same obsolete, substandard, dangerous roads. So when the highway trust fund is busted in future years and is further drained of moneys for badly needed highways and highway upgrading, when our highway system begins to deteriorate because the fund is so overburdened with nonhighway drains that it cannot do the basic job for which it was created, when the people of America who are dependent on that highway system begin to complain, I hope those Members who supported the busting of the fund will stand up and tell those people that they were selected to pay the price, that it was thought to be more important to buy mass transit for a few of our largest cities than to upgrade the road system of the rest of the Nation, that they just will have to look elsewhere to find the funds to maintain their roads.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have deep misgivings about this aspect of the conference report. I think it is a slap at all of the people living outside of the big cities, who are dependent almost exclusively on our highway system for their transportation. I think it is a slap particularly at the people of rural America who now suffer the most from the grossly inadequate road system of rural America. And I think it is a slap at the families of all the people who will die on substandard roads in the future because there was no money left to make them safe.

I am voting for this bill. I am voting for highway safety. I am voting for the upgrading of substandard roads. I am voting for a better road system for America. I am voting to preserve the integrity of the trust fund this year. I mourn the busting of the fund in future years.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the most controversial issue of this legislation is represented by the conversion of the trust fund for mass transit. If the Members will recall, the House version of this bill had no diversion for any of the 3-year authorizations. The conference report comes back to this House with no diversion for fiscal 1974; with the diversion for fiscal 1975 from the trust fund in the sum of $200 million for buses; and for complete diversion for any and all forms of mass transportation for fiscal 1976 up to $800 million.

What this House must understand is that immediately upon signing this legislation, the administration must apportion the balance of the funds for fiscal

1974. Prior to December 31 of this year, the administration must apportion the funds for fiscal 1975.

And immediately upon that apportionment, those funds can be obligated by the several States. This means all this House salvaged out of this conference report were 4 lousy months of no diversion. Within 4 months the trust fund can be opened first for the purchase of buses and then, a year later, for purchases of any form of mass transit within the financial limitations.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that this does not represent the position of the House nor is it even a compromise of that position.

Let me explain to you why this occurred. First, the White House worked in rather intriguing fashion, and most effectively I might add, to undermine the House position on this issue. Some of the spokesmen for the administration were less than forthright with me. In fairness let me say, this does not include the Department of Transportation. DOT's position was set forth initially as favoring diversion, and the Department held steadfast to that position, never offering to change. Second, that awesome array of special interest groups, the vaunted "Highway Lobby" referred to by some pundits as the mighty and powerful highway juggernaut, turned out to be, when the chips were down, little more than a spineless, sputtering chameleon—changing from "principle" to capitulation. There were some exceptions, but these were very few indeed. When this occurs—when the troops desert you—there is little alternative in the face of such overwhelming odds but to salvage what you can. This I believe the conferees did, and I might add did in an admirable fashion.

If you were aware of the conglomeration of rash counter-productive, untenable provisions that were sent to us by the other body, you could more readily appreciate the significance of my remarks. Without enumerating all of these provisions, suffice it to say that the House conferees did an outstanding job in that regard.

Certainly, insofar as the diversion issue is concerned, I feel I lost the battle. Bnt in doing so, I can say to you that I also feel I won the war because this conference report contains intact the highway safety legislation I authored. This is a redeeming feature which makes the battle seem worthwhile. Every provision, every categorical grant called for in my proposal—all designed to save lives—your lives, the lives of your family, your friends, and your constituents—is retained in this legislation. The highway safety provisions of S. 502 constitute the most comprehensive, profound highway safety legislation ever enacted by the Congress of the United States. If implemented properly and fully funded, this legislation will save literally tens of thousands of lives annually and prevent countless serious injuries. The priority of human life is such that I believe you could justify your vote for the conference report on the basis of the highway safety provisions alone.

Even if there were no other redeeming features in this legislation, in my humble judgment, the savings in lives, in human misery, in pain and suffering, to say nothing of the economic benefits, would more than justify your support of the conference report. And there are other redeeming features, some of which other speakers have alluded to.

Because of the principle involved and the consistent position I have historically taken on the diversion issue, constantly refusing to yield to some of the most excruciating pressures ever exerted, including a personal request from the President of the United States, I find accepting this conference agreement a most bitter pill to swallow. However, our Nation must have a highway bill. The economy demands it. The jobs of thousands upon thousands of working men and women depend upon it. The transportation system of this country requires it. And the safety of millions of Americans, the traveling public, dictates it. Therefore, I ask you on behalf of the welfare of our Nation to vote affirmatively on this conference report.

There are five points in the conference report that warrant additional clarification. They concern apportionments for rail-highway grade crossings, highway trust fund money for the pavement marking demonstration program, incentives for compliance with highway safety programs, the question whether the Secretary can advance the date for the installation of curb ramps for the handicapped, and the provision relating to highway safety standards.

RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS (SECTION 203)

Concerning rail-highway grade crossings, section 203(d) apportions funds provided for this program on a 50–50 sharing basis between rural and urban areas. This sharing formula was selected in accordance with the equality of funding between rural and urban systems provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973.

In approving this formula, it was contemplated that within the rural and urban categories, available funds would be apportioned for rural areas, half in accordance with the primary system—the "A" system—and half in accordance with the secondary system—the "B" system. Both of these systems have identical apportionment formulas.

The same intention holds true for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems in urban areas—the "C" system—and the Federal-aid urban system—the "D" system. The 50 percent of the funds which would be made available under this provision would be based half on the "C" formula and half on the "D".

Clarification is needed, in this regard, because of a difference in the apportionment formulas between the "C' and the "D" systems. The latter formula provides that "no State shall receive less than one-half of 1 percent of each year's apportionment" of Federal-aid urban funds. No similar floor on apportionments is contained for "C" system funds. Apportionments made under the "A" and "B" systems are identical.

Mr. WRIGHT. It might be well for my colleague from Ohio to explain the practical effect of such apportionment of funds.

Mr. HARSHA. Subsection (c) of section 203 provides that funds authorized by this section shall be available for projects on any Federal-aid system. Thus, based upon the priorities established by each State, it would be free to spend the moneys provided in either rural or urban areas.

Mr. WRIGHT. What you are saying then, Mr. HARSHA, if I may restate this point again, is that under the rail-highway grade crossings program, regardless of the apportionments formula used to allocate moneys to a State, it has the flexibility to spend the moneys provided where they are most needed.

Mr. HARSHA. That is correct and I thank my colleague from Texas for reiterating our intention in this regard.

PAVEMENT MARKING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM (SECTION 205)

The second point I want to clear up relates to section 205 of title II, The Highway Safety Act of 1973. Subsection (e) is the authorizations subsection of the pavement marking program. As reported by the Committee on Public Works and approved by the House, this program was to be fully funded out of the highway trust fund. This funding approach was accepted by the Senate in conference. This is a demonstration program. To properly demonstrate what can be achieved, the program must apply to highways both on and off the Federal-aid system. The results learned will inure to the benefit of the Federal-aid system.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with my colleague from Ohio, it was the intention of the conferees that the pavement marking demonstration program, both on and off the Federal-aid system, be fully funded with highway trust fund moneys for all 3 years.

Mr. HARSHA. Once again, I am indebted to my colleague from Texas for making the intention of our conference report clear on this point.

INCENTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE WITH HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS (SECTION 219)

I want to say a brief word about the provision which authorizes incentive grants to those States which adopt mandatory seatbelt laws. Seatbelts, of both the lap and shoulder variety, can save a great many lives. Indeed, in view of the substantial cutback in funding of the five categorical grant "action" programs that we had to make in order to reach a conference compromise, it may well be that the incentives feature offers the greatest promise of saving lives of any program in the Highway Safety Act of 1973.

Mr. WRIGHT. If I may, I would like to ask my committee colleague, how the incentive grants provision would work. Would the kind of seatbelt laws that a State adopts determine the amount of incentive award which would be made to it?

Mr. HARSHA. As conceived, the Secretary would be authorized to promulgate criteria by which the safety belt laws of the individual states could be evaluated. Through such criteria, the level of incentive grant could be deter-

mined. Where a State is in full compliance with the Secretary's criteria, a maximum of 25 percent of a State's section 402 apportionments could be made.

Mr. WRIGHT. I must say that I find this a very exciting feature of the bill. If, through this device, we can encourage the States to adopt mandatory seat belt laws, we will save a great many lives for the simple reason that most cars on the road today contain safety belts—some of the lap variety; some with both lap and shoulder harnesses.

Mr. HARSHA. I could not agree more with my colleague from Texas, who has done so much for the highway safety cause.

CURB RAMPS FOR THE HANDICAPPED (SECTION 228)

My final comment relates to section 228 of title II of the conference report, the section entitled "Curb Ramps for the Handicapped." This provision requires that each highway safety program submitted to the Secretary by a State for approval shall, "Provide adequate and reasonable access for the safe and convenient movement of physically handicapped persons, including those in wheelchairs, across curbs constructed or replaced after July 1, 1976, at all pedestrian crosswalks throughout the State."

As I understand it, the July 1, 1976 date contained in the legislation, was set in order to allow the necessary time for adoption of enabling legislation by the States and affected local governments. I think it important for the Secretary to know that it was the desire of the conferees that the sooner this program can be implemented in each State, the better. In other words, we urge him to use his persuasive powers to assure that these new curb ramps are installed at the earliest feasible date in each State, before the 1976 deadline, if possible. The increased mobility and safety to the handicapped which will be afforded will be worth the effort.

Mr. WRIGHT. I commend my colleague from Ohio, who has led the highway safety effort in our committee, for him humanitarianism in this regard.

HIGHWAY SAFETY STANDARDS (SECTION 229)

I should like to raise one additional point which relates to a minor discrepancy which exists in section 229, the highway safety standards provision. As passed by the House, this new subsection applied to "each uniform safety standard promulgated . . . before January 1, 1973." The conferees advanced that date to July 1, 1973, and the conference report so reflects this change.

Through oversight, however, this change is not reflected, as it should have been, in the statement of managers.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank my colleague from Texas for clarifying this matter.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the conference report we have before us here is the best one the conferees could come up with and still have a highway bill this year.

I have declined to sign the conference report because I am of the opinion that signing the report implies that I am commending it to my colleagues. I do not feel that I can do that in this instance. On the other hand, I do not think—when considerations of the overall necessity of the passage of this legislation are taken into account—that it is bad enough to vote against, or to risk depriving us of a bill.

It is bad in several respects which have been freely pointed out and upon which I will not linger here. Let me say in a general way that I do not believe the highway trust fund, into which the taxpayers have paid for a specific purpose, should be raided for another and different purpose. But, as I say, these reasons still do not warrant a negative vote or active opposition on my part.

Thank you.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I shall be very brief.

There is one aspect of this conference report—and I intend to vote for it, of course—that does disturb me, however, and it is a section that may eventually have some impact on the eastern boundary of my district.

In section 110(b) it appears to me that there is a veiled effort to accomplish the construction of a crosstown expressway in Chicago which will also, if the claims as I have them are correct, will spill across the boundary of the city of Chicago.

Therefore I would like some clarification as to what this new section actually does provide.

Mr. Speaker, Senator STEVENSON and Senator PERCY contend that this language would not permit the city of Chicago to bypass the provision that vests in the Governor's authority in such instances. Yet there has been insistence from other quarters that it does, and I just wonder, for the purpose of legislative history, what the gentleman from Texas might advise in this regard.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, respectfully disagreeing with the opinions expressed by the two Senators from Illinois, if indeed they did express such opinions as have been characterized by the gentlman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER), I must say that the language in subsection (b), as it appears on page 7 of the conference report, is clear and unequivocal.

It says that—

in any case where a segment of the Interstate System was a designated part of such System on June 1, 1973, and is entirely within the boundaries of an incorporated city and such city enters into an agreement with the Secretary to pay all non-Federal costs of construction of such segment, such segment shall be constructed.

Mr. Speaker, the word is not "may" but "shall."

Now, interpreting that as best I can in light of my limited knowledge of the Chicago situation, I should have to say that any part of the Interstate System lying wholly within the city of Chicago——

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I should have to say that any part of the Interstate System lying wholly within the city of Chicago—and I believe that applies to the cross-town freeway lying within the incorporated limits of the city of Chicago—may be constructed and will be constructed if the city of Chicago wishes it constructed and is willing to pay all non-Federal costs of construction.

In other words, the 10 percent of construction costs against which Federal money is matched.

Mr. COLLIER. May I ask the gentleman if what is involved here is a change in what has been basic law heretofore, wherein the approval had to come through the office of the Governor and where previously a municipality did not have this authority? Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman made a correct statement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute in order that I may amplify upon the statement.

In this bill a greater degree of flexibility is given to the cities of the Nation than ever has been given to them. They are accorded a broader degree of option within their unilateral rights to exercise such options. For example, a city is permitted for the first time to remove a controversial segment of the Interstate System lying within its borders if it desires to do so and if it can be certified by the Department of Transportation that that particular segment is not necessary to there being a continuous Interstate System. Now, having granted to a city a right under certain circumstances to remove a section which it does not want, the conferees felt it only fair and equitable that we should give to the city the right to retain and construct a segment that it does want. In each of these situations we have given to a city a greater degree of flexibility.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would rise for the same purpose, I think, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) had in mind, namely, to try to clarify the meaning and intent of section 110(b) of the conference report.

I understand the material embraced there was a matter not confided to the conference committee either by the House or the Senate, and therefore one of the reasons for the general waiver which the Committee on Rules gave and which I supported.

However, I did want to make it clear—and I said it in the committee—in supporting that general waiver I was not indicating my approval of all the matters which had come out in the conference report.

I have some very grave reservations about that particular section. However, there was extensive colloquy, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WRIGHT.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. An extensive colloquy was had on the floor of the Senate when this conference report was considered on this particular section. The colloquy indicates that the inter-

pretation to be placed on this amended section 103 of title 23 is that the State could be prevented from dedesignating a previously designated section of interstate highway——

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. And from transferring that mileage elsewhere under section 110(b) but that all of the State's responsibilities under title 23 still hold. In other words, with respect to the Uniform Relocation and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969, the Department of Transportation Act, and title 6, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

None of those responsibilities on the part of the State are abrogated by virtue of the inclusion of this amended language in section 103 of title 23; am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is right. I would say to the gentleman that it was not the intention, nor do I think it is the product of the conference committee, to abrogate or deny any existing right of the State except as is specifically enumerated; namely, that any segment of an interstate system lying within a city which that city wishes to construct and is willing to pay the non-Federal cost for the construction of, shall be constructed. Beyond that I think there is no intent, nor do I think there is any effect, of limiting the rights of the States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARSHA. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding. In addition, if I understand the gentleman, all of the environmental protections must be complied with before the construction of the highway can be undertaken. The Secretary does not lose—and I refer now to the Secretary of Transportation—any of his legal responsibilities and is not mandated to enter into an agreement to provide for the construction of a particular highway. This section, in short, does not mandate the construction of any particular highway?

Mr. WRIGHT. It mandates the construction only of a highway which fits the description of this paragraph. But it declares that, when the conditions herein enumerated are met, the highway shall be constructed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. But it would still require the agreement of the Secretary of Transportation, would it not, pursuant to other provisions of law?

May I have a response from the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the agreement of the Secretary of Transportation as mandated in the language of the act is that if there existed on the date aforementioned, June 30, 1973, a segment of Interstate System lying within the boundaries of a city, and if the duly elected officials of that city, speaking for the citizens of that city, wish to construct that segment, and if they are willing to contribute the non-Federal share of the cost of construction, that segment shall be constructed. To that extent, it would be a mandate to the Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If I may refer very briefly to the colloquy again that took place on the floor of the other body, the question was asked specifically at that time whether or not the language to which I referred mandated the building of any highway, and the response from the junior Senator from the State of Texas was, it is not a requirement that this be constructed; it would still require an agreement of the Secretary, and that is the point I am trying to make clear for our record this afternoon.

The gentleman agrees with that interpretation placed upon this language in the other body—that we still have the requirement of the agreement of the Secretary of Transportation?

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to remind the gentleman that this is general legislation; this is not local or special legislation. This makes no reference to any given stretch of highway. This refers to any segment of an Interstate System which was designated part of that system as of June 30, 1973, wherever it may lie within the borders of a city, and if that city is willing to do those things stipulated, it mandates the construction of that segment that qualifies.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify the meaning and intent of section 110(b) of the conference report on S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973.

Section 110(b) reads as follows:

(b) Section 103 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding subsection (e) (2) and (g) of this section, in any case where a segment of the Interstate System was a designated part of such System on June 1, 1973, and is entirely within the boundaries of an incorporated city and such city enters into an agreement with the Secretary to say all non-Federal costs of construction of such segment, such segment shall be constructed."

This provision was not contained in either the House or the Senate version of this Highway Act. It was not studied by any congressional committee nor was it debated on the floor of either House. Indeed, it was only added to the bill in conference on the last day, with little discussion and with several of the conferees absent. I believe that this sets a bad legislative precedent. Further, I am convinced that an even worse precedent would be established if the record were not clear as to precisely what this provision does and what it does not do.

When the conference report was before the Senate, the two Senators from Illinois, Mr. PERCY and Mr. STEVENSON, engaged in extended colloquies with the Senate managers of the bill, Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. STAFFORD. Throughout their colloquies two points were firmly established:

First. Nothing in this provision abrogates any of the responsibilities which the U.S. Secretary of Transportation has under Title 23, U.S.C. or any other Federal law, including the Uniform Relocation and Land Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4601, et. seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq.), section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1653(f)), and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000(d)).

Second. Nothing in this provision discharges the State of its basic responsibility under title 23, United States Code, to carry out the Federal-aid highway program. The essential Federal-State relationship which characterizes the program would not be substantially altered, nor would the basic grant-in-aid nature of the Federal-aid highway program be changed. Rather, each State would retain the responsibility of determining for itself its own priorities among the designated interstate routes within its borders. And each State would retain the authority to determine where within a designated corridor to build highways.

What the provision does essentially is to prevent a State from unilaterally designating a segment of the Interstate System, which was designated as of June 1, 1973 and which lies entirely within the boundaries of an incorporated city, provided that the city agrees to pay all non-federal costs of constructing such segment. Otherwise, all State and Federal provisions apply.

Inasmuch as relatively little doubt seems to have arisen as regards the U.S. Secretary of Transportation's continued responsibilities under the Uniform Relocation Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, title 23, and other Federal statutes, I shall concentrate, instead, on the implications of this section for the State's fundamental responsibility to carry out the program.

Since its inception in 1916, the Federal-aid highway program has been characterized by a cooperative Federal-State relationship in which the States have had primary responsibility for selecting and implementing projects. This cooperative Federal-State relationship has been one of the hall marks of the program and one of the essential reasons for its success. This conceptual basis of the program is not changed by this highway act. The basic departure which the 1973 Federal-Aid Highway Act marks from the past relates to a broadening of the purposes of the program and to a corresponding broadening of the uses of the Highway Trust Fund—not to a radical change in the decision-making process outlined in title 23, United States Code. While the bill does move further in the direction of involving local officials in planning and selecting urban transportation projects—which I very much support—the State's power and authority is by no means reduced. The goal is, rather, to increase local power and to require the concurrence of local and State officials in the formulation of urban transportation programs and policies. If anything, the State's role is enhanced by this legislation. For instance, section 123 of the conference report states:

The authorization of the appropriation of Federal funds or their availability for expenditure under this chapter shall in no way infringe on the sovereign rights of the states to determine which projects shall be federally financed. The provisions of this chapter provide for a federally assisted State program.

Other provisions of title 23 U.S.C. un-

derscore the point further. Examples include: Section 105, which directs the State to "submit to the Secretary for his approval, as soon as practicable after program approval, such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for each proposed project included in an approved program as the Secretary may require"; and section 110, which states:

As soon as practicable after the plans, specifications, and estimates for a specific project have been approved, the Secretary shall enter into a formal project agreement with the State highway department concerning the construction and maintenance of such project.

In summary, the State's preeminent role in carrying out the Federal-aid highway program is not significantly undermined by section 110(b) or any other provision of this bill. At the same time the power and influence of local officials has been increased so that their concurrence will be required before most urban transportation projects can either be undertaken or halted. In general I believe that this is a very healthy development. The local, elected officials closest to the problem should have an increased say over the transportation programs and policies which often have a major impact on their communities.

On the other hand, this requirement of concurrence has led many in my State to fear that the apparent inability of the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago to agree on whether or not to build the Chicago Crosstown Expressway would result in the State's having to forfeit both the $900 million in Federal funds allocated to the project and the jobs and other economic benefits that would come with a Federal grant of that magnitude. Regardless of the relative merits or demerits of the Crosstown, a sacrifice of $900 million cannot be taken lightly. Fortunately, under a separate provision of this bill, the options available to the city and State will be much broader than to build the Crosstown or to lose the $900 million. Instead, if the Mayor and the Governor agree not to build the Crosstown, $900 million would be made available out of the general revenues for public transportation improvements within the State, including the improvement and expansion of the Chicago Transit Authority. I hope for the sake of the citizens of the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois that this new provision may make a solution to the Crosstown dilemma possible.

Mr. HARSHA. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. COLLIER. Might I direct one question to the gentleman from Texas on this same matter? Do I then understand from the definition that he has given that if the crosstown proposal will at any point extend beyond the boundary of the city of Chicago then this authority would not exist unless the plans were changed in order to bypass the other provisions of the law requiring that there be approval by the Governor and the Director of Transportation; is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not sure I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. COLLIER. Very simply, if any one of these proposals is not totally within the boundaries, if at any point it spills over into another municipality, then this would not apply?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is not quite true. It would apply within the city.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute so that I might try to make this question totally clear.

Let us take for example the specific situation to which the gentleman refers. It is my understanding that this particular stretch of highway about which the gentleman is concerned lies within two cities, the city of Chicago and the town of Cicero, Ill. The city of Chicago might choose to exercise this option with respect to that portion lying within the city of Chicago. The town of Cicero might choose to do so or it might not choose to do so. The town of Cicero would govern within the limits of the town of Cicero, and the city of Chicago would govern within the city limits of the city of Chicago. If both agree, the segment may be built across both.

Mr. COLLIER. If only one agrees, what is the situation?

Mr. WRIGHT. If one does not agree, it does not build that segment of the highway, but the other would be permitted to build its segment of the highway unilaterally if it desired to do so and agreed to contribute its own matching funds.

Mr. HARSHA. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment and to applaud the work and words of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA). I feel proud to have been associated with him in this controversy and I have no hesitancy in commending and congratulating him for a valiant fight for what I believe was principle and not expediency.

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

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

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the minority leader's comments. They were truly justified in the case of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), the leader of the minority delegation on this conference committee. It goes without saying he is a man who does his homework and knows what he speaks of. He will always listen and always think something over. If he cannot change his mind he has a good reason for it and if he can, he does. We owe to the gentleman from Ohio great thanks for being able to overcome many of the problems and he has in the many consultations enabled us to have close coordination and liaison on both sides which made possible this outstanding achievement.

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader for his comments and associate myself with his remarks concerning the knowledge and integrity and legislative skills of the ranking minority member on this committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA). Not only were his remarks earlier this afternoon truly eloquent, but also his contributions to this bill have been monumental. In the years to come human lives will be saved on the highways of this country because of the creative endeavors of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA). I am honored to join in paying this tribute to our ranking minority member.

Mr. GERALD F. FORD. By the words of praise for the gentleman from Ohio, BILL HARSHA, I do not mean to speak harshly about other members of the conference from the House side. I think they did a good job under the most adverse circumstances. They did as well as they could to uphold the House position. If they had the support they should have had from sound proponents with the right ideas, including some in the administration, we would have come back with even better legislation.

I am not bitter but I cannot help but be critical. As we drive down our interstate highways, as we drive down other highways partially funded by the Federal Government where they are constructing portions of the highway with Federal tax money paid for highway construction, we see signs that read something like this.

"Your highway taxes at work."

Crews are digging, they are pouring cement, they are erecting bridges of one kind or another. Since this new highway bill now provides for diversion from the highway fund of some construction to the purchase of buses, to the purchase of equipment, and eventually, I am sure, the bottomless pit of operating subsidy, I rue the day when, instead of putting signs on the side of the road, "Your highway taxes at work" building highways, they will have some high-speed bus purchased with highway tax construction money with a sign hung on the rear, "Your highway taxes at work."

I wonder how many of the people who paid those highway taxes for the construction of highways, are going to appreciate that bus pushing them off the highway.

Let me get back to the fundamentals of the legislation.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Ohio needs a special commendation for the safety portions of this legislation. It is monumental. It is forwardlooking.

There is another provision in here that I strongly support, and it is the new section 147, "Priority Primary Routes." This is an absolutely essential provision and will presumably speed-up the remaining portions of U.S. 131 in Michigan.

There are portions of our highway system that need this special emphasis, such as U.S. 131 and U.S. 31 in Michigan, and I am told that the mass transit lobby

disapproves of this new provision. That could not make me happier, because I want priority primary routes constructed.

I applaud the effort of the conferees in achieving this provision.

Let me conclude with this comment: It is awfully hard to swallow a bill that diverts funds from the highway trust fund, but because of the safety features, because of the priority primary route provision, it is my intention to support the conference report.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the comment regarding diversion, does the gentleman accept the concept of a trust fund for establishing mass transit?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I certainly do, and to the extent I have any influence, I will do all I can to achieve that result.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, and I want to associate myself with his remarks.

It will be a sad day in this country, and for those of us who let this through, when we pass a conference report on a bill that permits this raid on the highway trust fund.

As the gentleman said, we will come to portions of the road where they will have some kind of gimmick with a sign on it to say, "We succeeded in stopping the road at this point."

Regardless of the fact that the money in the trust fund specifically was put there by the voters for highway construction, it has been diverted to other interests.

I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL).

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my support for the House-Senate conference report on the comprehensive Federal Aid-Highways Act.

I am supporting this legislation despite my continuing opposition to opening the highway trust fund for uses other than those originally intended.

This conference report contains a provision diverting up to $1 billion from the trust fund for financing urban mass transit systems—$200 million in 1975 and $800 million in 1976.

I continue to believe that the best way to finance urban mass transit systems—and I am not questioning the need for them—is to set up a special trust fund for that purpose, just as we have done for highways and airports.

But my objection to this feature is overshadowed by the many excellent provisions contained elsewhere in the bill.

I have nothing but the highest commendation for the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Public Works, Mr. HARSHA, who is also the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee on which I serve, and the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. WRIGHT, for the excellent work they have done with this legislation.

I count it a pleasure to serve with men of their vision and ability and dedication, and I commend them especially on their valiant efforts to preserve the integrity of the highway trust fund for as long as possible. They are both outstanding public servants, and this House is the better for having them.

Among the very worthwhile provisions of the bill are:

An expansion of the Interstate Highway System, and the primary and secondary roads system that supports it. This expansion is of particular importance to the Nation's rural areas, which need these new and improved transportation routes to help them open up for development and growth;

A comprehensive highway safety program designed to help reduce accidents and fatalities on the Nation's highways. This section includes important provisions dealing with extensive bridge repairs and railroad crossing signal improvements, as well as improved marking systems and high hazard area improvements:

A section I sponsored in the committee, calling for new corridor hearings on the proposed Corporation Freeway in Winston-Salem, N.C., the largest city in my district. These new hearings will guarantee that the voice of the people is heard and their concerns fully considered before any further work is done on this proposal.

In general, I find this legislation deserving of my support, and I am confident it will be beneficial to the Fifth District of North Carolina, to the State, and to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI).

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the highway bill is up for a vote today. I want to say that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) did a fine job, a splendid job at all times. He put in many, many hours and a lot of work.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Public Works, I can say that we have had extensive hearings. We have listened to hundreds of witnesses. We worked mornings and afternoons. We listened to everybody interested, those who were for it and those who were opposed. There is not a Member of the Committee on Public Works who can say I did not give him all the time he could ask for all the questions he wanted to ask.

We worked very hard in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and before the Rules Committee, and the Speaker knows what we have done in the conference committee.

I have been in the House for 23 years. I have been on many conferences, but I had never witnessed anything like that in my life.

We came out with a good bill, and we, the Members of the House, should be proud of it. This will be the finest legislation ever enacted by any Congress. So I am going to ask the Members to vote for the conference report.

I was going to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) some questions for the record. Of course, the other gentleman, Mr. COLLIER and Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, asked him questions and I hope those are in the record.

Everybody knows how I feel about highways. That is why I want to put this in the record.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have this legislation before the House, and I hope it will pass by a big vote.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in support of this legislation. It has been the most difficult piece of highway legislation to ever come before this body.

On the other hand, with its difficulty has come to greater degree of understanding of the problems which this country faces in the field of transportation, particularly urban transportation.

A bill has been put together here which recognizes the relationship between urban and rural highways and which addresses itself also to the needs of mass transportation in our cities.

As everyone in this body knows. I represent an entirely urban district in the great city of Chicago. This bill contains substantial benefits in both mass transportation and highways which will benefit the city of Chicago as well as the other great cities of America.

You also know that I have, over the years, been a staunch defender of the integrity of the trust fund. I continue to believe that it is only through the highway trust fund that it has been possible to produce the best highway system in the whole world and I will continue to fight for the continuance of that fund.

In this bill, we allowed a limited diversion from that trust fund for mass transit and added $3 billion for the general fund for mass transit.

The conference report is an excellent compromise and I urge this body to pass it.

There is one element of the bill I would like to expand on, which is that of the interstate transfer provisions and those areas dealing with removal of segments from the Interstate System.

The House position prevailed for the most part on the subject. The previous status of existing law commonly referred to as the Howard-Cramer amendment was retained with the exception of increasing the allowable mileage provision from 200 to 500 miles and the use of the 1972 interstate cost estimate in place of the 1968 cost estimate.

The second House provision on interstate transfer allows the withdrawal of an interstate segment and using the Federal share of the cost of such route for mass transit purposes from the general fund.

It is therefore the intention of this bill that existing interstate transfer pro-

visions with respect to highway routes themselves still retain the same principle as in existing law. I emphasize this point because it has come to the attention of the committee that certain interstate transfers have been approved and proposed which may not be in accord with present law. For example, it is not proper to remove an existing toll road from the Interstate System and expect to construct a substitute route which will increase the interstate cost in the next estimate.

The Committee on Public Works is concerned with the many costs of the Interstate System and does not want to see those costs accelerated by this kind of action.

By the same token, the conference committee added a section which will require already designated segments of the Interstate System in cities to be built if the city is willing to put up the matching money. We would expect this provision to be followed diligently by the States and the Secretary also.

A word about section 164 of the conference report, with specific reference to subsection (B) thereof, dealing with school bus operations.

First, the intent and legal effect of this section will not prevent those cities which have their own mass transit buses to allow them to be used by riders of school age to travel at reduced fares, nor to prohibit the routing of a public transit bus adjacent to school facilities, as a part of the regularly scheduled bus system service for any passenger.

In addition, either a school bus, if operated by a public body, or a public mass transit bus can be used on individual charter-type trips to transport schoolchildren to various points of interest within the actual geographic area served by the school bus operation or the city mass transit bus operation.

This would mean, for instance, that in the case of the Washington, D.C., area, public mass transit buses could be used to carry schoolchildren on special trips to such places of interest as Mount Vernon, the Washington Monument, or similar places within the metropolitan geographic area of the city, but are not to be used to carry schoolchildren on long distance trips, such as a visit from Washington to the city of New York.

I want to reaffirm that it was the intent of the conference committee that drafted subsection (h) of paragraph (B), section 103, title 23, that urban segments of the Interstate System, such as the Chicago Crosstown, be constructed if the local municipalities provide the local 10 percent matching funds.

Urban Interstate segments, such as FAI 494, commonly called the Chicago Crosstown, are necessary to complete urban transportation systems essential for the mobility of urban residents and necessary for the economic viability of urban areas such as Chicago.

It is quite clear that the intent of this subsection and the intent of the conferees is the following: that in any case where a particular portion of an Interstate System lies wholly within the boundaries of an incorporated city, that portion of the Interstate System may be constructed under this subsection, on the condition further contained in this subsection that the incorporated city agrees to pay all non-Federal costs of construction.

The Chicago Crosstown is taken as a prime example of the use of this section and it is a good one. Individual segments of the Interstate have logical terminal points on that freeway. It starts on the north at the Kennedy Expressway, proceeds south and crosses the Eisenhower Expressway, proceeds south further and crosses the Stevenson Expressway and then proceeds easterly to the Don Ryan Expressway. The route could logically be a connecting link between any of these freeways or all of them. This is for the local officials to decide.

This subsection would also allow two or more cities, adjacent to each other, who wish to band together and provide funding from their respective municipalities for those segments or portions of the Interstate System that are through their cities, to do so under this subsection. It is perfectly clear that regardless of the construction or nonconstruction of any other segments of the Interstate System that may link into a particular city, if that particular city determines to go ahead with that portion of the Interstate System that lies within its boundaries, it shall be done.

It is theoretically possible under this subsection that a circumstance may arise where an incorporated city may determine that the construction of a segment of an Interstate System is so essential to development of its overall transportation plan that this may require the Department of Transportation, through the Federal Highway Administration, to take a long look at this city's problem and determine that it may be necessary to develop a plan working through the city itself that will allow for the construction of this particular interstate segment.

This type of philosophy is consistent with other sections of this legislation which provide greater local determination regarding transportation plans and programs.

The committee intended, under this subsection, and this subsection only, that a direct relationship between local government and the Department of Transportation would be established.

Conferees on the part of the House wish to make it perfectly clear that this subsection appears in this particular piece of legislation to assure that vitally needed highway facilities such as the Chicago Crosstown be constructed at the earliest possible date.

One final point I would like to make has to do with the benefits in the transit elements of the bill for the elderly and the handicapped.

Section 301(g)(2) would authorize additional relief in meeting the transportation needs of the elderly and handicapped in those instances where UMTA determines that assistance under section 301(g)(1) is "unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate" to meet the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons.

In such cases a private nonprofit corporation or association may apply for capital grants or loans for equipment and facilities under section 301(g)(2) with the understanding that requirements such as compliance with sections 13(c) and 3(e) of the act, demonstration of financial, legal, and technical ability, and evidence of unified or officially coordinated planning be met as a prerequisite to eligibility for funding.

Other elements of the conference report will be covered by other members and I know that the Members of this body will be happy with the explanation they will receive on this difficult piece of legislation.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend congratulations to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), whose district is just north of mine. I know that the gentleman has been known for years as the father of the highway trust fund. I know what great effort and compromise on his part it took to agree to the compromise on the use of the highway trust fund for mass transit purposes.

I take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, during the House floor debate in April on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1972, I argued the need for a more realistic use of the highway trust fund. The trust fund, originally proposed for building and maintaining our Interstate Highway System, has served its purpose over the years.

What was responsive to the needs of all the people in 1956, however, is not necessarily vital or even vaguely appealing today. My fellow Chicagoans have watched pollution exceed acceptable levels and have witnessed the steady proliferation of roads. The physical changes have undoubtedly affected people psychologically. The masses began crying out for relief but were told that relief cost money.

The 1972 National Transportation Study confirmed my worst suspicions about Chicago. A comparison between the vehicular miles traveled and the miles of freeway available indicated that the Chicago freeways handle a capacity 110 percent greater than had been provided for.

Proponents of opening up the highway trust fund lost the House battle in April. The House failed to approve "busting" the highway trust fund for mass transit use by the cities. The situation was not without hope, however, since the Senate bill's language permitted the cities to use their trust fund allotments for mass transit.

The compromise of the House and Senate versions of the legislation is being debated on the House floor today before the August recess. The conference report delays opening the trust fund until fiscal 1974 and the cities will then have access to trust funds though reduced in amount from that approved by the Senate.

Although breaking the highway trust fund is the bill's most significant breakthrough, it is not the only section of the bill worthy of note. The conferees responded to the crisis of highway fatali-

ties in our Nation by authorizing funds to correct unsafe conditions.

The conference report provides safety research funds to evaluate the effects of drug use on driver behavior. Funds from the highway trust fund to identify and later eliminate roadside hazards and obstacles are also included. We all know areas with notoriously high accident rates but this bill proposes to do something about them.

A provision of the bill emphasizes local controls over highway projects, permitting the top city official to override a Governor's objections to a road project directly affecting the urban area. Although the Crosstown Expressway is not explicitly mentioned, this provision of the bill would pave the way for the expressway's construction despite the vehement objections of Governor Walker.

I have consistently opposed the Crosstown. Under ordinary circumstances, therefore, I would object to this language in the report which was not in the House-passed version. As I mentioned above, however, the conference report opens the highway trust fund for mass transit purposes in the cities. I was advised that objecting to the language affecting the Crosstown during debate would jeopardize floor approval of the section relating to mass transit.

The conference report on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 is an "all or nothing" proposition. I will not, therefore, vote to defeat the precedent-setting aspects of the highway bill in order to halt construction of the Crosstown.

Despite my serious reservations about the Crosstown, I am able to recognize both sides of the arguments. I have previously discussed at length with constituents my opposition to the Crosstown and I see no value in repeating myself at this time.

I do feel compelled, however, to comment on the Senate floor remarks by the Republican Senator from Illinois during the August 1 Senate debate on the conference report. Rather than confine his remarks to a factual analysis of Crosstown, the Senator inferred that the people of Chicago were "bulldozed" into accepting the Crosstown despite the devastating effect the expressway would have on their lives.

According to the Senator from the fine State of Illinois, section 110(b) of the conference report is a thinly-veiled attempt "to do one thing and one thing only—build the Crosstown Expressway in Chicago . . ." The Senator neglected to mention that this section of the report applies to numerous highway projects across the Nation.

The Senator from Illinois charged that section 110(b) was an attempt to build the Crosstown despite the fact that the Governor of the State does not want it built.

The Crosstown Expressway design project began in October 1967 and while Governor Walker disapproves of the construction, Illinois' former Governor Ogilvie approved the project.

On April 7, 1972, Governor Ogilvie directed the Department of Transportation to reevaluate the State's commitment to the Crosstown. The Department completed its study and the Governor reported the findings January 2, 1973. In the Governor's words:

> Their re-evaluation reaffirms the need for an expressway and public mass transportation system along the lines of the Crosstown concept. They report that such a system can be completed with a minimum of adverse effect on the environment. And they report further that the social and economic rights of the people of the communities affected can be assured and safeguarded.

In the Governor's words—

> It is my judgment that the completion of the Crosstown is justified for the greater good of the greatest number of the people of Cook County and of Illinois.

Some type of Crosstown route has been suggested since publication of the Daniel Burnham Plan of Chicago in 1909. Similar plans were part of the city of Chicago plans of 1939 and 1947.

The Chicago Area Transportation Study—CATS—a scientific urban transportation study, proposed a crossgrid of expressways in 1962, including the Crosstown route.

The Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission—NIPC—prepared a Comprehensive General Plan for the six counties of the Chicago metropolitan area and supported construction of the Crosstown in 1969–70. The study tested for residential development costs, job accessibility, air quality and resource management.

The Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council of Chicago gave its approval to the Crosstown pending specified corrections in the plan. According to Senator STEVENSON who commented on the Crosstown on the Senate floor August 1, the Council will now update its earlier study.

The Crosstown is nothing new to Chicagoans. The planning stages have been going on for 10 years now.

In 1963, the Transportation Advisory Group—TAG—was the first to analyze proposed routes for a Crosstown. Cook County and Illinois highway officials joined in this effort and were advised by CATS, the Chicago Area Transportation Study, and the Chicago Transit Authority.

On November 7, 1963, TAG established the Crosstown Expressway Task Force. The task force was comprised of government engineers and city planners. Their report, filed in 1966, proposed a Crosstown which was later rejected by the community for esthetic as well as practical reasons.

In 1967, the Crosstown Study Team reviewed and eliminated designs for the Crosstown. The Crosstown Design Team became the study team's professional consultant and in August 1968, the name of the group was changed to Crosstown Associates with the addition of a number of consulting engineers.

The Crosstown goals later formulated by Crosstown Associates attempted to stress the human interest aspects of the expressway as well as considerations of traffic needs. The emphasis was not only on maintaining the appearance of the area surrounding the Crosstown but on improving it with the addition of parks and recreational areas.

In his remarks on the Senate floor, the senior Senator from Illinois alleged that the Crosstown was being forced on the people of Chicago in "devious" ways since community acceptance of the proposal was not possible.

The number of public meetings held to discuss the project since 1969 exceed 50. Civic and homeowners' associations met with representatives from the Illinois Department of Transportation and/or city of Chicago and Crosstown Associates. Parties were encouraged to air their views, voice their apprehensions and demand answers to their questions.

As a result of community meetings, public hearings, and a general exchange of information, opposition to the Crosstown has been significantly reduced. I have noticed this change particularly during the last year.

If the Crosstown plans are discarded, the highway trust fund investment of $900 million will be transferred out of Chicago and into the hands of other locales across the country. These highway trust funds will be permanently lost to us. Many argue that Chicagoans have paid their share of road taxes over the years and they should not defer to other highway projects across the Nation when the Crosstown is itself such a potential source of income.

The actual building of the expressway will generate employment for workers and income for material suppliers. Furthermore, a sizable number of jobs created will be in unskilled and semiskilled categories.

The actual building of the expressway will generate employment for workers and income for material suppliers. It is estimated that an average of 6,300 jobs per year over a 10-year construction period will materialize. Again I stress, a sizable number of jobs created will be in unskilled and semiskilled categories.

Income earned while working on the Crosstown will in turn be spent in the Chicago metropolitan area for goods and services, thus improving the livelihood of countless other Chicagoans.

The commercial growth expected in the industrial parks within the Crosstown corridor is certainly a factor to consider. Reversing the trend that commercial establishments desert the cities for the suburbs, the Crosstown could indirectly contribute to improving the tax base.

These remarks should not be interpreted as a challenge to the Senator's credibility. I simply believe that no cause is served by lashing out against the Senate and House conferees and then concluding that section 110(b) does not necessarily apply to the Crosstown in Chicago at all.

Even supporters of the Crosstown are quick to admit the roadblocks. The 1970 Uniform Relocation Assistance Act guarantees a great deal to families and businesses uprooted by the Crosstown.

The environmental pitfalls of an expressway are another area of concern. Standards set in section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, section 1653(f) of 49 U.S.C., section 470f of U.S.C. and section 309 of the Clean Air Act of 1970 must be met, and will be met, I am assured by the sponsors of the conference report.

In closing, I would merely add that

the question of whether to approve or disapprove the Crosstown is better left to the people back home in Chicago. I am confident that the Crosstown controversy will be resolved equitably, assuming that all facts and figures relating to it are made available for public inspection.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to add my congratulations to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and the other members of the conference from the House, and to the members of the staff of the Public Works Committee, for a splendid achievement. I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have read carefully the statement of Senator PERCY of Illinois on the Federal-Aid Highway conference report wherein he said:

If one were reading through this bill, the language of section 110(b) would probably escape notice. It looks small and insignificant, buried as it is. However, it represents an attempt to change the entire history of our highway program by bypassing the Governor of a State, and trying to let the Mayor of a City authorize highways. This is, indeed, a radical change. But even more than that, this language is an attempt to get around the serious objections which have been raised to building a highway in the third largest City in the Nation, at a cost of over $1 billion.

Then Senator PERCY goes on to say:

This section does not relieve a State of its responsibilities under the law. The responsibility continues to rest with the State, and no one else, including a City, to actually construct the highways. As a part of that responsibility the State has to use its judgment and its discretion in seeing that all of the applicable laws are met before construction can even begin.

We find expressed here two different points of view: First, the city may or may not. Second, the State may or may not.

On the other hand, we find Senator STEVENSON of Illinois saying:

It would be a mistake for anyone to assume that this amendment settles the Crosstown controversy in the City of Chicago. Nine hundred million dollars of taxpayers' money in the highway trust fund has been set aside for the construction of this highway and mass transit facility. Yet the positions of the State House in Springfield and City Hall in Chicago with regard to how the $900 million ought to be spent have been uncompromising. It is not and should not be the business of the Congress to intervene and dictate a settlement in such local disputes.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate-House conference committee, Hon. JAMES WRIGHT of Texas, according to the August 3 edition of the Chicago Tribune, said, and I quote:

I think the language is very clear, if the city wants to put up the (local) share of the money, it can build the Crosstown.

I want to point out to my colleagues in the House that we have here three separate views on the intent of this conference report. There has been a great deal of effort to establish congressional intent, yet the Federal courts, the executive branch of Government, and the various agencies making up the Federal bureaucracy have, in the last 10 years, paid very little attention to, and in many instances, have flagrantly violated, the intent of Congress.

I have had firsthand experience with violations of congressional intent. Congressional intent is very clear regarding a Congressman's right to send franked mail on official business anywhere in the United States, when it has the name, address, and ZIP code of the individual on the envelope. Yet, a suit was brought against me for exercising that right—a right that was substantiated by the expression of congressional intent on this House floor—and the lower district court issued an injunction against me, the circuit court of appeals upheld the decision of the lower court, and the Supreme Court refused to grant me a writ of certiorari. So much for congressional intent.

It is my fervent hope that this legislation will act as a conduit to bring the Governor of Illinois and the mayor of Chicago together in an amicable settlement that will benefit the people of our city and our State.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents over 3,000 man-days of hard work on the part of the members of the House-Senate Conference Committee. It is historic and landmark legislation because, for the first time in the history of our country, the highway trust fund has been cracked, and in 1975 the cities of America will receive $1 billion for mass transit from this fund. All of us know that the Interstate Highway System will be completed by 1980, and that we will have available billions and billions of dollars thereafter from the trust fund to use for developing and maintaining an efficient and safe mass transit system that is sorely needed in order to prevent our cities from choking to death.

As public officials, all of us, whether we are Governor, mayor, or Congressman, want to do what is best for the people of our State, our city, and our Nation. It is my hope, although we have many divergent views—pro and con—that all of us will continue to work together to insure that what is best for the people we are privileged to represent will finally be accomplished.

I do not want to raise false hopes that congressional intent will resolve this problem because I have little faith in congressional intent since I have experienced firsthand flagrant violations of congressional intent. In my humble opinion, the only way that the people can come out on top is for their public officials to recognize their needs and wants, and to work toward meeting and resolving those needs and wants.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) a member of the conference committee.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, S. 502 represents the greatest transportation bill ever adopted by the Congress of the United States. It represents the most advanced progress for urban America of any legislation adopted in the history of this country.

It also represents the finest compromise ever enunciated by Members of the House.

I should especially like to pay tribute to two individuals, JIM WRIGHT, and BILL HARSHA, who have helped to mold this bill. I understand and appreciate that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HARSHA, does not fully support certain provisions of the bill. This shows his legislative skill and ability, to mold a product by which he can agree with 75 percent of the package and still support it.

Mr. Speaker, it shows that these Members have the individual ability to negotiate the compromise that we need to put together legislative proposals in the House of Representatives.

I salute these two Members, the gentleman from Texas, JIM WRIGHT, and the gentleman from Ohio, BILL HARSHA.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), one of the conferees.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has performed an outstanding service in bringing to the House floor an effective and thoughtfully balanced report that merits the support of every Member of this body.

No conference in my memory has ever faced a more difficult task in dealing with problems ranging all the way from the pressing needs for mass transit in our big cities to the improvement of two-lane country roads on which more than 30,000 Americans are dying each year.

The conference has dealt responsibly with the needs of rural America by substantially increasing the funding for rural highway programs. Failure to act in this fashion would intensify the transportation problems of our cities, by accelerating the flow of people from the countryside to our already crowded urban centers.

Our population today is badly distributed; 80 percent of our people live on 5 percent of our land area. Half of all our people live on the perimeter of the mainland, within 50 miles of the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, or the Great Lakes.

The best and brightest of our young men and women are still leaving the farms and small towns, because there are more job opportunities in the cities. We are not going to reverse that flow unless and until we develop adequate highways that will encourage industries to locate in those rural and semirural areas.

The conference report is sound and constructive legislation that looks to the transportation needs of all America, the needs of our small towns and rural areas, and the needs of our crowded cities.

I call your particular attention to that

section of the bill authorizing the use of highway trust funds totaling $225 million over the next 3 years for construction of economic growth center development highways.

This program was initiated as a demonstration project in the 1970 Highway Act to determine whether highways can be used to promote the development of new communities, with significant potential for economic growth, away from the established population centers.

Over half of the $100 million authorized for this demonstration has been obligated. The program has attracted sufficient interest and support to warrant its expansion into a regular part of the Federal-aid highway program, and the conference report so recommends.

The objective of this program is to revitalize and diversify the economic life of our rural and smalltown areas, to enhance and disperse industrial growth and, so far as possible, to reverse the flow of population into our congested cities.

I also call your attention to the $140 million for forest development roads and trails and the other parts of the bill dealing with public domain highways and Indian roads. These are very necessary adjuncts to our regular Federal-aid highway program to the States and serve to give us a complete highway program.

I am personally pleased also that the inclusion of the House provision on priority primary routes was retained in the bill with substantial funding for the next 3 years. This program is a natural transition as the Interstate System draws to completion to provide a means to proceed with those important rural roads and urban streets which have been neglected during the concentrated effort to complete the Interstate System.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation deals responsibly and equitably with the transportation needs of the cities and the country. I urge final passage of the conference report.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I guess that in every compromise there are balances in disappointments. I believe that the committee and the conference committee worked very hard.

Mr. Speaker, I also have some disappointments. I have nevertheless indicated that I support this bill, because I am pleased that, for the first time, there will be an opportunity for some local mode and flexibility in the handling of funds.

I am happy to see that the fund will be available for the purchase of buses in 1975 to the tune of $200 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see that in 1976 we will, at long last, be able to determine for ourselves what to do with our own contribution in the trust fund. I believe that that is a step forward.

I believe frankly that if we consider the situation in this country, the overwhelming numbers of people who live in urban areas who are choking to death from carbon monoxide, the problems of pollution and congestion, we will recognize that this step forward is a very small step indeed.

Nevertheless I think this is an affirmative step in the right direction and that now we can begin to look to the future for a properly interrelated and planned urban system.

I join with others in complimenting the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) for his effort in the highway safety section of the bill.

I myself am grateful that some provisions were placed in the bill for aid to the handicapped and the elderly, in which I played a role.

I am happy to see, also, that cities can receive directly a fair and equitable share of their funds in the urban system, although I sought a much larger provision for direct earmarking.

The most glaring omission of the bill is that it provides no money for mass transit operating revenues. In New York City, for example, we are faced with a doubling of the cost of subway and bus fares, which are already too high. Unless we are able to maintain fares at their present levels, or preferably roll them back, history has shown that more and more riders will shift to the automobile. The cost of this shift, in terms of traffic congestion and environmental consequences, is incalculable. The fight must continue, therefore, to secure this type of desperately needed assistance.

On the whole I think it represents a significant achievement in the long campaign for badly needed aid for urban mass transit systems.

I urge support of this conference report.

Of course, I am happy to see the President has indicated he will sign this measure quickly into law so that we can get on with the business of developing a better balanced transportation system.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point up a bit of the legislative history with respect to one portion of the conference report.

Section 154 of the conference report, appearing on page 29, is a portion related to the controversial North Expressway, a part of the proposed relocation of U.S. Highway 281, a 9.6-mile section serving traffic between downtown San Antonio and the San Antonio International Airport concerning certain highways in this area.

The Texas State Highway Department pressed a plan to construct the expressway through Almos and Breckenridge Parks and other areas that affected environmental concerns.

On August 13, 1970, the Secretary of Transportation, at the request of the State of Texas, authorized Federal participation in the North Expressway. The State of Texas thus voluntarily submitted itself to Federal law with full knowledge of the controversial nature of the project and applicable Federal statutes. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit subsequently enjoined the Texas Highway Department from constructing the proposed North Expressway through the area.

What happened there was the addition by the Senate of a nongermane amendment, or one that would have been nongermane under the jurisdiction of this Committee on Public Works under rule XI, section 16, wherein it is said:

> But it shall not be in order for any bill providing general legislation in relation to roads to contain any provisions for any specified road.

This is an amendment which would have violated that and which was placed in the conference report as section 154, to which I have referred. That went in on the Senate side. It would have been subject, of course, to a point of order under rule XXVIII, clause 4, in that it violated rule XVI, clause 7, and rule XI, section 16, providing for the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works.

I could not raise the point. I could not make the point of order under rule 28, clause 4, because the Committee on Rules saw fit to waive all points of order. I must construe the Committee on Rules' holding in this light: that certainly the Committee on Rules did not consider that section to be of significance or of great enough importance for this body to consider that point separately. I had thought it important as a matter of principle that the House not take a nongermane amendment without affording any opportunity for its separate consideration on the floor. To do so, of course, would permit the matter to become law without any specific consideration at any level in the House's processes. Certainly it could not reasonably be conceived that the Rules Committee intended this if the amendment had any important effect, like a waiver of application of the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act in any area in which a NEPA statement is required under general law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield one-half minute additionally to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. For that reason this provision which has not had the debate of the House, nor the consideration of any committee of the House, and which the Committee on Rules did not think worthy of debate, must be construed as an unimportant amendment, one which does not in any way remove the NEPA limitations.

It must have the effect of accomplishing only what the language on its face purports to accomplish: to terminate the contractual relationship between the Federal and State Governments on the portion of the San Antonio North Ex-

pressway in question and provide for the repayment of certain Federal funds involved therewith. It cannot reasonably be construed to alter the duty that devolves on any Federal governmental agency to design and direct its action with the necessary regard to its impact on man's environment. The whole of the action must be in accord with these considerations and must be accomplished after the recommendation or report called for in 42 U.S.C. 4332(C).

Thus, where Federal highway construction covers an entire area, the project must be considered as a whole. And the whole plan must be accomplished in compliance with such policies and recommendations. The nongermane Senate amendment does not say that the State of Texas can buy itself immunity from such Federal policy application for the portion of a total project, federally instituted, going through Almos and Breckenridge Park. That portion of the total project is a part of, or is a result of, a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment, and it cannot be excised from the application of the provisions of the Environmental Policy Act except by clear legislative language purporting to accomplish that end. Certainly, the language of this amendment cannot be read as such clear language, and there is no legislative history in any hearings before a committee in the House, or on the floor of the House that can be used to amplify the language of the amendment so as to give it a meaning other than that which its words spontaneously yield.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the statement made by my colleague (Mr. ECKHARDT) that section 154 of this bill is an unimportant section. I submit that this section is just as important and just as valid as any other section of the bill and that it means exactly what it says.

When the State of Texas pays back the Federal aid highway funds on account of sections of the San Antonio North Expressway in Bexar County, Tex., as stated in that section, the Federal Government will cease to have any interest therein and the State of Texas can proceed to build those said portions according to State law.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the distinguished chairman on page 24, section 143(1) of the conference report. This deals with a route from the Southeastern part of the United States to Kansas City. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if there is any language in that section, which provides for a feasibility study, to prevent a study of the closest and the cheapest route between the terminal points mentioned, that is, Kansas City, and Brunswick, Ga.?

Mr. WRIGHT. In response to the question of the gentleman from Missouri, there is nothing in this language which would prevent the study of alternate routes between the terminal points mentioned in each of these enumerated highway studies that have been directed to be made by that section of the bill.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. He knows the situation in my district. The southeast section of Missouri is cut off from the State capital city of Jefferson City in that there is no direct highway route between the two points. This is a problem we have been plagued with for five decades. If the "crow flight" route were adopted in connecting Brunswick, Ga., with Kansas City, taxpayer funds would be saved while at the same time giving us a highway from Missouri's "bootheel" to the vicinity of Jefferson City and then on to Kansas City.

From the statement of the able manager of the bill, I am sure the Department of Transportation will look carefully at this issue and give every consideration to our position.

Mr. PERCY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will just take a moment to thank the chairman and his committee for their support of the demonstration program that permits local communities to solve the problem of eliminating railroad grade crossings over Federal-aid highways within urban areas.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding in order to clarify certain aspects of the report. Under section 130 of title 23, Federal funds—which may amount to 100 percent of costs, except that the railroads must pay up to 10 percent—are to be used to eliminate "hazards of railway-highway crossings" where the federally aided highway system is involved. Such funding can amount to no more than 10 percent of all highway expenditures.

Section 203 of the bill is to eliminate hazards of railway-highway crossings—"separation, relocation or protection." Such funds can be expended on the Federal-aid system only with the Federal share amounting to 90 percent.

The question arises as to what, if any differences exist between this section and existing law, that it, section 130 of title 23. Since they both have similar purposes, why was it necessary to set up two separate sections, or rather, repeat what already exists.

There is, of course, a need for section 230, since it permits the expenditure of funds on roads off the Federal-aid system. Three categories of hazards are mentioned, including the hazard of railroad-highway crossings. Once again, the Federal share is 90 percent. It would be helped to determine if funds can be used only on nonfederally aided roads. In other words, could a Federal-aid highway be involved along with non-Federal roads. There may be a problem on this particular aspect since both sections are specifically directed to the Federal and non-Federal roads, respectively.

The questions are: First, what type of roads are involved; and second, whether track relocation is permitted under both section 203 and section 230.

Mr. HARSHA. Under section 203 it is possible for a relocation or the construction of protective devices, or for a separation of railroad crossings, under that provision, provided they are on the Federal aid system.

If the particular railroad crossing that the gentleman has reference to is not on the Federal aid system. Then if it meets all of the requirements set forth in the other section 230(b), referring to what we call a Safer Roads Demonstration Program, and if it is off of the Federal aid system, it is eligible for funding for relocation, in my judgment, proving it meets all of the requirements and priorities set forth in the legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act, and I congratulate the conferees for adopting what I consider an acceptable compromise that can be supported by those of us who have been working to open the highway trust fund for bus or rail transit purchases.

This is not a perfect bill, as I am sure all will agree, and I am sure that each of us could find provisions with which we do not concur.

But, in fact, this proposal does place us on the right track to providing for a balanced transportation system by allowing flexible funding out of the highway trust fund.

Yes, the cities need the money immediately.

Yes, mass transit is needed now—not tomorrow or next year.

But this proposal, which permits immediate contract authority for bus or rail transit purchases, gives the Department of Transportation the authority necessary to act immediately to begin solving our transportation problems in our pollution-clouded cities.

Next year trust fund revenue will be available for bus purchases, and the following year rail systems are eligible for trust fund allocations.

When we consider that only last winter such a proposal was not even germane, and when we consider that only 1 year ago such a proposal was considered radical, I feel that all of us who have worked to permit flexibility in the use of highway trust fund revenue can be pleased.

This is a step, but a necessary step, toward flexibility and, as a result, I congratulate the conference committee and urge my colleagues to adopt this proposal.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the conference committee on the fine job they have done in reaching agreement on the highway bill. They have reached a solution that will be of great value in improving the system of transportation in this country.

At this time I draw attention to two provisions of special importance. The first of these provisions, which was wisely retained by the conference committee, provides for a study of laws and regulations governing toll bridges. Such a study is long overdue.

The situation which exists with respect

to two Mississippi River toll bridges in my district provides an example of the need for a study of how bridge tolls are set.

The second area of special interest concerns the authorization for the Secretary of Transportation to conduct feasibility studies on the construction of several highways, including one that would directly link Chicago and Kansas City.

The bridges I refer to are the Keokuk Bridge which carries traffic between Keokuk, Iowa, and Hamilton, Ill., and the MacArthur Bridge which spans the Mississippi between Burlington, Iowa, and Gulfport, Ill. The bridges are owned by the cities of Keokuk and Burlington, respectively.

The Keokuk Bridge was originally built as a private toll bridge in 1866. In 1941, the bridge was conveyed to the city of Keokuk by a deed subject to a condition that the city maintain the bridge as a free bridge for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. In 1952, 4 years after the bridge became free of debt, a 10-cent toll was established for passenger cars and the same toll remains in effect today.

Between 1952 and 1968 revenues of $3½ million from vehicular traffic and $1½ million from railroad and other accounts were collected—a total of approximately $5 million. Over $1½ million were used for nonbridge purposes by the city of Keokuk, including transferrals to the municipal building fund, airport fund, and other municipal projects.

The toll for passenger cars on Burlington's MacArthur Bridge had been 25 cents since 1933.. The rate included the right to recross the bridge without further charges prior to midnight of the day on which the toll was paid. In 1968, the Burlington City Council eliminated the "free return" in effect doubling the toll.

Burlington has utilized revenues from the MacArthur Bridge for purposes unrelated to the maintenance and operation of the bridge. For example, between 1959 and 1968 revenues totaled approximately $4.15 million, and of that amount approximately $2½ million was transferred to the city of Burlington and utilized for various municipal programs. The action taken in 1968 was purportedly for the purpose of obtaining additional funds with which to provide raises for the police and fire departments.

Complaints to the Federal Highway Administrator caused him to order hearings as to the reasonableness of the tolls on these bridges in view of the large amounts being diverted to nonbridge related functions. A hearing examiner was appointed and hearings were held in April 1970. The hearing examiner relying in part on the case of *Clarksburg-Columbus Short Bridge Co.* v. *Wooding*, 89 F.2d 788 (C.A.D.C. 1937) rev. as moot, 302 U.S. 658, found in both the MacArthur Bridge and Keokuk Bridge cases, that the rates were not unjust or unreasonable. The Clarksburg case involved the question of the reasonableness of certain railroad freight rates.

The Federal Highway Administrator overruled the hearing examiner. He did so on two grounds, first, he felt he has the power to look at the uses or purposes of bridge toll revenues in determining whether tolls are reasonable, and second, the hearing examiner was incorrect in trying to utilize the comparison test set forth in the Clarksburg case, set forth above. The Administrator ruled that the term "reasonable and just" should be more broadly construed in light of the legislative history of bridge toll legislation passed by the Congress over the past 40 years. Thus, that in considering the reasonableness of tolls, allowance would be made only for bridge related costs. Burlington and Keokuk were ordered to submit new toll schedules on this basis.

Burlington sought a review of the Administrator's decision in their case in U.S. District Court for the southern district of Iowa. In the meantime, the Administrator ordered a new toll schedule into effect which was designed to produce only revenues sufficient to cover bridge related costs. The district court on January 13, 1971, held the order to be arbitrary and capricious, and without adequate basis in law, and permanently enjoined enforcement of the order. The judge held that since the case was one of the first instance, and since there was a "dearth of agency expertise" on the question, he was not required to give the usual deference to the interpretation of a statute by an administrative agency. He found further that the Administrator was incorrect in failing to apply the Clarksburg case.

The decision of the district court was appealed to the court of appeals for the Eighth Circuit Court. Because of the similarity between the MacArthur Bridge and Keokuk Bridge cases, the Federal Highway Administration has held the Keokuk Bridge case in abeyance pending the outcome of the court proceedings. The MacArthur Bridge case was argued in October of 1972, and the opinion by the circuit court was filed January 2, 1973. It affirmed the district court decision, except as to the remedy and order prescribed, and remanded the case to the district court. The district court order had enjoined the Administrator from setting tolls on any basis. The circuit court felt the question of the new toll schedule should have been remanded to the Administrator, with directions to conduct further hearings and to determine the question of reasonableness based on the findings of the district court. They specified that the Administrator be directed to include in his consideration the factor of a reasonable return on invested capital, which they define as:

> Invested capital as used herein shall include the amount, if any, which the City paid in acquiring the bridge in 1923, plus the amounts which it has paid subsequent to that date for additions to and reconstruction of the bridge; it shall not include amounts spent for interest on revenue bonds or for normal maintenance and repair since acquisition; and replacement cost shall not be a factor in such determination. No consideration need be given to debt service on existing debt by the Administrator in determining tolls inasmuch as a reverse currently exists in excess of the amount of the bonds presently outstanding.

The district court has remanded the case to the Administrator, with directions to conduct new hearings in line with the circuit court opinion. The Administrator is now in the process of appointing an administrative law judge to conduct the new hearings on both the MacArthur Bridge and Keokuk Bridge tolls. It is anticipated that the hearings will be held in late June.

Thus while the Federal agencies and courts argue over whether or not the tolls are reasonable, residents of my Illinois congressional district must continue to pay tolls which support not the bridge they cross but the municipal programs of the Iowa cities which own the bridges. In effect, my constituents are blackmailed into this payment, because the nearest alternate crossing is at Fort Madison, Iowa, 25 miles from the MacArthur Bridge and 23 miles from the Keokuk Bridge. To my constituents these bridges are a vital public service to which they must have reasonable access in order to perform such vital daily functions as going to work, taking their children to school, and obtaining medical care.

I am confident that the study called for in this bill will demonstrate the need for a procedure whereby the Federal Highway Administrator would be required to give his prior approval to any increase in the tolls charged on bridges over navigable waters.

The conference report also authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to conduct feasibility studies on the construction of several highways, including one that would directly link Chicago and Kansas City. This highway would pass through west-central Illinois and cross the Mississippi River at a point between Hannibal, Mo., on the south and Nauvoo, Ill., on the north. As you will remember, the study on this highway was the subject of an amendment I offered to the Highways Act and was approved by the House; a similar study was provided in the Senate version of the legislation.

The study is the first step toward the construction of a highway that has been long-needed and would have many benefits. A direct route would reduce the highway distance between Chicago and Kansas City by 125 to 150 miles, thereby saving travelers several hours time and frequently considerable cost. West-central Illinois, northeast Missouri, and southeast Iowa are presently unserved by any interstate or major highway network; a Chicago-Kansas City highway would provide access to a great agricultural region and would enable far more efficient transportation of agricultural products to major urban centers. It would also enable tourists to visit a large number of historic and recreational sites which are not now easily accessible. Most important, such a highway would encourage new industries to locate in this rural area, providing much-needed economic diversification and growth.

The construction of this highway has long been hoped for by the residents of my district. I am extremely pleased that the conferees has provided us with the

first step toward this goal. These provisions and the others contained in the bill reported out of conference deserve support, and I urge the Members to give their approval to the conference report.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the Federal Highway Act of 1973. This is a compromise bill; had we not compromised with the other body, we simply would not have a bill at all. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) for their dedicated and devoted leadership on this long and difficult conference.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that this bill contains the program developed in our Public Works Committee for a Priority Primary Route System. This vitally needed program will authorize 70 percent Federal funding for improvement of heavily traveled roads that connect to the Interstate System. This is an important step toward development of a new system of interstate connectors.

I am pleased that this conference report also contains provisions to eliminate or reduce the dangers of highway-railroad crossings.

One of the most horrible of all traffic accidents is that grinding crash in which a train pulverizes a motor vehicle. Oftentimes the wreckage and the unfortunate victim or victims inside are dragged hundreds of feet down the railroad right-of-way.

I am sure almost every Member can recall just such a crash somewhere in his district, just as he can recall that the dangerous crossing involved continues to exist today just as it has for many, many years.

There are more than 220,000 public railroad-highway grade crossings in the United States at the present time, about one-third of them in urban areas and two-thirds in rural areas. Approximately 12,000 crashes between trains and motor vehicles occur at these crossings each year, resulting in 1,500 deaths and 7,000 injuries. Over 40 percent of these accidents happen at crossings where some sort of protection already exists, indicating that the problem is not always the lack of warning devices, but the inherently dangerous condition itself. In these cases, the only true solution is grade separation of the street or highway and the railroad track. This, of course, can be costly and difficult to achieve in view of the often complex local environmental and economic conditions. But we must do all that we can on an orderly, priority basis.

Section 203 of the act requires each State systematically to survey its road system to identify those railroad crossings which may require separation, relocation, or protective devices, and to establish a schedule of corrective projects. At a minimum, such a schedule must provide for signs at all railroad-highway crossings.

To help the States improve these dangerous crossings on the Federal-aid system $25 million is authorized for fiscal 1974, and $75 million for each of fiscal years 1975 and 1976. Other funds for this purpose remain available out of a State's regular apportionment for highway projects on all systems.

The act requires that the States report to the Secretary of Transportation by September 30, 1974, and every year thereafter, on progress being made to implement the highway crossings program and on accident reductions achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in urging the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the substitute bill agreed upon by the conference committee on S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

The most important difference between the House and Senate versions of the bills involves the highway trust fund financing for public mass transit. The Senate bill included the so-called Baker-Muskie amendment, which would have made $80 million in trust funds available for mass transit at the option of local officials. The House version contained no provision for using trust funds for mass transit, but did include the Wright amendment, which would have permitted local officials to exchange urban system trust funds for an equivalent amount in mass transit financing from general funds.

The compromise agreed upon by the conferees would permit up to $200 million in urban system funds for fiscal year 1975 to be used for bus purchase; beginning in fiscal year 1976, projects for fixed rail facilities and purchase of rolling stock could be approved.

The Wright amendment would be retained, but restricted to fiscal year 1974 and fiscal year 1975 only. Trust fund financing for buses or rail would cease in the event of enactment of an urban transportation fund or similar assured financing measures.

This is the most important provision of the conference report, and while I have made it clear repeatedly that in my view this is not enough, I certainly support this first effort to open the highway trust fund, and urge each of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as the House today considers the conference report on S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973. I would like to address myself to one particular aspect of this important piece of legislation which is especially vital to the economic growth of southeastern Ohio.

That section of the act to which I am referring is the Economic Growth Center Development Highway provision—section 122. Though I am strongly opposed to the use of trust fund moneys for mass transit, I nevertheless want to commend the conferees for including the House-passed Economic Development Highway language in the conference report and, at the same time, I want to again underscore my support for the long-overdue expanded assistance this section of the 1973 Federal Highway Act will provide to rural areas with untapped economic potential.

Southeastern Ohio in general, and the tri-county region of Meigs-Vinton-Gallia counties, in particular, exemplify the rural regions of America which the House Public Works Committee had in mind when that committee first wrote the Economic Growth Center Development Highway language into the 1970 Federal Aid Highway Act.

The Economic Development Highway section of the conference report before us converts the program from a demonstration project to a permanent part of the Federal highway program.

The House version of the bill included an authorization of $150 million for each of fiscal years 1974 through 1976. The conferees have decreased this, I am told by the committee, to $50 million for fiscal 1974, $75 million for fiscal 1975, and $100 million for fiscal 1976. However, it is encouraging to note that even this revised authorization averages out to $75 million annually through June 30, 1976—an amount which is $25 million above the annual authorization for the 2-year demonstration program in the 1970 act. It is anticipated that the State of Ohio would get about 3 percent of each fiscal year's allocation for economic development highway construction and improvement, or approximately $6.75 million through June 30, 1976.

The original purpose for creating the economic growth highway program was stated as follows:

> To demonstrate the role that highways can play to promote the desirable development of the nation's natural resources to revitalize and diversify the economy of rural areas and smaller communities, to enhance industrial growth, to encourage more balanced population patterns, to check and, where possible, to reverse current migratory trends from rural areas and smaller communities, and to improve living conditions and the quality of the environment.

Actually, this is just a wordy way of saying something very basic and simple: that good roads and economic vitality are synonymous.

Consider, for example, that over 75 percent of all farm products produced in this country are transported to market by way of the highway system. One out of every six jobs in this country is in a highway-related industry—a total of 13.3 million jobs. The economic and social benefits realized as the result of good roads are practically beyond measure—easier access to industry, recreation, and population centers; vital linkage with rail, air, and water networks; increased land values; improved travel time; greater consumer access to goods and services; and lower commercial operating costs.

Some highways are built for people to get away. Others are built for regions to get ahead. Of the 3.8 million miles of highways, backroads, and streets across this country, almost 75 percent weaves its way through nonmetropolitan areas. Rural areas, especially those in the Appalachian region, which have been economically isolated and bypassed by significant industrial growth for years, constitute the most pressing need for enacting legislation such as this we are considering today.

To further document the importance of the economic development highway language in this bill, let me bring to the attention of the House a situation in

southeastern Ohio which could result in brightening the economic outlook of the area considerably. About 18 months ago, the American Electric Power Corp. announced plans for the construction of the new multi-million-dollar James Gavin Power Plant to be located at Chesire, in Gallia County, Ohio. At the same time, it was disclosed that the powerplant's fuel source would be provided by a new Meigs Mine complex, to be located in Meigs County and Vinton County, Ohio. Coal reserves abundant enough to feed the Gavin Power Plant for decades will be extracted from the foothills of Meigs, Vinton, and Gallis Counties. The workforce required to construct the powerplant, mines, and related operations has steadily grown since news of this important development first surfaced.

Construction of the powerplant is well along and the Southern Ohio Coal Co. mine complex is rapidly developing into one of the most efficient industrial operations in the Ohio Valley. The combined plant and mine facilities will employ some 3,000 workers by 1976. Altogether, it is estimated that over 6,000 new jobs will be created in the impact area by 1980. Population is projected to increase by about 17,000 persons and the number of new households is expected to increase by nearly 3,500 homes. Studies project that personal income within the region will jump $30 million annually and retail sales will increase $17 million. New businesses are opening and it is estimated that school enrollments will increase by about 2,500 pupils by the time the new facilities are in full operation.

To bring the importance of these figures into sharper focus for those unfamiliar with the region, consider, if you will, the vital statistics of this same area before the lid was lifted on this new economic opportunity.

In a region historically plagued by economic stagnation, the young people of the tricounty region generally left the area following graduation from high school to seek job opportunities in the already overcrowded urban areas of the State. The absence of adequate incentives to stay in the region resulted in census statistics such as one of every eight persons in the region being over 65 and the average household income in one county in the impact area being little more than $6,200 annually. Area unemployment figures consistently topped both State and national levels.

In the decade between 1960 and 1970, the total population of Meigs, Vinton, and Gallia Counties decreased by more than 4,000 persons. The number of basic jobs—mining, manufacturing, construction, communications, utilities—rose slightly, but job opportunities in such fields as agriculture, services, retailing, and Government fell. In 1960, 2,287 residents in these three counties got in their vehicles each day and drove to an out-of-county job. By 1970, the number had risen to 2,420.

Now, there is a chance to change all this. And in a very real sense, every Member of this House has the opportunity today to help southeastern Ohio hoist a new horizon.

The people of the Meigs, Vinton, and Gallia County region are understandably enthusiastic about the prospects of new economic growth far surpassing any other opportunity they have witnessed over the past half century.

While the cause and catalyst to change are nearing full operating strength, the importance of adequate secondary roads tying together the ingredients of this economic revolution is also becoming increasingly apparent. At present, the highways in the immediate impact area are inadequate, and plans for their improvement are not keeping pace with the projected needs of the region. The Athens Messenger of Athens, Ohio, has championed the better highways campaign locally and has appropriately called highway construction and improvement of existing roads in the area "Need No. 1."

As the result of untiring efforts by local community leaders and opinion-makers there has been some movement to earmark funds for road work in and around the mine complex and powerplant. Efforts to generate similar enthusiasm at the State level, however, have consistently evoked a response that more Federal aid is necessary if the secondary roads are to get the help they need and deserve.

Legislation specifically oriented to areas of high economic growth potential, we are told, would be most useful.

Legislation, just like section 122 of the 1973 Federal-Aid Highway Act. Enactment of this legislation including the economic development highway provision, along with the allocation of funds to respective States, can prove to be one of the most beneficial investments we can make in support of economic growth in depressed areas.

I have requested of the Governor of Ohio that, pending approval of the act, the State indicate its intention to utilize funding under section 122 for the specific purpose of upgrading the secondary road system in the tri-county impact area and thereby brighten the economic and social outlook of southeastern Ohio to a degree never before realized in the Ohio Valley.

If my motives for promoting this particular aspect of the bill were selfish, and the case I have cited were an isolated one, I would not bother to go to lengths about the matter in the first place. But the role highways can play in this tricounty region of southeastern Ohio is representative, I am sure, of many other areas throughout Appalachia and across America. The situation I have outlined does not merely reflect the anticipated growth of a three-county corner of southeastern Ohio, but more accurately reflects similar situations in many counties and countless corners of States from one coast to the other.

It is, then, in the interest of all such regions greatly dependent upon good roads and adequate access routes over which goods and services will flow that I ask your support for the economic development highway section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act. Though the impact of such legislation will be most readily seen in areas such as those noted, the benefits from it will ultimately reach out to all.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, while I recognize the fact that this conference report on the Federal-Aid Highway Act represents progress of a sort for mass transit and while I appreciate the difficulties with which the conferees had to deal, I must speak in opposition. This conference report perpetuates our distorted national transportation priorities and by excluding the provisions for operating assistance to existing mass transit systems it represents a refusal to accept the fact that efficient urban mass transportation is a matter of public responsibility providing benefits to the entire Nation, not just to individual transit riders or communities.

It does us little good to make heroic pronouncements about a better environment, or to talk about cleaning up our air by curbing the use of automobiles when transit systems across the country are threatened with insolvency and steadily lose riders because of necessary fare increases.

By deleting the $800 million for operating assistance that was contained in the Senate bill, but at the same time authorizing billions for miles and miles of highways, the conferees have failed to recognize that, as the New York Times put it editorially "additional billions for benefit of the private truck and automobile are not the total answer to the Nation's transportation needs."

This fall, New Yorkers will be asked to approve a $3.5 billion State transportation bond issue, at least partially on the basis of preserving the current fare on city buses and subways and averting a disastrous fare increase that could end of bankrupting the entire transit system in New York City.

Were the Congress living up to its responsibilities to our urban centers, a bond issue of this scope and nature would be unnecessary.

I understand that legislation to authorize operating assistance to mass transit systems will be revived in both the House and the Senate later this year. I intend to do all I can to see that legislation enacted. In the meantime, I must vote in protest against this conference report which, in terms of urban transportation needs, is tokenism at its worst.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have been able to pass this measure. But I would like to point out that this situation is really similar to that of a baby taking its first step; the significance lies in the fact that the step was taken, not in how far it went.

This is really not a very big step. But it may be the psychological turning point that will open up highway funds at all levels of government to provide a truly balanced transportation system. I have spoken many times over the last few months on this floor of the need to end the tyranny of the private automobile over the Los Angeles Basin. I have read from newspaper articles appearing in southern California which have described the incredible health hazards smog is causing my constituents and other south-

ern Californians. Our action today is not going to even put a serious dent in the problem, but I hope that it presage further, more substantial action.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report accompanying the bill, S. 502, the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

I opposed this bill when it originally came before the House because it failed to include use of urban area highway trust funds for mass transit purposes. The Senate version did include such a provision and I am pleased to see that the conferees agreed to include such a section in the compromise version of the bill.

The final version authorized urban areas to opt for the use of up to $200 million in urban area highway trust funds to purchase passenger buses. This would start in 1975. In the following year urban areas could use any amount of their urban highway funds for roads, buses, or rail mass transit. The 1976 bus-rail combination option would be possible in 1974 provided an urban area chosed to exchange its highway trust fund entitlement for a mass transit grant from general revenues.

One disappointment is that none of this trust fund moneys can be used for mass transit operating subsidies. This issue must be addressed by the 93d Congress if we are to have the hope of a viable, integrated transportation system in the 1970's. There is almost $18 billion in funds for highway construction authorized over the next 3 years under title I of the bill. Some $2 billion is authorized under title II for highway safety programs and $3 billion is authorized for urban mass transit programs in contract authority under the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

The bill is a fair compromise and should not be delayed further. While the provisions are not exactly what I would like to have seen in terms of tapping the highway trust fund for mass transit purposes, I am confident that once this first step is taken and it proves successful, future authorizations will permit local and State government to allocate their transportation dollars as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the report and I urge the President to sign it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 34, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

YEAS—382

Abdnor	Drinan	Long, La.
Abzug	Dulski	Long, Md.
Adams	Duncan	Lott
Addabbo	du Pont	Lujan
Alexander	Eckhardt	McClory
Anderson, Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	McCloskey
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Calif.	McCollister
Andrews, N.C.	Eilberg	McCormack
Andrews, N. Dak.	Erlenborn	McDade
Annunzio	Esch	McFall
Archer	Eshleman	McKay
Arends	Evans, Colo.	McKinney
Armstrong	Fascell	McSpadden
Ashley	Findley	Macdonald
Aspin	Fish	Madden
Bafalis	Flood	Madigan
Baker	Flowers	Mahon
Barrett	Foley	Mailliard
Beard	Ford, Gerald R.	Mallary
Bell	Ford, William D.	Mann
Bennett	Forsythe	Maraziti
Bergland	Fountain	Martin, N.C.
Bevill	Fraser	Mathias, Calif.
Biaggi	Frelinghuysen	Matsunaga
Biester	Frenzel	Mayne
Bingham	Frey	Mazzoli
Blackburn	Froehlich	Meeds
Blatnik	Fulton	Melcher
Boggs	Fuqua	Metcalfe
Bolling	Gaydos	Mezvinsky
Bowen	Gettys	Michel
Brademas	Giaimo	Milford
Brasco	Gibbons	Miller
Breaux	Gilman	Minish
Brinkley	Ginn	Mink
Brooks	Goldwater	Minshall, Ohio
Broomfield	Gonzalez	Mitchell, Md.
Brotzman	Grasso	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Mizell
Brown, Ohio	Green, Pa.	Moakley
Broyhill, N.C.	Griffiths	Mollohan
Broyhill, Va.	Grover	Montgomery
Buchanan	Gubser	Moorhead, Calif.
Burgener	Gude	Moorhead, Pa.
Burke, Calif.	Gunter	Morgan
Burke, Fla.	Guyer	Mosher
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Moss
Burleson, Tex.	Hammer-schmidt	Murphy, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton	Hanrahan	Natcher
Byron	Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi
Camp	Hansen, Wash.	Nelsen
Carey, N.Y.	Harrington	Nichols
Carney, Ohio	Harvey	Nix
Carter	Hastings	Obey
Casey, Tex.	Hawkins	O'Hara
Cederberg	Hays	O'Neill
Chamberlain	Hébert	Owens
Chappell	Hechler, W. Va.	Parris
Chisholm	Heckler, Mass.	Passman
Clark	Heinz	Patman
Clausen, Don H.	Helstoski	Patten
Clawson, Del	Henderson	Perkins
Clay	Hicks	Pettis
Cleveland	Hillis	Peyser
Cochran	Hinshaw	Pickle
Cohen	Hogan	Pike
Collier	Holifield	Poage
Collins, Ill.	Holt	Podell
Collins, Tex.	Holtzman	Preyer
Conable	Horton	Price, Ill.
Conlan	Hosmer	Pritchard
Conte	Howard	Quie
Conyers	Hudnut	Quillen
Corman	Hungate	Railsback
Coughlin	Ichord	Randall
Cronin	Johnson, Calif.	Rangel
Culver	Johnson, Colo.	Rarick
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Johnson, Pa.	Rees
Daniels, Dominick V.	Jones, Ala.	Regula
Danielson	Jones, N.C.	Reid
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Okla.	Reuss
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Rhodes
Davis, Wis.	Jordan	Riegle
de la Garza	Karth	Rinaldo
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Dellenback	Kazen	Robison, N.Y.
Dellums	Keating	Rodino
Denholm	Kemp	Roe
Dennis	Ketchum	Rogers
Dent	King	Roncalio, Wyo.
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Roncallo, N.Y.
Diggs	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Dingell	Kuykendall	Rose
Donohue	Kyros	Rosenthal
Dorn	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Downing	Leggett	Roush
	Lehman	Rousselot
	Lent	Roy
	Litton	Roybal
		Runnels
		Ruppe
		Ryan
		St Germain
		Sandman
		Sarasin
		Sarbanes
		Saylor
		Scherle
		Schroeder
		Seiberling
		Shipley
		Shoup
		Shriver
		Shuster
		Sikes
		Sisk
		Skubitz
		Slack
		Smith, N.Y.
		Snyder
		Staggers
		Stanton, J. William
		Stanton, James V.
		Stark
		Steed
		Steele
		Steelman
		Steiger, Ariz.
		Steiger, Wis.
		Stephens
		Stokes
		Stratton
		Stubblefield
		Stuckey
		Studds
		Sullivan
		Symington
		Talcott
		Taylor, Mo.
		Taylor, N.C.
		Teague, Calif.
		Teague, Tex.
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Thone
		Thornton
		Tiernan
		Towell, Nev.
		Treen
		Udall
		Ullman
		Van Deerlin
		Vander Jagt
		Vanik
		Veysey
		Vigorito
		Waggonner
		Waldie
		Walsh
		Ware
		Whalen
		White
		Whitehurst
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Williams
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
		Wilson, Charles, Tex.
		Winn
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Wylie
		Yates
		Yatron
		Young, Alaska
		Young, Fla.
		Young, Ga.
		Young, Ill.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zion

NAYS—34

Ashbrook	Gross	Price, Tex.
Badillo	Haley	Robinson, Va.
Bray	Harsha	Ruth
Breckinridge	Huber	Satterfield
Butler	Hunt	Schneebeli
Clancy	Hutchinson	Sebelius
Crane	Latta	Spence
Daniel, Dan	McEwen	Symms
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Wampler
Dickinson	Mathis, Ga.	Young, S.C.
Flynt	Myers	
Goodling	Powell, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—17

Boland	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Jarman	Smith, Iowa
Cotter	Landgrebe	Wiggins
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.	Wyman
Fisher	O'Brien	Zwach
Gray	Pepper	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Gray with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Zwack.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and Joint and Concurrent Resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5649. An act to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemption of the steamboat *Delta Queen* from certain vessel laws;

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 26, 1973, as "Women's Equality Day";

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October, 1973, as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week";

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that additional copies of hearings be printed; and

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of committee hearings on the relationship of pesticides to environmental issues and other matters.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1410. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for one year the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6370) entitled "An act to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividend is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to extend the mutual and self-help housing program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949; and

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution to make certain technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1888.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7935, FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1973

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates under that act, to expand the coverage of that act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1973.)

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, almost 40 years ago the Congress of the United States took up the question of establishing a minimum standard of working conditions in this country known as the Fair Labor Standards Act.

At that time the sides were pretty drawn as to the support of and opposition to this legislation.

Over these many years on occasions this matter has come again before the House, and the lines of opposition and of support have not changed very much. That is natural and to be expected.

This is a bread and butter issue. It deals with wages being paid and wages to be paid; it deals with hours of labor and payment for overtime.

Early in the beginning of this discussion it was recognized that there were different sections of the country that had different problems. It was recognized different types of employment had different problems and had to be treated differently. However, over the years the Congress has seen fit to remove in ensuing legislation some of the restrictions and to recognize changing criteria until we have reached the stage where we have almost a universally applied minimum wage and overtime act.

This Congress sent this particular matter to conference. It was a very difficult conference in a way, because the Senate had reached that point in its stage of thinking that most exemptions under the act should be removed. I might say that the most strenuous effort to remove the exemptions from the agricultural processing section of the bill were made by a Republican Member of the Senate, using as his arguments the statements made and the report made by two Republican Secretaries of Labor, Shultz and Brennan.

Some of us believed that the time had not yet come in certain areas to remove immediately the exemptions on overtime, so the House tried its best, and succeeded, I believe, in using a stretchout method of cutting down on overtime exemptions. In the conference the House receded 13 times on key measures. The Senate receded 29 times. No person who has ever served on a conference committee could hope or expect to hold tight to a solid position as either House passes it, so, therefore, we feel in this difficult kind of a legislative effort we did as best as we could to hold as nearly as we could to the House position.

In the early days during the passage of this legislation under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, a statement was made by the President that no product that was not produced under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act ought to be allowed to pollute the channels of commerce of this country. Further elaborating on that particular subject and statement of the President, the Senate wrote a provision in the act that stated no product, whether made or produced within the continental United States or anywhere else in the world, should be allowed to flow through the channels of commerce in this Nation. The House removed that provision after a great and long debate, and although there have been attempts to do the very thing that the President asked for, they have never been successful.

However, we did recognize not too many years ago that there was a movement in this country geographically of industrial and business activity, and during the great depression there was a great migration of industry, especially in the area of textiles, to the South. Industry will in any event, without exception in the history of the world since industrialization has come into being, always move to the low-wage area, and products for sale will always move to the high-wage area. Industry is only in being and was only conceived and created for one purpose: to produce goods for the use of peoples and to profit by it.

To counteract this very exclusive control over the production of goods, and the sale, and the profit from goods, the labor union came into being. The labor union was only conceived and put into being for one purpose, and that was to try to get an equitable share of the profits earned by the corporate entity for the men and women in the laboring and producing field. The labor unions have been able, in my opinion, to gain a reasonable part of the profit contributed by labor, but the great body of unorganized working in smaller groupings have been unable to organize, and so the Congress wisely, I believe, set up an organization within the Congress, the committee that handles minimum wage, to negotiate for the unorganized.

Any talk of giving somebody a gift by passing a minimum wage increase is as far from the truth as anybody can stray. The last amendment was in 1966. Just as a little example of what has happened during that time, in this area there is a particularly succulent sausage sold called a half-smoke. It is not made in my territory at all and I have a fondness for the product. In 1967 a half-smoke sold for 39 cents a pound. Last Friday I bought my usual allotment, as every now and then I do, and I bought 5 pounds at the market for 99 cents a pound. I talked to my wife yesterday and she said:

> If you have an opportunity, since you are not going to be in Washington for a month, you had better bring home about ten pounds. We are going to have a little barbecue later in the month.

I called up and asked the market if they had the half-smokes and they said "Yes." I neglected to ask the price. The price of a half-smoke which was 99 cents last Friday and 39 cents in 1967 had gone up to $1.49 a pound in these last several days. They did not say that the price of a half-smoke for those who work for $1.60 an hour would be set at a lower price. That person has to pay the same price as any Member or I for everything that person eats or wears or pays for taxes.

I cannot conceive of any realistic opposition to this legislation that will be raising the minimum wage in one instance by 40 cents to $2 an hour and in other instances by 20 cents.

Following good, historical lines of negotiation we have extended it to $2.20 in

different steps. Following the same historical pattern we have lowered the hours of labor for overtime work.

If Members had accepted my recommendation in 1966 that minimum wages be put under the cost-of-living index, that would have automatically raised these wages at a greater pace than we do and if it kept pace with increases we have granted our millions of Federal workers, the wage today would be $2.38 an hour.

Some come with the argument, and we will hear it again today, that this puts us at a disadvantage in international trade. That argument should have been made years ago because at no time in the history of this Nation has there ever been a lesser margin paid between overseas wages and the minimum wages paid in this country. When my father came to America as a boy of 14 he got a job at $1 a day, but he left a homeland where they were getting 6 cents a day. No one ever hoped or tried to believe that this labor in the United States at $1 a day could compete with 6-cent-a-day labor in Europe, nor can anybody ever expect the labor content of any product to be the difference between foreign and domestic productivity.

We have in this country today a bill of $100 billion a year being paid through 137 or so different agencies in one form of relief or another. Do not lay the blame for carrying the economy forward in this country onto the shoulders of the least paid worker. There can be no valid argument that this legislation burdens the economy or causes inflation. It can be said, but it cannot be proven.

I would hope that, just as other Congresses have before, we step away from those tightly drawn lines of opposition and support and march together to meet a very necessary increase in the minimum wage in this country. We are doing something, yes. Slowly but surely we are drawing toward that point where we will have a universal minimum wage.

Dr. Conlan said many years ago that one of the dangers in minimum wage was that it would soon become the maximum wage. In every other country on the face of the Earth except the United States of America, which today yet we hope and pray is still a free enterprise nation, that has been true. But the difference between the average wage in the United States and the minimum wage widens every year, because we allow the minimum wage to drift backwards as the normally negotiated wage climbs forward, so the difference between the minimum wage and the going wage in 1966 has now widened to a considerable gap, as the price of sausages from 1966 through this day has widened to a very considerable gap. These men and women, I tell the Members, are the strongest souls in these United States fighting for the free enterprise of labor and the free enterprise of industry and business. Why? Because they are willing to work for less than they would receive on welfare. Courageous, honest, decent people.

You and I—you and I are the only voice that they have to negotiate for them. No one else can do it.

As I said earlier, the conference was tough because the Senate had come to that point where it felt that the time had come to remove the many exemptions, and they tried to prove their point. In all honesty, they did prove it, that new innovations in production facilities; new innovations in technology; computerization of production; all of these things that have come through the inventiveness of the American people have created a greater production per dollar's worth of labor than ever obtained before in the history of this or any other country.

But even so, that worker has to meet his obligations to pay for his shelter, to pay for his clothing, to pay for his food. Any person in this House who would believe that in this day a person working for $1.60 an hour can hope to meet the lowest standard of living, it is not there—it is not there. It will not be.

I am very proud to say to the House that we recognized the difficulties in the House of Representatives, the deep and rooted convictions of Members, honest convictions. So we did try to hold as secure as we could to the House position. But one cannot just roll over strong sentiments of both Republican and Democratic Members of the U.S. Senate. They were as one unit. They stood firm. They stood solid. Republicans and Democrats.

We were able to hold to the line on the wages and wage schedules. We were able to hold close to the line on 29 vital issues. When we receded we receded in most instances to gain a point.

For instance, it is said, "Well, you gave up on food processing." Did we? Let us see. The bill came to the House phasing out the overtime exemptions in 2 years. The House, late in the day, accepted one amendment, the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon, and voted to hold the status quo, where there would be no reduction in the exempted hours of food processing, and the number of weeks.

We went to the Senate. The Senate amendment immediately wiped out all of the exemptions given to food processing. We succeeded in getting the Senate to accept a provision that in 4 years eliminates the overtime exemption.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield on that point?

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. First may I express my admiration for the gentleman in the well. I have watched his work over a period of years, and I believe he does a remarkably fine job.

I strongly favor the increase in the minimum wage. As I have said many times, to me it is by far the best "war on poverty" that could ever be waged. If we let people earn a living wage, we do not need so many welfare programs.

Also, I am delighted the bill came back from the conference including minimum wage coverage for domestic workers.

But in terms of the overtime exemption, as I understand it, in the Senate bill they removed all the exemptions for overtime, not only for food processing but also for cotton processing, sugar processing, and tobacco processing.

I do not understand why the conference report comes back so that in the year 1977 the overtime exemption for food processing is eliminated entirely, phased out in 1977, but for the cotton and sugar processing, as I understand the conference report, they could still have 6 weeks with 60 hours work each week and not pay any overtime. The reason I am troubled by that is partly the gentleman's earlier remarks about the increased price of foods. When we have perishable foods, and the people in the cannery business have to pay overtime during the harvest season—they have to pass it on to the consumer. Cotton and sugar do not fall in the class of perishable foods, so I do not understand why the Senate held so fast on the food processing overtime exemption but apparently was perfectly willing to allow the overtime exemption of 6 weeks at 60 hours for the cotton and sugar processing.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a bill in which there were no reductions on cotton or sugar. The Senate wiped out completely the allowances in cotton and sugar. We succeeded for the first time in the history of this legislation in reducing the number of hours that could be worked without overtime penalty. But let us consider the benchmark.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. DENT. Yes, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I will ask this question:

Is it not also true that the House bill went to conference with no reduction in the overtime exemption for food processing?

Mr. DENT. Yes. And what did we do?

Mr. Speaker, we worked out a compromise, and I believe that is what we went to the conference for.

We reduced it by a scheduled reduction in food processing, but we also reduced it hourly and weekly in cotton and sugar. We started with sugar and cotton with a 52-week exemption, the entire year, with unlimited number of hours. If they could get them to work 24 hours a day, they worked 24 hours a day.

We succeeded in bringing that down to 60 in 6 weeks, and lesser hours in other weeks, and we have started bringing it down. Everyone is on notice and everybody knows that when the next bill comes up, whichever Member may be around to handle it, that those particular industries will march along.

But with food processing, we started with a 14-week exemption—not a 52-week exemption period, and the benchmark difference is significant.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report to accompany H.R. 7930—Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1973—is the result of 3 trying days of conference

last week. I can say with complete sincerity, that the managers on the part of the House engaged in every sense in a meaningful conference. The House-passed bill was our benchmark and we did our best to uphold that position. The managers of the other body did the same. And the outcome is now before us for judgment.

I know there are those who will suggest we yielded on every crucial issue. But a measure of the differences between the two proposals against the emerging provisions of the conference report will demonstrate the shallowness of that argument. In actual fact, the conference report bears more the stamp of the House than the Senate. By actual count, the House receded on 13 key differences; the Senate receded on 29. On the question of schedules for increasing the minimum wage rates, for instance—invariably considered the most important feature of any minimum wage bill—the conference report contains the House position.

I cannot resist the temptation, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the latest in the litany of "Dear Colleague" letters my good friends Mr. QUIE and Mr. ERLENBORN have showered on us during the more than 3 years it has taken to arrive at this point in minimum wage legislation. It is dated August 1 and is a splendid example of creative writing.

They say they want you to resist the adoption of the conference report until "these inconsistencies are resolved in a manner compatible with the position of the House." When I read the listing of their complaints, I knew we were in good shape. Let us take them one by one.

First. They say the most "unacceptable" part of the conference report is the reinstatement of the historic ratio test for more than four students hired under the student differential. They go on to say that every employer who wants to give an employment opportunity for more than four students is limited to previous hiring experience.

Now that is simply not true. The historical ratio test will apply only to student employment in retail and service businesses, and not to employment in other areas. Moreover, they do not state that this test is in existing law, or that the Senate amendment retained its applicability to all retail and service employers—not alone to those employing more than four students.

Our objective was to make the student employment provisions as accessible and available as we could to the small businessman—and an employer who intends to employ more than four students at any one time is not likely to be very small.

So we have stood by the House position. And in the Conference, incidentally, the gentlemen who are now critical of our agreement in that respect helped shape it.

Second. Their second objection is to the phaseout of the limited overtime exemption applicable to agricultural processing. They say we "quickly receded" from the House position of no phaseout and agreed to the four-step phaseout—by 1977—provided in the conference report.

First of all, we did not "quickly agree." The agreement on that issue ultimately occurred on the third day of a 3-day conference.

Also, the Senate amendment provided for an immediate repeal of that exemption—with no phaseout schedule. We finally prevailed in insisting that the phaseout take place over an extended period, and a period of even longer duration than that provided by the original House bill.

What they do not tell you is that the administration has been recommending a phaseout of the exemption since 1970—and that Secretary Brennan reiterated that recommendation in testimony this year.

Third. They object to covering public employees engaged in law enforcement and fire protection activities. We do propose to cover these employees and they are entitled to that coverage. But we do so in a reasoned manner consistent with the unusual nature of the employment. We do not put them into a 40-hour workweek, as my friends suggest. Rather, we put them initially into a 192-hour per 4-workweek period—an average of 48 hours per week—to allow wide latitude in the ability of their employers to schedule their work.

Fourth. Mr. QUIE and Mr. ERLENBORN say that we contribute to abandoning the "traditionally protective treatment of small business in minimum wage legislation," by agreeing to phase out the retail or service establishment test exemption of $250,000.

This has nothing whatsoever to do with small business and let us not be fooled that it does. These establishments are parts of a chain or conglomerate. They have economic superiority over legitimate small businesses and should not be permitted—to the extent we can help with this legislation—to maintain that advantage.

The small businessman is protected in this report—he retains his $250,000 exemption without change. It is only elements of chains and conglomerates we are reaching here.

Moreover, the House conferees succeeded in resisting a Senate provision which did go to the heart of small business—a provision, in fact, which spoke to the treatment of so-called "Mom-and-Pop" activities.

Fifth. Finally, my friends close with some idle references to other provisions which are hardly earthshattering.

In sum and substance, they apparently have no legitimate complaint about the conference. But I know they had to say something after it ended because they had been telling you all along that we would go over there and merely accede to the provisions of the other bill. As I stated earlier, the Senate yielded on 29 points; we yielded on 13.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is moderate and balanced to the community of employers but nonetheless significant to America's workers.

It increases the minimum wage rate in gradual increments to $2.20 an hour for all covered workers. The increases are staged over time in order to diffuse any possibly adverse economic impact. There is no need to defend $2.20 an hour in the face of today's inflationary realities. It is indefensible. It is too little, but it is the best we can do.

The legislation will also extend minimum wage coverage to nearly 7 million workers, the most significant categories being domestic service employees and public employees. Overtime coverage will be extended to more than 8 million workers.

A summary of the provisions follows:

H.R. 7935—SUMMARY OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1973

Category of Coverage	Hourly rate	Effective date
A. Increase in the minimum wage rate:		
Nonagricultural employees covered under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act prior to the effective date of the 1966 amendments (including Federal employees covered by the 1966 amendments).	$2.00	1st day of the second full month after the date of enactment.
	2.20	July 1, 1974.
Nonagricultural employees covered under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act by the 1966 amendments and 1973 amendments.	1.80	1st day of the second full month after the date of enactment.
	2.00	July 1, 1974.
	2.20	July 1, 1975.
Agricultural employees covered under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.	1.60	1st day of the second full month after the date of enactment.
	1.80	July 1, 1974.
	2.00	July 1, 1975.
	2.20	July 1, 1976.
B. Extend coverage of the act:		
Minimum wage coverage will be extended to the following:	Overtime coverage will extended to the following:	
Federal employees.	Federal employees.	
State and local employees.	State and local employees.	
Domestic service employees.	Domestic service employees.	
Retail and service employees.	Retail and service employees.	
Conglomerate employees (in agriculture).	Seasonal industry and agricultural processing employees.	
Telegraph agency employees.	Telegraph agency employees.	
Motion picture theater employees.	Hotel, motel, and restaurant employees.	
Logging employees.	Food service employees.	
Shade grown tobacco processing employees.	Bowling establishment employees.	
	Nursing home employees.	
	Transit (local) employees.	
	Cotton ginning and sugar processing employees.	
	Seafood canning and processing employees.	
	Oil pipeline transportation employees.	
	Partsmen and mechanics in certain vehicle sales establishments.	

BRIEF SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. *Short Title.*—Provides that the act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1973."

SECS. 2 and 3. *Nonagricultural Employees.*—Provides a minimum wage rate for nonagricultural employees covered by the act prior to the effective date of the 1966 amendments, and Federal employees covered by the 1966 amendments, of not less than $2 an hour beginning on the first day of the second full month after the date of enactment, and

not less than $2.20 an hour beginning July 1, 1974.

Provides a minimum wage rate for nonagricultural employees covered by the 1966 and 1973 amendments to the act of not less than $1.80 an hour beginning on the first day of the second full month after the date of enactment, not less than $2 an hour beginning July 1, 1974, and not less than $2.20 an hour beginning July 1, 1975.

SEC. 4. *Agricultural Employees.*—Provides a minimum wage rate for agricultural employees covered by the act of not less than $1.60 an hour beginning on the first day of the second full month after the date of enactment, not less than $1.80 an hour beginning July 1, 1974, not less than $2 an hour beginning July 1, 1975, and not less than $2.20 an hour beginning July 1, 1976.

SEC. 5. *Government, Hotel, Motel, Restaurant, and Food Service Employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.*—The minimum wage rate for hotel, motel, restaurant, food service, and Government of the United States and the Virgin Islands employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be in accordance with the applicable rate in the United States.

Other Employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.—Provides for an increase of $0.12 an hour on wage orders presently under $1.40 an hour, and $0.15 an hour on wage orders $1.40 or more an hour, effective on the first day of the second full month after the date of enactment. Provides additional annual increases of identical amounts until the wage order rates are in conformance with applicable rates in the United States. In the case of an agricultural employee whose hourly wage is increased (above that required by wage order) by a subsidy paid by the Government of Puerto Rico, the increases shall be applied to the sum of (1) the wage rate and (2) the amount of the subsidy.

Provides for the establishment of special industry committees to recommend minimum wage rates for employees newly covered by the 1973 amendments (including employees of the Government of Puerto Rico and its political subdivisions). The recommended rates cannot be less than 60 per centum of the rates applicable to U.S. employees covered by the 1966 and 1973 amendments, or $1 an hour, whichever is higher.

With respect to other employees covered under wage orders, the rates cannot be less than 60 per centum of the otherwise applicable rates in the United States, or $1 an hour, whichever is higher. Employees of the Government of Puerto Rico and its political subdivisions are subject to this provision only in the initial establishment of wage order rates pursuant to the recommendations of special industry committees.

Provides further that, special industry committees recommend the minimum wage rate applicable in the United States except where pertinent financial information demonstrates inability to pay such rate. Also, that a court of appeals may upon review of a wage order specify the minimum wage rate to be included in the wage order.

SEC. 6. *Federal and State Employees.*—Amends definitions of the act to permit the extension of minimum wage and overtime coverage to Federal, State, and local public employees. Federal, State, and local public employees engaged in fire protection or law enforcement activities, or employed in correctional institutions, are provided a limited overtime exemption if under agreement entered into between the employer and the employee a work period of 28 consecutive days is accepted in lieu of a workweek of 7 consecutive days, and if overtime compensation is paid for employment in excess of 192 hours in such work period during the first year after the effective date, 184 hours in such period during the second year, 176 hours in such period during the third year, 168 hours in such period during the fourth year, and 160 hours in such period thereafter.

SEC. 7. *Domestic Service Workers.*—States a finding of Congress that domestic service in households affects commerce and that the minimum wage and overtime protections of the act should apply to such employees. This section prescribes therefore, the minimum wage (not less than $1.80 an hour beginning on the first day of the second full month after the date of enactment, not less than $2 an hour beginning July 1, 1974, and not less than $2.20 an hour beginning July 1, 1975) and overtime (compensation for hours worked in excess of 40 per week) rates applicable to such employees. If such employee resides in the household of the employer, minimum wage compensation only is required. The provision does not apply to a person who, on an intermittent basis, provides baby sitting services, or who provides companion services. Domestic service employees are described as those whose compensation for services constitutes "wages" under section 209 of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 8. *Retail and Service Establishments.*—Reduces and ultimately repeals the "dollar volume" test for coverage of retail and service establishments of a "chain" under the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act. Effective July 1, 1974, the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act will apply to such establishments with gross annual sales or services of $225,000 or more; and effective July 1, 1975, gross annual sales or services of $200,000. Beginning July 1, 1976, all such retail and service establishments will be subject to the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act.

SEC. 9. *Tobacco Employees.*—Retains a limited overtime exemption for employees engaged in activities related to the sale of tobacco. Overtime compensation must be paid for employment in excess of 10 hours in any workday and 48 hours in any workweek for a period or periods not to exceed 14 workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year. Without this section, the limited overtime exemption would be ultimately repealed by section 19.

Also repeals the present minimum wage exemption for employees engaged in the processing of shade-grown tobacco.

SEC. 10. *Telegraph Agency Employees.*—Repeals the minimum wage exemption for employees of small telegraph agencies, and reduces and ultimately repeals the overtime exemption for such employees. During the first year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, overtime compensation must be paid to such employees for hours worked in excess of 48 per week; during the second year, for hours worked in excess of 44 per week; and thereafter, for hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

SEC. 11. *Seafood Canning and Processing Employees.*—Reduces and ultimately repeals the overtime exemption for employees engaged in the processing and canning or seafood. During the first year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, overtime compensation must be paid to such employees for hours worked in excess of 48 per week; during the second year, for hours worked in excess of 44 per week; and thereafter, for hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

SEC. 12. *Nursing Home Employees.*—Amends the overtime exemption for nursing home employees to provide an overtime exemption for employment up to 8 hours in any workday and up to 80 hours in any 14-consecutive-day work period. This coverage is identical to that for hospital employees. The present overtime exemption for nursing home employees is for employment up to 48 hours in any workweek.

SEC. 13. *Hotel, Motel, and Restaurant Employees and Tipped Employees.*—Reduces the overtime exemption for employees (other than maids and custodial employees in hotels and motels) employed in hotels, motels, and restaurants. During the first year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, overtime compensation must be paid to such employees for hours worked in excess of 48 per week, and thereafter, for hours worked in excess of 46 per week.

The overtime exemption for maids and custodial employees in hotels and motels is reduced and ultimately repealed. During the first year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, such employees must be paid overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 48 per week; during the second year, for hours worked in excess of 46 per week; during the third year, for hours worked in excess of 44 per week; and thereafter, for hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

With respect to tipped employees, the tip credit provision of the act is not to apply unless the employer has informed each of his tipped employees of the tip credit provision and all tips received by a tipped employee have been retained by the tipped employee (either individually or through a pooling arrangement).

SEC. 14. *Salesmen, Partsmen, and Mechanics.*—Provides an overtime exemption for any salesmen primarily engaged in selling automobiles, trailers, trucks, farm implements, boats, or aircraft if employed by a nonmanufacturing establishment primarily engaged in the business of selling such vehicles to ultimate purchasers. Also provides an overtime exemption for partsmen and mechanics of automobile, truck, and farm implement dealerships.

SEC. 15. *Food Service Establishment Employees.*—Reduces and ultimately repeals the overtime exemption for employees of food service establishments. During the first year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, overtime compensation must be paid to such employees for hours worked in excess of 48 per week; during the second year, for hours worked in excess of 44 per week; and, thereafter, for hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

SEC. 16. *Bowling Establishment Employees.*—Reduces and ultimately repeals the overtime exemption for employees employed in bowling establishments. Beginning 1 year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, such employees must be paid overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 44 per week, and beginning 2 years after the effective date, for hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

SEC. 17. *Substitute Parents for Institutionalized Children.*—Provides an overtime exemption for couples who serve as houseparents of children who are institutionalized by reason of being orphaned or having one deceased parent. Further provides that such employed couples must receive cash wages of not less than $10,000 annually, and reside on the premises of the institution and receive their board and lodging without cost.

SEC. 18. *Employees of Conglomerates.*—Precludes the availability of the minimum wage exemption presently applicable for certain employees employed in agriculture to a controlling conglomerate with an annual gross volume of sales made or business done in excess of $10 million, if the conglomerate materially supports the employing agricultural entity.

SEC. 19. *Seasonal Industry Employees.*—Existing law provides an overtime exemption for employment in seasonal industries up to 10 hours in any workday or 50 hours in any workweek for not more than 10 workweeks during the calendar year. Existing law also provides an overtime exemption for employment in agricultural processing up to 10 hours in any workday or 48 hours in any workweek for not more than 10 workweeks during the calendar year. In the case of an employer who does not qualify for the over-

time exemption under both categories the exemption is extended to 14 workweeks during the calendar year for the category under which he does qualify.

The overtime exemption for employment in seasonal industries is reduced to 48 hours in any workweek for not more than 7 workweeks beginning January 1, 1974 nor more than 5 workweeks beginning January 1, 1975, and not more than 3 workweeks beginning January 1, 1976. The overtime exemption for employment in agricultural processing is reduced to not more than 7 workweeks beginning January 1, 1974, not more than 5 workweeks beginning January 1, 1975, and not more than 3 workweeks beginning January 1, 1976. In the case of an employer who does not qualify for the overtime exemption under both categories, the exemption is reduced from 14 workweeks during the calendar year to 10 workweeks during 1974, to 7 workweeks during 1975, and to 5 workweeks during 1976. Effective December 31, 1976, the overtime exemptions are repealed.

SEC. 20. *Cotton Ginning and Sugar Processing Employees.*—Repeals the current overtime exemption and provides a limited overtime exemption for certain employees engaged in cotton ginning and sugar processing as follows:

Annual workweeks	Hours of work permitted during each such workweek without payment of overtime compensation		
	1974	1975	1976 and thereafter
6 weeks	72	66	60
4 weeks	64	60	56
2 weeks	54	50	48
2 weeks	48	46	44
Balance of year	48	44	40

SEC. 21. *Transit Employees.*—Reduces and ultimately repeals the overtime exemption for any driver, operator, or conductor employed by an employer engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motor bus carrier. During the first year after the effective date of the 1973 amendments, overtime compensation must be paid to such employees for hours worked in excess of 48 per week; during the second year, for hours worked in excess of 44 per week; and thereafter, for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. In determining the hours of employment of such an employee, hours employed in charter activities shall not be included if (1) the employee's employment in such activities was pursuant to an agreement or understanding with his employer arrived at before engaging in such employment, and (2) if employment in such activities is not part of such employee's regular employment.

SEC. 22. *Cotton and Sugar Services Employees.*—Retains a limited overtime exemption for certain employees engaged in cotton ginning and sugar processing activities. Overtime compensation must be paid for employment in excess of 10 hours in any workday and 48 hours in any workweek for a period or periods not to exceed 14 workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year. Without this section, the limited overtime exemption would be ultimately repealed by section 19.

SEC. 23. *Motion Picture Theaters, Logging Crews, and Oil Pipeline Transportation Employees.*—Repeals the minimum wage exemption for employees of motion picture theaters, and logging employees, but retains the overtime exemption for such employees. Also repeals the overtime exemption for employees of oil pipeline transportation companies.

SEC. 24. *Employment of Students.*—Provides for the employment of full-time students (regardless of age but in compliance with applicable child labor laws) at wage rates less than those prescribed by the act in retail and service establishments, agriculture, and institutions of higher education at which such students are enrolled. Students may be employed at a wage rate of not less than 85 per centum of the applicable minimum wage rate or $1.60 an hour ($1.30 an hour in agriculture), whichever is the higher, pursuant to special certificates issued by the Secretary. Such special certificates shall provide that such students shall, except during vacation periods, be employed on a part-time basis (not to exceed 20 hours in any workweek). In the case of an employer who intends to employ five or more students under this section, the Secretary may not issue a special certificate unless he finds the employment of any such student "will not create a substantial probability of reducing the full-time employment opportunities" of other workers. The "historical proportion" provisions in existing law, as modified by the 1973 amendments, are also applicable to a retail or service employer employing five or more students under this section. These provisions are a limiting factor on the number of students which may be so employed.

In the case of an employer who intends to employ less than five students under this section, the Secretary may issue a special certificate if the employer certifies to the Secretary that he is not thereby reducing the full-time employment opportunities of other workers. The certification requirements are not applicable to the employment of full-time students by the educational institutions at which they are enrolled. Sections 15 (Prohibited Acts) and 16 (Penalties) of the act would be applicable to an employer who violated the requirements of this section. A summary of the special certificates issued under this provision is required to be included in the Secretary's annual report on the act.

Section 24 also provides that the Secretary may waive the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act with respect to a student employed by his elementary or secondary school, where such employment constitutes an integral part of the regular education program provided by the school and is in accordance with applicable child labor laws.

SEC. 25. *Child Labor.*—The employment of children under age 12 in agriculture is prohibited unless they are employed on a farm owned or operated by their parents or guardians, or on a farm exempt from the minimum wage provisions of the act. Children 12 or 13 years of age may work in agriculture only with the written consent of their parents or guardians or if their parents or guardians are employed on the same farm. For persons 14 years of age or older, prior consent is not required for employment in agriculture.

Any person who violates the child labor provisions of the act or applicable regulations, is subject to civil penalties. The Secretary is permitted to require employers to obtain employee's proof of age.

SEC. 26. *Suits by the Secretary.*—Authorizes the Secretary to sue for back wages (which he can do now) but also to sue for an equal amount of liquidated damages without requiring a written request from the employee. The Secretary could also sue even though the suit might involve issues of law that have not been finally settled by the courts. In the event the Secretary brings such an action, the right of an employee provided by section 16(b) of the act to bring an action on behalf of himself, or to become party to such an action would terminate, unless such action is dismissed without prejudice, on motion by the Secretary.

SEC. 27. *Economic Effects Studies.*—In addition to and in furtherance of the requirements of section 4(d) of the act, the Secretary is required to conduct studies on the justification or lack thereof for each of the exemptions provided by sections 13(a) and 13(b) of the act. Such studies shall include an examination of the extent to which employees of conglomerates receive the sections 13(a) and (b) exemptions and the economic effect of their inclusion in such exemptions. The report on the study would be due not later than January 1, 1976.

SEC. 28. *Effective Date.*—Provides that unless otherwise indicated, the effective date of the 1973 amendments shall be the first day of the second full month which begins after the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to speak to a couple of provisions in order to clarify any possible misunderstanding derived from the language of the conference report.

We extend minimum wage coverage, for instance, to logging employees in small crews. Their employers say, "How can we pay the minimum wage when they go out on their own in the morning and return at night? We do not actually know how many hours they worked during the day?"

The Secretary already has experience in that kind of situation and has been guided by the courts. Ordinarily such an employee has periods of complete freedom and it would be difficult to determine the exact hours worked. Accordingly, any reasonable agreement of the parties which takes into consideration all of the pertinent facts will be accepted as a proper basis for determining hours worked.

With respect to the student employment provision, I would point out that the term "employer" is defined in the statute and was not chosen without being mindful of legislative intent. It does not appear in the relevant provisions of existing law, so the Secretary cannot be guided by past practice.

We intend by the use of the term "employer," that the Secretary look to the highest level of person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee; that is, the highest structure of ownership or control. We intend, for example, that a controlling conglomerate or a chain be considered the employer when the Secretary determines whether one of its subsidiaries or establishments is employing less than five—or more than four—students pursuant to special certificates. See *Phillips* v. *Walling*, 324 U.S. 400 and *Mitchell* v. *Bekins Van and Storage Company*, 352 U.S. 1027.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report will enjoy an affirmative vote of substantial proportions. It not only deserves that degree of approval, but such an indication may help eliminate any doubt about its ultimate enactment.

Mr. Speaker, there are several provisions in this conference report which, I suspect, would not appear were it not for the persistent advocacy of the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON). The gentleman is a senior member of the subcommittee and has been the most attentive and diligent member with respect to the total legislation before us. But several of its provisions bear his personal imprint.

The overtime treatment of nursing home employees, for example, is due exclusively to the efforts of Congressman BURTON. That treatment requires the payment of overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 8 per day and

80 per each 2-workweek period. The 8-hour daily limitation is unique in the Fair Labor Standards Act and is enjoyed by only two categories of workers: hospital employees and now, thanks to PHIL BURTON, nursing home employees.

In this same regard, the 40-hour workweek will become reality to maids and custodial employees of hotels and motels. The reason again, is PHIL BURTON. While others were agreeing on a 46-hour workweek for all hotel and motel employees, PHIL's instincts led him to the most disadvantaged among that work force: the maids and custodial employees. It is not accidental that they alone were selected out from among their coworkers and accorded the 40-hour workweek. Unless, of course, you call PHIL's adamance accidental.

The conglomerate provision was conceived solely in his mind, although many of us quickly endorsed it. But PHIL was the first to focus on the inequity of conglomerates avoiding the payment of minimum wage rates and overtime—especially given their economic superiority. Although the Senate did not allow us to go as far with this provision as we would have liked, it is significant that the conference did not end without the inclusion of a conglomerate provision in the report. And PHIL's was the last voice heard on the subject.

We also finally succeeded in raising the minimum wage farmworkers to the same level applicable to all other workers. PHIL offered this proposal in committee where it was first approved. When he offered it, there were those who sincerely felt it would kill the bill, irrespective of its humane and compelling nature. But it looks as though PHIL's motivation and political sense prevailed, because the House voted affirmatively on the provision and the Senate soon followed suit. It appears in the conference report.

Finally, this legislation covers domestic service employees under the minimum wage and overtime provisions. No group of employees was ever more deserving of those basic protections. But they were denied until 1973. I will not suggest that PHIL BURTON was alone responsible for accomplishing this long-delayed response to humane need. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM) were strong and articulate advocates, as were others—especially women Members and those in the black caucus. But PHIL BURTON stood with them and was equally instrumental in defending the rights and simple entitlements of these economically and socially deprived workers.

I am grateful for his assistance in every respect. He was a resourceful and steadfast ally and shouldered many of the burdens that I, as chairman, would otherwise have been encumbered with. He is aware of my gratitude because good frends know and understand one another. But I thought outside observers should also have the benefit of knowing who played what role, so that history does not obfuscate the realities of the moment.

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

Mr. Speaker, some of us had some substantial differences concerning this bill when it went through the House. We did not prevail. And so I do not stand before the Members today arguing about the rates of the minimum wage, because they were the same in both bills; there was a little difference in the time in which they would go into effect in the Senate bill as distinguished from the House bill.

By the same token, I certainly would have liked to have seen a much better youth differential than was in the House bill. However, the majority of the House made a decision on that.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the House bill went through, I did not point out some of the improvements in the youth differential that were in the House bill. If I had, I might have given the impression that it was good enough and we could not have gotten the votes for our substitute. It turned out that we did not get the votes for our substitute anyway.

Coming back from conference, to me the greatest disappointment I have in the legislation was the change that was made as a result of the concession of the House to the Senate, the House receding. This is concerning a provision in the present law which I believe denies thousands of young people an opportunity for a job, because there are a number of retail and service employers who feel as I do: that it is much healthier for a young person to have a job, and those employers will then go out of their way to expand job opportunities for them, providing there is a youth differential without undue restrictions.

Now, in retail and service establishments, if an employer wants to hire more than four students under the youth differential program, he is limited to the proportion of hours in which he hired youth during the 12-month period prior to May 1, 1961. If he was established after that point in history, then he cannot hire any more students than another establishment in the same enterprise, or a similar establishment in as close an area as possible, in the 12-month period prior to May 1, 1961.

We have been putting such historical limitations in agriculture bills before, and I can tell you it throws the whole thing out of whack. Here again we are going back to the history of the experience in that 12-month period prior to May 1, 1961. It was terribly unwise. The House conferees should have stood by its language.

The other body accepted the fact that the employer only has to certify to the Secretary he will not replace full-time workers if he hires four fewer students, but if he wants to hire five or more the Secretary has to make a finding first that he will not replace full-time employees. Even if he makes that finding, he still cannot hire more than the experience in his own establishment or a similar establishment some place in the same metro area or some place else as close as possible prior to May 1, 1961.

Therefore I think the conference report is a mistake, and I hope that we would vote down this conference report and then write a better piece of legislation than we have now. I know it will take a little bit more time, but let us look at future years and the jobs of thousands of young people in this country which are at stake.

As I have pointed out before, young people are having tremendous difficulties these days, and one of the major ones is they cannot find jobs. A job at 85 percent of the minimum is a lot better than no job, roaming the streets and getting into trouble.

There are other provisions of the bill that I think we should not have receded from as we did. Rather than take more time to explain them, I will yield to some of my colleagues to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield now 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN).

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today has had a long history. I guess we have spoken concerning the minimum wage bill so many times on the floor of the House that most of our colleagues feel they have heard the story over and over so often they do not need to hear it again. However, I would like to remind the House that we had a vote on the minimum wage bill last year and also we had a vote on whether we would send it to conference after it was amended by the other body.

In adopting the bill last year we had a clear-cut vote on the question as to whether we would include the Canal Zone in the increase in the minimum wage. The House voted not to include the Canal Zone. Again this year we had a clear-cut separate vote on that issue, and the House voted not to include the Canal Zone. What happened in the conference? There was no discussion. The majority members of the conference did not say, "Well, now, the House position has been stated clearly twice, and we would like to argue with the Senate conferees that the House position ought to have been sustained." Oh, it would have been so refreshing had that happened, but that is not what happened. They immediately proceeded to accede to the Senate position and follow what was clearly thrown out twice by the House—before sending the bill to the other body.

Last year we refused to send the bill to conference. We made the argument then that we cannot have an honest conference if we do not have conferees a majority of whom are committed to our House position.

What happened this year on the Canal Zone amendment I think is a good indication we had an argument last year that was valid.

We have already had some colloquy on the floor concerning another separate vote taken in the House this year relative to employment in industries that are characterized by a seasonal character. The House clearly voted to sustain the position of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The vote was 257 to 173. With that clear-cut indication of the feeling of the House, do not the Members think it would have been refreshing if the majority of the House conferees had said, "We would like to take a vote," and at least once vote to sustain the House position? Then we will discuss this and maybe we will have to give in by adjusting our differences."

But no, that did not happen. They immediately moved away from the House position. They did not try to sustain it at all. I think that is another indication

of why someday the House rules ought to be changed, and I hope that will be soon, to provide that a majority of the House conferees ought to be those who are in favor of the House position and will try to sustain the House position in conference.

What has this conference done? It has brought out a bill that was worse than the bill that passed the House. I should like to point out a few things besides the youth or student differential that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) has discussed. We are extending—and the House bill would have extended—coverage to Federal, State, and local employees. The controversy in the committee over whether overtime coverage should go to fire and police employees led to the House bill, when it was brought to the floor of the House, excluding overtime coverage for fire, police, and correctional employees. The conference—and again I must report that our House conferees did not fight very much to sustain the House position—now extends overtime coverage to these employees of State, local, and Federal Government. Oh, it will be said that this is just phased down; we are not going to impose the 40-hour week immediately.

But look carefully at the conference report. It says if the employees enter into an agreement with the employer, then we will phase down; otherwise, if the employee decides he does not want to give up his right to time and a half or double time, the firemen and the policemen are going to have a 40-hour week from the effective date of this act. Just think what that might do and will do, if this becomes law, to the budget of the cities and the municipalities and the States that now and for years have had varying hours for fire and police that do not conform to the normal 40-hour week.

Where are they going to find the funds to all of a sudden start paying time and a half and double time for these employees?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. What is the situation with regard to congressional officers in this bill, so far as recordkeeping provisions are concerned?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am happy to inform the gentleman that the extension of the minimum wage and overtime provision does not apply to House employees. It applies only to a limited number of people in the legislative branch, and they would be employees of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. BAKER. Is the committee then telling me that they are relieving the House of this burden and imposing the law on all of the business community throughout our Nation, exempting ourselves?

Mr. ERLENBORN. It is, I think, a little worse than that. It is not just the business community we are going to impose this on. It is every housewife who employs a maid 1 day a week. She is going to have to keep records of the hours and the days of work for which she pays, and she is going to be subject to the enforcement of the law by the Department of Labor.

Mr. BAKER. How in the world can we justify leaving ourselves out of this enormous burden?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I wish I could answer the gentleman's question. I do not know.

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

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

Mr. COLLIER. How would the overtime provisions that the gentleman has related, as they affect municipal employees, be applied—to school employees?

Mr. ERLENBORN. School employees would be covered by a 40-hour week.

Mr. COLLIER. So that means that in a school situation if teaching personnel, training personnel, or substitute personnel were obliged to perform some service on Saturday in connection with extracurricular activities, and they were employed 40 hours a week, they would fall under the overtime provisions of this act?

Mr. ERLENBORN. In my opinion they would. The 40-hour week would apply.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there may be a little question on that because professionals are exempt and I do not know how the teachers would come under it. That question never came up. It would be a question whether the teachers would be considered to be professionals or not. Otherwise they would be covered.

Mr. COLLIER. What about the nonteaching staff? We had a question some years ago about a subsequent need for judicial review, adjudication and clarification as it applied to school employees, particularly school bus drivers. I would be just curious to know whether or not when a school, as so often happens and particularly during peak times of enrollment and so on would bring in a staff on Saturday, do they fall under overtime provisions of this bill?

Mr. ERLENBORN. As the gentleman from Minnesota stated, unless they are exempt as professionals they would fall under coverage of this bill.

Mr. QUIE. They would be covered.

Mr. ERLENBORN. And it would be necessary to pay them time and a half or double time.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I will yield only briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. As the gentleman knows we passed this coverage to the schools in 1966, and I think in all fairness as between the two parties it should be noted it was a gentleman on the Republican side of the aisle who offered the amendment and the conference adopted it. It was my recollection it was the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER) but I tried to confirm it while the gentleman had the time.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is true, and that is why I said now I would be interested in the application of the overtime provisions.

Mr. BURTON. I am not trying unfairly to utilize the gentleman's time. As I understand it the bus driver is not the problem under the educational part, but it was the bus drivers especially who would be working overtime and it would not be affecting the basic educational institution.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would like to move to another topic and that is the question of the $250,000 gross test for retail establishments. The conferees receded to the Senate provision with an amendment. It is described on page 28 of the conference report in this fashion:

> The Senate amendment expanded the coverage of large retail and service activities to include employees of all establishments of chain operations in which the chain enterprise has gross annual sales of more than $250,000. The House bill had no similar provision. The Senate receded with an amendment that phased out the dollar volume establishment test in sec. 13(a)(2) as follows:
>
> 1. $250,000 until July 1, 1974.
> 2. $225,000 on and after July 1, 1974.
> 3. $200,000 on and after July 1, 1975.
> 4. Repealed July 1, 1976.

What will the effect of this be. It means if under single ownership there is a retail establishment, that has a $240,000 gross business, they will not be under the provisions of the act, but if one man owns two small establishments and if he does only $50,000 worth of business, he will be and both of the establishments will be under the act. It really makes very little sense. It has nothing to do with the competitive position of the one store to the other, the size of the store, and so forth. The mere fact that there is common ownership of the several small stores, two or more stores would make all of them come under the provisions of this act for minimum wage and overtime.

This sort of result seems to me to be completely ridiculous and foolish and has no bearing to the historic posture of this act to exempt small business, and to make the minimum wage and overtime provisions apply only to the retail and service establishments.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this conference report should be rejected.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUBER).

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, this was my first attempt to serve on a conference committee. Regrettably, I did not have the chance to sit in on all of the meetings, but it was certainly instructive to me, at least, as an individual who has been meeting payrolls for years—almost 30 years—to see how this minimum wage process is carried out.

I enjoyed the chairman's comments about steel and problems of tobacco. Last night, in the bill providing for the Alaskan pipeline, we required the construction companies to fill their future needs of steel pipe from the United States and not use foreign steel.

I happen to serve on the board of a steel company with warehouses in three

States. We do not stock foreign steel as a matter of policy. Also, I drive an American-made car, and would presume that everyone who puts in these requests to buy American-made products also uses American products. Regrettably, I understand this is not always the case. There seems to be two sets of values in these matters.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I not only use an American car, but I do not even allow a non-American car to get in my driveway.

Mr. HUBER. I agree with the chairman completely. I point out only that when we try to bring in these artificial barriers to protect our industry I am not sure we are accomplishing our goal. When we think we are helping the American worker are we actually helping him? Previous objectors to this report have indicated we are not going to improve the position of the young worker. We are going to make it much more difficult for him to get a job—$1.60 an hour is ridiculous for the principal wage earner of a family. I just cannot imagine people living on that low wage. I favor an increase in the minimum wage, but we should also provide for the young single teenager, and make him employable. Before we move we must be very careful how we attack these problems. Fine sounding slogans, saying we must use American boats or buy steel pipe from America, are not enough. We ought to make sure that our people can manufacture those products at a price that is competitive.

We are not encouraging industry by means of this measure or making it more productive; we are making it tougher and tougher for our products to compete, not because of the minimum wage—that is not where the problem is. If our products were competitive we would not have to worry about buying American, and this is a question of productivity.

I would hope that before this term of the Congress is over, we help make our industry more competitive with its foreign counterparts. Just passing arbitrary, false standards is not, in the long run, a solution to the problem.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a review of the conference report has confirmed my belief that the House conferees have receded to the Senate in some of its important provisions. The provision most important to me and to my constituents is the one that relates to coverage of public safety and fire fighting employees.

I voted for the House bill because these employees were specifically exempted. I cannot vote for the conference report, because the House has accepted the Senate language, and that language would be disastrous for the municipalities in my area.

The provisions, described on pages 26 and 27 of the Senate Committee Report, are complicated, but careful study indicates that the bill requires overtime over 196 hours for each of 13 28-day periods during the first year. The number of hours is reduced each year for 5 years. At the end of the 5 years, overtime must be paid over 160 hours in each 28-day period.

Firefighters in my district work 24-hour shifts with 48 hours off. Their total hours in a normal 28-week period would be about 228.

It is true that Labor Department regulations exempt sleep time from the normal 24-hour shift. However, if fire calls occur during the sleep time, this exemption is lost. Since fire calls are unpredictable, overtime is unpredictable. Municipal budgets are fine-tuned to municipal levies and levy limits. Municipalities cannot stand uncertainties.

St. Louis Park, Minn., a town of 55,000 in the middle of my district, computes its extra costs over the 5-year period at today's wage and fringe scales to be nearly $1 million. If the city of St. Louis Park were to reduce its shifts to 8 hours, it would have to add 13 extra men. The cost over 5 years at today's wage and fringe rates would then be about three-quarters of a million dollars.

The city of St. Louis Park has not made a determination yet as to whether it will pay the overtime or hire the new firefighters. The reason it has not done so is because it is even now subjected to a mill-levy limitation imposed by the State legislature. It is already at its limit, and therefore it cannot accept either of the alternatives noted above. Realistically its only alternatives are first, to cut firefighting services or second, to cut some other needed local service and then decide whether to pay overtime or hire new firefighters.

I submit that this bill puts the municipalities in my district into an impossible position. This bill is supposed to protect people, but instead this Senate provision will render irreparable harm to the people of my district.

The bitterest irony of the whole situation is that the firefighters themselves have expressed opposition to the plan. They like their 24-hour shifts, and they enjoy the part-time jobs and the leisure which those shifts afford them.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, even though I voted for the House bill, I must vote against the conference version and indicate my support of the veto if a veto should follow. I would like to repeat that if the proponents of this bill had not been greedy—if they had not been so willing to take the Senate position, which probably never could have passed the House—many Members, like myself, might have supported this bill. Because they had to have the whole loaf, they have probably caused the failure of this bill.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota for his awareness of the problems of municipalities. Having served in city government, I recognize the problem this would create. I join the gentleman in his remarks, and will follow his lead and vote no on this bill.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SARASIN. As the gentleman from Minnesota stated he did, I voted for the original bill also. I have a problem with this.

When I was in the Connecticut Legislature, we passed an overtime provision, or a sort of minimum wage standard, applying to everyone, and we found out that at least the fire departments in the State were in a real dilemma simply because they had contracts negotiated in good faith and were now told to go on a 40-hour week. They came back to the legislature and asked that we repeal that portion of the law, and we did.

My question is, As this bill has now been brought back to us, if adopted, what would the status of that situation be?

Mr. FRENZEL. I really cannot answer the gentleman. All I can say is that the municipalities in my district believe they are going to be stuck with overtime cost, or will have to hire additional firemen, or will have to reduce services in the city.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Oregon has effectively pointed out that one of the problems we have in this bill as it comes back to us is the fact that on behalf of some, that is cotton processing and sugar processing, exemptions from overtime are maintained, but for all others in the seasonal industry they are effectively eliminated, though over a period of time.

As one who has historically had an interest in what we do to try to provide an adequate supply of food I must admit I am very disturbed and unhappy over the action of the House conferees in bending to the will of the Senate and taking provisions not in the House bill and in fact specifically rejected in the House by a record vote.

That kind of action on the part of the House conferees is but one reason why I believe the conference report ought to be rejected and voted down.

I do not say that lightly. I recognize full well the arguments that can be made on behalf of an increase in the minimum wage. But on balance, when we consider all the implications contained in this conference report—the youth differential and the effect this will have on young people's employment opportunities; on State and local employees; on seasonal industries across the United States of all kinds, who will, in my judgment, at least, find it more difficult to deal with the problem of highly perishable products in a way that makes sense and supplies food in the way it should be done in this country—as we look at the effect on households by virtue of the action of the conference, I believe the conference report should be rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman on his action on the conference report. I share his extreme disappointment concerning what seems to be a retrogres-

sion rather than any progress on this matter of the youth opportunity wage.

Mr. Speaker, am I correct in my understanding that the conference report takes us back to the 1961 law in requiring recertification, thus making it even more difficult for the limited number of college students who would be available or could draw the 85 percent of the minimum under the law? The recertification requirements would make it even more difficult for that limited number to qualify?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

That kind of retrogression, it seems to me, was a serious mistake. Of all the issues dealt with in the minimum wage, the question of what we do with youth employment is to me the most fundamental. What we have done is to go backward, and we have not even retained what the House was attempting to do in dealing with this problem.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, he will recall that I offered that amendment and we were unsuccessful when we had that amendment considered earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is one of the most serious defects in this conference report.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I rise to associate myself with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) and the gentleman who preceded him in the well, Mr. FRENZEL, of Minnesota. I find it most regrettable that the House conferees receded to the Senate in regard to two specific points.

First, as the gentleman from Minnesota has so eloquently stated, the overtime provisions for police and firemen will raise havoc in the small towns and communities in my congressional district.

Second, the subject of a proper youth differential is a subject that I have heard from more in regard to minimum wage than any other facet of the entire bill. In my congressional district part-time employment for high school youths and others in that age bracket has given them an opportunity to develop partially their own independence. I think it is tragic that the conferees did not recognize this important difference.

I sincerely hope that if this conference report is voted down, new minimum wage legislation will be brought quickly back to the House floor so that the millions of people who will rightfully benefit by this increase can receive the benefits as stated in the rest of this conference report.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) in order to respond to a deliberate misrepresentation.

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

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be interested in considering problems of inflation and wage needs to read the enclosed article from the UAW Washington Report, of July 16, 1973, volume 13, No. 29, United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Workers of America, UAW, as it shares with its members the views of U.S. News & World Report on pay raises, and fringe benefits in an article headed "Congressional Goodies."

We will all wish to consider this carefully as future legislation on the subject of pay raises and fringe benefits are considered. When UAW and U.S. News & World Report agree on this issue congressional decisions should be easier.

The article follows:

CONGRESSIONAL GOODIES

On top of a base of $42,500 a year, members of the House and Senate also receive—

Liberal retirement benefits after five years service. Top pension; $34,000 a year after 32 years of service.

Rent-free offices: one in Washington, D.C., as many as three at home.

Salary allowance for staff, based on number of constituents. Top allowance: $586,160 for Senators, $165,168 for House members.

Free mailing privileges on "office business" mail, plus allowances for airmail and special delivery—up to $1,520 a year for Senators, $910 for Representatives.

More than 300 hours of free long-distance calls.

Telegram allowance based on number of constituents—as high as $20,000 a year for Senators from largest States.

Stationery allowance of up to $4,250 for House members, up to $5,000 for Senators at special cut-rate stores on Capitol Hill.

Free official round trips home—18 a year for House members, a much greater number for Senators, based on a complex formula. In addition: travel allowances of 20 cents a mile for getting to and from Washington at the start and finish of session. And: an allowance of $50 a day while on official business overseas.

Up to $3,000 a year tax deduction for living costs in Washington.

Free underground parking on Capitol Hill.

Free emergency medical care from physicians and nurses at Capitol Hill medical center, which contains examination room, laboratory.

Free drugs if prescribed by Capitol physicians.

Medical care in any military hospital at a flat fee of $61 a day, regardless of the type of treatment.

Government-subsidized health-insurance plan.

A $45,000 life-insurance policy at special rates, plus widows benefit equal to one year's salary—$42,500.

Free swimming pools and gyms—one for Senators, one for House members.

Free steam rooms, masseurs, physiotherapy.

Free haircuts for Senators, $2 for Representatives, at special barber shops; beauty shops at reduced rates for female members.

Free flowers for offices, entertaining.

Reduced-rate meals, free of sales taxes, at private dining rooms in Capitol.

TV and radio-studio service, at discount rates.

Free access to congressional research service for help on speeches, answering constituents' queries.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, of course, there is some apparent misunderstanding with reference to what the report before us did in terms of youth employment and what is the current state of the law.

The conference committee in the main stayed with the House provision, over the very vigorous objection of the Senate, and, I might add parenthetically, somewhat to my own surprise.

Mr. Speaker, currently all the employers of youth must obtain precertification and must establish some historical relationship in their hiring patterns before they can hire students. The bill before us somewhat simplifies that procedure where four or fewer students are involved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make this one final observation.

I wish to commend my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. DENT) for the 4 long years he has put into this bill, because all of us know that we last enacted minimum wage legislation some 7 years ago. Most of the persons covered under the minimum wage bill have not had an increase as a result of the minimum wage for 6 years.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania deserves the plaudits of all of us.

I would like to note, also, if I may, the meaningful effort made by a number of our colleagues on the other side to reach as best an accommodation as they might. I am sure they would be the first to admit as to wages we won the fight, because there was no effort to raise our wages on the Senate side.

Mr. DENT. I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota wants to rebut anything the gentleman from California said. I know you feel strongly about your youth differential, but do not vote on a misapprehension. This restriction only applies to retail and service business. In all other instances it does not apply. We now allow every retail store in the United States four free employees. They do not have to be certified. It has to be an enormous establishment to hire four new or five employees all together.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania says it only refers to a retail service establishment.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield? Is it not true that the historical ratio is in the bill from its inception and it only refers to service in retail employment?

Mr. QUIE. It is in the law, but I pointed out earlier that you took it out in the House. The House-passed bill removed the historical ratio test. I pointed out that if a retail or service employer wanted to hire more than four, he will still be limited by historical experience. If he hired four or less he would not. There are thousands of students who will be denied jobs because of that.

Another thing is that agricultural processing cannot even have a youth differential. You will recall the Matsunaga amendment was adopted and accepted which would have permitted a youth differential for agricultural processing, and I offered that amendment in the conference, but it was rejected.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

What the agricultural portion of this legislation does never did concern itself with this, and you know it. I know that the Senate removed the employ-

ment of those 12 years and younger unless they were on a farm with their parents. The crops that are gathered in off season, when they are in school in many areas of this country, are strawberries and potatoes and cherries. That picking is done by closing the schools down for the period of picking these crops.

They wiped out that exemption and we put it back in and extended it to accept the historical procedure. They put it right back to where it was, because now that employment——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act did an excellent job defending and preserving the substantive position of the House on the major issues. I highly recommend support for the conference report.

The schedule of increases in the minimum wage and the effective dates were virtually the same in the two bills and the conference adopted the House position. The increases in the minimum wage will begin on the first day of the second full month after enactment. Subsequent increases will occur on July 1 of each succeeding year.

The House conferees' success was most important on some issues on which Senate provisions with no counterpart in the House bill were totally rejected by the conference.

"MOM AND POP" STORES

The Senate would have repealed the provision excluding the annual gross volume test of the so-called Mom and Pop stores. But the House conferees insisted and we preserved the Mom and Pop exemption from minimum wage and overtime coverage. It is important that Members understand that this legislation does not affect the small businessman. The conference report phases out—by 1976—the $250,000 establishment test; that test applies, however, only to individual retail or service stores within a "chain" operation. The conference report retains the $250,000 enterprise test—and that test applies to the independent stores and businesses in your town and mine. Those exempt businesses will not be treated any differently under this legislation than they are now under existing law.

CHILD LABOR

The Senate bill had child labor provisions which would have prohibited the employment of children on farms other than those owned or operated by their parents without the written consent of their parents or guardians. Violations of the Senate provisions would have subjected farmers to fines of up to $1,000. Again, the House stood firm. The employment of children is prohibited only on the largest farms covered by the act under the 500 man-day test and the conglomerate farms. The small farmer in the neighborhood can continue to employ youngsters in healthy and useful farmwork with the consent of their parents.

YOUTH DIFFERENTIAL

With respect to the youth differential the House conferees won a substantial victory, preserving the idea that the small businessmen should not be required to undertake complicated precertification and accounting procedures to be able to hire as many as four students at the subminimum wage. The possibility of students being employed at a subminimum wage in retail and service establishments, agriculture and institutions of higher education as provided in the House bill was preserved. The House provision that permitted a minimum wage and overtime exemption for students employed by an elementary or secondary school if the employment constitutes an integral part of the school's regular education program was also retained.

SEASONAL HAND HARVEST WORKERS

The Senate amendment would have repealed immediately the minimum wage exemption for local and seasonal hand harvest workers. The House had no such provision and here the conference resulted in a compromise. The seasonal hand harvest exemption from minimum wage coverage was retained, but hereafter such workers will be counted as employees for purposes of the man-day test for coverage.

SEASONAL PROCESSING WORKERS

Instead of immediately repealing the overtime exemption for seasonal employees or industries, as the Senate would have done, the House conferees succeeded in phasing down the removal of the exemption and putting off the repeal of the exemption for 5 years.

TOBACCO EMPLOYEES

The House position with respect to the overtime exemption of employees engaged in a range of activities connected with the warehousing and sale of tobacco was preserved in its entirety. In addition, an overtime exemption for employees engaged in the processing of shade-grown tobacco was added.

COTTON GINNING AND SUGAR PROCESSING

The present overtime exemption for cotton ginning and sugar processing employees was reduced, but in such a way as not to harm either industry. There will be no changes in 1973. Thereafter, the number of permitted hours per workweek will gradually be reduced through 1976 but substantial and adequate overtime will be permitted.

SEAFOOD PROCESSING

The Senate amendment would have repealed outright the overtime exemption for seafood canning and processing employees. The conference resulted in a gradual phaseout over a 3-year period.

In these and in a number of other respects the conference arrived at compromises. The Senate would have eliminated immediately virtually all the overtime exemptions and expanded coverage to a degree which very few Members of the House would have approved. The House conferees managed to resist the strongly felt Senate positions and we came up with compromises which are consistent with the position of the House in every major respect.

I would like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), and the other members of the conference for the excellent work that was done in the conference and for the first-rate results of their efforts.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, normally I know the circumstances are such that the majority retains the last time for themselves. Therefore, I will yield back the balance of my time rather than take the 2 minutes now, taking unfair advantage.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report which accompanies the bill H.R. 7935, the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1973.

As a cosponsor of the bill and as one of the House conferees, I take particular pride in this report and feel it includes the best provisions of both the Senate and House passed bills. This report is not only a triumph for the Congress, but more importantly, for the working man and woman of America who stand to gain the most from the adoption of this report.

The minimum wage figures agreed to by the conferees represent a true awareness and sensitivity to the financial plight of the average worker in America today, who is forced to endure constantly rising prices without an equivalent rise in his take-home pay. In light of this, it was imperative for the conferees to come up with a realistic hourly minimum wage figure, which would be adequate enough to allow the average worker to support a family, but reasonable enough not to trigger any inflationary spiral. The increase in the minimum wage to $2.20 an hour for most nonagricultural workers by July 1974, and for agricultural workers by July 1976, is the most outstanding aspect of this bill. For the first time, agricultural employees will be under the same minimum wage category as nonagricultural workers.

This report also calls for a substantial extension of the minimum wage coverage for a wide sector of the American work force. Included in this group are such major groups as Federal, State and local employees, domestic employees, and retail and service employees of "chain stores."

The conferees also took the important step of agreeing to modified Senate provisions which would phase out by the year 1977 overtime exemptions on seasonal industry and agricultural processing employees, except sugar processing and cotton ginning employees.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay special tribute to my distinguished friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for his tireless and dedicated efforts on behalf of the American worker. I urge the adoption of this report by my colleagues and the signature of the bill by the President so that the long-overdue benefits proposed in the measure can be enjoyed by the American workers as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. QUIE. 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 253, nays 152, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—253

Abzug	Gonzalez	Pickle
Adams	Grasso	Pike
Addabbo	Green, Oreg.	Podell
Anderson, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Preyer
	Griffiths	Price, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.	Grover	Pritchard
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gude	Railsback
	Gunter	Randall
Annunzio	Hamilton	Rangel
Ashley	Hanley	Rees
Aspin	Hansen, Wash.	Reid
Badillo	Harrington	Reuss
Barrett	Harsha	Riegle
Bell	Hastings	Rinaldo
Bennett	Hawkins	Rodino
Bergland	Hays	Roe
Bevill	Hechler, W. Va.	Rogers
Biaggi	Heckler, Mass.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Biester	Heinz	Roncallo, N.Y.
Bingham	Helstoski	Rooney, Pa.
Blatnik	Henderson	Rose
Boggs	Hicks	Rosenthal
Bolling	Hillis	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Holifield	Roush
Brasco	Holtzman	Roy
Breaux	Horton	Roybal
Breckinridge	Howard	Runnels
Brinkley	Hungate	Ruppe
Brooks	Ichord	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Sandman
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Colo.	Sarasin
Burke, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Sarbanes
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Okla.	Saylor
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Schroeder
Burton	Jordan	Seiberling
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Shipley
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Sikes
Carter	Kluczynski	Sisk
Chisholm	Koch	Skubitz
Clark	Kyros	Slack
Clausen, Don H.	Leggett	Snyder
	Lehman	Staggers
Clay	Lent	Stanton, James V.
Cohen	Litton	
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Stark
Conte	Long, Md.	Steed
Conyers	McCloskey	Steele
Corman	McCormack	Stokes
Coughlin	McDade	Stratton
Cronin	McFall	Stubblefield
Culver	McKay	Stuckey
Daniels, Dominick V.	McKinney	Studds
	McSpadden	Sullivan
Danielson	Macdonald	Symington
Davis, Ga.	Madden	Taylor, Mo.
Davis, S.C.	Mailliard	Taylor, N.C.
de la Garza	Maraziti	Thompson, N.J.
Delaney	Mathias, Calif.	Thornton
Dellums	Matsunaga	Tiernan
Denholm	Mazzoli	Udall
Dent	Meeds	Ullman
Diggs	Metcalfe	Van Deerlin
Dingell	Mezvinsky	Vander Jagt
Donohue	Milford	Vanik
Dorn	Minish	Vigorito
Drinan	Mink	Waggonner
du Pont	Mitchell, Md.	Waldie
Eckhardt	Mitchell, N.Y.	Walsh
Edwards, Calif.	Moakley	Wampler
Eilberg	Mollohan	Whalen
Eshleman	Moorhead, Pa.	White
Evans, Colo.	Morgan	Widnall
Fascell	Mosher	Williams
Findley	Moss	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Fish	Murphy, Ill.	
Flood	Murphy, N.Y.	
Flowers	Natcher	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Foley	Nedzi	
Ford, William D.	Nichols	Wolff
	Nix	Wright
Forsythe	Obey	Wyatt
Fraser	O'Hara	Wydler
Fulton	O'Neill	Yates
Gaydos	Owens	Yatron
Giaimo	Passman	Young, Ga.
Gibbons	Patten	Zablocki
Gilman	Perkins	
Ginn	Peyser	

NAYS—152

Abdnor	Ashbrook	Bray
Anderson, Ill.	Bafalis	Broomfield
Archer	Baker	Brotzman
Arends	Beard	Brown, Ohio
Armstrong	Bowen	Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan	Haley	Powell, Ohio
Burgener	Hammer-schmidt	Price, Tex.
Burke, Fla.		Quie
Burleson, Tex.	Hanrahan	Quillen
Butler	Hansen, Idaho	Rarick
Byron	Harvey	Regula
Camp	Hinshaw	Rhodes
Casey, Tex.	Hogan	Roberts
Cederberg	Holt	Robinson, Va.
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Robison, N.Y.
Chappell	Huber	Rousselot
Clancy	Hudnut	Ruth
Clawson, Del	Hunt	Satterfield
Cochran	Hutchinson	Scherle
Collier	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Collins, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Sebelius
Conable	Kazen	Shoup
Conlan	Keating	Shriver
Crane	Kemp	Shuster
Daniel, Dan	Ketchum	Smith, N.Y.
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Kuykendall	Spence
	Landrum	Stanton, J. William
Davis, Wis.	Latta	
Dellenback	Lott	Steelman
Dennis	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
Derwinski	McCollister	Steiger, Wis.
Devine	McEwen	Stephens
Dickinson	Madigan	Symms
Downing	Mahon	Talcott
Duncan	Mallary	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, Ala.	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Erlenborn	Martin, Nebr.	Thomson, Wis.
Esch	Martin, N.C.	Thone
Flynt	Mathis, Ga.	Towell, Nev.
Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne	Treen
Fountain	Michel	Veysey
Frelinghuysen	Miller	Ware
Frenzel	Minshall, Ohio	Whitehurst
Frey	Mizell	Whitten
Froehlich	Montgomery	Wilson, Bob
Fuqua	Moorhead, Calif.	Winn
Gettys		Wylie
Goldwater	Myers	Young, Fla.
Goodling	Nelsen	Young, Ill.
Gross	Parris	Young, S.C.
Gubser	Pettis	Young, Tex.
Guyer	Poage	Zion

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander	Hanna	Pepper
Blackburn	Hébert	Rooney, N.Y.
Boland	Jarman	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	King	Smith, Iowa
Cleveland	Landgrebe	Wiggins
Cotter	Lujan	Wyman
Dulski	Melcher	Young, Alaska
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.	Zwach
Fisher	O'Brien	
Gray	Patman	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cotter for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Fisher against.
Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. King against.
Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Jarman against.
Mr. Cleveland for, with Mr. Blackburn against.
Mr. Alexander for, with Mr. Brown of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Melcher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1888, AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1888) to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 31, 1973.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

(For Senate amendment to House amendment, see proceedings of the Senate of July 31, 1973.)

Mr. POAGE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. POAGE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POAGE moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill, S. 1888, with an amendment as follows: On page 48, line 14, in the engrossed Senate amendment, insert the following new subsection (d) to section 815 of paragraph 27:

"(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to implement policies under this Act which are designed to encourage American farmers to produce to their full capabilities during periods of short supply to assure American consumers with an adequate supply of food and fiber at fair and reasonable prices."

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves that the motion of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. POAGE, be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, for 6 months the general

farm bill has traveled an arduous path but I believe our actions today can finally crystalize all the hard work the Congress has put into enacting a major new farm program. Hundreds of amendments have been considered, voted, rejected, or adopted to this bill as the will of the Congress has determined. Your conferees met at all hours and on weekends to resolve the differences between the Senate and House-passed bill—and were able to resolve 110 out of 111 of those differences.

Abiding by the position of the House, conferees insisted on the House position and prevailed on a vast majority of the issues in disagreement. Finally, on the last difference—the so-called Dickinson amendment—neither body was willing to budge from its adopted position and the conferees reported in disagreement.

Before us we have a bill that would have been the conference bill if we had not been forced to report in disagreement. It assures farmers they will not be faced with complete loss of income in case of a market collapse, and will enable them to get the credit necessary for full production. Only with full production can we feed America and meet present export demands. This is a full production bill. It should be welcomed by consumers and producers alike.

The amendment I am offering will assure that American farmers produce to their full capabilities during periods of short supply in order that consumers will be provided with an adequate supply of food and fiber at fair prices. It is a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture that he implement policies under the act to encourage farmers to produce more in time of shortage, and I ask that it be adopted as a final supplement to the 110 areas of conference agreement embodied in the Senate bill before us.

If we vote affirmatively for my motion, we will in effect agree to a bill that has the support of the administration and can receive the President's signature. Passage of the bill now is necessary to assure that next year's crop is planted to obtain the fullest possible agricultural production.

If we do not pass this bill, there is every likelihood that next year's farm program will instead be based on old laws designed to retard agricultural production instead of encouraging it. In such a case, the bread tax would still be in effect. To vote against my motion would be to reject a better and more effective food stamp program with rigid guides to insure that there will be no abuse under the program. It would reject a totally new conservation program designed to wage an all out attack on pollution and erosion in rural America.

I urge Members of the House to vote affirmatively for the previous question and for the adoption of the Senate bill with the additional amendment I am offering.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes for discussion only to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have never been quite sure just what "for discussion only" means, but I shall not take more than the 5 minutes.

First, I should like to say that I think the chairman has done a splendid job in the conference. He is quite correct when he says that the House prevailed in the majority of instances in our controversies with the Senate conferees. I was and still am against the bill. We did not prevail in maintaining the House provision banning food stamps for strikers. That is the only remaining issue.

Mr. POAGE has come up with a perfectly legal and ingenious device, I want the Members to all understand, and I am not criticizing him one bit for having done so. It is only this situation in which we find ourselves. There can only be one amendment to the motion, unless the previous question is voted down. The amendment Mr. POAGE has offered is perfectly innocuous. It means nothing whatsoever, and it is offered in order to prevent someone else from offering a motion, someone like Mr. DICKINSON, banning food stamps for strikers.

We did twice, here in the House take action to bar food stamps for strikers. I will say to Mr. POAGE's everlasting credit, he stuck to that position in the conference, and five of our seven conferees did, but the Senate on a very close vote did not go along. That is the point in disagreement. If we are to have a chance to vote again on the matter of banning food stamps for strikers, we must defeat Mr. POAGE's motion. I want to be sure that the Members all understand that.

I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) for purposes of discussion only.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, may I present a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation now, it is a very delicate parliamentary situation. What we are voting on is a Senate amendment to a House amendment to a Senate bill. That means it has been amended to the first degree, and with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture adding this innocuous amendment, that is an amendment to the second degree, and no more are allowed.

My question is, On the motion for the previous question, if the question is voted down, should a substitute or an amendment be offered to the motion of the chaiman, must it be germane to the innocuous amendment?

The SPEAKER. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas is now before the House. The amendment contained in the motion of the gentleman from Texas would be subject to a germane amendment if the previous question on this motion were rejected.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain the situation. An attack on the motion for the previous question would avail us nothing. The Chair has ruled that in order to substitute or to amend the motion put by the chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, it must be germane to the amendment that he has offered. It is an innocuous amendment saying that we are going to urge the farmers to do good in the food and fiber business. So any amendment to his amendment must be germane to that, and it cannot be one a limitation of payments or assignment of acreage, or food stamps, or anything else. So the parliamentary situation is very simple. There is only one way to get at it, one way only, and that is not to vote down the previous question, but it must be a direct attack on and a vote down of the motion offered by the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

If that is voted down, in that case the floor will be open for another motion to concur with an amendment which I intend to offer if recognized. Unless that is done none of the other wished-for amendments and none of the other opponents will prevail, and there is nothing to amend other than the technical amendment or innocuous amendment that has been offered.

So to restate it, there is only one way we can get to any substantive amendment because only one amendment will lie. It will not open up Pandora's box. It will not open up the bill for a multitude of amendments. We do not have to worry about whether it will open up the whole thing and whether they can get at the acreage allotments or limitation of payments or whatever. Only one amendment will prevail.

If the innocuous amendment the chairman has offered prevails, that is it, that is all. If it is voted down, then one other amendment may be offered. If it passes, that is if it is my amendment and if it passes, then that is the end of it. If that is voted down, then one other amendment may be offered until an amendment is accepted. So that is the parliamentary situation. It is as clear as I can make it, as complicated as it is.

We have one issue before us. If we are interested in seeing that the truly poor and the really hungry children get the food stamps we have authorized them to get and we want to see to it that they continue to get them but we do not want to authorize food stamps for strikers, then when we reach that point we must vote down the motion offered by the chairman of the committee to adopt the Senate amendment with an amendment, vote that down, and then I will seek recognition to offer my motion or my amendment which is then to concur in the Senate amendment with my amendment, and that will be a straight up and down vote on the issue and we will reconcile it at that time.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has explained the situation very clearly. Those of us in the majority who voted against the food stamps for strikers and who want to maintain our position will have to do just what the gentleman said just now, and that is to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman for purposes of discussion only 1 additional minute.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in this 1 minute I would like to publicly thank the chairman and the conferees of the House who stuck to the House position. They sustained the House position, including the chairman. It was a tough vote, including the Senate side.

Members will probably hear that if we do not accept this, the bill is dead, but it is not so. We will come back and we will get a farm bill and I ask the Members not to be scared about having no farm bill, because we will have a farm bill. That is just a talking point and I hope the Members will not fall for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally indebted to the chairman for upholding the position of the House and for the many courtesies the chairman has extended to me.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes for discussion only to the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of 3 or 4 days the House labored long in a somewhat controversial atmosphere in an earnest effort to write a farm bill. I did not approve of the bill as it left the House. I thought it had many deficiencies. But fortuitously because of the framework of the bill that the Senate passed and the framework of the bill we passed, the conferees ingeniously were able to come up with a conference report that is much more satisfactory.

I have in my possession, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture which he has asked me to read, and it is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1973.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: By this letter I pledge my support of the Senate passed Farm Bill which has been transmitted to the House, and I want you to know that it will be my recommendation that the President sign this bill if it's passed in its present form by the House.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I agree virtually entirely with the Secretary of Agriculture. I support the farm bill, especially that portion relating to agriculture. However, it is my intention to support the position taken by the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) and the position taken by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

The House conferees tried, but were unsuccessful, in insisting on the Dickinson amendment which was in the House version. It is regrettable that, under the procedure we are faced with, we cannot have again a straight up-and-down vote on the Dickinson amendment, but the facts of life are that in order to have that vote again we must, under the interpretation of the parliamentary situation, vote down the Poage amendment.

The Poage amendment is an innocuous but clever amendment. The facts are that if the Members want to insist on an important amendment that the House approved twice, perhaps three times, Members should vote "No."

If that amendment is defeated, then either an amendment offered by the gentleman from California or an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will give us a chance to reiterate and reemphasize the Dickinson amendment and attach it to the farm bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) for the purpose of discussion only.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for this time. My main purpose is to let any who may be interested know that there will be more than one person on his feet when the time comes seeking recognition; not just the gentleman from Alabama. He seeks to amend the bill in regard to the question of food stamps for strikers.

In my case, and in the case of Mr. CONTE, we will seek to offer a motion to concur with an amendment, but a different amendment than that proposed by the gentleman from Texas or that proposed by the gentleman from Alabama.

The House on two different occasions very strongly, by record vote, supported a tight limitation on payments to farmers. The first test vote was 195 to 157 on the House Agriculture Appropriation bill. Then, when the farm bill came along, by an even stronger vote of 246 to 103, it supported the very strict, no-loophole limitation language that I offered.

This vote came on the heels of the House supporting a much looser form of payment limitation offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BERGLAND), so the House very clearly has voiced its support for strict limitation by a far greater margin, I must say, than the House has ever voted to deny food stamps for strikers, so on the scale of equity between these issues, I would think the House would want to vote down these motions until the opportunity would come for my motion to reinstate strict payment limitation language.

The motion I am prepared to offer, if I am recognized for it, will not only restore the strict limitation language which the House twice by strong margins has voted to support, but also to strike from the bill the $10 million per year which would be made available to Cotton, Inc.

The conference committee can be congratulated on some of the achievements it has accomplished. I believe, in respects other than the two items I have mentioned the bill now before us is superior to the bill that emerged from the House.

Nevertheless, on these two vital issues I believe the House should not pass up the opportunity presented to it again this day to reinstate the tight limitation language on individual payments and also strike from the bill the $10 million authorized to Cotton Incorporated.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes for discussion to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is oblivious to public sentiment and ignorant of economic conditions. That is the conclusion one must draw if this farm bill is passed. It is so inflationary, so full of loopholes, and so contrary to the public interest, it is a hoax on the American public.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment offered by the distinguished committee chairman, so that the vital reforms that the House passed on earlier on several occasions and by overwhelming margins can be salvaged and restored.

Government by subsidy has been the keynote of the farm program for too many years. This year seemed an opportune time to begin the long overdue process of dismantling these costly and outmoded farm doles.

Such a course was overwhelmingly favored by the administration, public sentiment, and economic conditions.

The American public became enraged by farm subsidies when they realized that beef supplies are scarce, when the price of chicken started edging toward a dollar a pound, and when shortsighted Government programs began disrupting their diets and their pocketbooks.

Public sentiment was clearly expressed in the agriculture appropriations bill on June 15, when two amendments were adopted: a strict $20,000 ceiling on subsidy payments and a prohibition against further subsidies to Cotton, Inc.

When the omnibus farm bill came before the House, these two amendments were quickly adopted. A strict $20,000 per farm ceiling on subsidy payments—with tough prohibition against the practices of subdividing farms or subleasing cotton acreage allotment in order to evade the payment limitation—was approved by a vote of 246 to 163.

Then, the amendment to bar further subsidy payments to Cotton, Inc., the promotion-research darling of the cotton lobby—that spends money better than it promotes cotton, was approved by a vote of 241 to 162.

Then, as my colleagues will remember, the committee chairman took the bill away from the House over the weekend. And then the deals started coming. Take out the cotton section and pass the rest of the bill. Give us Cotton, Inc., and you will get food stamps for strikers. Take out the escalator clauses and the President won't veto it. And so on.

It was only after deal after deal fell through that my liberal colleagues realized they had been taken. That is when I put the cotton section back in the bill.

At that point, we still had a salvageable bill.

But we lost the amendment to prohibit funds to Cotton, Inc., on a parliamentary fluke during the hectic chaos of final passage.

As you remember, the confusion at that time was so great, the committee chairman had to print the final version of the bill in the RECORD so that members could know what they had passed.

On the $20,000 payment limitation provision, my attempt to offer a motion to instruct conferees was adroitly blocked by another parliamentary subterfuge. With only one "motion to instruct" allowed, a member of the committee offered an innocuous "sweetheart" motion about food for North Vietnam that really had only one purpose. It was meant solely to block my motion, so that conferees would not be bound to the payment limitation provision.

That allowed the farm bill conferees to

do us in again. Just like they did in 1968, 1969, and 1971, when previous payment limitation amendments passed by the House were gutted. Again, they have pulled the plug on the payment limitations sections and opened up all the old loopholes. They have subverted this section so that farm subsidy payments can be bigger than ever.

The Federal Government doled out $4 billion in subsidies last year. Over the next 4 years, the subsidy bill could amount to another $12 billion.

It is time for the Congress to enact a farm bill without allowing secret tradeoffs, "sweetheart" motions, and parliamentary ploys that block the will of the majority. It is time we stopped selling the consumer down the river to make a handful of "fact cat" corporate farmers even richer.

This farm bill does not help the small family farmer. It gouges the consumer and the taxpayer. The prime beneficiaries are "King Cotton" and the big corporations who take a good giveaway when it is offered.

I urge my colleagues to vote down the motion offered to concur with the amendment, so that these vitally needed reforms may be restored in the farm bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes for discussion only to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Chairman POAGE has handled this most complicated and arduous assignment with inordinate skill. I should like to note there is a significant danger, if there is any amendment other than the thoughtful one the chairman has in mind, to the bill. There would be great danger the Senate might not accept the bill at all.

For those of us who live in the cities it is very important that the fundamental food programs be maintained as they are in this bill, and they certainly will become law if we will just have the good sense to follow the leadership of the gentleman from Texas through this procedural morass and on the substance of the votes we shall have in the next 30 minutes.

I urge my colleagues to follow the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a farm bill Members need to vote "aye" on ordering the previous question and to vote "aye" on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 54, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

YEAS—349

Abdnor	Badillo	Bowen
Abzug	Bafalis	Brademas
Addabbo	Barrett	Brasco
Alexander	Beard	Bray
Andrews, N.C.	Bennett	Breaux
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bergland	Breckinridge
Annunzio	Bevill	Brinkley
Armstrong	Biaggi	Brooks
Ashbrook	Bingham	Brotzman
Ashley	Blackburn	Brown, Calif.
Aspin	Blatnik	Broyhill, N.C.
	Bolling	Broyhill, Va.
Burgener	Hechler, W. Va.	Powell, Ohio
Burke, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Preyer
Burke, Fla.	Heinz	Price, Ill.
Burke, Mass.	Helstoski	Price, Tex.
Burleson, Tex.	Henderson	Pritchard
Burlison, Mo.	Hicks	Quie
Burton	Hillis	Quillen
Butler	Hinshaw	Railsback
Byron	Hogan	Randall
Camp	Holifield	Rangel
Carey, N.Y.	Holt	Rarick
Carney, Ohio	Holtzman	Rees
Carter	Horton	Regula
Casey, Tex.	Howard	Reuss
Cederberg	Huber	Rhodes
Chamberlain	Hudnut	Riegle
Chappell	Hungate	Rinaldo
Chisholm	Hunt	Roberts
Clancy	Hutchinson	Robinson, Va.
Clark	Ichord	Rodino
Clausen, Don H.	Johnson, Calif.	Roe
Clay	Johnson, Colo.	Rogers
Cochran	Johnson, Pa.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
Collins, Ill.	Jones, N.C.	Rose
Collins, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Rosenthal
Conlan	Jordan	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Karth	Roush
Corman	Kastenmeier	Rousselot
Crane	Kazen	Roy
Culver	Keating	Roybal
Daniel, Dan	Ketchum	Runnels
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Kluczynski	Ruth
Daniels, Dominick V.	Koch	St Germain
Danielson	Kuykendall	Sarasin
Davis, Ga.	Kyros	Sarbanes
Davis, S.C.	Landrum	Satterfield
de la Garza	Latta	Saylor
Delaney	Leggett	Schroeder
Dellenback	Lehman	Sebelius
Dellums	Litton	Seiberling
Denholm	Long, La.	Shipley
Dennis	Long, Md.	Shoup
Dent	Lott	Shriver
Derwinski	McClory	Shuster
Devine	McCloskey	Sikes
Dickinson	McCollister	Sisk
Diggs	McCormack	Skubitz
Donohue	McEwen	Slack
Dorn	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Downing	McKay	Snyder
Dulski	McKinney	Spence
Duncan	McSpadden	Staggers
du Pont	Macdonald	Stanton, J. William
Eckhardt	Madden	Stanton, James V.
Edwards, Ala.	Madigan	Stark
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Steed
Eilberg	Mailliard	Steiger, Ariz.
Erlenborn	Mann	Stephens
Esch	Maraziti	Stokes
Eshleman	Martin, Nebr.	Stratton
Evans, Colo.	Martin, N.C.	Stubblefield
Fascell	Mathias, Calif.	Stuckey
Findley	Mathis, Ga.	Studds
Fish	Matsunaga	Sullivan
Flood	Mazzoli	Symington
Flowers	Meeds	Talcott
Flynt	Metcalfe	Taylor, Mo.
Foley	Mezvinsky	Taylor, N.C.
Ford, William D.	Milford	Teague, Tex.
Fountain	Miller	Thompson, N.J.
Fraser	Minish	Thomson, Wis.
Frelinghuysen	Mink	Thone
Frenzel	Mitchell, Md.	Thornton
Frey	Mitchell, N.Y.	Tiernan
Fulton	Mizell	Towell, Nev.
Fuqua	Moakley	Treen
Gaydos	Mollohan	Udall
Gettys	Montgomery	Ullman
Gibbons	Moorhead, Calif.	Van Deerlin
Gilman	Moorhead, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Ginn	Morgan	Vanik
Goldwater	Mosher	Veysey
Gonzalez	Moss	Vigorito
Goodling	Murphy, Ill.	Waggonner
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.	Waldie
Green, Pa.	Myers	Walsh
Grover	Natcher	Wampler
Gude	Nedzi	Ware
Gunter	Nelsen	White
Guyer	Nichols	Whitehurst
Haley	Nix	Whitten
Hamilton	Obey	Widnall
Hammer-schmidt	O'Hara	Williams
Hanley	O'Neill	Wilson, Bob
Hansen, Idaho	Owens	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Hansen, Wash.	Parris	Winn
Harsha	Passman	Wright
Hastings	Patten	Wyatt
Hawkins	Pepper	Wylie
Hays	Perkins	Yatron
	Pickle	Young, Fla.
	Pike	Young, Ga.
	Poage	Young, Ill.
	Podell	Young, S.C.
		Young, Tex.
		Zablocki
		Zion

NAYS—54

Adams	Drinan	Minshall, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Gerald R.	Pettis
Anderson, Ill.	Forsythe	Robison, N.Y.
Archer	Froehlich	Roncallo, N.Y.
Arends	Giaimo	Sandman
Baker	Grasso	Scherle
Bell	Gross	Schneebeli
Biester	Gubser	Steele
Broomfield	Hanrahan	Steelman
Brown, Ohio	Harrington	Steiger, Wis.
Buchanan	Harvey	Symms
Clawson, Del	Hosmer	Teague, Calif.
Cohen	Jones, Okla.	Whalen
Conable	Kemp	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Conte	Lent	Wolff
Coughlin	McDade	Wydler
Cronin	Mallary	Yates
Davis, Wis.	Mayne	
	Michel	

NOT VOTING—30

Boggs	Hanna	Peyser
Boland	Hébert	Reid
Brown, Mich.	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Cleveland	King	Ruppe
Cotter	Landgrebe	Ryan
Dingell	Lujan	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	Melcher	Wiggins
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Wyman
Gray	O'Brien	Young, Alaska
Griffiths	Patman	Zwach

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Wyman.
Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Cleveland.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. King.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Lujan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, is the demand for a division of the question to concur with an amendment in order?

The SPEAKER. Under the present conditions such a demand is not in order.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate's decision to continue the provision of food stamps for workers on strike. I urge the House to do likewise for two reasons. I would have misgivings about a collective bargaining system whose balance could be lost because one side to a dispute faced hunger in defending its legitimate interests. And these misgivings would intensify if the health of innocent children were to depend on the forsaking of one side's negotiating position.

The integrity of the collective bargaining process is strengthened, not diminished, by allowing working people and their families to receive food stamps if they qualify in other respects. Many union families would not so qualify, but the stamps insure that members at the lower tip of the income spectrum can participate in strike activity. As for the responsibility of Government, it lies in making certain that collective bargaining is truly an adversary process between two capable parties. It is my opinion that

cutting off food stamps would greatly interfere with that process.

This conviction prompts my second objection. We all agree, I am sure, that children in this country, and for that matter, all around the world, must have access to required nourishment, regardless of the acts of their parents. We have also established that in the United States there are indeed thousands of children without wholesome diets who are suffering physical and mental harm from which they will never recover. It is troubling enough that Congress has so far failed to pass the programs to save these youngsters; certainly we should refrain from anything which might add to their numbers. Here, however, we are discussing a proposal to deny food stamps to the offspring of parents who possess fewer resources than the typical union family and who join their more fortunate coworkers in perfectly legal actions.

If decent food and the option to strike are both basic rights, than we have no business forcing poor workers to choose one or the other.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this strategy is designed to preclude the House from working its will on the one out of three areas of disagreement, the Dickinson amendment. I supported the Dickinson amendment when it was considered in the House and would like to do so tonight but what we are faced with is a motion to concur with an amendment. Since I support the farm bill I have no choice because of the parliamentary situation. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the ruse being used today of a nonconferring report effectively precludes the Members of the House from having a full debate on the issues as well as diminishing the ability of Members to vote on the Dickinson amendment.

I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, at the decision of the conferees to bring back a report in disagreement. The rules of the House on the manner of handling this makes it almost impossible to have a substantive debate on the matters in agreement as well as those in disagreement.

I support the farm bill and I also support the Dickinson amendment but the motion with which I am faced leaves me no choice but to vote aye.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the conference committee compromise provision with respect to the question of food stamps for recipients of the new supplemental security income program. This was a genuine attempt to prevent the aged, blind, and disabled from losing benefits to which they are now entitled or would be entitled to in the future under the old welfare system. Unfortunately, the compromise provision would result in an administrative nightmare that worsens even the complexity of the current welfare programs.

This compromise provides that recipients of the new SSI benefits or of additional State payments are eligible for food stamps unless their new cash payments at least equals the total of the State welfare payment in effect in December 1973 and the food stamp bonus payable at that level on that date. This sounds good in theory, but the problem is that these benefit comparisons would have to be made on a case-by-case basis.

Let me show you exactly what is entailed in administering this provision. Now, when an aged person applies for Federal-State old age assistance, the State figures out the grant amount and, generally, computes a food stamp entitlement and eligibility for medicaid. Under this new operation, the person applies for SSI first. The Federal agency computes this payment. Then, if the Federal Government also administers the State supplement, the agency must compute that payment and medicaid entitlement based on different sets of rules—which will vary from State-to-State—than apply to SSI. Then, somebody will have to compute what the welfare payment for this person would have been under the still different set of rules which applied to the State welfare program in December 1973. Then, the food stamp agency must compute what the food stamp bonus would have been under the old State payment. Then, the total of the old welfare payment and the old food stamp bonus are compared with yet another amount: the total of SSI and State supplement amounts.

If the new total is less than what would have been paid under the old welfare program and food stamps—mind you, the person need never have actually received this hypothetical amount, since this nonsense applies to new recipients as well as old, the person is eligible to participate in the food stamp program. The food stamp bonus is then recomputed based on the total of SSI and State supplements using new food stamp schedules and rules.

In my judgment, this is an impossible, crazy provision. Would any of my colleagues want to be responsible for running this thing? For making all those computations correctly and assuring the Congress that you will have made no errors when the GAO comes around to audit?

I want to remind my colleagues that we have already legislated the requirement that States assure that no current welfare recipient is worse off in terms of cash after the implementation of SSI. Regardless, we should not accept this provision.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased with the provisions of S. 1183, the omnibus farm and food stamp bill which has been passed by the House today. I believe that the general farm provisions have been extensively reported and well understood. I should like to limit my comments this evening to one aspect of the food stamp program which is highly technical and perhaps needs some clarification.

I refer to those provisions in the bill that relate to food stamp eligibility for so-called supplemental security income recipients. By the amendment to section 3(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, the committee intends that the Department will not alter the regulations relative to those who are automatically eligible—as of July 1973—for food stamps, that is, if they are adult-recipients of public assistance or eligible under Public Law 92-603, as amended.

In addition, we intend that the words in the conference committee amendment "for any purpose" shall be construed to mean: If any individual receives income benefits or payments as described in the amendment and said payments are equal to or greater than the sum of the food stamp cash-out, plus the December 1973, entitlement described therein, then, in that event, said individual if and when so disqualified to receive food stamps, shall not have his income and resources conconsidered as a member of the household in determining the eligibility of the other individuals, if any, in said household, for purposes of their eligibility, or for the bonus value entitlement under the food stamp program.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the issuance of food stamps to strikers is an emotional matter more than a factual matter. It is absolutely correct that a person who goes out on strike ought not to automatically be given free food stamps. The Congress has never intended that this would be the case, and I do not think that even labor union members feel that this is so.

The only person who ought to receive food stamps is a person you would be classified as a poverty level recipient.

In effect, food stamps is a welfare type of assistance and we make them available when a person becomes almost destitute and needs help. I think that for that reason when handled properly food stamps can be a good thing—whether they are a regular worker, or a union employee, or a private citizen.

Our present law says that a person can receive food stamps when he has liquid assets not in excess of $1,500 and also that he must not refuse to work at any comparable job except at the specific plant which has been struck. If that law is enforced, I do not think there would be this hue and cry that we hear every year in the Congress. I am afraid the average person thinks that any union employee on strike can automatically get food stamps. That is not the case or certainly it should not be the case.

I am afraid, however, that the law is not being enforced as rigidly as we think it should. If the Secretary of Agriculture would see that these regulations were carried out, I think that you would see a lot of the opposition, or at least the bitter opposition, on the food stamp matter erased.

The conferees this past week recognizes that there must be a stronger enforcement on the food stamp matter. Let me read the language from the committee report on page 40 as follows:

"They deplore the lack of enforcement of existing food stamp regulations which require that an able-bodied person in the household register for employment "including a person who is not working because of a strike or lockout at his usual place of employment." It is the specific intent of the Conferees that this provision of the regulations be rigidly and uniformly enforced by the Department of Agriculture and those agencies administering the program at the local level under the auspices of the Department. Eligibility for strikers for food stamps should be carefully scrutinized prior to certification and certification made only in those cases where the household of the individual striker applicant meets all of the requirements of eligibility as in the case of other applicants.

Mr. Speaker, that language is a clear

indication to the Department of Agriculture to see that the food stamp regulations are properly enforced. If they are not enforced, assuming the passage of this legislation, then this House and this Congress will pass strong legislation against the food stamp program. I do not think a person ought to be denied food stamps because he is a member of a union, just as he should not be automatically entitled to it. He must be eligible for the stamps.

I am going the "second mile" this year on food stamp matters and, like many Members of this House, will hold in abeyance our judgment as to how this law will be enforced. It had better be enforced strongly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 151, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—252

Abdnor	Dulski	Long, La.
Abzug	Eckhardt	Long, Md.
Addabbo	Edwards, Calif.	Lott
Alexander	Eilberg	McCloskey
Anderson, Ill.	Evans, Colo.	McCollister
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fascell	McCormack
Annunzio	Flood	McFall
Ashley	Flowers	McKay
Aspin	Foley	McSpadden
Badillo	Ford, William D.	Macdonald
Barrett	Fountain	Madden
Beard	Fraser	Mahon
Bergland	Froehlich	Mailliard
Bevill	Fulton	Martin, Nebr.
Biaggi	Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.
Bingham	Gaydos	Mathis, Ga.
Blatnik	Gettys	Matsunaga
Boggs	Ginn	Mayne
Bolling	Gonzalez	Mazzoli
Bowen	Green, Pa.	Meeds
Brademas	Gross	Mezvinsky
Brasco	Gude	Miller
Breaux	Guyer	Minish
Brinkley	Hamilton	Mink
Brooks	Hammer-schmidt	Mitchell, Md.
Brotzman		Mitchell, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hanley	Mizell
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Moakley
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Mollohan
Burke, Calif.	Harsha	Montgomery
Burke, Mass.	Hawkins	Moorhead, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Hays	Morgan
Burlison, Mo.	Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher
Burton	Helstoski	Moss
Carey, N.Y.	Henderson	Murphy, Ill.
Carney, Ohio	Hicks	Murphy, N.Y.
Carter	Hillis	Myers
Casey, Tex.	Holifield	Natcher
Chappell	Holtzman	Nedzi
Chisholm	Howard	Nelsen
Clark	Hungate	Nichols
Clay	Ichord	Nix
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Obey
Conyers	Johnson, Colo.	O'Hara
Corman	Jones, Ala.	O'Neill
Culver	Jones, N.C.	Owens
Daniels, Dominick V.	Jones, Tenn.	Passman
	Jordan	Patten
Danielson	Karth	Pepper
Davis, Ga.	Kastenmeier	Perkins
Davis, S.C.	Kazen	Pickle
de la Garza	Keating	Pike
Delaney	Kluczynski	Poage
Dellums	Koch	Podell
Denholm	Kuykendall	Preyer
Dent	Kyros	Price, Ill.
Diggs	Landrum	Price, Tex.
Dingell	Latta	Quie
Donohue	Leggett	Railsback
Dorn	Lehman	Randall
Drinan	Litton	Rangel
		Rarick
Rees	Sikes	Tiernan
Regula	Sisk	Udall
Reuss	Skubitz	Ullman
Riegle	Slack	Van Deerlin
Roberts	Staggers	Vanik
Rodino	Stanton, J. William	Veysey
Roe		Vigorito
Roncalio, Wyo.	Stanton, James V.	Waggonner
Rooney, Pa.		Waldie
Rose	Stark	Walsh
Rosenthal	Steed	Wampler
Rostenkowski	Steiger, Wis.	White
Roush	Stephens	Whitten
Roy	Stokes	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Roybal	Stratton	
Runnels	Stubblefield	
Ruth	Stuckey	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
St Germain	Sullivan	
Sarbanes	Symington	Wright
Scherle	Taylor, Mo.	Wyatt
Schroeder	Teague, Tex.	Yates
Sebelius	Thompson, N.J.	Yatron
Selberling	Thomson, Wis.	Young, Ga.
Shipley	Thone	Young, Tex.
Shriver	Thornton	Zablocki

NOES—151

Adams	Erlenborn	Milford
Anderson, Calif.	Esch	Minshall, Ohio
	Eshleman	Moorhead, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.	Findley	
Archer	Fish	Parris
Arends	Flynt	Pettis
Armstrong	Ford, Gerald R.	Powell, Ohio
Ashbrook	Forsythe	Pritchard
Bafalis	Frelinghuysen	Quillen
Baker	Frenzel	Rhodes
Bell	Frey	Rinaldo
Bennett	Giaimo	Robinson, Va.
Biester	Gibbons	Robison, N.Y.
Blackburn	Gilman	Rogers
Bray	Goldwater	Roncallo, N.Y.
Breckinridge	Goodling	Rousselot
Broomfield	Grasso	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Oreg.	Sarasin
Buchanan	Grover	Satterfield
Burgener	Gubser	Saylor
Burke, Fla.	Gunter	Schneebeli
Butler	Haley	Shoup
Byron	Hanrahan	Shuster
Camp	Harrington	Smith, N.Y.
Cederberg	Harvey	Snyder
Chamberlain	Hastings	Spence
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Steele
Clausen, Don H.	Heinz	Steelman
	Hinshaw	Steiger, Ariz.
Clawson, Del	Hogan	Studds
Cohen	Holt	Symms
Collier	Horton	Talcott
Collins, Tex.	Hosmer	Taylor, N.C.
Conable	Huber	Teague, Calif.
Conlan	Hudnut	Towell, Nev.
Conte	Hunt	Treen
Coughlin	Hutchinson	Vander Jagt
Crane	Johnson, Pa.	Ware
Cronin	Jones, Okla.	Whalen
Daniel, Dan	Kemp	Whitehurst
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Ketchum	Widnall
	Lent	Williams
Davis, Wis.	McClory	Wilson, Bob
Dellenback	McDade	Winn
Dennis	McEwen	Wolff
Derwinski	McKinney	Wydler
Devine	Madigan	Wylie
Dickinson	Mallary	Young, Fla.
Downing	Mann	Young, Ill.
Duncan	Maraziti	Young, S.C.
du Pont	Martin, N.C.	Zion
Edwards, Ala.	Michel	

NOT VOTING—30

Boland	Hébert	Peyser
Brown, Mich.	Jarman	Reid
Cleveland	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Collins, Ill.	Landgrebe	Ruppe
Cotter	Lujan	Ryan
Evins, Tenn.	Melcher	Smith, Iowa
Fisher	Metcalfe	Wiggins
Gray	Mills, Ark.	Wyman
Griffiths	O'Brien	Young, Alaska
Hanna	Patman	Zwach

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Brown of Michigan against.

Mr. Lujan for, with Mr. Boland against.

Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Cotter against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Peyser against.

Mr. Melcher for, with Mr. Cleveland against.

Mr. Reid for, with Mr. Landgrebe against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Ryan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Patman.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43, TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 1888

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) to make certain technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1888.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1888) to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices, the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make the following corrections in the text of the bill as finally approved by the two Houses.

On page 7, line 2, strike the quotation marks.

On page 20, line 3, strike "(a)".

On page 28, at the end of line 17, insert a comma.

On page 28, line 18, strike out "(C)" and insert "(D)".

On page 29, line 10, after the quotation marks, insert a comma.

On page 29, line 11, strike out "(D)" and insert "(E)".

On page 29, line 16, strike out "(E)" and insert "(F)".

On page 29, line 19, strike out the period and insert ", and".

On page 29, line 20, strike out "(F)" and insert "(G)".

On page 40, line 20, before the first word, insert quotation marks and "SEC. 703."

On page 40, line 21, strike out the double quotation marks and insert single quotation marks.

On page 40, line 23, strike out the period and the double quotation marks and insert single quotation marks and a period.

On page 45, line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

Strike out the matter which begins with line 18 on page 52 and ends with line 19 on page 53, and insert such matter on page 54 after the last line on that page.

On page 67, line 13, after "amended", insert "(1)".

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask, What is the unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has made a unanimous-consent request for immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution, to correct technical errors in the bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to move to take up the Senate concurrent resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is not a privileged concurrent resolution. It can only be called up by unanimous consent or some other procedure that is authorized by the rules of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8510, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8510) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 26, 1973.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we are considering today authorizes appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1974. The managers on the part of the House worked out a compromise with our Senate counterparts which reconciles the differences in the authorized levels for specific programs and categories, and other matters which were in disagreement between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 8510.

In passing H.R. 8510, the Senate struck all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted new language. I shall now review how the differences between the two versions were reconciled in conference.

This year the National Science Foundation requested a total authorization of $579,600,000, plus $3 million in excess foreign currencies. The level authorized by the House was $609,900,000, plus $3 million in excess foreign currencies, and the corresponding totals in the Senate version were $643.1 million and $3 million in excess foreign currencies.

Of the 13 budget categories in the NSF authorization bill, the House and Senate were in disagreement over authorization figures for 7 of these categories. The Senate accepted the House figure for five of the categories in disagreement, and the remaining two were compromised approximately halfway between the figures approved by the two bodies. The total authorization agreed to by the conferees is $632.6 million plus $3 million in excess foreign currencies. This total is $22.7 million more than authorized by the House, and $10.5 million less than authorized by the Senate for fiscal year 1974. At this point I should like to insert into the RECORD a table showing the details of the budget actions. I shall also explain these actions more thoroughly in a few moments.

There were a number of other important actions taken by the conferees. The proportional obligational requirement included in the House bill was stricken, and the traditional transfer clause found in the fiscal year 1973 authorization action was substituted. This action, taken reluctantly by the House conferees, was agreed to in order to assure that any proportional obligational requirement finally enacted would be in complete accord with general anti-impoundment legislation which might be approved by the Congress.

Other major actions by the conferees included the setting of obligation minima for three programs in two of the budget categories, together with obligation minima for three of the budget categories themselves. Other provisions in the final bill free $4.5 million of fiscal year 1973 funds allocated for ship construction/conversion and for other purposes; require the NSF to keep its authorizing committees fully and currently informed of all its activities; and prohibit NSF funds to be used for research on a living human fetus outside the mother's womb. I shall describe all of these actions in more detail later on.

At this point I should like to discuss the actions taken by the conferees that affect authorized funding levels for the 13 budget categories.

The NSF budget category Scientific Research Project Support contains almost half the total NSF funds. This year NSF requested $275 million for the purpose of supporting basic research activities under the supervision of outstanding scientists throughout the country. The House increased this level by $10 million, while the Senate retained the lower level requested by NSF. The conferees agreed on the higher House level in order to help assure a more adequate base of research results for the many vital, high technology programs of this Nation.

NSF requested $99.6 million for national and special research programs. These are major research activities beyond the capabilities of single institutions, and are often worldwide in scope. The House increased the requested budget level by $3 million so that the oceanographic ship, *Eltanin*, could be put back in service. This should permit it to continue its vital antarctic research program for another year. The Senate increased the House figure by an additional $6 million for oceanography-related programs. The conferees compromised halfway between, for an authorized total of $105.6 million.

For national research centers, the $46 million total that was requested by NSF was approved by the House and the Senate, and confirmed by the committee of conference.

The computing activities budget of NSF was authorized at $8,200,000 by the House and $10 million by the Senate. The conference committee accepted the lower House figure, feeling this would still permit NSF to carry out its activities in this area at substantially the same level as during fiscal year 1973.

Both the House and Senate versions of this bill had approved $8,300,000 for science information activities. This was an amount identical to that requested by NSF, and the conferees confirmed this total.

There was also no change made in the Foundation request for international cooperative scientific activities; $6,200,000 was made available for this purpose.

The program research applied to national needs provides support for a significant amount of applied and problem-oriented research at NSF. The House previously increased the Foundation request of $70.5 million to $71.3 million, in order to provide more funds for programs in energy research and technology. The Senate, mainly because of large increases in energy research and earthquake engineering, approved an authorization of $111.7 million. The compromise of $91 million is $19.7 million above the House figure and $20,700,000 below the Senate figure. This does, however, provide about $40 million for energy research activities, together with smaller increases for earthquake engineering and technology assessment.

The NSF request of $1 million for intergovernmental science programs was unchanged by action of the House, the Senate, and conferees.

NSF requested no fiscal year 1974 funds for institutional improvement for science although it announced plans to spend $9 million of prior year funds for this purpose. Both the House and Senate bills include $2 million in fiscal year 1974 funds in order to maintain the total obligational authority for institutional grants at the same level as in fiscal year 1973.

For graduate student support the conferees recommended $11.5 million, the sum approved by the House. This is $500,000 above the Senate authorization and compares to a NSF request of $6.7 million.

Over the years science education improvement has been one of the most important activities of the National Science Foundation. This year NSF requested only $26.2 million for this purpose, although it testified that it intended to obligate $33.8 in prior year funds for these programs. The House increased the NSF request by $9 million, while the Senate approved only $2.2 million more than requested. The conferees accepted the House figure for this category, and specified that the $9 million increase above the Foundation request be allocated between the following five activities:

Ethnic minority college program.

Technician/technologist science education projects.

Science faculty fellowships and research participation.

Undergraduate student projects.

Undergraduate scientific instructional equipment program.

I should like to remind my colleagues that last year Congress passed an amendment to the Foundation's basic act, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 which emphasized the responsibilities of the Foundation for supporting programs in science education at all levels in our Nation's educational institutions. This increase aims at carrying out that mandate.

The planning and policy studies budget category was authorized at a level of $2,600,000 by the House, an increase of $600,000 over the NSF request. The corresponding Senate figure was $4,600,000. The Senate concurred in the lower House figure, and the conferees agreed that this increase should at least for the time being, permit adequate additional planning capability for the Director of the National Science Foundation as he carries out his new responsibilities for coordination of Federal scientific activities as specified by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1973.

The program development and management budget category provides the NSF with staff salaries and other needs for its day-to-day operating activities. NSF requested $29 million for this purpose, but the House, the Senate, and the conferees approved $30 million because of anticipated additional costs related to the Director's assumption of many functions of the Office of Science and Technology and the President's Science Adviser.

Section 2 of the bill as reported by the Committee of Conference contains spending minima for three budget categories, as well as minima for three activities contained within two additional to permit it to be used for broad oceanship construction conversion.

The Senate bill had a floor of $3 million under the Oceanographic Ship Construction/Conversion program in the National and Special Research programs budget category. The conferees agreed to increase this minimum to $6 million and at the same time broaden the language to permit it to be used for broad oceanography-related programs, including ship construction/conversion.

The Senate bill also contained a $25 million minimum for energy research and technology and an $8 million minimum for earthquake engineering, both in the budget category research applied to national needs. The conferees accepted these specific minima, although, as I shall explain later, a language change broadened the restriction so that the funds which were authorized and appropriated in prior years but not obligated by June 30, 1973 were also included as allowable under the minimum obligation feature.

Additional minima that were specified by the conferees were: $10 million for institutional improvement for science, $13 million for graduate student support, and $67.5 for science education improvement. These figures also include prior year funds. Referring the minima for these budget categories to new obligational authority alone we find that they total $1 million for institutional improvement for science, $10.5 million for graduate student support, and $33.7 million for science education improvement.

I mentioned earlier that the minimum obligation levels contained in section 2 of the bill as recommended by the conferees refer to prior year funds as well as fiscal year 1974 funds. This is possible because in the past the NSF appropriation has been no-year money. This means that funds not obligated by the end of the fiscal year are kept on their books and can be obligated at any time in the future. The appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974, which has passed both the House and Senate ends this practice and makes the NSF money "1-year." The House and Senate versions of the appropriation bill which I just referred to, also specified that funds which are unobligated in June 30, 1973, shall be merged with and added to fiscal year 1974 funds. Thus, the action of the conferees in merging a prior year funds with the new obligation authority for the purpose of specifying obligation minima makes this section similar to the authorization bill as passed by the two bodies.

I should like to emphasize that this action of merging new funds with old in no way increases the total available to the NSF for these activities, but merely describes these funds in a different way so that they are more easily compared to the funds in the appropriation bill.

I should like to state emphatically that the activities and budget categories included in section 2 represent programs judged to be extremely important by the Committee of Conference for the scientific well-being of the country. Although these minimum obligation levels are sometimes lower than the amount authorized by the individual budget categories, that fact in no way reduces the significance of the higher authorized level. That higher level should be considered as an appropriate goal for NSF if sufficient appropriations are made available.

Section 3 as recommended by the conferees provides not more than $5,000 for extraordinary expenses authorized by the NSF Director. Section 4 authorizes $3 million in excess foreign currency for NSF expenses outside the United States. Section 5 provides that authorized funds shall remain available for obligation or expenditure by NSF for such period or periods as specified in the appropriation act. These three sections were contained in both the House and Senate bills as passed, and need no further explanation at this point.

H.R. 8510 as passed by the House included as section 2 a proportional obligation requirement. This was designed to prevent selective withholding of appropriated funds for NSF programs as authorized by Congres. It required this proportional obligation of funds in all of the budget categories which I have just mentioned with the exception of the last. "Program Development and Management."

The managers on the part of the House reluctantly agreed to delete this section in conference. They did so, however, in order to make sure any such requirement would be compatible with any general anti-impoundment legislation which might be passed by Congress later this year. Furthermore, the Conferees agreed to request that the appropriate legislative committees in both the House and Senate give further consideration to developing legislation that would include a proportional obligational requirement for inclusion in next year's authorization bill. As I understand it, this means that we will continue to make efforts to perfect the wording of such a requirement, following closely the progress of general anti-impoundment legislation. If the NSF should deviate significantly from a spending pattern that would have resulted from section 2 of the House bill being included in the authorization act, then we will probably include such language in next year's bill and recommend its passage once more. I believe that this will serve notice on the NSF that we are serious about enforcing congressional priorities in those programs which are funded by congressional action, and shall insist those priorities shall be implemented in the future.

Section 7, the "Student Unrest" provision, is identical to section 7 of the House version and section 8 of the Senate version. An identical section is included in last year's authorization act as well as the acts for a number of previous years.

Section 8 of the bill as recommended by the Committee on Conference is identical to Section 8 of the House version of H.R. 8510, which provides that the $4,500,000 earmarked for Oceanographic Ship Construction Conversion in the fiscal year 1973 authorization act, Public Law 92-372, be made available for other purposes. With NSF taking research ships out of service for lack of operating funds, it is silly to require them to construct more.

Section 9 is the same as Section 10 of the Senate version. No similar provision was included by the House. This section requires that the NSF keep its authorizing committees fully and currently informed on all its activities.

The House conferees accepted this provision in order to facilitate the oversight activities which the legislative committees must perform with respect to NSF. It is expected that in partial fulfillment of this section, the NSF will provide the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate with full and complete reports on all of its activities at the end of each quarter of the year, with the first such report due on September 30, 1973. We shall expect these reports to give detailed accounts of precisely how the Foundation is acting to meet the requirements set forth in the authorization act and in the related conference and committee reports.

Section 10 is identical to section 9 of

the House bill, a floor amendment adopted by the House which provides that no NSF funds may be used to support research on a human fetus outside the mother's womb and with a beating heart. The Senate conferees receded to the House position on this section.

Section 11 lists the short title of this act.

There were two sections in the Senate bill which were deleted by the committee of conference which have not been discussed heretofore. First, section 4 in the Senate version authorized additional supplemental amounts for increases in salary, pay, retirement or other costs as authorized by law. This section was deleted as unnecessary, the conferees agreeing that the specific legislation authorizing such increases is adequate for the purpose of providing additional funds for the program development and management budget category.

The Senate version included as section 9 a provision that would establish a Division of Energy Research and Technology. The conferees agreed to omit this section on the grounds that it was unnecessary and that it put artificial restraints on NSF administrative flexibility. The conferees also agreed, however, that Energy Research and Technology is a proper emphasis for the NSF, and that the Foundation should establish such a division under its existing authority as soon as practicable.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report as adopted by the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate represents a sound program of research and education in the sciences by the National Science Foundation. It is fiscally responsible in every way, being significantly less in its total new obligational authority than last year's authorization act. The NSF has done a good job in the past, and they will continue to do so. I believe this report is worthy of the support of every Member of this distinguished body.

I should also like to take this opportunity to compliment the conferees who represented the House of Representatives. They have done a capable job in representing the interests of this body and have reported a fine bill.

I hope that all of my colleagues will enthusiastically support this conference report on H.R. 8510 authorizing appropriations for the NSF for fiscal year 1974.

H.R. 8510—COMPARISON OF FISCAL YEAR 1974 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BUDGET: HOUSE, SENATE, AND CONFERENCE VERSIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Budget category	Fiscal year 1973 authorization [1] 92–372 (1)	Fiscal year 1974 NSF request (2)	Fiscal year 1974 House authorization (3)	Fiscal year 1974 Senate authorization (4)	Fiscal year 1974 Conference (5)	Fiscal year 1973 carry-over funds to be released (6)	Total fiscal year 1974 NSF obligational authority (7)
1. Scientific research project support	269.01	275.0	285.0	275.0	285.0		285.0
2. National and special research programs	125.04	99.6	102.6	108.6	105.6		105.6
3. National research centers	41.70	46.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	2.0	48.0
4. Computing activities	11.70	9.1	8.2	10.0	8.2	.9	9.1
5. Science information activities	10.50	8.3	8.3	8.3	83.		8.3
6. International cooperative scientific activities	4.70	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2		6.2
7. Research applied to national needs (RANN)	80.00	70.5	71.3	111.7	91.0	8.7	99.7
8. Intergovernmental science programs	1.70	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0
9. Institutional improvement for science	18.50		2.0	2.0	2.0	9.0	11.0
10. Graduate student support	21.20	6.7	11.5	11.0	11.5	[2] 2.5	[3] 14.0
11. Science education improvement	80.80	26.2	35.2	28.7	35.2	33.8	69.6
12. Planning and policy studies	2.75	2.0	2.6	4.6	2.6		2.0
13. Program development and management	29.30	29.0	30.0	30.0	30.0		30.0
Subtotal	696.90	579.6	609.9	643.1	632.6	56.9	689.5
Foreign currency program	7.00	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0
Total	703.90	582.6	612.9	646.1	635.6	58.9	604.5

[1] Includes reprograming actions.
[2] An additional $3,500,000 in fiscal year 1973 funds for postdoctoral fellowships is not planned for release in year 1974 by NSF.
[3] Does not include the $3,500,000 in fiscal year 1973 funds earmarked for postdoctoral fellowships in the legislative report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, Report No. 93–284, pt 122.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Republican conferee on the NSF authorization for fiscal year 1974, I would like to indicate my complete endorsement of the conference authorization. This conference report was agreed to unanimously by all conference committee members and I urge that the House give its support to the report.

The committee of conference agreement provides a fiscal year 1974 NSF authorization of $632.06 million plus $3 million of foreign currency. This amount is an increase of $22.7 million over the original House authorization of $612.9 million; but I emphasize that, in spite of this increase, this year's conference authorization is $68.4 million or approximately 10 percent less than last year's authorization.

The House conferees have carefully reviewed the final conference authorization and while a significant number of changes were made in order to reach an accord, the modifications do result in a further strengthening of the fiscal year 1974 NSF program. In particular, the committee of conference gave additional emphasis to NSF's activities in basic research, applied research, and science education.

Among the major budget increases agreed to by the conferees was a $20 million addition to the NSF program of research applied to national needs—RANN. In recent years, the Foundation has expanded its research efforts in selected applied research areas which are most relevant to the Nation's pressing domestic problems. This work is designed to supplement high priority mission-oriented Federal research which is generally too broad in scope or too fundamental in substance to be pursued by a particular mission agency. The two program areas within this NSF activity which were increased, and for which minimum spending levels were established, are energy research and earthquake engineering.

I personally look forward to NSF becoming more heavily involved in energy related research. This Nation is faced with an enormous increase in energy demand that is being complicated by factors as diverse as exhausted fuel supplies, international balance of payments, environmental preservation, and the cost of living. The implications, as well as dimensions of the energy problem require a sharp and immediate focusing of our resources in this critical area.

The second area within RANN which was increased over the original House authorization is earthquake engineering. This NSF program is unique in that it is the only effort of its kind aimed at discovering practical methods and techniques to alleviate the destructive forces caused by earthquakes.

Three other important program categories which were addressed by the committee of conference pertain to general science education.

I am especially pleased the Senate agreed to the position of the House in providing additional funding for institutional improvement for science, graduate student support, and science education improvement.

The emphasis given by the conference report to those three select education areas is very significant. Many of the individual activities in the science education field have suffered severe cutbacks over the past few years to the point whereby a once well-balanced program is being seriously jeopardized. In this bill, the bulk of the funding, therefore, is directed to the restoration and further strengthening of this effort. Hopefully, this infusion of new money will not only provide a symbolic revitalization of the program, but also indicate the intent of the Congress to have these programs more appropriately funded in future years.

As further emphasis, because of the past reluctance of NSF to obligate the full funding recommended by the Congress in the general science education area, statutory minima were included

for all three programs of institutional improvement for science, graduate student support, and science education improvement. The inclusion of such minima will limit the funding which NSF can either transfer to other categories or simply not obligate. The minima for these three efforts is $10 million for institutional improvement for science; $13 million for graduate student support; and $67.5 million for science education improvement.

Our intention, therefore, is that out of the $94 million authorized for expenditure in the general science education area, NSF will be required by law to spend not less than $90.5 million.

I would also like to stress that the conferees gave careful consideration to the proportional obligation requirement which was contained in the original House bill. The concept of program minimas was adopted in lieu of the proportional obligation requirement, however, because of the desire by the conferees to assure that such a requirement would be compatible with any general anti-impoundment legislation which might later be passed by Congress.

But I call to the attention of OMB and NSF that the conferees did agree that further consideration would be given to the proportional obligation approach prior to drafting next year's legislation should there be significant deviation by NFS from the expanding pattern and the program priorities outlined by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the conference report under consideration here does provide a fiscal program improved and strengthened over that originally submitted by NSF. Budget increases are being recommended but these additions are supported by compelling evidence.

The conference report as adopted by House and Senate conferees outlines an excellent program and one which deserves our complete support. I especially want to compliment the staff of our Science Committee for an outstanding job in laying the basis for our negotiations with the Senate conferees; our staffers were exceptionally effective.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it was only a month ago that this body passed the National Science Foundation Authorization for fiscal year 1974. We did so with an overwhelming vote of 364 to 6 and I wholeheartedly urge that we likewise endorse the conference report that is before us today.

The conferees first recommendation is for an increase of $3 million for national and special research programs. These involve such projects as the international decade of ocean exploration, global atmospheric research, arctic and antarctic research, an international biological research program, and logistical assistance for the field of oceanography. Since most of these involve international cooperation not only will this grant support important large scale research, but it will also foster the free exchange of information between the most scientifically advanced nations. The Assistant Director for national and international programs of the NSG, Dr. Thomas B. Owen, said in the House hearings on this bill that the overall objective here is:

> To maximize the effectiveness of cooperative science efforts that support our Nation's foreign policy and the advancement of U.S. national research objectives. (Page 183.)

In addition, I think it is clear to all of us that the oceans offer an incredible potential for productive development. To further this end, and to avoid the destructive exploitation of marine resources that ignorance so often engenders, I feel that $3 million is a farsighted and reasonable increase to the $102.6 million that we agreed upon before.

The other area where the conference report would authorize additional funds, is under the title "Research Applied to National Needs." The thrust of this $19.7 million boost is to increase scientific efforts in energy research. The 1972 report of the Task Force on Energy of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics states:

> Now is the time to implement a greatly increased national energy research and development effort. Studies alone are not enough. Adequate funds and technical manpower must also be committed. (Page 3.)

This NSF program is specifically intended to provide practical solutions.

The conferees' amendment provides that of the amount authorized for "Research Applied to National Needs" "not less than $25 million shall be available for energy research and technology programs including, but not limited to solar, geothermal, and other unconventional energy sources." Page 2. What does the task force on energy have to say about solar and geothermal energy? On solar energy it states:

> Because of its continous and virtually inexhaustible nature, solar energy R. & D. should receive greatly increased funding. Near term applications of solar power for household use seems likely, and central station terrestrial solar power and satellite solar power are attractive long-term possibilities. (Page 5.)

And regarding geothermal energy, the report concludes:

> Because of the vast reserves of thermal energy located in the earth's underground water and rocks, and its widespread distribution, geothermal energy should have greatly increased R. & D. emphasis. (Page 5.)

In view of the recent energy shortage, it is imperative that this work be undertaken. Similarly, the conferees' recommendation that the NSF establish a division of energy research is an important step toward the long-term alleviation of the energy crisis.

The weather, earthquakes, the environment, and our cities will also receive added NSF attention with these funds—all with the goal of providing usable knowledge beyond that already available.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. TEAGUE of Texas and his fellow conferees for the excellent job they have done. Since its establishment in 1950, the NSF has made an indisputable contribution to science and to this country and I hope my colleagues support it today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8658, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8658) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 30, 1973.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report we present at this time to the House carries a total of $954,731,200 for the District of Columbia. This amount coupled with Federal grants of $234,431,100 will provide a total budget of $1,189,162,300 for fiscal year 1974.

When we consider the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have 748,000 people in the District of Columbia, I am sure the Members will agree that the amount contained in this conference report certainly is adequate for the operation of the District of Columbia government during the fiscal year 1974.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia funds contained in the conference report total $954,731,200. This amount is $9,447,800 below the House bill, and $3,928,300 below the Senate bill. This allowance is $36,492,800 below the amount requested in the budget for the fiscal year 1974. The Federal payment to the general fund is $187,450,000. This is the same as in both the House and Senate bills. The Federal funds in the bill for the District of Columbia, Mr. Speaker, total $417,717,000.

When we add the $234,431,100 in Federal grants along with the other items that are from Federal funding, we have a total of $689,425,100. This amount includes the Federal payment of $187,450,000 I mentioned earlier, plus the payment for water and sewer service to the Federal establishment which totals $4,083,000, revenue sharing in the amount of $37,277,000, Federal loans totaling

$226,184.000, and the Federal grants which total $234,431,100.

Mr. Speaker, for operating expenses the conference report carries a total of $786,920,200. This amount is $552,200 above the House bill and $4,064,400 below the Senate bill. We have a repayment-of-loan figure in this conference report which totals $39,633,000. This is the same as the amount carried in both the bills as they passed the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, under this conference report we have a total of 38,747 positions funded. When we consider the total amount carried in this conference report, and compare it with any of the 50 States or any city in the country, we will find the budget per capita is the largest in the United States of America.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I will insert a tabulation summarizing the action taken.

The tabulation referred to follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1974 (H.R. 8658)

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Agency & Item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended by conference action	Conference action compared with— New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Conference action compared with— Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	Conference action compared with— New budget (obligational) authority recommended in House bill	Conference action compared with— New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
FEDERAL FUNDS									
Federal payment to the District of Columbia:									
General fund	$181,500,000	$190,000,000	$187,450,000	$187,450,000	$187,450,000	+$5,950,000	−$2,550,000		
Water fund	2,550,000	2,555,000	2,555,000	2,555,000	2,555,000	+5,000			
Sanitary sewage works fund	1,524,000	1,528,000	1,528,000	1,528,000	1,528,000	+4,000			
Total, Federal payment to the District of Columbia	185,574,000	194,083,000	191,533,000	191,533,000	191,533,000	+5,959,000	−2,550,000		
Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay (from the U.S. Treasury):									
General fund	90,968,000	190,700,000	187,969,000	177,969,000	177,969,000	+87,001,000	−12,731,000	−$10,000,000	
Highway fund	16,706,000	11,900,000	11,900,000	11,900,000	11,900,000	−4,806,000			
Water fund	2,933,000	7,067,000	7,067,000	7,067,000	7,067,000	+4,134,000			
Sanitary sewage works fund	13,960,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+11,040,000			
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	6,252,000	4,248,000	4,248,000	4,248,000	4,248,000	−2,004,000			
Total, loan appropriation to the District of Columbia	130,819,000	238,915,000	226,184,000	236,184,000	226,184,000	+95,365,000	−12,731,000	−10,000,000	
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	316,393,000	432,998,000	417,717,000	427,717,000	417,717,000	+101,324,000	−15,281,000	−10,000,000	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS									
Operating expenses:									
General operating expenses	(64,829,000)	(69,278,000)	(66,491,000)	(68,564,000)	(67,539,000)	(+2,710,000)	(−1,739,000)	(+1,048,000)	(−$1,025,000)
Public safety	(200,229,000)	(213,450,000)	(210,960,000)	(205,558,700)	(206,357,000)	(+6,128,000)	(−7,093,000)	(−4,603,000)	(+798,300)
Education	(187,900,000)	(200,836,000)	(196,567,000)	(199,399,700)	(198,029,000)	(+10,129,000)	(−2,807,000)	(+1,462,000)	(−1,370,700)
Recreation	(14,079,000)	(14,300,000)	(14,300,000)	(14,300,000)	(14,300,000)	(+221,000)			
Human resources	(216,335,000)	(220,587,000)	(216,401,000)	(220,493,600)	(218,443,000)	(+2,108,000)	(−2,144,000)	(+2,042,000)	(−2,050,600)
Highways and traffic	(22,105,000)	(23,485,000)	(23,274,000)	(23,460,200)	(23,460,200)	(+1,355,200)	(−24,800)	(+186,200)	
Environmental services	(45,302,800)	(45,873,000)	(44,593,000)	(45,426,400)	(45,010,000)	(−292,800)	(−863,000)	(+417,000)	(−416,400)
Annualization of pay increases		(13,782,000)	(13,782,000)	(13,782,000)	(13,782,000)	(+13,782,000)			
Additional municipal services, inaugural ceremonies	(879,000)					(−879,000)			
Settlement of claims and suits	(158,000)					(−158,000)			
Total, operating expenses	(751,816,800)	(801,591,000)	(786,368,000)	(790,984,600)	(786,920,200)	(+35,103,400)	(−14,670,800)	(+552,200)	(−4,064,400)
Repayment of loans and interest	(28,144,000)	(39,633,000)	(39,633,000)	(39,633,000)	(39,633,000)	(+11,489,000)			
Capital outlay	(122,981,000)	(150,000,000)	(138,178,000)	(128,041,900)	(128,178,000)	(+5,197,000)	(−21,822,000)	(−10,000,000)	(+136,100)
Grand total, District of Columbia funds	(902,941,800)	(991,224,000)	(964,179,000)	(958,659,500)	(954,731,200)	(+51,789,400)	(−36,492,800)	(−9,447,800)	(−3,928,300)

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to compliment the gentleman for taking at least a few minutes to explain this conference report. It is quite contrary to the previous conference report that we had a few moments ago on the National Science Foundation. I want to compliment the gentleman for taking just a few minutes to explain it. The District of Columbia, in my opinion, is much, too much overstuffed with Federal funds but, of course, we cannot do very much about it at this late hour and in this conference report.

I thank the gentleman for the explanation that he has made.

Mr. NATCHER. 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.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 47, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—342

Abdnor	Andrews, N.C.	Aspin	Biester	Chappell	Dingell
Abzug	Andrews, N. Dak.	Badillo	Bingham	Chisholm	Donohue
Adams	Annunzio	Barrett	Blatnik	Clark	Dorn
Addabbo	Arends	Bell	Boggs	Clausen, Don H.	Downing
Anderson, Calif.	Armstrong	Bergland	Bolling	Clawson, Del	Drinan
Anderson, Ill.	Ashley	Bevill	Bowen	Clay	Dulski
		Biaggi	Brademas	Cochran	Duncan
			Brasco	Cohen	du Pont
			Bray	Collins, Ill.	Eckhardt
			Breaux	Conable	Edwards, Ala.
			Breckinridge	Conte	Edwards, Calif.
			Brinkley	Conyers	Eilberg
			Brooks	Corman	Erlenborn
			Brotzman	Coughlin	Esch
			Brown, Calif.	Cronin	Eshleman
			Brown, Ohio	Culver	Fascell
			Broyhill, N.C.	Daniels, Dominick V.	Findley
			Broyhill, Va.	Danielson	Fish
			Buchanan	Davis, Ga.	Flood
			Burgener	Davis, S.C.	Flowers
			Burke, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Flynt
			Burke, Fla.	de la Garza	Foley
			Burke, Mass.	Delaney	Ford, Gerald R.
			Burlison, Mo.	Dellenback	Forsythe
			Burton	Dellums	Fountain
			Butler	Denholm	Fraser
			Carey, N.Y.	Dennis	Frelinghuysen
			Carney, Ohio	Dent	Frenzel
			Carter	Derwinski	Frey
			Casey, Tex.	Devine	Fulton
			Cederberg		Fuqua
			Chamberlain		Gaydos

Gettys	Mann	Schroeder
Giaimo	Maraziti	Sebelius
Gibbons	Martin, Nebr.	Selberling
Ginn	Martin, N.C.	Shipley
Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.	Shriver
Gonzalez	Mathis, Ga.	Sikes
Goodling	Matsunaga	Sisk
Grasso	Mazzoli	Skubitz
Green, Oreg.	Meeds	Slack
Green, Pa.	Metcalfe	Smith, N.Y.
Gubser	Mezvinsky	Snyder
Gude	Michel	Staggers
Gunter	Milford	Stanton,
Guyer	Miller	J. William
Haley	Minish	Stanton,
Hamilton	Mink	James V.
Hammer-	Minshall, Ohio	Stark
schmidt	Mitchell, Md.	Steed
Hanley	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steele
Hansen, Idaho	Mizell	Steelman
Hansen, Wash.	Moakley	Steiger, Ariz.
Harrington	Mollohan	Steiger, Wis.
Harsha	Montgomery	Stephens
Harvey	Moorhead, Pa.	Stokes
Hastings	Morgan	Stratton
Hays	Mosher	Stubblefield
Hechler, W. Va.	Moss	Stuckey
Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.	Studds
Heinz	Murphy, N.Y.	Sullivan
Helstoski	Natcher	Symington
Henderson	Nedzi	Talcott
Hicks	Nelsen	Taylor, Mo.
Hillis	Nix	Taylor, N.C.
Hinshaw	Obey	Teague, Calif.
Hogan	O'Hara	Teague, Tex.
Holt	O'Neill	Thompson, N.J.
Holtzman	Owens	Thomson, Wis.
Horton	Parris	Thone
Hosmer	Passman	Thornton
Howard	Patten	Tiernan
Hungate	Pepper	Udall
Hunt	Perkins	Ullman
Ichord	Pettis	Van Deerlin
Johnson, Calif.	Pickle	Vander Jagt
Johnson, Colo.	Pike	Vanik
Johnson, Pa.	Poage	Veysey
Jones, Ala.	Podell	Vigorito
Jones, N.C.	Preyer	Waggonner
Jones, Okla.	Price, Ill.	Waldie
Jordan	Price, Tex.	Walsh
Karth	Pritchard	Wampler
Kastenmeier	Quie	Ware
Kazen	Quillen	Whalen
Keating	Rangel	White
Kemp	Rees	Whitehurst
Kluczynski	Regula	Whitten
Koch	Reuss	Widnall
Kuykendall	Rhodes	Williams
Kyros	Riegle	Wilson, Bob
Landrum	Rinaldo	Wilson,
Latta	Robinson, Va.	Charles H.,
Lent	Robison, N.Y.	Calif.
Litton	Rodino	Wilson,
Long, La.	Roe	Charles, Tex.
Long, Md.	Rogers	Winn
McClory	Roncalio, Wyo.	Wolff
McCloskey	Roncallo, N.Y.	Wright
McCormack	Rooney, Pa.	Wyatt
McEwen	Rose	Wydler
McFall	Rosenthal	Wylie
McKay	Rostenkowski	Yates
McKinney	Roush	Yatron
McSpadden	Roy	Young, Ga.
Macdonald	Roybal	Young, Ill.
Madden	Runnels	Young, Tex.
Madigan	St Germain	Zablocki
Mahon	Sarasin	Zion
Mailliard	Sarbanes	
Mallary	Schneebeli	

NAYS—47

Archer	Froehlich	Rarick
Ashbrook	Gilman	Roberts
Bafalis	Gross	Rousselot
Baker	Hanrahan	Ruth
Beard	Huber	Sandman
Bennett	Hudnut	Satterfield
Broomfield	Hutchinson	Saylor
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Byron	Ketchum	Shuster
Camp	Lott	Spence
Clancy	McCollister	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Mayne	Towell, Nev.
Conlan	Moorhead,	Treen
Crane	Calif.	Young, Fla.
Daniel, Dan	Myers	Young, S.C.
Daniel, Robert	Powell, Ohio	
W., Jr.	Randall	

NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Collier	Evins, Tenn.
Blackburn	Cotter	Fisher
Boland	Dickinson	Ford,
Brown, Mich.	Diggs	William D.
Cleveland	Evans, Colo.	Gray
Griffiths	Lehman	Reid
Grover	Lujan	Rooney, N.Y.
Hanna	McDade	Ruppe
Hawkins	Melcher	Ryan
Hébert	Mills, Ark.	Shoup
Holifield	Nichols	Smith, Iowa
Jarman	O'Brien	Wiggins
King	Patman	Wyman
Landgrebe	Peyser	Young, Alaska
Leggett	Railsback	Zwach

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Shoup.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. King.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Lehman.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Blackburn.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Wyman with Mr. Young of Alaska.

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. 6: On page 4, line 21, insert:

Provided further, That $6,821,700 shall be available for reimbursement to the United States for services provided to the District of Columbia by the offices of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum of $6,821,700 named in said amendment, insert the following: "$7,821,700".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 15, line 16, insert:

SEC. 18. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to, and that I may be permitted to include a tabulation summarizing the action taken.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8760, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8760) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the distinguished gentleman from California propose to take 2 or 3 minutes to tell us what happened in conference on this bill?

Mr. McFALL. Yes, I do.

Mr. Speaker, I have about a 4-minute speech which I believe explains the bill and the changes which were made.

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 31, 1973.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on the transportation appropriations bill is a good one. In a few instances, after considering all pertinent factors, we are recommending that programs go forward at a faster rate than is proposed in the budget. These few relatively minor increases, however, are more than offset by reductions in other parts of the bill.

The $2,898,446,006 of new budget authority included in the bill is $112,286,000 less than the budget request and $227,005,089 less than the fiscal year 1973 appropriations. In addition, appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations have been reduced by $28,757,000. The net effect of these actions on current year ex-

penditures is a reduction of about $60 million below the budget.

The bill is $145,215,000 more than when it left the House. Most of this amount, $118 million, is for two items on which we had deferred action because of lack of legislative authority. Both of these items are budgeted and both amounts agreed to by the conferees are within the budget requests. The other increases over the House bill are relatively small.

In summary, the conference agreement includes a total of $51,450,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. This is $975,000 more than provided by the House and $1,550,000 less than proposed by the other body. We have not approved the 10 staff assistants requested for the Department's secretarial representatives.

For the Coast Guard, the bill would provide $748,228,006. The major change from the House bill under this heading is in connection with the Coast Guard Reserve.

We did not include funds for this program when the bill was before the House because the authorizing legislation had not yet passed. After the vote on the conference report, I will offer a separate motion to concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate $25 million for the Coast Guard Reserve.

Most of the differences between the two bills for the Federal Aviation Administration were fairly evenly divided.

Although we did agree to a $6 million Senate add-on under the Federal Highway Administration, the conference agreement is, in total, $1,480,000 less than when the bill left the House. In the area of highway safety the bill includes $44,757,000, which is $125,000 more than the House bill and $5 million below the Senate.

The other major increase over the House bill is for Amtrak. As you will recall, we did not include funds for Amtrak in our original bill, because the authorization had not yet passed the House. In conference we agreed to provide $102.1 million for Amtrak. This is partially offset by a rescission of $9.1 million of previously appropriated funds.

There were two other important actions taken by the conferees in connection with the appropriations for the Federal Railroad Administration. The first deals with railroad safety. In this area, we have earmarked $1.4 million for additional railroad safety inspectors, and have included $1.5 million for grants-in-aid for railroad safety. The second action deals with the tracked air-cushion vehicle research program. The conference agreement increases the funding for this research by $3 million to a level of $6.5 million. I feel, as do the other conferees, that this $6.5 million should be used primarily for research on the 150-mile-per-hour tracked air-cushion vehicle.

For the urban mass transportation administration, the conference agreement represents about an even split between the two bills.

There were no amendments in disagreement under title II. With respect to the limitations on obligations contained in title III of the bill, the conference agreement is $2,650,000 below the budget. In addition, the language prohibiting new or increased user charges has been retained by the conference action.

In summary, I think it is important to point out that this bill was about $140 million below the budget when it left the House. It was about $42 million below the budget as passed by the other body. And in its present form it is $112 million less than the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be agreed to. I will insert a table in the RECORD giving the conference figures in detail:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1974

[Note: All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— New obligational authority, 1973	Budget estimate, 1974	House bill	Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION									
Office of the Secretary									
Salaries and expenses	$23,970,000	$24,500,000	$24,300,000	$25,200,000	$24,475,000	+$505,000	−$25,000	+$175,000	−$725,000
Transportation planning, research, and development:									
Appropriation	31,500,000	28,675,000	24,500,000	25,500,000	25,000,000	−6,500,000	−3,675,000	+500,000	−500,000
By transfer	(7,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(−6,000,000)			
Transportation research activities overseas (Special foreign currency program)		500,000					−500,000		
Grants-in-aid for natural gas pipeline safety	875,000	875,000	875,000	1,500,000	1,175,000	+300,000	+300,000	+300,000	−325,000
Consolidation of departmental headquarters	800,000	850,000	800,000	800,000	800,000		−50,000		
Total, Office of the Secretary	57,145,000	55,400,000	50,475,000	53,000,000	51,450,000	−5,695,000	−3,950,000	+975,000	−1,550,000
Coast Guard									
Operating expenses	548,900,000	546,370,000	544,400,000	547,900,000	545,400,000	−3,500,000	−970,000	+1,000,000	−2,500,000
Appropriation for debt reduction	−164,905	−171,994	−171,994	−171,994	−171,994	−7,089			
Subtotal, operating expenses	548,735,095	546,198,006	544,228,006	547,728,006	545,228,006	−3,507,089	−970,000	+1,000,000	−2,500,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	131,550,000	74,500,000	74,500,000	77,250,000	75,500,000	−56,050,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000	−1,750,000
Alteration of bridges	12,500,000	7,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	−8,500,000	−3,000,000		
Retired pay	[1] 76,789,000	81,000,000	81,000,000	81,000,000	81,000,000	+4,211,000			
Reserve training	31,735,000	25,000,000	[2] Defer	25,000,000	25,000,000	−6,735,000		[2] +25,000,000	
Research, development, test, and evaluation	17,500,000	17,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	−3,500,000	−3,000,000		
State boating safety assistance	4,500,000	4,500,000	3,500,000	4,500,000	3,500,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000		−1,000,000
Total, Coast Guard	823,309,095	755,198,006	721,228,006	753,478,006	748,228,006	−75,081,089	−6,970,000	+27,000,000	−5,250,000
Federal Aviation Administration									
Operations:									
Appropriation	1,150,538,000	1,211,250,000	1,193,500,000	1,206,800,000	1,200,500,000	+49,962,000	−10,750,000	+7,000,000	−6,300,000
By transfer	[1] (21,523,000)					(−21,523,000)			
Engineering and development	[3] 22,700,000	13,750,000	11,500,000	13,750,000	11,500,000	−11,200,000	−2,250,000		−2,250,000
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	302,650,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	−52,650,000			
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	66,000,000	70,000,000	55,000,000	66,500,000	62,095,000	−3,905,000	−7,905,000	+7,095,000	−4,405,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):									
Planning grants	15,000,000	3,000,000				−15,000,000	−3,000,000		
Development grants (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(100,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+100,000,000)			

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1974—Continued

[Note: All amounts are in the form of "appropriations" unless otherwise indicated]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— New obligational authority, 1973	Budget estimate, 1974	House bill	Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Federal payment to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (intragovernmental transaction)	[1] ($73,397,000)					(−$73,397,000)			
Operation and maintenance, National Capital Airports	12,265,000	$14,800,000	$14,400,000	$14,400,000	$14,400,000	+2,135,000	−$400,000		
Construction, National Capital Airports	2,600,000	3,400,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+400,000	−400,000		
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	1,571,753,000	1,566,200,000	1,527,400,000	1,554,450,000	1,541,495,000	−30,258,000	−24,705,000	+$14,095,000	−$12,955,000
Federal Highway Administration									
Salaries and expenses:									
Appropriation	13,325,000	15,200,000	14,300,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	−525,000	−2,400,000	−1,500,000	
By transfer	[4] (98,498,428)	[4] (106,000,000)	[4] (101,900,000)	[4] (101,900,000)	[4] (101,900,000)	[4] (+3,401,572)	[4] (−4,100,000)		
Highway beautification:									
Appropriation	965,000	1,020,000	1,000,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	+55,000		+20,000	
Appropriation to liquidate contract authorization	(12,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+18,000,000)	(−5,000,000)		
Highway-related safety grants (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization	(12,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(−5,000,000)	(−3,000,000)		
Rail crossings—demonstration projects	2,000,000	18,000,000	10,000,000	18,000,000	14,000,000	+12,000,000	−4,000,000	+4,000,000	−4,000,000
Railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects				15,000,000	6,000,000	+6,000,000	+6,000,000	+6,000,000	−9,000,000
Territorial highways (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(2,000,000)	(2,600,000)	(2,600,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(+500,000)	(−100,000)	(−100,000)	
Darien Gap highway	15,000,000	30,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	−10,000,000	−25,000,000	−10,000,000	
Federal-aid highways (trust fund—appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(4,891,990,000)	(4,320,000,000)	(4,315,900,000)	(4,315,900,000)	(4,315,900,000)	(−576,090,000)	(−4,100,000)		
Right-of-way revolving fund (trust fund—appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(35,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(4,000,000)			(−35,000,000)	(−16,000,000)	(−4,000,000)	
Forest highways (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(23,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(−15,000,000)			
Public lands highways (appropriation to liquidate contract authorization)	(16,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(−13,000,000)			
Total, Federal Highway Administration	31,290,000	64,220,000	40,300,000	51,820,000	38,820,000	+7,530,000	−25,400,000	−1,480,000	−13,000,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration									
Traffic and highway safety	77,185,000	[5] 56,882,000	44,632,000	49,757,000	44,757,000	−32,428,000	−12,125,000	+125,000	−5,000,000
By transfer			(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(+9,000,000)	(+9,000,000)		
State and community highway safety (appropriation to liquidate contract authorizations)	(70,000,000)	(100,557,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+30,000,000)	(−557,000)		
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	77,185,000	56,882,000	44,632,000	49,757,000	44,757,000	−32,428,000	−12,125,000	+125,000	−5,000,000
Federal Railroad Administration									
Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses	2,835,000	3,200,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	+65,000	−300,000		
By transfer	[1] (56,000)					(−56,000)			
Railroad research	10,350,000	13,000,000	10,500,000	10,350,000	10,350,000		−2,650,000	−150,000	
Railroad safety	7,000,000	8,000,000	7,000,000	9,400,000	8,900,000	+1,900,000	+900,000	+1,900,000	−500,000
Grants-in-aid for railroad safety				1,500,000	1,500,000	+1,500,000	+1,500,000	+1,500,000	
High-speed ground transportation research and development	52,500,000	27,100,000	17,100,000	23,600,000	20,100,000	−32,400,000	−7,000,000	+3,000,000	−3,500,000
Grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation	9,100,000	93,000,000	[3] Defer	115,500,000	102,100,000	+93,000,000	+9,100,000	+102,100,000	−13,400,000
Rescission of unobligated balance				(−9,100,000)	−9,100,000	−9,100,000	−9,100,000	−9,100,000	−9,100,000
Emergency rail facilities restoration	[1] 34,748,000					−34,748,000			
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	116,533,000	144,300,000	37,500,000	163,250,000	136,750,000	+20,217,000	−7,550,000	+99,250,000	−26,500,000
Urban Mass Transportation Administration									
Urban Mass Transportation Fund:									
Administrative expenses	6,542,000	7,000,000	5,200,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	−1,542,000	−2,000,000	−200,000	
Research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training	96,250,000	63,000,000	29,600,000	40,800,000	35,050,000	−61,200,000	−27,950,000	+5,450,000	−5,750,000
Appropriation to liquidate contract authorization	(232,000,000)	(380,000,000)	(380,000,000)	(380,000,000)	(380,000,000)	(+148,000,000)			
Total, Urban Mass Transportation Administration	102,792,000	70,000,000	34,800,000	45,800,000	40,050,000	−62,742,000	−29,950,000	+5,250,000	−5,750,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development									
Limitation on administrative expenses	(797,000)	(840,000)	(820,000)	(820,000)	(820,000)	(+23,000)	(−20,000)		
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	2,780,007,095	2,712,200,006	2,456,335,006	2,671,555,006	2,601,550,006	−178,457,089	−110,650,000	+145,215,000	−70,005,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the House bill	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with— New obligational authority, 1973	Budget estimate, 1974	House bill	Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES									
National Transportation Safety Board									
Salaries and expenses	$7,785,000	$8,000,000	$7,975,000	$7,975,000	$7,975,000	+$190,000	−$25,000		
Civil Aeronautics Board									
Salaries and expenses	[1] 14,373,000	14,767,000	14,767,000	14,767,000	14,767,000	+394,000			
Payments to air carriers	80,800,000	66,431,000	66,431,000	66,431,000	66,431,000	−14,369,000			
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	95,173,000	81,198,000	81,198,000	81,198,000	81,198,000	−13,975,000			
Interstate Commerce Commission									
Salaries and expenses	[1] 33,720,000	35,000,000	34,750,000	34,750,000	34,750,000	+1,030,000	−250,000		
Payment of loan guarantees	[6] 12,000,000					−12,000,000			
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	45,720,000	35,000,000	34,750,000	34,750,000	34,750,000	−10,970,000	−250,000		
The Panama Canal									
Canal Zone Government:									
Operating expenses	[1] 55,950,000	59,361,000	59,000,000	59,000,000	59,000,000	+3,050,000	−361,000		
Capital outlay	4,500,000	4,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000		
Panama Canal Company:									
Limitation on general and administrative expenses	(20,556,000)	(21,037,000)	(21,037,000)	(21,037,000)	(21,037,000)	(+481,000)			
Total, the Panama Canal	60,450,000	63,861,000	62,500,000	62,500,000	62,500,000	+2,050,000	−1,361,000		
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority									
Federal contribution	[7] 131,181,000	[8] 97,745,000	[8] 97,745,000	[8] 97,745,000	[8] 97,745,000	−33,436,000			
Interest subsidy	[1] 4,885,000	12,728,000	12,728,000	12,728,000	12,728,000	+7,843,000			
Total, WMATA	136,066,000	110,473,000	110,473,000	110,473,000	110,473,000	−25,593,000			
Commission on Highway Beautification									
Salaries and expenses	[1] 250,000					−250,000			
Total, title II, related agencies	345,444,000	298,532,000	296,896,000	296,896,000	296,896,000	−48,548,000	−1,636,000		
TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS									
Department of Transportation									
Federal Aviation Administration:									
Grants-in-aid for airport development (limitation on obligations)	(280,000,000)	(280,000,000)	(280,000,000)	(310,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	+$20,000,000)	(−$10,000,000)
Federal Highway Administration:									
Highway beautification (limitation on obligations)	(40,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(45,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(−5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(−5,000,000)
Territorial highways (limitation on obligations)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)				
Forest highways (limitations on obligations)	(20,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(18,000,000)	(18,000,000)	(18,000,000)	(−2,000,000)	(+2,000,000)		
Public lands highways (limitation on obligations)	(12,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(−2,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(−2,000,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:									
State and community highway safety (limitation on obligations)	[9] (95,000,000)	[9] (90,200,000)	[9] (80,000,000)	[9] (85,000,000)	[9] (80,000,000)	[9] (−15,000,000)	[9] (−10,200,000)	[9]	[9] (−5,000,000)
Urban Mass Transportation Administration:									
Urban mass transportation fund (limitations on commitments)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(980,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(985,550,000)	(−14,450,000)	(−14,450,000)	(+5,550,000)	(−14,450,000)
Total, limitations on obligations	(1,451,000,000)	(1,450,200,000)	(1,412,000,000)	(1,484,000,000)	(1,447,550,000)	(−3,450,000)	(−2,650,000)	(+35,550,000)	(−36,450,000)
Total, title I, II, and III, new budget (obligational) authority	3,125,451,095	3,010,732,006	2,753,231,006	2,968,451,006	2,898,446,006	−227,005,089	−112,286,000	+145,215,000	−70,005,000
Consisting of—									
Appropriations:									
Fiscal year 1973	(2,994,270,095)					(−2,994,270,095)			
Fiscal year 1974	(131,181,000)	(2,920,372,006)	(2,662,871,006)	(2,878,091,006)	(2,808,086,006)	(+2,676,905,006)	(−112,286,000)	(+145,215,000)	(−70,005,000)
Fiscal year 1975		(90,360,000)	(90,360,000)	(90,360,000)	(90,360,000)	(+90,360,000)			
Memorandum:									
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations	(5,393,990,000)	(5,075,157,000)	(5,050,500,000)	(5,046,400,000)	(5,046,400,000)	(−347,590,000)	(−28,757,000)	(−4,100,000)	
Appropriations for debt reduction	(164,905)	(171,994)	(171,994)	(171,994)	(171,994)	(+7,089)			
Rescission of unobligated balance				(−9,100,000)					(+9,100,000)
Grand total	(8,519,606,000)	(8,086,061,000)	(7,803,903,000)	(8,005,923,000)	(7,945,018,000)	(−574,588,000)	(−141,043,000)	(+141,115,000)	(−60,905,000)

[1] Includes funds provided in 2d supplemental appropriation bill, Public Law 93–50.
[2] Amount not considered by House due to lack of legislative authorization.
[3] Includes $3,500,000 for passenger screening systems.
[4] Excludes administrative costs of highway-related safety grants program.
[5] Excludes $35,063,000 which is not authorized.
[6] Plus interest to the date of payment.
[7] Advance appropriation for fiscal year 1974.
[8] Includes $90,360,000 advance appropriation for fiscal year 1975.
[9] Also includes obligations for Federal Highway Administration, highway-related safety grants.

I should like now to yield to the distinguished ranking Republican on the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 8760, the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974.

I believe that this is a bill that every Member of the House can be proud of. Its $2.9 billion price tag is $227 million below the new obligational authority provided in 1973.

The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCFALL) deserves our commendation for the expertise he has displayed and the leadership he has provided as the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. All the conferees on this important bill are to be applauded for their efforts in fashioning this year's transportation bill. The teamwork and dedication displayed by the members of the Transportation Subcommittee and by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) resulted in eliminating $70 million of the increases the Senate added to the House-passed version of the bill.

I believe that this bill is a fiscally responsible bill. While it is $145.2 million above the new obligational authority provided in the House bill, the increase should be placed in context. Fully $118 million of this increase is attributable to two items which the House did not act upon because of the lack of authorizing legislation—$25 million for the Coast Guard Reserve and $93 million for Amtrak. Both of these items are at the budget level. Further, the conference bill provides $112.3 million less than was requested in the budget.

I am extremely pleased that the bill now contains an appropriation for the Coast Guard Reserve. Because of the lack of authorizing legislation, the House was unable to provide an appropriation for the Reserve, despite the broad-based support for the program. The $25 million provided in the conference bill is a barebones amount, but I firmly believe that this is absolutely necessary in order for the Reserve to fulfill its essential functions.

This spring the Coast Guard Reserve did an admirable job of assisting the victims of the Mississippi River flood. This was the first time the Reserve was called up under its peacetime mission, and I am sure it will not be the last. These Reservists also provide assistance in such activities as marine environmental protection, boating safety, domestic icebreaking, port safety and security, and search and rescue operations.

I would like to emphasize the search and rescue responsibilities of the Coast Guard Reserve, because it is very important to a number of my colleagues.

As you may remember, the House adopted an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT). This amendment added $600,000 to the operating expenses of the Coast Guard for the operation of search and rescue stations that were slated for closing. The Coast Guard now intends to use the $600,000 to keep 10 of the 13 stations operating on at least a limited basis. I think that it is important to note that the operation of many of these stations will depend heavily on the Coast Guard Reserve. I believe that this is a very productive use of our valuable Reserve manpower, and it is an indication of the return our Nation will receive on its investment in the Reserve in 1974 and in the years to come.

The action taken by the conferees also insures that there will be an increased effort to study the natural gas pipeline distribution system. In light of some of the recent disasters, the need for this study is unquestioned, and the committee expects the Department to make a report to the Congress on this very important matter by the end of October.

Other important provisions in the final version of the bill include $1.4 million for an additional 95 railroad inspectors, and $4.75 million for university research in the Office of the Secretary and in the urban mass transportation administration. The research funds will be used to bring a broad base of talent to bear on the major transportation problems of today and tomorrow. The Department is making a real effort to see that these programs meet our transportation needs and that they complement the development of a national transportation policy.

I am confident that this bill will allow the Federal Government to continue leading the effort to develop a viable national transportation system. I urge my colleagues to approve this conference report.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman states that one of the increases in the bill, a sizable increase, was $93 million for Amtrak. That was withheld from the bill when it passed the House, when this bill was approved by the House, by reason of no authorization. Has that authorization been enacted into law and signed by the President?

Mr. MCFALL. We had anticipated in the conference that the bill would be acted on in the House, since it was on the calendar for this week. However, no action was taken on that bill. The language in the bill requires an authorization by the Congress for the program before some of the money will be available. The authorization has passed the Senate, I might tell the gentleman from Iowa, but it has not passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but it still is unauthorized?

Mr. MCFALL. That is correct, but some of the money would not be available for expenditure until fully authorized by law.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1973, I received a letter from Adm. Chester R. Bender, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, informing me that the Coast Guard Station at Sodus Point, N.Y., which is in my congressional district, was to be closed. This was one among 13 search and rescue stations throughout the country slated to be closed. Because of my familiarity with the operation of this station and the valuable service provided to the boaters in Sodus Bay and Lake Ontario, I immediately contacted the Department of Transportation and requested that this decision be given a second look in light of information which I supplied on the necessity of this operation in the Sodus Bay area. Since that time, my staff and I have endeavored to work directly with the Coast Guard on this problem, however, the response I have received has been less than adequate. It has been very difficult for me or my staff to get information from the Coast Guard on the Sodus Point Station.

On June 20, I, along with other Members of the House sought to reverse the decision to close the 13 stations by supporting an amendment offered by Congressman GUY VANDER JAGT, which increased the amount of the Coast Guard appropriation by $600,000. This money was to be applied to the preparation of a report by the Coast Guard with respect to the closing of certain search and rescue units during 1973, and to the reopening and operation of any search and rescue units determined by such report to be desirable for the maintenance of an effective search and rescue capability.

The Coast Guard proceeded with the study, and on July 25, a Coast Guard report was delivered to my office which outlined a plan for reopening 10 of the 13 search and rescue stations on a limited basis. Of major concern to me was the plan for the Sodus Point Station. According to the report—

> SAR services in the vicinity of Sodus Point will be provided by the Coast Guard Auxiliary. The area has an active Auxiliary flotilla, but due to the nature of the Auxiliary operations and the limitations of their craft and personnel, only weekend and holiday service will be provided. Due to the local availability of the Auxiliary, emergency service may be provided during the week. This service will continue throughout the normal boating season. Two stationkeepers will be required to assist in the administration and security. Although many Reservists live in the Sodus area they are already augmenting nearby regular Coast Guard Stations.

In addition, the Sodus Point Station is to be allocated $36,700—$20,000 is for salaries of the two stationkeepers, $1,200 to cover moving costs of this personnel, $1,000 for communications costs, $9,000 for the operation and maintenance of the plant and property, $2,000 for start-up and support costs and $3,500 for patrol costs. No Coast Guard vessels are authorized for use at Sodus Point, whereas two had been stationed there.

While this plan will provide some of the protection needed by weekend and holiday boaters, it will not provide the 24-hour year-round service which was available prior to the closing and which is vital for the safety of boaters and others in this area. Prior to the closing

of this station, there were a number of severe boating accidents resulting from the presence of an abnormal amount of debris floating on and sitting under the surface of the bay and lake due to damage by tropical storm Agnes and the abnormally high lake levels. Within 28 days of the closing of this station, five persons have lost their lives in boating accidents. The first incident occurred on June 2, the day after the station was finally closed. On this day, a small overloaded outboard motor boat capsized within 900 feet of the Coast Guard Station site and within the navigational channel out of the bay which the station overlooks. Two of the boat's occupants were able to swim to safety and two drowned after floundering in the water for several minutes. Then, on June 28, a Thursday—a day which according to the Coast Guard report would not be covered by the Auxiliary—three men and two women spent 10 hours clinging to a capsized boat in Lake Ontario just a half mile from shore. The ordeal finally became too much for the two women and one of the men and they were swept away and drowned. It is incidents such as these which point out the glaring need for this station, and I am sure that there have been other such tragedies at the other stations which were closed.

When the Department of Transportation's appropriations bill was sent to the Senate, I talked with my colleagues, Senators JACOB JAVITS and JAMES BUCKLEY about the Vander Jagt amendment and what Senate action would be necessary to make clear the intent of the amendment and to achieve the reopening, on a full-time basis, of the Sodus Point Station. The Senate Appropriations Committee, in reviewing the bill, felt it would be necessary to add an additional $922,000 for the reopening, on a full-time basis, of all of the 13 stations which were closed. The intent of the committee, to fully reactivate the 13 stations, was made clear in a statement by Senator JAVITS. The Senate then passed the bill and asked for a conference with the House. The House conferees, feeling that the Coast Guard should have sufficient funds to reopen the stations, did not go along with the Senate action. However, it is evident that the Coast Guard does not intend to reopen any of these stations on a full-time basis, but rather on a limited schedule of holidays and weekends. As can be noted by the two incidents which I related, this is simply not adequate.

I think that all of us will agree that no price can be put on a human life. I realize it is not possible at this late stage of the legislation to take the necessary action to revise this bill; however, in view of the statement of the conferees, I trust this situation will be watched carefully and closely so at the appropriate time the money can be reinstated.

Mr. McFALL. I would assure the gentleman that is correct. We are aware of this matter in the Great Lakes area. The House expressed its will by adding $600,000 for this in June. I think the gentleman has referred to the program that the Coast Guard has for operating these rescue stations. It is a program which will utilize the Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary.

We did not put in the additional $922,000 included by the Senate because we believe there will be a shortfall in military personnel in Coast Guard in the coming fiscal year and they will have sufficient money to provide the activities necessary for these SAR stations.

We are aware of the problem and the Coast Guard has submitted a plan. We think it will work. Both the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and I, as well as the other members of the committee want the Coast Guard Reserve activities to be increased. We think the Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary will be able to do this job.

We will monitor it and if there are complaints by Members of Congress that the job is not being done, we will ask the Coast Guard to provide the necessary facilities and men in order to do the job necessary to provide safety in the Great Lakes area.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman from New York who has spoken to me on this matter many times that even though we agreed to delete the additional $922,000 from this conference report, in the conference report the gentleman will find this language:

The conferees reiterate the positions expressed in both the House and Senate committee reports with respect to the importance of the Coast Guard's search and rescue operations. The conferees are desirous that adequate search and rescue capabilities are provided in those areas in which the Coast Guard has indicated that it will reopen SAR stations.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I compliment the conferees on the part of the House for accepting $25 million for the Coast Guard Reserve. They do play a very important part.

Mr. McFALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and all of the other conferees for their cooperation on this bill.

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

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York. I am very much dissatisfied with the weekend service at Plum Island Station as it has been given. I was one of those who wanted to increase the funds. I was told by the Coast Guard originally when the money saving was talked about that we were going to save $113,000 by closing that station. Now they tell me it will cost $115,900 to open it for the weekend. The totals do not jibe. There has to be more investigation and of course my office is doing it but I think in the view of both the House and the Senate they are not complying with what is wanted at these stations.

Mr. McFALL. I assure the gentleman we will cooperate with him to see that the Coast Guard is available and ready to do the job necessary in this area.

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

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

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I say to the Members of this body that I am very appreciative of the efforts of the chairman, Mr. McFALL.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said. If anybody in the Coast Guard reads the record of what has occurred here today, they are going to realize that they will lose some good friends in the House of Representatives if they do not have some straight answers and good information. I am grateful that we are going to have weekend service through the auxiliary, but I have always, as we all have on coastal waters, dealt with them and relied on what they told us. However, some of us were terribly misled. We are going to remember it, and take a hard look at it in the future.

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

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

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, the $3.2 million figure with respect to the continuation of the appropriation for continued train service between New York, Kansas City, Chicago, and Florida raises a question in my mind. The ICC and Amtrak have proposed that the Floridian Limited will be discontinued.

Is there any assurance in this conference report that the train service on these lines will be continued?

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, we have provided $3.2 million for this purpose. I cannot assure the gentleman that this will force Amtrak to provide service.

We have asked them to do it and provided the funds for them to do it. We hope that they do.

Mr. HUDNUT. It is the gentleman's intention that they do it?

Mr. McFALL. Yes.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for 30 seconds?

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

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of the Members have received many letters from those in the aviation community regarding the increase of user taxes in the upcoming year. I would like to point out that the House conferees insisted on the language that will prevent such an increase of user taxes. It is amendment No. 44, page 10 of the conference report.

The Members might want to bring

that to the attention of their staffs in answering their mail.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. As a member of the conference committee, I examined the legislation carefully and I believe that the appropriations bill will help us to meet our transportation needs.

But I would like to direct my remarks to specific provisions of the report dealing with urban mass transportation for the handicapped. When this transportation bill originally came before the House in June, I offered an amendment which would have added $3 million to the bill for the purpose of funding research and development in transportation for the aged, the handicapped, the lame, all those who need help in their desperate plight for transportation. These disadvantaged people were looking to the Congress for leadership in research to provide breakthroughs in new forms of transportation. Unfortunately, my amendment was defeated by a narrow margin.

The need is critical, as is shown by letters I have received from my constituents, such as the letter from Lois Henneman which reads, in part, as follows:

We are desperate, fighting handicapped citizens trying to live and work in dignity. We want to pay our share, but $8.00 a day is too much for anyone. Mr. Robert Reneker, President of Swift and Company, for which I work, pays $1.00 a day on public transportation to and from his home. I have to pay $8.00. As a former Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd said "mobility is the fifth freedom, we would like to enjoy this fifth freedom along with everyone in the country."

I urged members of the conference committee to reexamine the provisions in the appropriations bill dealing with mass transportation for the handicapped.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that the conference committee decided to increase the funds available for this purpose in the special projects appropriation by $1 million.

I would hope that the administrators of the urban mass transportation program would have imagination and foresight in using the $1 million to help meet the urgent transportation needs of the handicapped. I believe that it would be the desire of all my colleagues to see this money spent on research to help the many disadvantaged and crippled people in this country live in independence and dignity.

I urge support of the conference report.

Mr. McFALL. 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.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—ayes 359, noes 5, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—359

Abdnor	Donohue	McEwen
Abzug	Dorn	McFall
Adams	Downing	McKay
Addabbo	Drinan	McKinney
Anderson, Calif.	Dulski	McSpadden
	Duncan	Macdonald
Anderson, Ill.	du Pont	Madden
Andrews, N.C.	Eckhardt	Madigan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Edwards, Ala.	Mahon
	Eilberg	Mailliard
Annunzio	Erlenborn	Mallary
Archer	Esch	Mann
Arends	Eshleman	Maraziti
Armstrong	Fascell	Martin, Nebr.
Aspin	Findley	Martin, N.C.
Badillo	Flood	Mathias, Calif.
Bafalis	Flowers	Mathis, Ga.
Baker	Flynt	Matsunaga
Barrett	Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne
Beard	Ford, William D.	Mazzoli
Bell		Meeds
Bennett	Forsythe	Mezvinsky
Bergland	Fountain	Michel
Bevill	Fraser	Milford
Biaggi	Frelinghuysen	Miller
Biester	Frenzel	Minish
Blatnik	Frey	Mink
Boggs	Froehlich	Minshall, Ohio
Bolling	Fuqua	Mitchell, Md.
Bowen	Gaydos	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brademas	Gettys	Mizell
Brasco	Giaimo	Moakley
Bray	Gilman	Mollohan
Breaux	Ginn	Montgomery
Breckinridge	Goldwater	Moorhead, Calif.
Brinkley	Gonzalez	
Brooks	Goodling	Moorhead, Pa.
Broomfield	Grasso	Morgan
Brotzman	Green, Oreg.	Mosher
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Moss
Brown, Ohio	Gude	Murphy, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Gunter	Murphy, N.Y.
Buchanan	Guyer	Myers
Burgener	Haley	Natcher
Burke, Calif.	Hamilton	Nedzi
Burke, Fla.	Hammer-schmidt	Nelsen
Burke, Mass.		Nix
Burleson, Tex.	Hanley	Obey
Burlison, Mo.	Hanrahan	O'Hara
Burton	Hansen, Idaho	O'Neill
Butler	Hansen, Wash.	Owens
Byron	Harrington	Parris
Camp	Harsha	Passman
Carney, Ohio	Harvey	Patten
Carter	Hastings	Pepper
Casey, Tex.	Hays	Perkins
Chamberlain	Hechler, W. Va.	Pettis
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Pickle
Chisholm	Helstoski	Pike
Clancy	Henderson	Poage
Clark	Hicks	Podell
Clausen, Don H.	Hillis	Preyer
	Hinshaw	Price, Ill.
Clawson, Del	Hogan	Price, Tex.
Clay	Holt	Pritchard
Cochran	Holtzman	Quie
Cohen	Horton	Quillen
Collier	Hosmer	Randall
Collins, Ill.	Huber	Rangel
Collins, Tex.	Hudnut	Rarick
Conable	Hungate	Rees
Conlan	Hunt	Regula
Conte	Hutchinson	Reuss
Conyers	Ichord	Rhodes
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Coughlin	Johnson, Colo.	Rinaldo
Cronin	Johnson, Pa.	Robison, N.Y.
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Daniel, Dan	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Jones, Okla.	Rogers
	Jones, Tenn.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Daniels, Dominick V.	Jordan	Roncallo, N.Y.
	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Danielson	Kazen	Rose
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Rosenthal
Davis, S.C.	Kemp	Roush
Davis, Wis.	Ketchum	Rousselot
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Roy
Delaney	Kyros	Roybal
Dellenback	Landrum	Runnels
Dellums	Lent	Ruth
Denholm	Litton	Sandman
Dennis	Long, La.	Sarasin
Dent	Long, Md.	Sarbanes
Derwinski	Lott	Satterfield
Devine	McClory	Saylor
Dickinson	McCloskey	Scherle
Diggs	McCollister	Schneebeli
Dingell	McCormack	Schroeder
Sebelius	Studds	White
Seiberling	Symington	Whitehurst
Shriver	Talcott	Whitten
Shuster	Taylor, Mo.	Widnall
Sikes	Taylor, N.C.	Williams
Slack	Teague, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Smith, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Snyder	Thomson, Wis.	
Spence	Thone	Winn
Staggers	Thornton	Wolff
Stanton, J. William	Towell, Nev.	Wright
	Treen	Wyatt
Stanton, James V.	Udall	Wydler
	Ullman	Wylie
Stark	Van Deerlin	Yates
Steed	Vander Jagt	Yatron
Steele	Vanik	Young, Fla.
Steelman	Veysey	Young, Ga.
Steiger, Ariz.	Vigorito	Young, Ill.
Steiger, Wis.	Waggonner	Young, S.C.
Stephens	Waldie	Young, Tex.
Stokes	Walsh	Zablocki
Stratton	Wampler	Zion
Stubblefield	Ware	
Stuckey	Whalen	

NOES—5

Ashbrook	Gross	Symms
Crane	Powell, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—69

Alexander	Hawkins	Reid
Ashley	Hébert	Roberts
Bingham	Heinz	Robinson, Va.
Blackburn	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Boland	Howard	Rostenkowski
Brown, Mich.	Jarman	Ruppe
Broyhill, Va.	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Carey, N.Y.	King	St Germain
Cederberg	Kluczynski	Shipley
Cleveland	Koch	Shoup
Cotter	Landgrebe	Sisk
Edwards, Calif.	Latta	Skubitz
Evans, Colo.	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	Lehman	Sullivan
Fish	Lujan	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	McDade	Tiernan
Foley	Melcher	Wiggins
Fulton	Metcalfe	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Gibbons	Mills, Ark.	
Gray	Nichols	
Green, Pa.	O'Brien	Wyman
Griffiths	Patman	Young, Alaska
Grover	Peyser	Zwach
Hanna	Railsback	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Cotter with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Gibbons.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Koch.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Lehman.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Nichols.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rostenkowski.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Melcher with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Robinson of Virginia.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Shoup.

Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cederberg.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. St Germain.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Young of Alaska.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. King.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Heinz.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Bingham.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Grover.

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. 7: Page 4, line 25, strike out "1975" and insert "1977".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "1976".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 5, line 9, insert:

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; $25,000,000: *Provided,* That amounts equal to the obligated balances against the appropriations for "Reserve training" for the two preceding years shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation by the Ninety-third Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 7, line 25, strike "1975" and insert in lieu thereof "1976:"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 9, line 15, strike "1975" and insert in lieu thereof "1976."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 11, after line 12 insert the following:

RAILROAD-HIGHWAY CROSSING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses of railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects, to remain available until expended: $15,000,000, of which $5,943,000 is for projects at Elko, Nevada, and $6,000,000 is for projects at Wheeling, West Virginia, and $3,057,000 for project at Lincoln, Nebraska; and $10,000,000 of these amounts shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law by authorizing legislation of the Ninety-third Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

RAILROAD-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses of railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects, to remain available until expended: $6,000,000, of which $1,700,000 is for projects at Elko, Nevada, and $600,000 is for projects at Wheeling, West Virginia, and $700,000 is for projects at Lincoln, Nebraska; and $4,000,000 of these amounts shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation by the Ninety-third Congress.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 15, line 12, strike "$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,400,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "$8,900,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 15, line 13, after the comma insert the following: "of which $1,400,000 shall be available only for additional safety inspectors."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 15, after line 14, insert the following:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR RAILROAD SAFETY

For grants-in-aid to carry out a railroad safety program, $1,500,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of authorizing legislation by the Ninety-third Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 16, after line 2, insert the following:

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations heretofore granted under the head "Grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation" are reduced by the sum of $9,100,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 16, after line 6, insert the following:

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, $115,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $61,500,000 shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation by the Ninety-third Congress: *Provided,* That not to exceed $7,100,000 is to be expended only in connection with the construction of station and related facilities to serve the Metroliner at New Carrollton, Maryland.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, $102,100,000, to remain available until expended, of which $48,100,000 shall be available only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation by the Ninety-third Congress: *Provided,* That not to exceed $500,000 is to be expended only in connection with the construction of station and related facilities to serve the Metroliner at New Carrollton, Maryland.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like the record to show I am unalterably opposed to this amendment, but under the circumstances I will not seek a vote on it this evening.

Mr. McFALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 27, strike out "which are in excess of the levels in effect on January 1, 1973" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "which did not exist as of January 1, 1973, until such program is reviewed and approved by the appropriate committee of the Congress.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. M'FALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McFALL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "which are in excess of the levels in effect on January 1, 1973, or which did not exist as of January 1, 1973, until such program is reviewed and approved by the appropriate committees of the Congress".

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report (H.R. 8760) just agreed to and to include therewith pertinent material and tables.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was recorded as being absent on the vote on the conference report on the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1973 (H.R. 7935). I was delayed on official business in my office. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was presiding this afternoon over a panel on the curbing of crime before the Junior Bar Section of the American Bar Association and while I was absent so presiding I missed the vote on rollcall No. 427 and rollcall No. 428. If I had been present I would have voted "aye" on both of those rollcalls.

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 asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the day or the week, if any, and the schedule for the House on resumption following the recess.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield I will be happy to respond.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, there will be no further legislative business for today, and we have already adopted the adjournment resolution.

As far as the program for the week of September 3, 1973, on Monday and Tuesday we will be continuing the August recess and we will come back into session on Wednesday.

On Wednesday we will have H.R. 7645, State Department authorization, conference report;

House Journal Resolution 512, the HUD loan insurance, conference report:

H.R. 8920, Lead Base Paint Poisoning Prevention amendments, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 8449, national flood insurance expansion, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Then on Thursday we will have H.R. 6912, par value modification, conference report;

H.R. 1672, Small Business Act amendment, conference report;

H.R. 8351, Amtrak authorization, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Then on Friday we will have S. 1697, emergency eucalyptus assistance, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 8547, Export Administration Act amendment, open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Other conference reports may be brought up, and any further change in the program will be announced during that week.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I want to wish to the minority leader, the Speaker, and all the Members of the House, a restful and enjoyable vacation. I hope when we come back after Labor Day that we will be well rested and ready to go to work for 4 weeks until October 15, when we do hope for adjournment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, that I am grateful for his best wishes.

I extend to him the same wishes; to the Speaker, and to all the Members on both sides of the aisle.

FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF POW'S/MIA'S

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the National League of Families of POW's/MIA's held their fourth annual meeting in Washington. Of course, most of those in attendance were the loved ones of those 1,200 servicemen still listed as missing in action.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat again what I have said on the House floor previously. We cannot allow our happiness over the return of the known prisoners of war to blunt in anyway our desire to obtain a complete and factual accounting of those men still missing. It is our duty and obligation to make certain that all points of the peace agreement dealing with missing in action are carried out. I urge my colleagues to join with me to help the loved ones of the missing in action in their time of need.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a report on the National League's recent meeting by the executive director and a copy of 31 resolutions passed by them.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT ALBRIGHT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JULY 30, 1973.

More than 500 wives and parents of Americans who are still listed as prisoners-of-war or missing-in-action in Southeast Asia have just concluded their fourth annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

The vast majority of these wives and parents, and many others who were unable to come to Washington, are deeply disturbed by the inability of our Government to obtain the "accounting" of our missing men that was promised in the Paris agreement, signed six months ago.

Obviously, the blame for this failure must be laid at the feet of the North Vietnamese. Under the terms of the agreement, North Vietnam accepted full responsibility for the accounting of all missing Americans "throughout Southeast Asia."

But while we recognize that North Vietnam is to blame for not living up to these terms of the agreement, our members also have been constantly and painfully aware that not one of our own Government leaders—neither the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense nor any other important official—has made a single effort to call public attention to this problem.

As a result, many Americans today probably think the prisoner-missing issue has been fully resolved. Yet, we still have men listed as prisoners-of-war who were not released by the other side and have not been accounted for: we still have over 1200 "missing men" about whom no new information of any kind has been made public since the cease-fire was signed last January.

To date, we have not even been allowed to exhume and repatriate the remains of a single American serviceman who is acknowledged by the other side to have "died in captivity."

Last Thursday, leaders of our organization met with Dr. Henry Kissinger. At that time, we made plain to him our growing dissatisfaction with the fact that our elected and appointed leaders have not made strong public demands that the North Vietnamese account for our missing, return our dead and explain the discrepancies that exist with respect to men who we know were captured but who were neither released nor accounted for. And we also told Dr. Kissinger that it is important that the American people be made

aware that the prisoner/missing issue is still very much an issue.

Dr. Kissinger indicated that this would be done. Yesterday, the White House furnished us with the text of a diplomatic note on this subject, which was later delivered to the North Vietnamese, in Paris.

We understand that today the White House and State Department are simultaneously releasing (or have already released) the text of this document to the press.

We are gratified to see this swift action.

We are gratified that the North Vietnamese have now been put on notice about their derelictions.

But we cannot let this opportunity pass without reminding the world that North Vietnam's leaders already know better than anyone else what they have not done. We want the world to know. We want the world to be made aware of the fact that they have not yet had even the common decency to return the bodies of the 23 Americans they admit died in Hanoi's prisons, or the bodies of 22 others they admit died in captivity in the south.

Our citizens must be reminded that even though we did get back some of our men who were held as prisoners-of-war, there are still more than 1200 families all across the country who continue to live in the agony of not knowing the fate of their husbands and sons.

We want our fellow citizens to start asking their elected officials about these men.

Where are those men who were captured, who we know were captured, and who were not returned to us, who were not listed among those having died in captivity, and about whom the other side has furnished absolutely no accounting of any kind? Where are they?

Where are the more than 300 men listed as missing in Laos, about whom we have no information of any kind? Why has no information been provided on those men captured in Laos and of whom we have capture-photographs—the strongest possible evidence that they were, indeed, taken prisoner? Where are they?

Why cannot immediate arrangements be worked out to return the bodies of the 55 men who have been officially listed by the other side as having died in captivity? Why?

These are a few of the questions, we want our fellow countrymen to start asking—loud and clear. And we want to hear them repeated at the White House, in the State Department, at the Defense Department, on the floors of the House and Senate, in our embassies abroad, in the chambers of our state capitols and by our representative at the United Nations. And we want, and demand, that these questions be asked again and again and again, in every responsible forum, until they have been satisfactorily answered.

RESOLUTIONS—ANNUAL CONVENTION, JULY 1973

1. The League urges the President to press for additional information from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) the Pathet Lao, the Khymer Rouge and the Viet Cong, concerning all Americans who are still missing; that the case of each man carried in missing status be judged on an individual basis, and that where discrepancies exist, the Government of the United States will pursue every feasible avenue of investigation, and that where the information is conclusive as to the circumstances surrounding the incident, statuses be reviewed and charged in accordance with the preponderance of information.

2. Resolved that prior to a status change, a review may be initiated by the wife, children, parents, brothers, sisters, and thereafter, there must be an opportunity for the family members to participate in the review and final decision based on the evidence and information considered.

3. The League shall use every means at its disposal to prevent the changing of status on any missing-in-action personnel until Article 8 (B) of the Paris Agreement is fully implemented.

The League endorses as an acceptable procedure for changing a status, the following:

At the request of a family member (wife, parent, child) a review will be held before any status is changed.

The appropriate service secretary shall not change a status to MIA of those presently carried as POW, and

When U.S. inspection teams have received all required assistance from the DRV, PRG, Pathet Lao, etc., for the purpose of discharging their responsibilities and thus enabling them to make recommendations to the appropriate service secretary concerning status changes, the following procedures shall prevail:

(a) change to POW if MIA is found to be alive.

(b) change to KIA if remains are found that can be positively identified.

(c) change to PFOD if remains are not recoverable but new information warrants a change.

4. The League is opposed to any and all presumptive findings of death in Southeast Asia until after our search teams have been permitted to enter all areas of South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, complete their searches in all said areas, and make their reports.

5. The League strongly recommends that all United States Government officials (military and civilian) immediately cease using such phrases as:

"All POWs returned", "We have no evidence of any POWS still alive in Southeast Asia", and "our involvement in Southeast Asia is over with",

and speak instead in terms of the discrepancies in the accounting of our POW/MIAs.

6. The League shall initiate and continue a massive letter writing campaign to acquaint and solicit support of the media on the MIA issue. This shall include: (a) discrepancies, (b) military efforts to account for MIAs, (c) lack of cooperation by the DRV, PPRG, Pathet Lao, and Khymer Rouge, which prevents full accounting.

7. The League strongly recommends that the Defense Department, all four services, and the State Department adopt uniform procedures for all aspects of accounting including notification or processing of information to next-of-kin.

8. The League strongly recommends that DOD keep each individual family (both primary and secondary next-of-kin) fully informed of new and continuing procedures being used to account for each man, such as: visits to site of incident and whether or not information is uncovered.

9. The League strongly requests that families receive regular status reports through service newsletters on activities of the Joint Casualty Resolution Center.

10. The League shall inquire as to what department, team or organization in Southeast Asia is actively seeking further information on the possibility of locating missing Americans who are still alive, and whether General Kingston has a counterpart charged with such responsibilities.

11. The League shall pursue a vigorous policy of opposing any U.S. aid for reconstruction of NVN until the North Vietnamese have assisted the U.S. Government in obtaining the return of all living POWs and the fullest possible accounting of all Americans who are missing in action in Southeast Asia.

12. The League shall establish a liaison office in Southeast Asia to be manned by our own concerned members in order to achieve on-the-spot results and action for our missing men.

13. The League's Board of Directors shall contact DOD regarding the practice some casualty sections have indulged in of recording statements made by family members that are not pertinent to the man himself; the inclusion of certain observations made by the family members in the record by the Casualty officers tend to read differently than was intended.

14. The League shall undertake a mass media campaign to include a documentary of those individuals missing-in-action or captive in Southeast Asia; this project should begin no later than 1 August. The documentary should be requested of a major network sympathetic to our cause.

15. The League's Board of Directors is hereby directed to respectfully request that all representatives and senators take a public position on the MIA issue. We suggest that the Congress use their mailing, local newspaper column, and all other means at every opportunity to speak out positively on the MIA subject and that the vote on HR–271 Bill be a roll-call vote.

16. We unanimously recommend that the League send letters and fact sheets to all members of Congress by return receipt requested, and also undertake a bulk mailing (cards) campaign to our elected officials.

17. The League requests that President Nixon appoint an individual at the White House Executive Staff level whose primary responsibility will be to carry out the President's pledge for the complete accounting of our missing men.

18. The League proposes that a village-to-village campaign project be started on a national level. This should be implemented through letter writing from a humanitarian standpoint on behalf of each man missing in Southeast Asia.

19. The League's Board of Directors is instructed to contact Congressman Huber to introduce a (second) bill similar to HR–271 on Laos, Cambodia, and the People's Republic of China.

20. Resolved that the current retiring National Coordinator be an ex-official member of the Board of Directors for one year.

21. The "most favored nation" Bill for Russia is now before the House Ways and Means Committee (chaired by Wilbur Mills). The League is instructed to request an Amendment asking Russia to influence North Vietnam to abide by and implement the Paris Agreement of 27 January 1973.

22. The League urges all international brotherhoods of Unions to refuse to load or unload, manufacture or otherwise handle cargo and any and all commodities destined for countries having friendly relations with North Vietnam until North Vietnam accounts for and returns (or causes to be accounted for and returned) all living Americans detained anywhere in Southeast Asia, and all dead Americans previously carried as POW or MIA.

23. The League requests on open hearing by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before 15 August with witnesses to include a Laos returnee released by North Vietnam and a returnee who was held by the PRG, so that the Committee and public may be made aware of the number of men still unaccounted for in those areas.

24. The League respectfully requests the Governments of China and USSR to exhaust all efforts available through their good relations with North Vietnam, PRG, Khymer Rouge, and Pathet Lao to seek the release and accounting of all missing in action and prisoners of war. And that, this resolution be delivered personally to the representatives of

the Governments of Russia and China located in the United States, or, if refused, to leaders in Peking and Moscow with the news media present.

25. The League requests the State Department and the Defense Department to permit returnees to publicly reveal all information they have about missing men who were not repatriated (i.e., names written on walls, men seen at one time). The League firmly believes that families and the public have the right to know this information.

26. The League is dissatisfied with the inactivity of the United States Government and North Vietnam in providing the Joint Casualty Resolution Center the rights of overflight and entry into all of Southeast Asia. The League demands that all efforts be exhausted to make all parties (the Governments of U.S., DRV, PRG, Pathet Lao and Khymer Rouge) aware of the fact that American POWs must be released or satisfactorily accounted for and the missing accounted for within six months.

27. The League strongly opposes the granting of "most favored nation" status for trade with the United States to either Russia or China until these two countries have assisted in bringing the war in Southeast Asia to an end, and until they have demonstrated their insistence that North Vietnam must vigorously assist the United States in obtaining the fullest possible accounting of all Americans missing throughout Southeast Asia.

28. The League believes that the present U.S. role in the United Nations is actually encouraging the United Nations' attitude of indifference toward the plight of missing Americans and their families. The League believes that unless the United Nations is able to secure an acceptable accounting of MIAs in 90 days, our Government should immediately reduce its share of the United Nations Budget to 7% which is our percentage of the population of all UN member states. The League further believes that such action is not merely an option, but a legal obligation of our Government under Article I of the Geneva Convention.

29. Be it moved that the Board arrange the program at the next convention to allow time to have the resolutions printed and in the hands of the delegates prior to voting on them.

30. Resolved that we as a League sponsor a cross-country run from The West Coast to East Coast ending in Washington, D.C. by persons carrying an American flag to call attention to the fact that the war is not over for some 1,300 Americans still missing in action or prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and their families.

31. The League at its 1973 National Convention goes on record to identify and make known to all family members and concerned citizens the names of those senators and congressmen on the national and state levels who actively support the National League of Families and all State Chapters in their efforts on behalf of over 1,300 men missing in Southeast Asia. We also resolve that we will identify and name those senators and congressmen on the national and State levels who show NO concern for our men or fail to actively support the work of our National League and State Chapters.

IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION IS PREMATURE

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from engaging in public debate over the guilt or innocence of the Watergate principals, but the introduction of an impeachment resolution has forced me to speak out. Such action is ill-conceived, improvident, and inconsiderate of the rights of constitutional due process.

I am a Democrat, but we are talking here about the Presidency of the United States. This issue transcends partisan politics. The welfare of the Presidency is directly related to the welfare of this Nation and hence this matter should be dealt with in a most responsible and cautious fashion.

Let me remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that no one has even been indicted yet with the exception of the actual burglars of the Watergate. Yet, in fact, the President and many of his present and former aides have been tried, convicted, and condemned in the news media.

Where are the rights of these men to a fair trial? This must be paramount to the right of a free press to inform and the right of the public to know. This country has always considered the rights of an individual sacred and rightly so. We make a mockery of our judicial system when the circus-like atmosphere of the Senate investigating committee hearings on national TV makes an unbiased trial impossible.

Impeachment of the President may be in order at a later date. This process, however, has grave import and should not be taken lightly. We must be certain that a preponderance of evidence exists before taking so serious a step.

I have no argument with legitimate congressional inquiry for legislative purposes. However, I condemned the Valachi hearings in 1963 for their public indictment and trial of Italo-Americans through the characterization of organized crime as a peculiarly Italian thing: and I condemn the Senate hearings today as a biased investigation which seeks to trap and embarrass the President rather than protect his rights as an individual, and pursue their stated purpose of determining the need of additional legislation.

If anything is to be condemned, it is the fact that under these circumstances a swift and fair trial cannot be accomplished in this country, if any resolutions are in order, this Congress should be calling for an overhaul of the judicial system to guarantee every American—including the President of the United States—a speedy, unbiased trial on charges presented against him.

CONGRESSMAN KEMP PARTICIPATES IN CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMEMORATION

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from the 39th District of New York, JACK KEMP, has just returned from Taipei where he was participating in the Captive Nations Week commemoration in the Republic of China. At the major rally during the commemoration, Mr. KEMP was the featured speaker. His remarks are of such great significance and so pertinent to foreign policy developments that it is with special emphasis that I insert them into the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. I believe that this address merits the study of all Members.

JACK KEMP has become one of the outstanding leaders in the Congress in efforts on behalf of freedom of peoples in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union proper, such as the Ukranians, Soviet Jews and numerous other non-Russian captives in the U.S.S.R. He has participated as House spokesman in the U.S Congress on Captive Nations.

The Captive Nations Week commemoration in the Republic of China is another example of the spirited leadership he is providing in the endless struggle that we must continue to wage so that all men will ultimately be free. This address by JACK KEMP was delivered on July 17 in Taipei, Taiwan.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP'S SPEECH DURING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference, it is a great honor to be here in the Republic of China, Free China, to commemorate with you this Captive Nations Week. I join with you, in rededicating ourselves and our best efforts to hasten the day when man's birthright of freedom is enjoyed by all who still live in the darkness and bondage of Communism.

In just three years, my country, the United States of America, will celebrate its 200th anniversary of independence and freedom as a nation. One of our founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson, said at the inception of our nation, "The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time." That ideal, I believe, is as true for you as it is for me and it is as true for the mainland Chinese as it is for captive peoples around the world; and that is why I am here today to help proclaim with you this noble ideal. Together we can say to the world this ideal is an eternal truth that transcends time and place as well as race and color.

We commemorate today the hundreds of millions of human beings, once free, who now live not by their choice behind the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. We, who are free to come and go as we choose, to read and watch what we wish, to assemble without fear, to speak our minds and our hearts, here assembled, send forth a message to the Chinese on the mainland, to the besieged peoples of the Southeast Asian peninsula, to the Soviet Jews, Ukrainians and other nationalities in the Soviet Union, to the people of the Baltic States, to the Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Czechoslovaks, to the East Germans, and all the people of Eastern Europe, to the Cubans, to every Captive people throughout the world: "We have not forgotten you, we will never forget you and that freedom is your birthright."

The youth, the workers and the intellectuals in the captive world know what it means to be deprived of liberty. With their grasp of the real and true values of human existence, the captives of totalitarianism are freedom's most trusted allies; tomorrow they shall be its staunchest guardians.

By participating in Captive Nations Week we proclaim to the world that we will never acquiesce to the bondage of any people and we reassure our captive brothers that we are still determined to work for everyone's freedom, which in essence means our freedom as well.

In this time of great uncertainty and anxiety around the world, I believe that the basic premises and convictions that have guided American foreign policy in its defense of the free world and in its defense

against communist aggression and expansionism since the end of World War II are not only still valid but are still accepted by the majority of the American people and by our President. That premise rests on negotiation and diplomacy undertaken from a position of strength.

Nowhere can any man be totally free until everywhere men are free. You citizens of Free China know that fact only too well.

Your scholar, Lin Yu-tang, has pointed out that: "This is the lesson of Chinese history. The greatest tyrants always have the shortest dynasties." I am confident, as I know you are confident, that the basic love of the Chinese people for freedom, peace, tolerance, understanding and the Golden Mean, will prevail.

I am also proud to be here today because I think that the Republic of China is one of the most important and inspiring symbols of freedom and progress in the world today. Just as the Berlin Wall is a symbol of communism's fear of freedom, the Republic of China is a symbol of man's indomitable will and desire for freedom.

The real revolution in Asia is not taking place in mainland China but right here on Taiwan in the Republic of China where you have accomplished a cultural, economic and political miracle paralleling the American revolution in its promise of human freedom. What greater rebuke to communism than the startling contrast betwen Taiwan and the mainland, one free the other slave. But the survival of freedom requires more than just determination. It requires an adequate defense capability, and I believe it is the role of the United States to assure the ROC the military means so necessary to the defense and promotion of Chinese freedom as it is also our role to help freedom-loving people throughout the world.

It is indeed tragic and a blow to the free world that the Republic of China was deprived of representation in the United Nations, which you had served so faithfully and responsibly since its inception. It would add greatly to the tragedy if the act were considered by any party to be a precedent for future action. It would be equally harmful if anyone were to interpret the events of the past few years as indicating a slackening of American support for your nation. On the contrary, the most significant document is still very much in force: the Mutual Defense Treaty of March 1955 which commits the United States to the defense of the Republic of China and the Pescadores; and which has been reaffirmed by President Nixon in his foreign policy reports to Congress, most recently in April and May of this year when he stressed our nation's policy of friendship for the 15 and a half million people of your country. The Formosa Resolution, passed into law by the 84th Congress, also continues to authorize the President to take actions necessary to protect the Republic of China and the Pescadores against attack. I want to assure you these are not just words but the commitment of American honor by our President, the U.S. Congress and, more importantly, the American people. It is being reaffirmed by a resolution introduced in the U.S. Congress last week of which I am honored to be co-sponsor and which at last notice, is being supported by more and more of the ROC's many friends and allies in the United States Congress.

We in the United States must not for one moment allow ourselves to forget that the Republic of China has always been among our most trustworthy and loyal allies. You have never betrayed the United States and never for a moment thought of concluding a separate peace during World War II despite the many opportunities and we in Congress believe the United States has an equal commitment to you both militarily and morally.

I believe the American people must also understand that the strategic importance of the Republic of China is incalculable to the stability of the East Asian and Western Pacific region—an area for which the United States has made great sacrifice. Since the days of the Korean War, the Republic of China has become increasingly important to U.S. strategic interests in the area. Geographically, your nation acts as a vital link in the Western defense system ringing Communist China from Japan to Thailand.

Let me turn for a few minutes to Southeast Asia. We in America do not look on the Pacific as an alien sea, or upon Asia as a feared or alien shore. For generations, we have traded across this ocean, and now the jets go back and forth. In a very real sense, we are a Pacific people, as we are also an Atlantic people. We are not—nor can we ever be—indifferent to what happens here. And least of all can we turn away from an aggression which seeks to crush free and independent nations and toward that end, would eject the protective and positive American influence from the Western Pacific. While it is true that America cannot and in fact should not be the world's policeman, it is the essence of the Nixon Doctrine as enunciated by our President at Guam that we will continue to be relevant throughout the world in our leadership, providing military and economic assistance and above all keeping strong the integrity of our commitments and treaties with the free world allies. And, in so doing, we help defend our own nation. This to my way of thinking is the essence of our role here in Asia, to provide assistance and support to the non-communist countries of Asia.

I was privileged to be at the White House reception when President Nixon stated the essence of our mission in Southeast Asia so well. He said, "If any country, with the support of a major power, invades another country and conquers it and imposes a communist government upon that country, and it succeeds, then that kind of action will be tried again, or at least encouraged. So if the communist invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnam, supported by major powers, were to succeed without our acting, it would not only mean that 17 million South Vietnamese would come under Communist tyranny with all the bloodbath that would inevitably follow, but it would mean in the Mideast, in Europe and in other parts of the world this same thing would be encouraged."

"But there is a brighter side to that," the President said, "If on the other hand, that kind of invasion of one country by another country, supported by a major communist power, if it fails, if it is stopped, if it is discouraged, then the chance of its being tried again in Asia and in the Mideast, in Europe, or in Latin America, is reduced." One need only visit Asia to realize the truth of his statement. There are perhaps better roads we might have chosen to an honorable peace, but this does not mean we should now give in or give up to Le Duc Tho in current negotiations for the implementation of the Paris Agreement. On the contrary, America must not give in. If the communists are sincere in seeking peace, they should be willing to abide by the Paris Agreement as well as the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962. Those agreements in which the Soviet Union and Red China concurred certified the right of South Vietnam along with Laos and Cambodia to make its own way within a framework of neutrality.

If the communists are now willing to return to that legal basis we could say fine and move on to the more creative work that awaits us all in the vast Pacific Basin; trade, education, the growing of food, stamping out of disease, funding of industry, and communications. But if the enemy is bent on exploiting the treaty in order to leave the rest of Southeast Asia vulnerable to continuing aggression, then let us without delay force them into the open so that no one will be in doubt what is at stake and who is at fault.

None of us will take second place to any other in willingness to do everything possible to achieve peace. But it is precisely because we do want peace that we plead for a review of history.

We must never forget the two lessons men everywhere and in every time have had to learn: that the price of freedom is dear but not nearly so costly as the loss of freedom—and that the advance and continuation of civilization depends on those values for which men have always been willing to die. National defense is not a threat to peace; it is the guarantee of peace with freedom; and as costly as arms for defense may be, there is one thing far worse than an arms race and that is arms inferiority.

Page after page of history has been bloodied by the reckless adventures of power-hungry monarchs and dictators who mistook man's love of peace for weakness.

The dust-bin of history is littered with the remains of those countries which relied only on diplomacy to secure their freedom. We must never forget—in the final analysis—that the only road to the peace we all want and to a realistic opportunity for people to determine their own destinies is to negotiate from strength, and not weakness.

How many nations have backed down the road of good intentions to end up against a wall of no retreat with the only choice to fight or surrender? We do not repudiate man's dream of peace. We must not. It is a good dream and one we share with all men, for that dream is as old as man himself. But how to preserve freedom and win the peace needs our constant attention and study.

We can go back a few years and recall a time of crisis with which you are all familiar. The mainland Chinese were threatening to invade the offshore islands and Formosa. The world tensed and we heard the familiar terror talk that any action of any kind would bring on World War III. And then another voice was heard speaking. Dwight David Eisenhower said: "They'll have to crawl over the Seventh Fleet to do it."

The invasion of Formosa did not take place; no young men died; and World War III did not follow.

By contrast in 1962, after the Geneva Agreement for the neutralization of Laos was a failure, we listened to those who said that Laos would be the wrong place, at the wrong time to make our stand known. So we backed down from the 1962 Geneva Agreement in Laos in order to "buy peace in our time." But instead, we helped buy war in Vietnam.

From Southeast Asia to Formosa, to the Middle East, credibility is the first line of defense against potential aggression. If no one believes in our word or in our agreements, we will have ushered in an era not of negotiations but of trepidation and self-doubt not worthy of a world leader and dangerous to the free world.

Let me make my own position clear. I believe that the United States has work to do and a place to fill in the Pacific, and that we must remain steadfast until the security of our allies has been assured in freedom and independence.

And I totally reject the idea that the Republic of China can be used as a bargaining counter in any negotiations between major powers. The status of your Nation is not negotiable because your freedom is not negotiable.

You should know that less than two months ago, on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., I was pleased to be one of more than 50 U.S. Congressmen who participated in an extended discussion of US–Sino policy. The participants in that discussion were men and women of both political parties and all philosophical persuasions. The thrust of their remarks was that the United States should and must stand fast by its old ally and good friend, the Republic of China, for if America's commitment is not valid here on Taiwan or in Southeast Asia, how can it be valid in the Middle East, in Europe, or anywhere in the world.

Free China is unquestionably a great symbol of freedom to the still enslaved people in mainland China. Thousands of young Chinese risking their lives to seek freedom in Hong Kong are indisputable proof of the love of liberty in the hearts of the Chinese people. The number in the first four months of this year is twice that of the same period in 1972. And last year, refugees poured out of mainland China at the fastest rate since the Great Exodus in 1962. The Republic of China is also a symbol to the 20 million Chinese who live in other Asian countries—Chinese who still pledge allegiance to Free, not Communist China. It is also a symbol of US determination to keep its commitments to old friends and allies and the world. Other nations will weigh their own future with the US by observing US relations with the Republic of China.

I for one will do all that I can to keep the US and the Republic of China what they have been and should continue to be—friends, allies, and partners in freedom.

I am steadfast in my determination that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of China will be preserved.

These are not happy times for those of us who enjoy freedom because so many of our brothers are not free. It is easy sometimes to grow discouraged when you consider just how many remain behind the Bamboo and Iron Curtains—more than one billion men, women, and children. Yet, we dare not grow discouraged. So much, so many, depend upon us. We, you and I, have a solemn responsibility in all that we say and do to the captive peoples.

What can we do? We can hold rallies like this one to demonstrate to captive and captor alike that we have not forgotten those who are enslaved and that we will not rest until they are slaves no more.

We can put pressure through public attention on the captors to grant basic human freedoms to their captives. Public pressure can and does work. It has resulted in freedom for thousands who otherwise would have remained behind the Iron Curtain, such as Soviet Jews. But much more must be done. Trade and credit concessions, and diplomatic negotiations can be used to encourage the freedom movement. We can continue to insist on the truth by telling about the plight of captive peoples. We can talk about the thousands of courageous Chinese who have risked their lives to leave Maoism for a free future in Hong Kong or on Taiwan but most of all we must keep in sight our goal of freedom for all. We must encourage and support captive peoples. We must keep the faith and promote the spirit of liberty that burns in the hearts and minds of people everywhere. For after all, it is this spirit that provides our greatest hope. It is a spirit that will never die as long as there are freedom loving people such as are gathered here in this hall, such as Dr. Ku and the World Anti-Communist League and the Asian People Anti-Communist League whom I salute and commend. This spirit unites people everywhere and it is the spirit of one young prisoner who told me what it meant to him who was a captive of the Communists for seven years. I asked him what was the one thing that helped him the most to prevail. He said to me, "Mr. Congressman, if you lose your money you have lost nothing; if you lose your health you have lost something; but if you lose your spirit, you have lost everything." Let us resolve never to lose that spirit, as it is truly the hope of the world. Thank you.

PRESSURE ON NELSEN COMMISSION

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter I recently received from Mr. Duane Roloff, chairman of the Martin County Republican Committee in my Second Congressional District in Minnesota.

The letter tends to speak for itself. However, the reason I call this to the attention of the Members of the House at this time is that I assume that each of you may have individuals receiving calls back in your districts similar to that which Mr. Roloff received. I only hope that the calls you receive in your district regarding this matter do not distort the facts, as it appears they were distorted in the conversation between the individual who called him from Washington and Mr. Roloff.

I do not recall that I have ever questioned the motives of a Member of this House who has supported one particular type of bill over another in the Congress. I must say that I am surprised that a representative of a coalition of "activist groups," as Mr. Roloff referred to them, is questioning my motives in urging that the Nelsen Commission recommendations be separated from a bill recently reported out of the House District Committee. I urged that action in subcommittee and in the full committee as the wisest path. At no time have I said or intimated that I wanted these separated because I want the game played my way.

I am vitally interested in the well-being of the District of Columbia, as the RECORD in this Congress and earlier Congresses will clearly indicate. But I am for good government, and as I indicated to Mr. Roloff and to others publicly, I do not want the work of the Nelsen Commission to go down the drain with something I feel jeopardizes the implementation of the many recommendations we have made for economy, efficiency, and improved services in the District government.

Obviously Mr. Roloff felt that pressure was being applied to him by the individual who spoke to him. This prompted him to correspond with him, and he has consented to the insertion of his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Certainly if the contact with Mr. Roloff is indicative of the other calls that have been made to my district, many of you may expect much the same treatment during the period of the summer recess which is ahead of us.

Let us debate the merits and vote the issues on the floor when this matter comes up after the recess and, as Mr. Roloff suggests, "not give too much credibility to the pressure being applied" by the activist groups.

MARTIN COUNTY REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE,
Minnesota, Minn., July 28, 1973.

Representative ANCHER NELSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANCHER: I received a telephone call Thurs. evening at approximately 10 PM. from a Julie Kalnaberda from Washington, D.C. She indicated she works for the YWCA League and is participating in a coalition of "activist groups" working for the District of Columbia self government. She indicated that her group was making a number of calls to various groups within your congressional district for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on you to support the current omnibus bill being presented on D.C.

I did question her at some length about the various proposals and the only conclusion I could come to would be that if you are "dragging your feet" on this as she indicated, it is because they appear to be wanting too much too soon and some of the items in the omnibus bill are dangerous.

This morning I received an Air Mail Special Delivery letter with many photo copied articles, editorials, Summary of H.R. 9056. The thing that bothers me about it is the fact that they have some fancy stationary, they have preaddressed mailing labels, the postage cost 92c, the telephone call was rather lengthy, the gal that called was very persuasive in her arguments, and this in itself raises a red flag with me, but there is an additional point that I would like to make on it.

In a number of instances she referred to the fact that in the past you had helped the District of Columbia Committee and they were greatful for it but you seem to be out of touch with things as they are currently. She made references to the fact that this year Congress had to pass a law to make it legal for kite flying in the District of Columbia, made reference to the fact that the laws as they were originally passed were very out dated, and that your reluctance at this time to follow along with all the changes seem to indicate that just because you weren't getting your way with the Little Hoover Commission Report you were going to say if the game can't be played my way, I won't play at all. Her inference was that you were out of step with the times and that we should then put pressure on you so that you would support the bill.

I thanked her for her time, advised her that she had given me her side of the story and I would correspond with you, get your view, then make a decision that seemed logical to me.

I have to make an assumption at this point, and it is as stated above that if you are in fact, "dragging your feet", I would assume that it was because you feel that it goes too far considering the fact that the District of Columbia does have its peculiar setup whereby the very large portion of the otherwise taxable base of the City is owned by the Federal Government and thus belong to all the people of the Country and thus the responsibility for taxation should then also rest with all of the people of the Country and the only way this can be done is through the end result of the expenditure of taxation being held by the Representatives of all of the people of the Country, namely Congress. It would seem that you will undoubtedly receive much pressure, but I rather doubt that this will be from groups that are normally on "your side of the fence anyway" and thus hope that you do not give too much credibility to the pressure being applied.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DUANE ROLOFF,
Chairman.

BURIAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by a number of my constituents that the present $250 veterans' funeral and burial expense allowance is wholly inadequate to pay the cost of such services. Perhaps in 1958, when this amount was originally approved, it was sufficient to cover burial costs. But today, 15 years later, it certainly is not sufficient. I feel that the original congressional intention—that of providing financial assistance to ensure a decent funeral and burial of those who have fought for their country and who have had a service connected disability—should be supported today by increasing the amount available for these purposes.

For this reason I am introducing a bill which would increase the veterans burial and funeral allowances from $250 to $750.

STATEMENT OF CARMINE BELLINO AND AFFIDAVIT OF OLIVER W. ANGELONE

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

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD a statement by Mr. Carmine Bellino, Chief Investigator of the Watergate Committee, regarding charges recently made by Mr. George Bush concerning activities by Mr. Bellino during the Kennedy/Nixon debates. Attached also is an affidavit by Mr. Oliver W. Angelone, a D.C. private investigator, refuting the affidavits of Joseph Shimon and John Leon, as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 24, 1973.

STATEMENT BY CARMINE BELLINO—7/24/73

I have read the charges about me made by George Bush and the affidavits attached to his statement. The charges are absolutely false. I categorically and unequivocally deny that I have ever ordered, requested, directed or participated in any electronic surveillance whatsoever in connection with any political campaign.

By attacking me on the basis of such false and malicious lies, Mr. Bush has attempted to distract me from carrying out what I consider one of the most important assignments of my life. I shall continue to exert all my efforts to ascertain the facts and the truth pertinent to this investigation.

STATEMENT BY OLIVER WILLIAM ANGELONE

Oliver William Angelone, being duly sworn deposes and says:

1. I make this affidavit for submission to Senator Sam Ervin and Senator Howard Baker, Jr.

2. I have been advised that affidavits insinuate that I may have participated in electronic surveillance during the 1960 presidential campaign. The insinuations are entirely false.

3. During the 1960 presidential campaign, Mr. Carmine Bellino was engaged in locating the source of anti-Catholic literature. Mr. Bellino requested that I assist in finding out whether an individual, whose name I cannot now recall, was registered at any of the hotels in Washington.

I may have requested Mr. Joseph Shimon to assist in obtaining some information from a hotel. I may also have told Mr. Shimon that the information was requested by Mr. Bellino.

I know I did not request Mr. Shimon to engage in any activities except to obtain the information as requested.

4. I was never requested to engage in any electronic or physical surveillance of any person at any time during the 1960 presidential campaign, and I did not engage in such activities.

OLIVER WILLIAM ANGELONE.

Sworn to before me this 25th day of July, 1973. John Drew.

PRICE CONTROLS AND COST OF LIVING COUNCIL

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

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, since today is our final day of legislative activity before we recess for 4 weeks I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House a situation which in my opinion is placing the American economy in serious jeopardy.

I refer to the administration's on-again off-again price controls and the fruitless activities of the Cost of Living Council. Since the Cost of Living Council was first created on December 22, 1971, by Executive order and since the President exercised the authority to impose price controls on the American people, the economic stability of this Nation has gone from bad to worse.

Since 1971 the cost of a pound of hamburger has jumped 24 cents per pound, pork chops have increased 49 cents per pound, bacon has climbed 41 cents per pound to a record price, 1 dozen large eggs has gone up 30 cents and rents have reached record levels. In short, Mr. Speaker, the burden on the average American is becoming increasingly intolerable in spite of, or perhaps even because of the efforts of the Cost of Living Council.

Members of this body will, I am sure, face a veritable hornets nest of consumer and constituent protest during their visits to their districts in the coming weeks. Today, I would like to offer the hope that when we return from recess in September that we promptly take a new hard look at the problems which now beset the American public because of the constant tinkering with the Nation's economy by the Cost of Living Council. The phases and changes in the price control laws change more often than phases of the moon and each time create chaos to the consumer and the business community as well.

This Cost of Living Council costs the taxpayers of this Nation almost $5 million annually in administrative expenses, and yet because of the Council and its long lists of announcements, revisions, and changes, the public confidence in the economic stabilization program has decreased to where it is questionable as to how much longer the general public will have any faith at all in its efforts to stabilize the economy.

Each new phase of the price controls program has seen the Cost of Living Council spend valuable time getting reorganized. Meanwhile the new program has each time lost momentum and the cost of living for the man on the street has taken another jump forward. Seeing no success in its efforts at holding the line on prices, the Council has turned its costly machinery to extensive recordkeeping.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to continue to juggle the American economy like so many oranges in a basket, we do not need to spend millions of dollars annually so the Cost of Living Council can keep records of the feat.

I believe the Council is doing more harm than good and I believe at this point the American housewife, who this week is learning that she can no longer afford to buy beef in the supermarket, agrees with me. I urge the President to abolish the Cost of Living Council and give serious consideration to abolishing the entire program of price controls and return this Nation to a free economy. If however, the decision is that this Nation must continue in this economic straitjacket, I believe the Internal Revenue Service, an agency which has widespread respect among the citizenry, could handle the necessary recordkeeping with its present administrative staff.

By turning the current activities of the Cost of Living Council over to the IRS, we would at least be promoting more efficiency in Government since the duties and the responsibilities will rest with the organization which is already providing most of the personnel for the current economic programs.

PENSION REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, last week Senator PHILIP HART introduced legislation which I believe would bring tremendous progress in reforming our private pension system. For this reason, I am introducing a similar bill today although I wholeheartedly support the pension reform legislation which has previously been introduced by Congressman DENT.

The legislation now being discussed by the House has been extremely important in focusing attention on abuses in the pension system. Proposed reforms would remedy the dangers a long-service employee has of losing his earned pension. Giant strides in the areas of vesting, funding and insurance are being made by these reforms.

But reforms must go further, they must deal with the basic structure of the pension system. The basic assumption in the pension system is that large numbers of persons must lose in order to have a few benefit. True reform would abolish this assumption.

The real shortcoming of provisions presently being considered is that the benefits will not be extended to most workers. First, they will not benefit 50 percent of our workers, those that are not covered by a pension plan. Second, of the workers presently covered by pension plans, proposed reform will not

benefit the worker who changes jobs frequently in our mobile society. In most plans a worker who changes jobs only once every 5 years will not receive any benefits from these reforms.

Finally, the surviving spouse or dependents of pension program participants will receive no benefit. Since the Federal Government provides a tax subsidy to the private pension system to the tune of $8 billion annually, it is imperative that reforms encompass the broadest possible base of the working population. The bill I am introducing would do that.

This bill would completely restructure the private pension system. It would create a limited number of private, competitive, insured institutions regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. These institutions would vie for contributions made by employers for their employees or by employees and self-employed persons for themselves and their dependent spouses. An employee need not be covered by a pension plan to make contributions to these institutions. Employees can evaluate each institution and choose where their contributions will be invested. These contributions will be tax deductible. The employee chooses when to retire, he then begins receiving a lifetime annuity calculated on the basis of the total amount in his account and his actuarially determined life expectancy. If the pension participant dies the surviving spouse would continue to receive benefits.

An added advantage of this new structure is that the institutions would bear the administrative costs of the retirement funds. Many small firms previously have been hampered in starting pension plans because the administrative costs were prohibitive. This obstacle for small firms would be removed under this new system.

Now that we have begun pension reform, we should not leave it at the first stage but carry through with our efforts to extend reform to cover all workers.

INCREASING NUMBERS OF POLICE KILLED IN ACTION COMMENSURATE WITH RISING CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the alarming and steady escalation in the crime rate in America over the past 17 years, of which the increasing number of policemen killed in the line of duty is just one aspect, has aroused the deep concern of all responsible citizens. For the past 17 years the Nation's crime totals have been rising yearly, with annual increases ranging from 1 percent in 1959 to a staggering 17 percent in 1968. Just this year we have seen the beginning of the reversal of this appalling trend. On March 28, President Nixon announced that the crime totals for 1972 showed a decline of 3 percent. The credit for this encouraging development goes to the dedicated members of our law enforcement profession. The decline is directly attributable to the efforts of law enforcement.

We must realize what a demanding task our policemen are performing and we should commend them accordingly. More than our commendations, however, they need our concerned and continuing support. The fight against crime is the responsibility not only of the beleaguered policeman, but of all members of society. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice made the following statement in its 1967 Task Force Report on the Police:

> The fact is, of course, that even under the most favorable circumstances the ability of the police to act against crime is limited. The police did not create and cannot resolve the social conditions that stimulate crime. They did not start and cannot stop the conclusive social changes that are taking place in America. They do not enact the laws that they are required to enforce, nor do they dispose of the criminals they arrest. The police are only one part of the criminal justice system; the criminal justice system is only one part of the government; and the government is only one part of society.

If we hope to make further progress in the fight against crime, we must clarify and strengthen the laws our police enforce; we must coordinate all elements of our criminal justice system, and we must band together as a society in supporting and cooperating with our police forces in this most urgent endeavor. I am happy to be able to say that efforts are already underway to further these three objectives. I am pleased, too, that I am serving on a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee which is responsible for reforming the Federal Criminal Code.

The argument which claims that strict enforcement of the law often conflicts with the alleged right of the criminal to sympathetic treatment and a second chance ignores the far more fundamental rights of the law-abiding citizen. Even those citizens who have been fortunate enough not to become the innocent victims of crime have paid dearly for society's leniency toward crime. They have paid in the form of fear, anxiety, and forfeited freedom, as well as in higher courts and higher taxes. The American people have a right to safety, order, and security. If we do not want our society and our American way of life to be placed at the mercy of criminals, we must take a resolute, unequivocal stand against crime.

Essential to a firm posture against crime are a well-defined, enforceable system of laws and an unambiguous, well-publicized set of penalties for unlawful behavior. The Criminal Code Reform Act would accomplish a comprehensive, systematic revision of Federal criminal laws. The bill has two main facets, the redefinition of Federal crimes and the establishment of clear criteria for sentencing. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation and I am also pleased to be a member of the special subcommitee of the House Judiciary Committee charged with the responsibility for this legislation.

A few examples will give you an idea of the kind of changes we propose to make. First, Federal jurisdiction would be expanded to cover a few areas of compelling Federal interest not adequately covered under present law. These extensions of Federal jurisdiction will serve to complement State jurisdiction and thus increase the effectiveness of State judicial systems, while preserving their integrity. One extension of Federal jurisdiction, for instance, would make it a crime to travel in interstate commerce not only for the purpose of bribing a witness in a State court proceeding, but also for the purpose of intimidating such a witness. In such cases intimidation, which might even take the form of extreme violence, is not covered under present Federal law. This change will facilitate the successful completion of State criminal proceedings.

In addition to these extensions of Federal jurisdiction, the reform act would redefine Federal crimes, reduce the number of different classes of offenses where the multiplicity of categories breeds confusion rather than clarity, and codify general defenses available to the defendants. This is all in the interest of eliminating ambiguity and furthering uniform interpretation of the laws. The clarification of the insanity defense is one of the most needed of the new definitions. The present proposal would make the insanity defense applicable only if the defendant, "as a result of mental disease or defect, lacked the state of mind required as an element of the offense charged." The mere presence of mental disease or defect would not be a sufficient defense.

The Criminal Code Reform Act would also provide more definite criteria for sentencing. These criteria would prevent unjustified disparity in sentencing for similar offenses and protect the suspect from the personal whim of a hostile judge. Since our new attitude toward crime puts priority on the protection of the innocent, law-abiding citizen, rather than the coddling of the hardened criminal, the new proposals set mandatory minimum prison terms for those offenders whose continued presence in society would entail inordinate danger to peaceful citizens. Mandatory minimum prison terms will be prescribed for traffickers in hard narcotics, persons using dangerous weapons in the execution of a crime, and persons convicted as leaders of organized crime.

Clarification of the criteria determining sentencing does more than facilitate a uniform meting out of punishment; it is essential if our system of penalties is to have its full deterrent value. More important than crime detection is crime prevention. One of the prime factors preventing a criminal from committing a crime is contemplation of the punishment he will face if he is caught. The establishment of fixed criteria for sentencing will remove from the mind of the potential criminal the hope that he might get off because of the discretionary authority of the judge.

To achieve the maximum deterrent to crime, we must not deny ourselves the use of our greatest weapon—the death penalty. I strongly support the proposal to reinstate the use of the death penalty. Present proposals would make the death

penalty apply where it is now in the statutes and in cases of war-related treason, sabotage, and espionage. It would be mandatory unless a posttrial hearing uncovers certain mitigating factors.

Another important step toward crime prevention is the strengthening of laws against the disseminators of dangerous drugs. The rise in crime during the 1960's can, in part, be tied to the growing traffic in hard narcotics during the same period. Drug abuse and addiction have been shown to be a direct cause of crime. While we must continue to expand our treatment and rehabiliation services to help the addict free himself from the bonds and misery of addiction, we must, at the same time, redouble our efforts to clamp down on the pusher. The pusher, aside from his own criminality, instigates others to commit crime. He plays on the naivete of our young people and draws them into a life of misery and crime. Such individuals are a danger to society and they should not be allowed to roam free. In the interest of protecting society and of removing one source of increased crime, I support proposed legislation to increase sentences for heroin and morphine offenses and to deny pretrial release to those charged with trafficking in heroin or morphine.

In addition to a strong, clear, enforceable set of laws, a concerted attack on crime requires coordination and cooperation. We must make sure that all elements of our criminal justice system operate as a team, and we, the public, must accept our duty to support and cooperate with our law enforcement officers. Proposals to expand Federal jurisdiction to cover loopholes in criminal jurisdiction are aimed at aiding State jurisdictions in carrying out their judicial proceedings. In this way, the ability of the combined Federal and State criminal systems jointly to foil the criminal will be enhanced. The President's proposed law enforcement special revenue sharing will meet the need for financial cooperation, as well, between the Federal and the State criminal justice systems.

At the State and local levels, too, efforts are being made to pool law enforcement resources. Some localities are trying to make the resources of metropolitan police forces available to rural jurisdictions, which, statistics show, have been least able to cope with the rising crime rate. While crime in the nation as a whole dropped 3 percent in 1973, in the suburbs and rural areas it continued to rise by more than 2 percent. Sharing of law enforcement capabilities by metropolitan and rural jurisdictions will help to alleviate this situation. In addition, many State law enforcement agencies are providing crime laboratory facilities and information systems for the use of local agencies. In this way, localities can have the benefit of facilities they could not themselves afford, and crime information gathered throughout the State can be stored in one central location, making coordination of our local agencies much more feasible than it has been in the past.

Not only must law enforcement procedures on various levels be coordinated, but also the law enforcement process must be better integrated into the total criminal justice system, if we are to insure maximum effectiveness in fighting crime. One priority in this area is reducing the time between arrest and trial. We must provide speedier and more rational trial procedures in Federal criminal cases.

We must also actively seek to improve the relationship between the police and the average citizen. The average American citizen wants a safe, peaceful place in which to live and raise his family, a place free from the constant danger of personal injury or property loss, a place where his children can enjoy their youthful pastimes without being exposed to the wiles of the drug pusher and the hardened criminal. Over the past 15 years or so, some citizens have lost their faith in the ability of our law enforcement officers to make America a safe place to live. It is the mistaken policy of leniency toward crime which is at the root of this loss of confidence. The unnerving rises in crime which this policy fostered, together with the underhanded efforts of a few hostile people to discredit the integrity of the police and undermine their authority, have left the average citizen discouraged and bewildered. We must renew our confidence in our police forces and actively cooperate with them in the effort to eradicate crime. Any sign of citizen apathy or faltering of support for the police makes the criminal bold and limits the authority the police command in the eyes of the criminal.

Because of the crucial importance of police-community relations, they have become the subject of considerable discussion among law enforcement experts. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice made the following statement in 1967:

> Police-community relationships have a direct bearing on the character of life in our cities, and on the community's ability to maintain stability and to solve its problems. At the same time, the police department's capacity to deal with crime depends to a large extent upon its relationship with the citizenry. Indeed, no lasting improvement in law enforcement is likely in this country unless police-community relations are substantially improved.

Suggested approaches to the problem center around training the police in human relations, informing the public, including youngsters, about the role of the police, providing forums for communication between the police and the community, and enabling the police to respond more quickly and more relevantly to citizen problems and complaints.

The police forces here in Prince George's County are well on the way to implementing these suggestions. Trainees undergo extensive training in human relations. This training includes sessions at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in which recruits test their tact and presence of mind in simulated pantomime situations. To acquaint young people with the role of the police, the department's community relations division presents safety talks with films to children in kindergarten through grade six and runs day-long classroom "rap" sessions for junior and senior high school students. These school programs have won the commendation of the National Conference on Criminal Justice. The department also conducts classes in traffic law, juvenile law, and home safety at the community school, an adult summer school in the Landover area. The county ride-along program gives both young people and adults an opportunity to observe at first-hand how a policeman goes about his job. Through this program, any citizen who is a sophomore in high school or older may ride along with a patrolman on a regular tour of duty. To provide a forum for constructive interchange between citizens and police, beat officers meet once every two weeks with neighborhood groups to discuss local concerns. "Operation Identification," run at the local rather than the county level, allows citizens to participate directly in facilitating the work of the police by labeling valuables with identification numbers. Police-community cooperation is also the key to a special crisis intervention program which provides for joint investigation of potentially explosive situations by members of the police department and members of the County Human Relations Commission. In many cases, the police officer and a representative of the Human Relations Commission, by talking with the persons involved, have been able to prevent small disturbances from growing into major confrontations. Finally, to inform citizens in need of available community services, the department's community relations division acts as a 24-hour referral agency.

The policeman is not just a crime fighter; he is a community servant who must always be ready to help those in need, whatever their need may be. Our policemen are learning how better to communicate their concern for the individual citizen and their willingness to help. The rapport they create will not only help in the fight against crime, but it will be an invaluable contribution to the renewal of the feeling of cooperation and shared responsibility, which have always characterized the American way of life.

Our police forces are performing their role admirably. With their help, with the benefit of the proposed crime legislation and with the support of all Americans, we can make America the peaceful, safe place to live which we all deserve. We have made progress in the fight against crime, as indicated by the 1972 crime totals, but can make far more progress through legislative channels in this Congress.

NEED FOR DEEPWATER PORTS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my comments today are on the need for deepwater ports in America

and on the corresponding need for the Congress to continue to exercise leadership in this important area.

Our acute energy shortage has been brought to the attention of every American in recent months. We have learned just how much we rely on petroleum products to keep the country and the economy moving. We have seen how our fuel needs, our balance of payments, the strength and stability of the dollar, the health of our domestic economy, and our national defense posture are so tightly interwoven that if one strand frays, all the others are affected.

We rely heavily on oil imports to satisfy our energy needs. This reliance will not diminish in the foreseeable future, and many experts believe it will increase significantly. It is an urgent priority, then, that the United States have the best, most economical port system to handle oil imports.

Deepwater ports will be needed because the fuel will reach the United States in supertankers of unprecedented size. Since our natural ports cannot handle these huge vessels, we must construct offshore terminals which can cope with supertankers. The Maritime Administration reports that if we do not build our own deepwater port facilities, we will have to rely on transshipment through neighboring foreign terminals, such as in Canada, the Bahamas, or elsewhere. This would heighten our already dangerous reliance on outside sources and our unfavorable outflow of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the need for deepwater ports is both evident and immediate. I urge the Congress to move expeditiously toward legislation which will accelerate the construction of superports. We need legislation which insures the environmental soundness of ports, setting up stringent but reasonable environmental criteria to protect our beaches and marine life. Just as the secondary economic benefits of deepwater ports—refineries, general industrialization, petrochemical plants—must be considered, so must the corresponding secondary environmental impact be evaluated.

While the task of selecting the sites for deepwater port facilities may come later, I will touch briefly on the advantages of Ameraport, off the coast of Alabama and Mississippi. A July report of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers found after extensive study that the development of deepwater ports along the gulf coast is economically and environmentally feasible, that in fact two or three ports in the gulf coast area are economically desirable.

The Ameraport off Alabama and Mississippi is uniquely qualified within the Gulf Coast area. Transportation costs to the southeastern and eastern States would be reduced. Completion of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and a deepwater port in the Gulf of Mexico should fall into approximately the same construction-completion time frame. The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, joining forces with the waterways, highways, and railroads of the area, will connect the Gulf of Mexico with mid-America by a strong, reliable, balanced transportation system.

Ameraport embodies sound national security since its location off Alabama and Mississippi would disperse refineries rather than crowding them into areas already heavily populated with these facilities. Ameraport provides better nautical safety and reduced possibility of oil spills by minimizing the traffic of supertankers in areas with numerous oil and gas production platforms.

Many other arguments could be offered in favor of deepwater ports generally and Ameraport specifically. But perhaps the important entreaty to make to this body is that a bill be passed in the near future which will provide the legislative fuel to drive the deepwater port issue to the point that the United States leads the world in superport capability and efficiency.

BUFFALO EVENING NEWS SAYS "COME AND DO BETTER"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress 2½ years ago because I loved my country and wanted to help it, and because I considered the competition of ideas to be the highest of all forms of competition.

During these difficult times, when the political profession is under increasing attack and cynical regard, I cannot encourage too strongly that young people get involved in the political process. Watergate notwithstanding, politics is not fraught with dishonesty, deception, or dirty tricks. It is a very human institution tended by individuals with very human characteristics. In that context, the need for idealistic, highly motivated, enthusiastic young people of high moral principle has never been greater.

The Buffalo Evening News, in an August 1 editorial, commended John Ehrlichman for his answer to Gordon Strachan who had previously counseled American youth to stay away from politics. At this point, I insert the News editorial on John Ehrlichman's rebuttal of Strachan:

COME AND DO BETTER

However one may regard John D. Ehrlichman's Watergate testimony in general, or his overall attitude toward the swollen role of the presidency in our system of constitutional checks and balances, we'll say this for him: He gave America's youths a much better piece of advice about the public service than his young White House colleague, Gordon Strachan, did a week earlier.

Mr. Strachan had given a kind of ultimate testament to his own disenchantment with government, as a result of his getting caught in the Watergate web. He said his advice on political careers would be: "Stay away." But that's not John Ehrlichman's view. Said he:

"Our government and our politics are only as idealistic as the people who administer the laws and run the campaigns and fulfill the traditions. If some young Americans know that their ideals or ideas or motives are sounder or purer than those of the people now in politics or government, then I think Gordon should have said to them, 'Come and do better.' . . .

"People must be attracted who will come here to fight for what they believe in and to work long hours to get things done. . . I hope that young people don't stay away. I hope they come here and apply their idealism and their enthusiasm and their high moral principles. . . . But young Americans, if you come here come with your eyes wide open. If you go to work for the President and the executive branch there are very few in the Congress or the media that are going to throw rosebuds at you. If you favor change . . . you will have to fight for it.

"And be prepared to defend your sense of values. . . . You will encounter a local culture which scoffs at patriotism and family life and morality. . . . But you will also find many great people who know that a pearl of great price is not had for the asking and who feel that this country and its heritage are worth the work, the abuse, the struggle and the sacrifices. Don't stay away. Come and join them and do it better."

As sound a piece of career counseling, all in all, as we've ever heard, and worthy of inclusion in any college political science textbook. In the context of Watergate, however, we would have to offer just one addendum—one which the John Ehrlichmans of this administration could have used in their youth:

Come and do better, by all means. But when you come bring one thing more than idealism, enthusiasm, high principles and wide-open eyes. Bring reverence for the American constitution, and especially for all those liberties of the people and restraints on the government embodied in its Bill of Rights.

No one armed with that need worrk about getting involved in any future Watergate nor need he doubt that "this country and its heritage are worth the work, the abuse, the struggle and the sacrifices."

The following is the actual testimony of John Ehrlichman as he tells young people to "come and do better":

I could not close without commenting on Gordon Strachan's answer of the other day to the question "Do you have any advice for the young Americans who are expressing their disenchantment with government and the political process." Gordon said "Stay away." And your gallery laughed. But I don't think many other Americans laughed at that answer, I certainly didn't, nor do I agree with Gordon's advice. Our political system and our real governmental institutions are not just the buildings and the laws and the traditions that one sees here in the City of Washington. Our Government and our politics are only as idealistic, as honest, as the people in those buildings who administer the laws and run the campaigns and fulfill the traditions. If some young Americans know that their ideals or ideas or motives are sounder or purer than those of the people now in politics or government, then I think Gordon should have said to them "Come and do better. Don't stay away."

Somehow, in politics and government it seems that there is always someone to fill the job. If you don't take it, you can be sure that somebody else will. We are either going to have highly motivated able people running the political campaigns and filling the offices in government or we will surely have seat-warmers and hacks who will fill these places and the country will be the worse for it. People must be attracted who will come here to fight for what they believe in and to work long hours to get things done. I hope that young people don't stay away, I hope they come here and apply their idealism and their enthusiasm and their high moral principles. I hope they come and test their ideas and their convictions in this marketplace. I hope they do come and do better.

With young Americans "If you come here come with your eyes wide open. If you go to work for the President and the Executive Branch there are very few in the Congress or the media that are going to throw rose-

buds at you. If you favor change in what our Government is and what it does in our society you will have to fight for it. No such thing has been won here by default, at least not recently, and be prepared to defend your sense of values when you come here, too. You will encounter a local culture which scoffs at patriotism and family life and morality just as it adulates the opposite, and you will find some people who have fallen for that line. But you will also find in politics and Government many great people who know that a pearl of great price is not had for the asking and who feel that this country and its heritage are worth the work, the abuse, the struggle, and the sacrifices. Don't stay away. Come and join them and do it better."

Mr. Vice Chairman, this Select Committee has an awesome responsibility to find the truth. Such a search cannot be made by one whose eyes are clouded by pre-conception or partisanship, it can only be found by those with open mind, free of bias and unfairness. I am confident that the truth is there to be seen. It only needs the see-ers.

I include John Ehrlichman's closing statements at this point for the RECORD:

Mr. Vice Chairman and Members of the Committee, I prepared for this hearing with just two objectives: First to state the truth as nearly as recollection and research could enable me to do and thereby to establish the falsity of the charges made against me by your star witness. For nearly five days I have submitted to your cross-examination to permit a test of the truth of my testimony. In my opening statement I listed a number of questions which I asked you to inquire about because I believe they are central to this matter and because I have some information about them.

In the past five days a great deal of time has been spent mostly on a few of them. As a result, there is now remaining one matter which I believe is important enough to mention in passing to the Committee. I did not have an opportunity to review with the Committee my notes of my second interview with Gordon Strachan. I think it is important to the Committee to know that as you read those notes the question which I continually put to Mr. Strachan all the way through was "Is there anything else. Are you giving me the whole list. Are these all the people in the White House who are involved, and have you told me everything you know about their involvement." In other words, the list you see in the Strachan notes is intended, as I recall the interview with Mr. Strachan, to be an exclusive list, and that does not appear on the face of the notes, and I think it's important for you to have that.

My secondary objective here was to be prepared to raise a voice for the President, who is unrepresented here. As your questions developed, I had no opportunity to do so as his advocate, I only shed some light on facts which disproved a few of the false allegations which have been advanced against him here. I do not apologize for my loyalty to the President any more than I apologize for my love of this country. I only hope that my testimony here has somehow served them both.

BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION TO EVALUATE WHITE HOUSE TAPES SUGGESTED AS MEANS OF BRINGING WATERGATE HEARINGS TO END

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, as a means of ending the trauma of Watergate which engulfs all of us as long as the hearings before the Senate select committee continue, I have written to President Nixon to respectfully suggest that he submit the tapes in question to a blue ribbon commission of executive, legislative, and judicial leaders for evaluation and judgment.

I respect the confidentiality of the tapes and I concede to the President whatever degree of Executive privilege he wishes to invoke to guard the privacy of these conversations within his office. By the same token, I realize that as long as there is not some report on the contents of the tapes to verify the truth of the President's statement about his involvement, there will be people who will have doubts and who will use these reservations to discredit the President and his administration.

It is for this reason that I have written to the President to urge him to make the tapes available to a blue ribbon commission so that his position can be established before the world with all doubts removed. In so doing there will be no need for the hearings to continue and the special prosecutor can end his investigation.

I believe my proposal to be reasonable and workable. For the sake of the country and his leadership which we need so desperately, I trust President Nixon will agree to a compromise of this sort and we can set about naming the members of the Commission. The composition of the Commission and the responsibilities with which it would be charged are spelled out in my letter to President Nixon. I feel obliged to place a copy of the letter before my colleagues with the hope that others will agree to the propriety of this approach and will also prevail upon the President to accept it.

My letter to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A public controversy rages over whether or not you should release selected tapes of conversations in your office to the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities and to the Special Prosecutor, Archibald Cox.

My own opinion is that these are personal, private matters. They are a record of conversations which took place in your office; at your meetings. Whether or not they should be made public is entirely up to you. When you say they enforce the truth of your statements about your knowledge of events, I accept that.

I regret that more people don't accept it with the same faith in your integrity as I do. As long as their doubts persist, there will be an unwillingness to give you the benefit of the doubt and all that you have done in the name of peace and progress will erode. This should never happen. It isn't fair to you and it isn't fair to the country.

For this reason, I respectfully submit a suggestion for verifying what you say about the contents of the tapes and, at the same time, accommodate the needs of the Senate Committee and the Special Prosecutor.

I suggest that you, The President, voluntarily and openly offer to make available to an independent blue-ribbon commission all requested and relevant tapes, papers and other documents; and that you offer to meet privately with the commission and discuss in detail your personal knowledge and beliefs.

I would suggest that this commission serve as the *sole* body seeking or gaining access to these Presidential sources; that the commission study the sources thoroughly and impartially; and then report fully to Congress, the Supreme Court, to the President and to the American people simultaneously on all facts relevant to the Watergate incident with emphasis upon "what the President knew or should have known and the time at which he knew it or should have known it," specifically with regard to any conspiracy to obstruct justice. All other information—personal as well as that affecting national security and international relations—would remain thoroughly confidential, upon penalty of being held in contempt of Congress and the Supreme Court.

The Senate Select Committee, the Senate as a whole, the House of Representatives, the Special Prosecutor, the Attorney General, the Supreme Court and all others dealing with the investigation and prosecution of the incident, would accept the findings of the commission as "full, fair, accurate and sufficient" for all purposes whatsoever.

I suggest that this commission be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States as chairman; with two members from the federal judiciary as selected by the chairman; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; the President of the Senate; two Governors of the States, one chosen by Congress and the other by the President; and two members at large, one chosen by the President and one chosen by Congress.

Mr. President, such a commission would be representative of the three branches of government and of the people. They would be in a position to impartially evaluate all the points in question and present findings which would be "full, fair, accurate and sufficient." Such a report would clarify once and for all your role; the Select Committee could complete its hearings; the Special Prosecutor could complete his investigation; the nation could move away from the diversion of Watergate and concentrate on the people's welfare.

I trust, Mr. President, that you will agree with this approach and give it your blessing for the good of the country and the President who guides it.

Respectfully,

LAMAR BAKER,
Member of Congress.

THIRTEEN BILLION DOLLARS IN FARM EXPORTS: A NEW ERA FOR FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the sale of wheat to Russia, the importance of developing and maintaining foreign markets for our farm products and the impact of this effort on our economy and the entire Nation; these are events and issues that demand thorough discussion and better public understanding.

THE RUSSIAN WHEAT SALES GOOD OR BAD

First of all, I want to discuss the importance of last year's significant increase in grain exports, including the much discussed and often misunderstood sale of wheat to Russia.

This was the biggest sale of wheat ever made to a single country in U.S. history—totaling some 400 million bushels. This, and the subsequent sale of wheat and feed grains to China was important for

a number of reasons; first, our involvement on the battlefields of Southeast Asia was settled on the wheat fields of America because our food was a powerful inducement to these two countries to seek a final setlement; and second, our food will continue to be an effective force in securing an enduring peace.

Furthermore, the sale greatly reduced our stocks of surplus wheat and taxpayers saved more than $450 million in storage and related program costs. The subsequent increased price of wheat poured millions of additional dollars into our farm States' economy.

Contrary to some critical reports and news stories, the export subsidies in this sale did not amount to $300 million—they were only $158.3 million.

If all of this is true—and it is—then why the controversay surrounding the Russian wheat sale? Why the critical GAO report? Why the misconceptions in some of the press?

Some of the criticism directed at the Russian wheat sale is valid. While I publicly predicted the sale more than 6 months before it was announced, I also publicly voiced my displeasure at the sloppy way it was being handled. I questioned the lack of communication between USDA and the farmers. I questioned the lack of proper guidelines in handling such a massive sale. I sharply questioned the ability of our rail transportation and port facilities to handle such a volume of grain in so short a time. I suggested that the delivery of this grain should be stretched out so it would not overtax our boxcar capacity and leave our own farmers stranded with millions of bushels of wheat they could not deliver for sale.

Yes, this type of criticism is valid, and I noted it at the time, not a year later. The people who now attempt to make political hay of the sale by grasping at straws prove they have 20–20 hindsight. Their exaggerated charges and tortion of facts frankly smacks of political opportunism.

We must not forget that in spite of the errors of handling the sale, the overall results are excellent—a very good deal for the United States.

I think it is time to put this Russian sale in proper perspective—to evaluate its immediate and long-range impact on our whole farm export efforts which are so vital, not only to us in the agricultural Midwest, but to the entire country.

It does no good to keep bemoaning past mistakes. The responsible thing to do is correct them and this is being done.

Certainly, the Russians purchased a sizable quantity of wheat from us last year at a price far below this year's price, but that was the price of wheat at that time.

The lower price of last year was available to any foreign purchaser of wheat at that time and represented no special deal. That is the way the market works. It is significant that the Russians and Chinese have already ordered 300 million bushels of our wheat for delivery this fiscal year at the present much higher price.

It does no good for eastern economists and newsmen to arouse public resentment by using the Russian wheat sale as the sole cause of recent food price increases. This is a blatantly false charge and anyone who knows the difference between a bushel of wheat and a bale of hay realizes it.

It is important to remember that the last time wheat was selling for $3 a bushel in Minneapolis was 25 years ago and the price of a pound loaf of bread was less than 15 cents. Today, with wheat again at $3, a pound loaf of bread in Washington costs 35 cents or more. So the price of food to the consumer involves far more than just basic farm prices.

To keep harping on mistakes now corrected and to keep misleading the public may seriously endanger our future export efforts. Such irresponsibility came dangerously close to resulting in an amendment to the farm bill a few weeks ago that would have precluded future shipments of grain to Russia and China, two of our biggest potential customers. While we were successful in defeating that amendment, next time if the misinformation peddlers are able to persist, we may not be as successful.

FARM EXPORTS AND THE FARMERS

Let us take a look at the impact the Russian wheat sale and our total foreign export program has had on farm prices.

The average national domestic price of wheat before the sale was $1.68 a bushel. After the sale of some 400 million bushels of wheat had been negotiated with Russia and after another 800 million bushels had been sold to other countries, the price of wheat rose to an average of $2.49 a bushel. Today, the price of wheat is well over $3 a bushel.

A year ago, before the Russian wheat sale, the country was burdened with a surplus of wheat in storage—more than 900 million bushels. Even with another record wheat crop in 1972, we now have only 400 million bushels on hand.

If we had a billion bushels of wheat carryover what do you think the price would be today?

But the Russian wheat and grain sale is only one small part of our total farm export effort.

A great many of us in Congress with fine help from commodity and farm organizations and the USDA have worked hard to expand and develop foreign export markets for our food. And we have succeeded.

Five years ago, in 1968, our total farm exports were $6.3 billion. In the last fiscal year the total was over $13 billion.

This farm export success with the promise of even greater expansion opens up a whole new era for American agriculture.

Last year's sale of some $13 billion of farm products to foreign countries is hopefully no "one-shot" phenomenon. We have built up our export market solidly and with care. Because we have, we now have a reputation of being abundant and reliable suppliers, but all of this could be shot down by ill-conceived actions based on misinformation.

We must realize that only if our export efforts are not hampered or endangered by self-seeking politicians and short-sighted policies, can our foreign export market be expected to expand to even greater levels in the years ahead.

Other nations are becoming more prosperous and the people in those nations are demanding more high protein food.

American farmers are the most efficient in the world and we are blessed with great natural resources for agriculture. We can remain not only competitive in the farm export market; we can be the leading supplier.

What does this mean for farmers? It means we can, under such legislation as the "target price" farm program, provide the incentives and income assurances so that farmers can meet not only the food and fiber demands at home but those of our foreign markets, as well.

The long-sought dream of "parity" and full freedom to produce for farmers may soon be realized, but only if we work at it.

FARM EXPORTS AND NORTH DAKOTA

Now let us examine what impact the Russian wheat sale had in North Dakota.

On July 1, 1972, just before the sale, there were 190 million bushels of wheat in storage in North Dakota. Our farmers were just starting to harvest a 216-million-bushel wheat crop. This meant that by the end of the harvest season, North Dakota wheatgrowers would be faced with a 400-million-bushel wheat stockpile.

The average price of wheat in North Dakota on July 1, 1972, was $1.33 a bushel.

It is an immutable law of farm economics that when large stockpiles of farm commodities "overhang" the market, the price is low and the price will not rise above Government support levels until sales remove the depressing pressure of surpluses.

And that is exactly what happened.

The Russian, other export and domestic sales removed all but 79 million bushels of the 400 million bushels. By July 1 of this year the price of wheat had risen from $1.33 a bushel to $2.38 a bushel within a year.

North Dakota's 1973 wheat crop is projected by USDA at 240 million bushels, and the price of wheat could average $3 a bushel in North Dakota—right now it is higher.

Now, let us see what all this means in dollars and cents to the economy of North Dakota.

North Dakota wheatgrowers sold more than 320 million bushels of wheat in the 12-month period of July 1, 1972, to July 1, 1973. Most North Dakota farmers got full benefit from the increased wheat prices because only 20 percent of the total wheat stocks, including the 1971 carryover and the 1972 harvest, was sold by September 30, 1972, according to the Statistical Reporting Service of the USDA.

But let us make a conservative guess that North Dakota wheat farmers enjoyed a 60-cent-per-bushel increase in the price of wheat over the July 1 market price of $1.33.

That adds to a net gain for North Dakota farmers of over $190 million.

If this year's wheat crop in North Dakota hits the projected estimate of 240 million bushels and the price is $3 a bushel—and it could be higher—then the price gain over the July 1, 1972, market of $1.33 a bushel would be $1.67

and the gross net increase in wheat income for this year would be about another $400 million.

In other words, the Russian wheat sale will mean a total increase in wheat income alone of $590 million to North Dakota wheatgrowers from July 1, 1972, through this marketing year.

That represents more than $950 for every man, woman, and child in North Dakota.

FARM EXPORTS AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

As everyone knows, the Nation has a tough fuel crisis on its hands—one that may be with us for some time.

Increasing oil imports makes this Nation dependent on the uncertain policies of foreign nations. It also badly upsets our balance of trade which is already in serious imbalance.

For the year ending July 1, 1973, our Nation's balance-of-trade deficit was approximately $4.5 billion and, in my view, it is extremely important to note that the United States purchased more than $4.8 billion worth of foreign crude oil during this same period. There is no question but what we will continue to buy increasing amounts of foreign crude oil to meet our accelerating domestic demands.

What do you think would happen to our balance of trade were it not for our $13 billion export of farm products? The dollar would soon be facing an even more alarming jolt on the world money market than it is now.

Just to be practical about it, I wonder if these people who are now questioning our farm export program are much interested in being cold or facing a blackout some winter when fuel oil that is needed is no longer available.

Finally, let me make one more observation about the vital relationship between farm exports and the fuel crisis.

By establishing better relations with Russia and China and developing permanent markets in those countries for our food products—and those markets have vast potential—we can exchange our food for their oil, of which they have massive reserves. Their food needs are even more critical than our oil needs.

The fact that they have a continuing need for great quantities of food reduces the chances of an abrupt halt in our fuel supply which is certainly possible if we depend solely on Mideast countries for our crude imports. This just makes good sense.

FOOD EXPORTS AND THE NATION

I have already pointed out what our $13 billion of farm exports have meant to bringing peace and to our balance of trade and what future exports can mean to soften the national fuel crunch.

There are other benefits to the Nation.

Food can lay the basis for an enduring peace.

Hungry people are restless and frustrated people, always subject to revolt and violence.

Food can be the most powerful tool for good will if used and distributed wisely and humanely.

Our Nation's farmers are without peer in their ability to produce. America is blessed with the most superb agricultural resources of any nation in the world.

I say, let us unleash our farm production to its fullest capacity. Farmers will respond to better prices gained through increased exports with increased production. Consumers at home will continue to eat better and cheaper than in any other nation and we will once again become the world leaders in this mutual quest for an enduring peace.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKINNEY), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, patriotism takes many forms, not the least of which is the conservation of our Nation's natural resources. And it is to this form of patriotism that I direct this piece of legislation I am introducing today, for I believe every American has the duty and responsibility to help protect our dwindling energy supplies.

Confronted with the reality of a gasoline shortage, we are now considering any number of proposals to ease the crisis situation, ranging from recommendations to reduce highway speed limits from 70 to 60 miles per hour, a move estimated to cut fuel consumption by 11 percent; to long-range measures such as mandating a decrease in the weight being the single most important parameter effecting urban fuel economy.

We Americans drive our 85 million cars nearly 1 trillion miles a year and in the process consume nearly 70 billion gallons of gasoline. By volume this is equivalent to 4.3 million barrels of crude oil a day and to 14 percent of all the energy resources consumed in the United States annually. It is clear that steps must be taken, and soon, to reduce the amount of gasoline consumed by the automobile. The inefficiency of today's motor vehicles is cutting deeply into our available supplies of oil and costing us dearly in foreign exchange. However, I believe in American technology and know-how and our ability to achieve ever greater fuel savings through alternative engine technologies. I would hope this could be achieved freely through the marketplace rather than through congressional mandate.

At the same time I believe a conscientious effort is required by all Americans to conserve gasoline. Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton has called upon Americans to cut down on their driving in order to help protect our petroleum resources. As part of this effort, I am today introducing legislation designed to help the prospective car buyer make a rational choice in the selection of his car in terms of gasoline consumption.

American motorists have an overwhelming number of size vehicles from which to choose and they can select from seemingly endless lists of optional equipment items. I believe the purchaser has the right to know the amount of gasoline consumed by the vehicle he is contemplating and be able to compare one car with another—with a breakdown in terms of gasoline consumption according to model and options. Over the life of his vehicle the average car owner spends nearly 60 percent of the original price of his car on gasoline. With possible rationing of gasoline and with rising prices for gasoline, our citizens will have their lifestyles modified and their pocketbooks pinched unless they begin to make gasoline consumption a prime consideration in the selection of their automobiles.

My bill would amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act, requiring that the fuel consumption of every new model car—both domestic and foreign—be prominently displayed in the form of a window sticker, beginning in January 1974. The fuel consumption label would list the gas consumed per mile in urban driving, in country driving; with power-guzzling devices such as air conditioners, power steering, and automatic transmission; as well as an itemizing of optional devices that may aid fuel economy, such as steel belted radial tires.

A recent study by the Environmental Protection Agency has confirmed what many automobile owners have suspected for years: small foreign cars get slightly better mileage per gallon of gasoline than their American competitors. And big cars, regardless of where they are manufactured, eat up more than twice as much gasoline as small ones.

When a prospective buyer enters an automobile showroom, he should have at his fingertips information that can perhaps influence him to buy a car which can help save our gasoline resources: That the American Gremlin gets 18 miles per gallon while the Javelin, depending on the model, varies from 14.3 to 10 miles per gallon. Or that in your Chrysler cars, one model Charger gets 12.2 miles per gallon and the Fury gets but 9.7 or 8.7, depending on the model. Maybe then he might choose the Chrysler Valiant which gets 17.9 miles per gallon. Looking at Ford cars, the buyer might want the Pinto at 21.4 miles per gallon instead of the Maverick model which gets 14.7 or the Torino model which gets but 8.5. Among the General Motors cars, one Vega model gets as much as 21.5 miles per gallon while another gets but 18. Such information, derived from Federal emission test procedures at the EPA laboratory, should be readily available to every purchaser so that he may make comparisons among our domestic cars and foreign imports.

With rising gas prices, this is invaluable information for the consumer. Moreover, we hear so much about the trouble-free rotary engine, but how many of us know that fuel economy data on the 1973 rotary engine vehicle represents a 35 percent loss in fuel economy when compared to the average for the same weight vehicle equipped with conventional engines. The mass production of this machine in our country could have a substantial negative impact on total gasoline consumption unless improvements are made in that engine.

In 1971 over 60 percent of new cars were sold with factory equipped air conditioning. EPA has just completed studies which demonstrate that air conditioning reduces gas mileage 9 percent

on the average and 20 percent on a hot day in urban traffic. This is something I believe the average car purchaser would like to know before he opts for an air conditioner—or at least before he turns it on.

Another pertinent statistic is that 90 percent of our automobiles are sold with automatic transmissions, which have been estimated to have a 5 to 6 percent fuel penalty. Also, differences in vehicle weight can account for as much as a 50 percent loss in fuel economy. A 5,000-pound motor monster consumes 100 percent more fuel than its 2,500-pound counterpart.

One of the few positive trends in fuel economy has been the increased use of radial tires on American cars. It has been estimated that a 10 percent increase in fuel economy can be realized from the use of steel belted radials. Many an American consumer, I am sure, would like to have that information when purchasing a car or when in the market for tires.

I might mention here that much has been made of the loss in fuel economy due to the recently mandated emission controls. I have read ads deploring the "drastically reduced mileage" because of the emission controls. Yet EPA studies show these controls increase gas consumption in the range of only 7 to 8 percent, a figure which can be offset, for example, by use of radial tires.

While, admittedly, consumers might get different mileage depending on the manner in which the vehicle is driven, type of route and terrain traveled, speeds at which the vehicle is driven, design of the engine, state of tune and overall mechanical condition, nevertheless information derived from tests prescribed by the Environmental Protection Agency would offer concrete mileage comparisons among the various model cars.

In essence, my bill is a consumer information measure. A prospective car buyer invariably asks about mileage. Uppermost in his mind may not be a desire to conserve our petroleum resources. Financial considerations may be his prime motivation. But regardless of his priority at the time of purchase, listing the energy consumed by the vehicle in urban driving, in country driving, and with power-guzzling accessories could prove a determining influence in the purchase and could help safeguard our energy resources.

Also, it is my hope that this legislation might encourage manufacturers to produce a vehicle that can achieve more efficient use of fuel. I don't believe an automobile engine that can get 35 miles to the gallon is a far-fetched fantasy.

A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON ENERGY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a twofold purpose in addressing my colleagues today, First, a few days ago a prestigious group of representatives from business, government, private research organizations, and major universities met in an Engineering Foundation, "Conference on Energy Research," and it is my privilege to present to the House of Representatives the recommendations of that conference. Secondly, as a result of the determination of that group, I am introducing today legislation to authorize a "White House Conference on Energy." In a statement to the Engineering Foundation Conference, I proposed that such a White House conference might provide the best possible forum for gathering a national consensus on the proper goals of energy policy and planning, and I was most gratified by the action of the Engineering Foundation Conference in making that proposal one of the conference's final recommendations.

By way of a little background on the Engineering Foundation Conference on Energy Research I would like to invoke a long-standing conviction of mine that Members of Congress who have colleges and universities in their congressional districts are blessed with a well-spring of expertise and provocative ideas which can be be immensely helpful in the performance of congressional responsibilities. My own continuing dialogs with the universities in my district have yielded countless legislative ideas and invaluable consultation on questions before Congress. One outgrowth of many such discussions with faculty members of the Cornell University Water Resources and Marine Sciences Center was the suggestion that government had not really tapped the wide spectrum of expertise and interest in this country which can contribute to energy policy and planning. A further corollary would be that government must encourage far more public participation in the formulation of energy policy, since the way of life of every individual may well be dramatically affected by the future implementation of such policy.

The seed of an idea which grew out of our discussion quickly grew to fruition through the hard work of several individuals who took it upon themselves to organize the kind of study group which we felt to be capable of providing a fresh look at the directions of Federal management and organization of energy research. On June 5 of this year invitations to an Engineering Foundation Conference on Energy Research were sent to environmentalists, businessmen, university representatives, consultants, and private research organizations by Mr. William C. Ackermann, Urbana, Ill., member of the National Academy of Engineering; Leonard B. Dworsky, Ithaca, N.Y., professor of civil engineering at Cornell University and chairman of the Power Division Research Committee of the American Society of Civil Engineers; and Mr. Eugene Eaton, Washington, D.C., president of Resources Technology and a consultant on energy matters to the National Academy of Engineering.

During mid-July some 70 individuals gathered at New England College, Henniker, N.H., and, during a week of intensive discussion, drew up a set of recommendations which are worthy of very close attention as we in Congress prepare legislation to reorganize Federal energy research and development agencies. I will insert a summary of those recommendations below, together with the text of a letter of transmittal to the President, but, before doing so, I would like to give my own overview of the thinking which came out of this conference.

Besides presenting us with some very specific suggestions on the policy alternatives which lie ahead, this group has contributed a most engaging suggestion of the process which our energy planning ought to take during the coming decades. I am most enthusiastic over this suggestion, implicit in the conference recommendations, that there can be an orderly movement toward energy resource objectives which necessarily involves every segment of public opinion.

As I previously noted, it was my honor to submit a statement to the conference in which I suggested the group might consider the feasibility and effectiveness of a White House Conference on Energy as a means of gaining the broadest possible consensus on energy policy and planning objectives. I should mention that I had hoped to present that statement personally, and to join the august company of my colleague from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK), and Dr. Gordon MacDonald of the National Academy of Sciences, who appeared as keynote speakers. As is too often the case, last minute committee business forced me to remain here; however, the conference did see fit to include the proposal in its final recommendations. It did so by placing the proposed White House Conference on Energy at the outset of a plan of policy development which maps the necessary steps for organizing government to properly undertake energy research.

If we are to plan and act on an orderly basis, there must be a clear idea of the beginning and end of that planning process. With the phrase "energy crisis" ringing everywhere, the beginning is not so hard to furnish. Through its working groups the Engineering Foundation Conference attempted to define some of the parameters of our energy supply capability and, then, to design the public institutions which best utilize the physical and technological resources available. The findings of these study groups are extensive in their scope, and at a future time I intend to go into some of their details; but for the present, I would generalize to say that the conference has very persuasively suggested that our dilemma lies not in the supply of energy resources, but in the institutions which are formed to manage that supply.

This contention, emanating from the conference recommendations, strikes me as one of those essential truths which has waited too long to be clearly stated. Perhaps, we have moved toward the ends suggested here, but I am not sure we have done so for the right reasons. Once clearly spelled out, the suggestion that the right organizational forms may yield the right supply of energy allows solid footing from which to begin considering planning alternatives.

If we have a start, then, we still lack direction; and in seeking that direction

the Engineering Foundation conference advises that we draw on the widest possible public consensus. This gathering of national needs and proposed solutions is the stuff of a White House conference, where representatives of every public voice can contribute to the formulation of energy research priorities while, at the same time, suggesting the "energy ethic" which can best serve our national goals and aspirations.

The fundamental equation here, and the necessary starting point for a White House conference, is that supply equals demand. This equation may offer a painfully pragmatic perspective on the way we are to husband energy resources in the future, yet it is now clear to the most hardened skeptic that the days of energy abundance are over—at least for a while. As long as the demand side of the equation continues to press the supply side, policy, organization, and management are going to have to give almost equal research and development time to the still unknown features of energy demand.

And, once demand becomes the subject of serious research, innumerable social questions must be considered, as planners and policy bodies assess the effect of various alternatives on the life styles we are now accustomed to. I am suggesting through my introduction of legislation to authorize a White House Conference on Energy that some of the answers to these questions of social adjustment may already be present, and we need only ask the same people who are to make that adjustment. Through a White House conference, the people of this country can determine how they can best fit future life styles to future energy supply.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say on this topic, but I will stop here for now, recognizing that I have touched only the first stage of a much larger proposal. My purpose for now is to propose that one excellent way to begin our effort to equalize energy supply and demand is to clarify present needs and future aspirations through a White House Conference on Energy. I ask that my colleagues consider this idea and that they note the summary of findings and recommendations of the Engineering Foundation Conference on Energy Research. I should also point out, as I insert this summary, that the recommendations in it come solely from the conference participants, who were given free rein in making their proposals:

ENGINEERING FOUNDATION CONFERENCE ON ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION

SUMMARY—FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A serious energy problem exists in the United States, and if massive attention, talent, and funds are not devoted to it at once, serious consequences to our national security, economy, life style and environment will result. The problem has immediate short, medium, and long term dimensions.

Energy research, development and demonstration are central to solution of our national energy problem. Although there are numerous excellent programs underway, we find that these are highly fragmented, underfunded, unbalanced, and that the overall program lacks policy, leadership, and plans.

The Conference recommends that an intense, directed, national and regional program of research, development, and demonstration (R.D. & D.) be initiated at once. Organizational units are proposed which can be established quickly and are adequate at this time. Their operational considerations are outlined.

A research, development, and demonstration effort at a billion dollars per year has been proposed by the President and from within Congress. If properly phased, this appears to be a reasonable initial effort.

The President is urged to convene a White House Conference on Energy to enhance public understanding, but timed so as not to impede implementation of Conference recommendations.

OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The R.D. & D. program must essentially be concerned with the equation: Supply-Demand. The program will be equally concerned with both sides of the equation, although equal funding may not be required on both sides. The program should be concerned with testing and demonstrating alternative courses of action in priority order while maintaining environmental quality, societal objectives and reasonable reserves.

Leadership must be exercised by the federal government using broadly representative advice and participation, and employing both public and private expertise and facilities.

The program must be concerned with immediate, short range (3–5 years) mid-range (5–15 years) and long range (15 years—end of fossil era).

The supply R.D. & D. must be concerned with all conventional fuels, conversions, and deliveries that are commonly recognized as well as environmental and social matters. It should also be equally concerned with unconventional sources and approaches for long range application. Attention must be devoted to creating incentives and streamlined contractual procedures and patent interests.

The demand R.D. & D. must be concerned with utilization, conservation, environment, economics, incentives, and education. It must utilize fully the social and behavioral sciences.

The program must be conducted in an open manner with attention to public information and opportunities for formal and informal input from the public.

There must be continuous overview of the R.D. & D. program from the perspective of total energy considerations and national objectives.

Planning and program evaluation coupled with needed adjustments in priorities or programs must be a major characteristic.

The R.D. & D. program must be a judicious mix of governmental, joint government/private, and private enterprises. Experience in the energy field, particularly, emphasizes the desirability of heavy use of the private sector for innovation and rapid transfer of new technology to commercialization.

Collection, analysis, and dissemination of date on manpower, fuel resources, and other pertinent factors as well as demands should be maintained on a regional, national, and international basis.

Universities should be encouraged to become heavily involved in energy R.D. & D. by conducting research and by developing qualified manpower in the technical, social, and managerial fields.

The Conference strongly favors competition while avoiding unnecesary duplication among qualified R. & D. entities whether within government, university, industrial, or private firms as a means of stimulating innovation, flexibility, and quality of R. & D. product.

We believe that the current generation of R.D. & D. programs and projects are sufficiently well identified that they should be undertaken without delay, but subject to the simultaneous establishment of planning, monitoring, and review processes. An example of an area urgently requiring attention is coal research and its conversion to cleaner and alternate forms.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Discussions at the Conference included numerous administrative suggestions — only three elements of which are set forth in this report. These must be staffed and advised by individuals broadly representative of the industry and the various interests.

Meanwhile, a strong consensus evolved with regard to several principles of energy organization. One is that planning, implementation, and regulation must be administratively separated. A further point is that the weapons function should be clearly separated from energy research.

The Conference recognizes that at various times in our national history circumstances have required, and we have successfully forged new technological organizations. The Manhattan Project, the AEC, and NASA are successful examples of these. Yet, while these are examples of our organizational and managerial genius, they are not appropriate models of the organization required for energy at this time.

The Conference also recognizes that many institutional arrangements are both possible and have been proposed for energy R.D. & D. and the numerous and important related fields. The Conference feels that it is critically important that we not lose time in debating and deciding upon the optimum or ultimate total institutional arrangement. Therefore, it proposes that the three organizational elements for which it sees a clear need be established at once with further organizational form evolving if this proves desirable. Specifically we propose:

1. An Energy Policy Council be established in the office of the President. This is viewed as a small, powerful, and essential body comparable to the Council of Economic Advisers or the Council on Environmental Quality. This Board would advise the President on all matters concerning energy including planning, evaluation, and priorities; the R.D. & D. agency, and related elements throughout government; and the relations and implications of all energy matters to national policy, objectives, and programs.

2. An Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Agency be created as an independent agency with location in government comparable to the present NASA, AEC, or NSF.

3. A national Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Planning Body be created with responsibility to concentrate on energy R.D. & D. national strategy and separated from the ongoing tactical operational programs of the independent Energy Research, Development and Demonstration implementing agency. A major characteristic of this Planning Body would be the wide and very strong mix of government and industry representatives; of those concerned with supply of and demand for energy; and of those concerned with environment, quality of life and life-styles. While initially this R.D. & D. planning agency should be a separate organization, its ultimate organizational locus would be determined by experience.

ABOUT THE CONFERENCE

The Engineering Foundation Conference on "Energy Research-Management Alternatives to meet Regional and National Needs" met at New England College, Henniker, New Hampshire during July 15–20, 1973. The Conference organization, the six supporting work group reports, the list of participants, and the invited papers are contained in companion documents.

The Conference participants of some 75 persons were not only concerned with the subject issue, but brought together a wide variety of backgrounds. This was enhanced by documents provided from recent reports

primarily from the Legislature and Executive branches of the federal government. Our deliberations were prefaced and greatly stimulated by a number of prominent invited speakers.

The findings and conclusions are the responsibility of the individual conferees. While not every individual may fully agree with every point, broad consensus was obtained in the findings and recommendations expressed here.

It should be emphasized that the conference was concerned with research, development, and demonstration; but this was considered with reasonable appreciation of the much larger total energy question which is far more complex and almost boundless. There was also a conscious effort to consider previous national efforts in advanced technology and the potential roles of branches and levels of government, the private sector, the universities, and other groups.

FRAUDULENT LAND-SALE SCHEMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RUPPE), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill aimed at fraudulent land-sale schemes, several of which have recently surfaced in my home area of northern Michigan. The story may well be familiar to you, inasmuch as public attention to this problem is growing daily.

An interstate land sales company sent out high-pressure salesmen through the small towns of Michigan, selling "investment mortgages" in "estates" in the Southwest, promising not only a regular investment income, but eventual ownership of beautiful terrain. The customers they pursued were almost without exception the elderly, especially retirees and widows, who are now in no position to recover from the loss of their life savings. Many invested thousands of dollars in a company they knew only through a door-to-door salesman and in land they had never seen.

Not surprisingly, those promised fat interest checks never appeared, and the company was not responsive when investors asked for their money back. Some people tried to foreclose on their "mortgages," only to be told that land was not worth a fraction of the selling price without the promised improvements.

This kind of fraud must stop. Unfortunately, it exploits one of most Americans' most treasured dreams: owning your own land, especially owning land at the right place and at the right time to make a profit. Too many purchasers have bought remote pieces of ground with no facilities and no future, despite warnings to the contrary.

I believe that all of us here in Congress have a legitimate concern in this area, whether we are from a State whose land is being exploited by these promoters, or whether we represent constituents who are being defrauded. All those who deplore deception should be offended by those abuses.

Congress recognized this problem in the late sixties, and passed the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, designed to halt the sale of parcels of desert and swamp to unsuspecting buyers. The heart of the act was disclosure. It required each company promoting interstate land sales to file reports with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to reveal vital information on financing, geographical considerations, the availability of water, and so forth. A copy of the report is to be furnished to the buyer, and functions as the primary safeguard.

This clearinghouse function of the Office of Interstate Land Sales is vitally important. However, I believe the time has come to recognize the need for a more vigilant role for that Office. Regulation in a variety of areas has shown that too often the consumer remains unprotected largely because of his ignorance of the safeguards available to him.

Unfortunately, there has been a widespread tendency both among the public and the land development industry to misconstrue the act's intent. This may be due to ambiguity in the language of the act, or hesitancy on the part of the industry, which may have feared a detrimental effect on its marketing practices. However, in the years since the act took effect, I believe it can be fairly said that the vast majority of legitimate land developers in this country have recognized the need for legislation. They want to help clean up the good name of the industry which has been smeared by the operations of a handful of unscrupulous developers.

I am today introducing a series of amendments to the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, designed to clear up any remaining ambiguities about the purpose of the act, and to strengthen the Office of Interstate Land Sales Registration. These amendments will change the emphasis of the program from that of data-collection to investigation and regulation. Overall, it will help correct those problems which have appeared since enforcement of the act began several years ago.

These amendments are aimed at easing the burden of enforcement of the act, encouraging a tougher stance by the Office of Interstate Land Sales, and making recovery a reasonable possibility. First, it eases the burden of proof on the purchaser to prove he was the victim of misrepresentation. Next, it extends the "cooling-off" period during which the purchaser has a chance to reflect on the deal he has made and perhaps check on its legitimacy. This cooling-off period is now denied those whose contract says that the purchaser acknowledges being given all the necessary disclosure papers. My amendments would not allow this vital protection to be signed away in the fine print of the contract.

This bill will also make it clear that it is unlawful for any developer to sell lots without furnishing an adequate bond to insure that the developer delivers all that he promised. Most important of all, this bill would direct the Interstate Land Sales Office to take affirmative action as to each development within its jurisdiction. Not only would they furnish information to those who are well enough informed to ask for it, but they would investigate the extent and accuracy of each registration and every alleged misrepresentation.

Mr. Speaker, there is something in our national character that treasures the ownership of land. My purpose in introducing this legislation is not to thwart or obstruct that natural tendency, but to assure that the American dream of owning one's own little corner of the world cannot be destroyed by a few unscrupulous land developers.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFIT ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that I believe to be most urgent legislation. This bill passed the Senate in March of this year, and I am hopeful that it will pass the House and become law when we return from the August recess.

This bill provides that when a public safety officer has been killed in the line of duty and the direct and proximate cause of such death was a criminal act or an apparent criminal act, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration shall pay a benefit of $50,000 to the specified persons under the act.

Public safety officer means a person serving a public agency as a law-enforcement officer including a corrections or a court official.

The risk of lethal violence faced daily by peace officers in city after city across the country has increased in the past few years. In my city of San Antonio we have witnessed the shameful occurrence of four deaths of law-enforcement officials in a matter of a few months this year.

Public safety officers, dedicated to their law-enforcement careers, are not nearly so concerned with their low salaries as they are of maintaining and preserving the security of their families. Legislation such as this bill will give them this well-deserved security.

This bill will also cover prison guards. The prison guard in recent years has been faced with an increase in violence within the prison system. It is obvious to all that we need prison reform, but we will always need guards, and unless these men and women feel that their families will be provided for if something should happen to them, we are not going to find the qualified people needed for these positions.

I recently received a sad letter from a resident of Texas who related to me the story of her friend's brother who was a prison guard at Arizona State prison and was killed while on duty this past June.

This young fellow's wife is Korean and has not lived in the United States very long. She was, as you can imagine, very dependent upon him. They also have three small children, which she must now raise without a father. I think we would all agree that this is a very sad situation for this woman and her family, and if this bill I am proposing today becomes law, this young woman and her family will be in some way compensated for their great and tragic loss. Money can in no

way replace a human life but it can lessen the hardships that the families will have to suffer.

Crime knows no jurisdictional boundary, nor respects the color of a law-enforcement officer's uniform. Each officer, whether sheriff, deputy, highway patrolman, policeman or prison guard, must be fully cognizant that death may come to him in the performance of his sworn duties.

I believe these guaranteed benefits would improve the quality of law enforcement by lifting the morale of those who enforce the law. Thus, this proposed legislation would have at least two positive results; direct financial benefits to the families of slain public safety officers, and improved law enforcement.

I urge that this legislation be passed as it is the moral obligation of this country to adequately compensate those who risk their lives to protect all of society.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE ADMINISTRATION TRADE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, time and again, both in the Ways and Means Committee and on the House floor I have spoken about the damages being inflicted on U.S. industry and the American laborer by the unfavorable trade policies this Nation has been burdened with in recent years. I have fought long and hard to protect the industrial economic base of this country and I have been backed in this effort by the organized average American working man and woman. Too often the voice of this truly "silent majority" is stifled by the overwhelming influence of lobbyists and fat cat tycoons who spend their tax-free profit dollars in efforts to prevent the Congress from enacting laws that will benefit the everyday worker and consumer. Now, with the defeat of amendments in the Ways and Means Committee that would provide for only the most minimal safeguards to threatened U.S. industries, we are faced with an administration trade bill that not only will cost thousands upon thousands of workingmen their jobs, but also surrenders to the President unlimited authorities that Congress will never be able to control. Every Member of this House should stop 1 minute and listen to the laborers of America. I am including in the RECORD the official policy statement of the AFL–CIO on the administration's trade bill, H.R. 6767, and suggest that this concise document be carefully reviewed in light of the continual erosion of America's economic power.

Following is the text of the AFL–CIO statement:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON ADMINISTRATION TRADE BILL, OAK BROOK, ILL., AUGUST 2, 1973

Much of America's current economic distress can be directly traced to misguided and misapplied foreign trade and investment policies.

The American worker, public and businessman are all suffering from erosion of the U.S. industrial base, the battering of the dollar and deepening trade deficits.

Trade legislation currently being drafted in the Congress fails to deal with the realities of the Seventies and would, in fact, accelerate the calamity facing the U.S. industrial society.

In a specific test vote, the House Ways and Means Committee rejected a provision that would have established minimum safeguards against the torrent of imports that are sweeping away American jobs.

In a contrary move, the committee accepted provisions that would provide the President with virtually unlimited authority to reduce to zero the minimum trade safeguards that now exist. Badly hit U.S. industries, such as chemical and allied products, apparel, electronics, shoes, steel products, steel, stone, clay and glass, autos and aircraft would suffer further heavy erosion or stunted growth as a result of the bill's provisions as they now stand.

In April, when the Administration's trade bill was introduced, the AFL–CIO categorized it as bad legislation. The trade bill that is now taking shape in committee is equally bad, having only cosmetic changes that appear to restrict the President's authority and appear to give the Congress control over trade agreements, but do not.

The bill provides no specific machinery to regulate the flood of imports. It does not deal at all with the export of U.S. technology and capital to other parts of the world where corporations can maximize profits and minimize costs at the expense of U.S. production and jobs. It does nothing to close the lucrative tax loopholes for American-based multinational corporations which make it more profitable for them to locate and produce abroad.

As it stands now, unless the committee reconsiders some tentative decisions and takes action to provide adequate and specific safeguards to meet these deficiencies, the bill is worse than no bill at all.

Unless it is revamped, the AFL–CIO must urge the House to defeat the Administration bill. We would then ask the House to turn to consideration of the Burke-Hartke bill which provides a comprehensive framework for restoring America's economic health and regaining the necessary balance in international trade.

A VETERANS' PENSION PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 30 the U.S. House of Representatives approved H.R. 9497 which provides for a 10-percent cost-of-living increase to veterans, widows, and children receiving nonservice-connected pensions as well as dependent parents receiving dependency and indemnity compensation.

According to that indomitable defender of veterans' causes, the Honorable OLIN E. "TIGER" TEAGUE of Texas, the Veterans' Administration has assured the Congress that the bill will restore practically all of the reductions in pensions which occurred as a result of the 20-percent social security rate increase last year.

This is all well and good for this year. But what about next year? And the year after that?

Because 90 percent of all social security payments is counted in determining total annual income of a veteran, a social security increase may cause an actual reduction in pensions depending on the exact amount of the increase and the amount of other income received by the veteran or dependent.

In fact, the Veterans' Administration released figures showing that 1.2 million pensioners had a reduction in their VA pensions as a result of the social security increase enacted in 1972. The VA also released figures that revealed that some 20,000 pensioners were dropped from the pension rolls entirely and 15,000 of these pensioners stood to suffer a loss in aggregate income as a result of the social security. Hopefully, the Senate and House will agree on a formula or a straight increase that will prevent this from happening.

More importantly, though, there should be a means to prevent automatically increases in social security benefits from decreasing a man's or woman's pension. Most of those receiving veterans pensions are social security recipients as well.

Today, I am introducing legislation which would provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions. The bill would also increase income limitations so that veterans might earn a little more money, if they wish, and not suffer a loss in pension.

Specifically, this legislation would:

Increase the income limitation from $2,600 to $3,000 for single veterans with no dependents.

Increase from $3,800 to $4,200 the income limitation for those with dependents.

Increase the maximum pension payments for single veterans from $130 to $140 a month; for a veteran with one dependent from $135 to $150 monthly; a veteran with two dependents from $140 to $155 a month; and a veteran with more than two dependents from $145 to $160 monthly.

Deletes social security payments from the maximum income limitation test.

One of the recommendations of the U.S. Veterans Advisory Commission, established by President Johnson, stated:

The Commission recommends that pensions as a benefit for war veterans and their survivors, should be maintained as a federal program providing financial aid above and beyond the levels of public assistance and that, within reasonably improved limits, increases in other form of income should not adversely affect veterans' pensions . . .

It is time that we put the Commission's recommendation into practice.

"SWEETHEART" ANTITRUST AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, which closely follows S. 782, authored by the distinguished Senator from California, the Honorable JOHN TUNNEY, except that my bill contains a retroactive feature. Both bills establish new procedures for settlement of antitrust cases via a consent decree. Only July 18 the Senate approved S. 782 by a unanimous vote, and I commend Senator TUNNEY for his keen perception and diligent work in initiating action on this vitally important subject.

About 80 percent of all antitrust cases are settled by consent decrees, which are agreements between the Justice Department and the defendant, approved by the court, as to action to be taken to remedy violations of law. By this procedure, a costly and time-consuming trial is avoided. However, the procedure has the disadvantage that a full airing of the facts usually does not take place, and indeed, it may even degenerate into a process for ratifying, quickly and quietly, an agreement which gives mere lipservice abating the violations, and lets stand the serious abuses that prompted the suit. In short, the decrees may take on the aspects of a "sweetheart" agreement.

The bill I am introducing today guarantees that in all efforts to settle through a consent decree, there will be an opportunity for significant involvement by both the courts and the public. Presently there is a 30-day period for comment by interested parties on the terms of the consent decree offered by the Justice Department. This legislation extends that period to 60 days.

Presently the Department of Justice provides no more information on the terms of the proposed settlement than that which can be contained in a brief press release, the circulation of which is relatively limited. This legislation requires the Department to publish a whole series of facts relevant to the case, including a complete description of the alleged violations of the law, an outline of the possible solutions that were considered, and an explanation of how the proposed settlement will deal with the practices or conditions enumerated in the complaint. In order to insure that this information receives wide dissemination, the bill further requires that the material be published in both the Federal Register, and in local newspapers. A related provision requires that the defendant file with the court information on communications it has had with Government officials.

Presently the Department of Justice is not required to respond to any of the comments it receives on the proposed settlement. This legislation requires that the Justice Department respond to all such comments, and that the response be both filed with the court and published in the Federal Register.

Finally, this legislation makes clear that the court is to take an active role in the proceedings, and not merely rubberstamp what is presented by the defendant and the Justice Department. In its consideration of the proposed settlement, the court is authorized to take into account all of the above information, and whatever else can be adduced through a hearing, the calling of expert witnesses, or other means, as the court sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, I became aware of the pressing need for this legislation through the work I have done in urging that an antitrust case now before the U.S. District Court in Cleveland, Ohio—United States against Standard Oil Co. of Ohio—be resolved promptly, and in a manner that serves the public interest. In my many communications with the Attorney General and others, I have been trying to accomplish in this specific case what this bill would mandate in all antitrust cases: a well-informed and comprehensive review of the proposed consent decree by the court and the public.

My initial concern over this case stemmed from the seemingly interminable delay the case encountered in its initial stages. The case was filed by the Justice Department in September 1970, and it was not until May 1973, that a proposed consent decree was filed. I have serious reservations about this consent decree, believing it to be, quite frankly, a capitulation by the Justice Department. For the information of my colleagues, I am attaching copies of the most recent correspondence I have had with Attorney General Richardson and U.S. District Court Judge Thomas Lambros. Also attached is a memorandum I received from the Northern Ohio Petroleum Retailers Association, outlining its objections to the consent decree.

Judge Lambros, a distinguished and highly regarded jurist, acted in a constructive manner by extending the period for comment and by holding, on July 16, a hearing on the consent decree. Judge Lambros has taken the case under advisement. Originally he planned to issue a ruling by the end of July, but on July 31, he stated that because of the complexities of the case, a decision would not be reached until September 10.

I believe the disclosure requirements of the legislation I am introducing today should be applied to this case, as well as to the ITT and other cases, and so my bill includes a section making certain of these requirements applicable to all consent decrees filed after December 31, 1972. I urge that the House act expeditiously to improve the antitrust laws in the manner contemplated in this bill.

Following are the items referred to above:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 30, 1973.

Hon. ELLIOT RICHARDSON,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RICHARDSON: This letter to you is in connection with an important antitrust matter, Civil Action No. C 70-895, United States v. The Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), pending in U. S. District Court, Northern District of Ohio. For your information, Justice Department attorneys have entered into a tentative agreement with the defendant resulting in a consent decree which, if approved by the court, will terminate this case very soon.

The reason for this communication is to urge you, while there is yet time, to abrogate the aforesaid agreement, as I seriously doubt that it is in the public interest, or failing that action, that you ask the court (as I have done) to continue this matter so you will have an opportunity to review personally the issues that are involved, and all the circumstances of this case. (I enclose a copy of my letter of May 16 to the Honorable Thomas B. Lambros, the federal judge in whose courtroom this litigation is pending).

I think it is entirely appropriate that you undertake such a review—and that you make your own independent decision because the timing of this matter is such that, obviously, you will bear the ultimate responsibility for how the case is concluded—even though you have had no hand in the developments that have brought the case to its present stage and, until now, no authority of influence over the proceedings.

Although I am not a party in this case. I have been watching its rather slow progress because I feel that the litigation is very much in the interests of my constituents, many of whom are customers of Sohio or other oil companies whose pricing policies are affected by Sohio's actions. This matter has assumed, recently, even greater urgency because of the shortage of gasoline and resultant projections that the price per gallon of gasoline is likely to rise steeply.

It is possible that, after familiarizing yourself with the facts, you might agree with me that *no settlement* of this case, whatever its terms, would be in the public interest—and that what is really required, to assure public confidence in the fairness of these proceedings, is a public airing of all the issues in open court.

In this connection, I might point out that the enclosed letter from your Justice Department to the defendant, dated May 2, indicates that the federal prosecutors are basing their agreement, at least in part, on the "oral representation" from the company.

To assist you in your review, I am taking the liberty of enclosing also a memorandum to me, dated February 13, from the Honorable Raymond J. Grabow, counsel for the Northern Ohio Petroleum Retailers Association.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1973

Hon. THOMAS B. LAMBROS,
U.S. District Court,
Federal Court House,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR JUDGE LAMBROS: This letter to you is in connection with Civil Action No. C 70-895, United States v. The Standard Oil Co. (Ohio).

On behalf of my constituents, I am asking that you refrain at this time from entering a final judgment in this case, and that you extend the 30-day period for the filing of views and objections by outside parties. These 30 days, of course, date from May 2, 1973, when a consent settlement was filed with your court, reflecting an agreement between attorneys for the Justice Department and the company.

Although I am not a party in this case, I have been watching its rather slow progress because I feel that the litigation is very much in the interests of my constituents, many of whom are customers of Sohio or other oil companies whose pricing policies are affected by Sohio's actions. This matter has assumed, recently, even greater urgency because of the threatened shortage of gasoline and resultant projections that the price per gallon of gasoline is likely to rise steeply.

The reason for my request to you is to give me time to state my objections to the consent settlement. I intend to make my views known to the U. S. Attorney General, but, as you know, the present occupant of that office, Mr. Richard Kleindienst has resigned and is staying on only until his successor is

qualified and takes over. Although President Nixon has named Elliot Richardson to the position of Attorney General, this nomination is being held up by this Senate because of controversial issues that have been raised by the appointment.

Therefore, I am in a position at this time where it would be pointless for me to write to the present lame-duck Attorney General, and inappopriate to write to the incoming Attorney General, whose identity is not known to me, since Mr. Richardson's nomination may or may not be confirmed. Further more, even if the nomination is confirmed, the 30-day period in the case before you may have lapsed by that time.

Therefore, again, I respectfully ask that you continue this matter until such time as I have had an opportunity to make my views known to the new Attorney General.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1973.

Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: This will acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for, your letter of May 30, 1973, requesting that I withdraw the consent of the government to the proposed judgment in U.S. v. The Standard Oil Company (Ohio), Civil Action No. C 70-895, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

I have reviewed the materials accompanying your letter and a copy of the proposed consent decree. However, inasmuch as I am still in the process of familiarizing myself with my new responsibilities, I do not think it appropriate in this case for me to reverse the action heretofore approved by the Antitrust Division under my predecessor.

The Antitrust Division, I am sure, is dedicated to the achievement of the same goals which you seek: lower prices for the consumer, adequate supplies of gasoline, and the freedom of independent businessmen to make their own individual decisions in economic matters. I doubt that a court will approve the entry of a decree which does not adequately serve these ends.

In this connection, I am advised that a petition for leave to intervene in this proceeding has been filed on behalf of the Northern Ohio Petroleum Retailers Association. Although it is the Department's policy to oppose formal intervention in proceedings of this nature, we do urge the courts to hear the views of those who object to decretal provisions as amici curiae. This procedure will be followed in this case, and I am sure that the court will have the benefit of and will carefully consider both your objections to the decree and those of NOPRA. To give the Antitrust Division additional time to consider your objections and those of NOPRA, we have requested an additional 15 days before the court considers whether it should enter the proposed decree.

I am sure that you can understand my reluctance to intervene on short notice in a matter which has been handled in its virtual entirety under my predecessor. However, I have instructed the Antitrust Division to give careful consideration to the views expressed in your letter as well as the objections of any other person in this proceeding.

Sincerely,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
February 13, 1973.

Re United States of America against the Standard Oil Co. (Case No. C 70-895).

Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress, Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you are keenly aware, the above-mentioned anti-trust case has been pending in the District Court in Cleveland, Ohio for since September 19, 1970. During the entire period of its pendency, you have been most diligent in attempting to have the case resolved without the passage of an unreasonable period of time. Unfortunately, the wheels of justice at the Justice Department have not moved with speed but at a turtle's pace—and, one wonder's how fast the case may not have moved without *your* diligent concern and repeated inquiry.

As you also aware, there is presently being considered at the Department of Justice (Anti-Trust Division), a proposed "Consent Entry" which if authorized by the department, and approved by Standard—and the Court, would conclude the case. A copy of a Plain Dealer news article dated February 11, 1973 is enclosed for general background information. I have been asked by James V. Cresente, Executive Director of the Northern Ohio Petroleum Retailer's Association, with whom you are familiar, to acquaint you with NOPRA'S position with respect to the contemplated consent decree being weighed by the parties to conclude the case.

Specifically, it is NOPRA's position that the consent entry does not go far enough to prohibit Standard Oil Company's marketing practices as related to their anti-competitive practices and their use of a method of marketing designated presently as "Incentive Manager Stations". The lawsuit was originally filed after the Justice Department assumed jurisdiction of the subject matter from the Federal Trade Commission; all this happening after NOPRA filed a formal, written and detailed Complaint with the FTC. In the Justice Department suit, SOHIO was accused of utilizing a marketing method of distribution known as "Commission Manager Stations". Thus, as a result of the so-called "C-Manager" operation, SOHIO was accused of controlling and influencing the price of gasoline and petroleum products being sold to the public within the State of Ohio and northeastern Ohio in particular.

In the suit filed by the Justice Department, and among the relief prayed for, was the request that SOHIO be enjoined and restrained from continuing, in any manner, to carry out, directly or indirectly, the agreements (C-Managers Stations), * * * and from engaging in any other agreements *having a like or similar purpose or effect.* (Emphasis given by us).

Almost immediately after the suit was filed, SOHIO proceeded to phase out the so-called "Commission Manager Stations" and began to introduce a hybrid-system of marketing outlet called "Incentive Manager or I-Manager Stations". Virtually, the same procedures were to be followed by the station manager whose income was derived from "commissions" on petroleum sales but whose scope of authority and jurisdiction was still rigidly controlled by SOHIO. By the use of the new hybrid system of "Incentive Managers" employees of the I-Manager are paid by the company, with the payroll being deducted from the commissions earned by the I-Manager. Many significant problems are generated from this method of operation, including the remaining and unanswered question—Who really controls the station? Is it the I-Manager or is it SOHIO? If the station is company-controlled, then the employees at the station properly are subject to being unionized; if not, then the employees are technically not available for unionization. If company controlled, SOHIO can still set and influence the price of petroleum products, such as in the objectionable "Commission Manager System"—the same as SOHIO can, we insist, under the hybrid system of "Incentive Manager", *and soon!*

It is NOPRA's position that the Justice Department has directly if not tacitly permitted SOHIO, ever since the filing of the lawsuit in September of 1970, to permit SOHIO to set up its "Incentive Manager Marketing System"—a hybrid, which still has the same effect upon the consumer market as the Commission Manager system. Also, since the Justice Department has asked that all similar methods be restrained, we believe that the obligation is incumbent upon the Justice Department to terminate any use of the "Incentive Manager System" as well. Simply putting a new facade on the same objectionable system is no way to conclude an offensive business practice by SOHIO. Gasoline and oil prices will still be influenced by SOHIO should this hybrid-system be allowed to exist. Either a station is company operated, or dealer operated! If company operated then SOHIO has a right to determine its pricing policies . . . but *not* when a station is dealer operated. Obviously, the effect on the consuming public as to *gasoline prices* is more than apparent.

NOPRA has communicated this same position to the Cleveland representatives of the Justice Department who have assured us that our objections would be forwarded to Washington for further consideration as related to the proposed consent decree. We are concerned that this lawsuit will be terminated by the Justice Department in a blaze of "fanfare" . . . but with the same anti-competitive end result—"Incentive Manager Stations", the old monster with a face-lift.

We are preparing to request the District Court, when the Consent Decree is presented for approval by the Justice Department, to voice our objections. However, we feel that your continued intervention and concern about the suit is needed to protect the consuming public from high gasoline and oil prices. We continue to solicit your support and will be pleased to provide further information to you should you believe it is needed.

Thank you.

RAYMOND J. GRABOW.

FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT IN CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak about section 525 of H.R. 8152, the Law Enforcement Assistance Amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. As it has emerged from conference, it contains an amendment to one of the donable surplus property provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. The apparent objective of section 525 was to add law enforcement programs to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be given to eligible donees under the Federal donable property program. However, section 525 amends only subsection 203(n) of the Federal Property Act; and therefore it falls short of that objective. Section 525 should also have amended subsection 203(j). That subsection establishes the three broad categories of purposes for which donable property may be transferred to eligible recipients. These

are education, public health, and civil defense. Section 203(j) also contains authority by which the Administrator of General Services, upon appropriate determinations by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the President, may in his discretion, donate the surplus property.

Neither section 525 nor any similar provision of H.R. 8152 was part of the bill as it passed the House. It is a Senate floor amendment accepted in conference.

The Federal Property Act falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. As chairman, I am naturally concerned by the existence of section 525 of H.R. 8152, which section was brought to my attention only after the conference report on H.R. 8152 was submitted to the House on July 26. My concern has been made even stronger because the attempt to bring law enforcement programs into the donation program appears, from a legislative standpoint, to be defective in that it fails to include amendments to the operative language for the donation program in subsection 203(j) of the Federal Property Act. Subsection 203(n), with or without the amendment, is simply an administrative and housekeeping provision for facilitating the implementation of the donation program by authorizing cooperative agreements between Federal agencies and the State surplus property distribution agencies. The latter are State instrumentalities required by the Federal Property Act itself with a mission of assisting in the distribution and control of property donated within each State to eligible recipients. It is my judgment that the language of subsection 203(n), as amended by section 525, does not authorize the Administrator of General Services to make donations for the benefit of law enforcement programs. Subsection 203 (n) is specifically tied to donations made pursuant to subsections 203(j) (3) or 203 (j) (4). As I stated, neither of these paragraphs is amended by section 525 of H.R. 8152.

The result is that we seem to have a legislative anomaly. Even applying liberal standards of statutory interpretation, I believe that the implementing authorities; namely, the Administrator of General Services and the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, are not given an adequate legislative base for taking any affirmative action to make donable property available for law enforcement programs.

The Federal donation program was created as a result of action by our committee. For many years, the committee had a special subcommittee specifically charged with jurisdiction over operations and legislation relating to the donation program. Our former Speaker, John McCormack, and our former colleague, John Monagan, chaired such subcommittees. Thus, the donation program has received continuous intensive oversight by our committee from its inception.

In this Congress, the legislative and investigative responsibility for this program has been assigned to the Government Activities Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman JACK BROOKS. That subcommittee now is making a full investigation of the operations and objectives of the donation program. Pending before that subcommittee today are 10 different bills that would open up the donation program to such additional categories of recipients as State fish and wildlife agencies, volunteer firefighting organizations, and public museums. The problem of adding new categories of eligibles is difficult. Thorough justification, along with careful property selection and distribution guidelines, must be provided when consideration is being given to new groups eligible to take from the declining volume of available surplus personal property.

This case well exemplifies, Mr. Speaker, the need of the House and the various committees to give close attention to the jurisdictional concerns of our Government Operations Committee when amendments to the Federal Property Act are included in other legislation. I am sure that all committees recognize this practical principle, and I hope the future will see it adhered to more strictly, so that we may avoid the kind of problem created now by the defective amendment of the Federal Property Act found in section 525 of H.R. 8152.

IN SUPPORT OF ESTABLISHING AN AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, our rich ethnic and cultural heritage of crafts, folk art, music, and dance is one of America's most treasured possessions. It reflects the values, traditions, dreams, and experiences of a multitude of people of different ethnic backgrounds working together to build a new Nation. In our increasingly urbanized and mechanized society, it is a reminder of the individual independence and initiative, freedom of expression and creativity, which have made our country great.

We live in a time in which the whole pattern of American life is undergoing considerable change. One might say, in fact, that the promise of American pluralism is at last coming into its own. A year or two ago, the best-selling volume entitled "The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics" focused on the passing of the 19th century "melting-pot" ideal of American society, an ideal which sought to blur the distinctiveness and identity of every group, reducing everyone to a kind of "least-common-denominator." In its place, we see an emerging diversity in which the whole "melting-pot" image has been replaced by that of a tapestry or symphony, an image which recognizes and even accentuates the special character of each part.

It is my belief that a better understanding of the contributions of various races and faiths and ethnic backgrounds to our cultural heritage would contribute immensely to lessening tensions, eliminating prejudices, and bringing about a better understanding among people. To this end, it is essential that we preserve our cultural heritage and ethnic traditions. This can be done in many ways—by sponsoring folk festivals, by teaching our young people to enjoy and appreciate the songs, music, craftsmanship, language, literature, and art of their ancestors; by keeping alive the skills which produce them; and by supporting efforts to bring folk art and culture to people in urban areas.

I believe that this is a matter of appropriate concern to the Federal Government, and so today I am introducing a bill which would establish an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress. This bill would make it a statement of national policy that the history of the United States effectively demonstrates that building a strong nation does not require the sacrifice of cultural differences; that American folklife has a fundamental influence on the desires, beliefs, values, and character of the American people; and that it is in the interest of the general welfare of the Nation to preserve, support, revitalize, and disseminate American folklife traditions and arts.

The proposed folklife center would be authorized to make contracts, grants, loans and scholarships to individuals and groups for the promotion of research, scholarship, and training in American folklife; for the organization and production of live performances, festivals, exhibits, and workshops related to American folklife; and for the production of exhibits, displays, audio-visual and other materials illustrating some aspect of American folklife. It would also establish and maintain an archive of all kinds of creative works, objects, materials, artifacts, and audio and visual recordings which can be loaned to museums, educational institutions, and other individuals and organizations, or disseminated and broadcasted over radio and television.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a great tragedy indeed if knowledge of the crafts, arts, and traditions that have contributed so richly to our cultural and ethnic heritage were to disappear from the American scene. Our young people, in particular, need a better understanding of that heritage to give them a sense of identity and individuality, as well as tolerance for the differences of others. Too often, instead of a real appreciation for the contributions of various ethnic groups to the development of our Nation, what they get are demeaning stereotypes.

In recent years educators and textbook writers have given greater attention to the treatment of minority groups in our textbooks, but we still have very far to go toward teaching our young people about the positive and tangible contributions of ethnic groups to American culture and experience. There is a great and urgent need for more research and scholarship, for teaching and resource materials, for more demonstrations and festivals of folk arts and crafts, and for means of preserving arts, crafts, and traditions which might otherwise be lost.

An American Folklife Center located in the Library of Congress could fill this need. I urge my colleagues' support for early action and speedy passage of this legislation.

THE 183D ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, August 4, 1973 marks the 183d anniversary of the U.S. Coast Guard. This organization is aptly referred to as the "humanitarian branch" of our armed services. It has a reputation for being one of the most efficient and effective units within our Federal service. Today I would like to express a few words of appreciation for the brave men and women serving in the Coast Guard.

It was Alexander Hamilton who established what evolved into our modern Coast Guard. In 1790, as first U.S. Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Hamilton called for the establishment of the Revenue Cutter Service. The Cutter Service merged with the Lifesaving Service to form the modern Coast Guard in 1915. The Coast Guard remained with the Treasury Department until the formation of the Department of Transportation in 1967.

Today the Coast Guard has a force of approximately 38,000 officers and personnel, 300 ships, 170 aircraft and 2,000 boats. The Coast Guard distinguishes itself as being a small and versatile branch of our armed services. An officer can be a cutter today and assigned to port safety function next year. Even Coast Guard equipment is designed for multipurpose use. Modern cutters are suited to both search and rescue and oceanographic duties. Coast Guard helicopters fly anti-pollution patrol, lift heavy loads for the construction of navigational aids and carry flood victims to safety.

The Coast Guard is made up of highly competent men and women many of its career people having been educated at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn. During the past decade, the Academy upgraded and modernized its education curriculum for aspiring young cadets. Writes H. R. Kaplan:

> Sea duty, however traditional, is only one aspect of an officer's career. Of increasing importance is knowledge of modern managerial techniques, psychology and many other related fields of administration. Some of these young men will have the responsibility of representing their country on international maritime groups . . . they will have to be able to think in global rather than purely service terms. The more parochial concept of education, which served well enough in an earlier day, no longer suffices.

Included in the ranks of the Coast Guard is an organized unpaid volunteer force of 37,281 dedicated men and women. The volunteers conduct an educational program to encourage safe boating, inspect motorboats for safety regulations and aid the regular Coast Guard in time of emergency. Recently this group helped in the fight to control the raging floods of the Mississippi River. Without their help, thousands of people would have died and the loss of property would have been far greater than it was.

Because authority is both coordinated and decentralized, the Coast Guard can perform a variety of tasks, domestically and globally. The Coast Guard was once primarily a defense service: in World War II, Coastguardsmen fought and died in the European and Pacific theaters, in the Atlantic, Pacific, Mediterranean and the Carribbean, and during the Vietnam conflict, the Coast Guard had patrol ships stationed in Indo-Chinese waters. Today, its primary defense duty consists of protecting fisheries. Off Alaska alone, there are 31,383 statute miles which the Coast Guard must protect. The late Nick Begich, Member of Congress from Alaska, said last year:

> An area of particular concern to Alaskans (is) our fisheries (which) are increasingly being taken over by foreign fishing fleets, and unless increased protection of these fisheries is forthcoming, the economic impact on Alaska will be quite devastating. . . .
>
> The Alaska Legislature . . . commends the United States Coast Guard for its foresight in designing ships of the secretary class and in particular for assigning a secretary-class ship to temporary duty in Alaska waters. . . .
>
> The United States Coast Guard is urgently requested to assign one or more ships of the "Mellon" class to duty in Alaska on a permanent basis, the only means by which our fisheries may receive increased protection from foreign encroachment.

The day-to-day functions of the Coast Guard are concerned with marine transportation and coordination. Coast Guard radio equipment keeps all U.S. ships alerted about potential navigational hazards; U.S. surface navigation capability and national presence in the polar regions depend on Coast Guard icebreakers. The International Ice Patrol locates, tracks, and reports the presence of icebergs to all participating ships.

Cooperation and teamwork are the keynotes of the Coast Guard philosophy. The automated merchant vessel report—AMVER—is a voluntary program operated by the Coast Guard whereby merchant vessels of many nations voluntarily furnish daily reports of their position, course, speed, and destination. The information is fed into a computer which maintains a continuous plot of the 5,600 ships which participate in the system. If a ship reports that it has problems, the AMVER computer quickly determines which nearby ships will be able to render aid.

AMVER is only a part of the Coast Guard's Search and Rescue duties. For years now, the Coast Guard has been hoping to coordinate a world-wide search and rescue force. Just 2½ years ago, the air and rescue seminar was held to create such a force. The United Nations Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—IMCO—requested that the Coast guard bring together 23 nations to study the feasibility of "Universal Search and Rescue—The Possible Dream." Participants in the Seminar included representatives from Australia, the Bahamas, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Poland, Spain, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia. Recommendations on particular problems were made by the Seminar on Search and Rescue Operations, Search and Rescue Communications, Search and Rescue Incidents and Search and Rescue Safety Programs. Today, a coordinated international network exists to answer the ever-mounting demand for search and rescue assistance.

The Coast Guard is also charged with the enforcement of Federal laws concerned with the orderly flow of seaborne commerce. Last year, the National Transportation Safety Board recommended and Congress passed legislation to empower the Coast Guard to establish traffic control systems in navigable waters where chances of accidents were high. The Board urged this action because the number of collisions on United States navigable waters increased from 735 in 1966 to 821 in 1970. To control sea-traffic, the Coast Guard first approves plans of vessels for design before construction. When the vessels have been constructed, they are monitored by the Coast Guard during loading and unloading operations. The Coast Guard makes periodic safety inspections all year round. In heavily trafficked areas, sea lanes have been established to further prevent potential collisions. And, an advisory system based on a radar plot of all traffic and close communications between the center and the participant ships has now been created.

If, however, an accident does occur, the Coast Guard, true to its motto of Semper Paratus, that is, always ready, is prepared. The Coast Guard aids in the fight against water pollution by controlling massive oil spills in offshore areas. A research and development program conducted by the Coast Guard yielded excellent results. Writes Suzanne Montgomery in "Undersea Technology:"

> A new system . . . to remove the oil cargo from a damaged tanker may well be a critical "band-aid" for use in averting a major pollution incident. The Coast Guard-developed system basically involves the air-drop of pumping equipment and huge collapsible plastic bags next to a stricken tanker. The oil cargo is transferred to the 500-ton capacity bags, which are then towed by surface craft to pier facilities.

This system is dubbed ADAPTS—Air-Deliverable Anti-Pollution Transfer System. ADAPTS is part of the early detection procedures used by the Coast Guard to enforce the Water Quality Improvement Act of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I think that it is apparent that the Coast Guard is one of the most valuable branches of our Armed Forces. I am especially interested in Coast Guard activities because I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard and Geodetic Survey and Navigation of the House Merchant Marine Committee. Of particular significance to me is the fact that the Coast Guard is responsible for carrying out pollution control activities. The problem of the pollution of our waters by oil from ships as a result both of collisions and dumping of waste is of concern to the Coast Guard Committee. And, I intend to continue, intensify and expand the efforts of the committee to see that our ports and waterways are made safe and free of pollution.

The Coast Guard Committee exercises oversight responsibility over all of the activities of the Coast Guard. It has jurisdiction over the authorization—appro-

priations for the Coast Guard for ships, planes, shore facilities and installation—of programs involving the acquisition, construction and improvement of facilities.

It has been my pleasure to sponsor a bill that Congress passed which authorized $103 million for the Coast Guard. This sum will, among other things, pay for the following:

The procurement of vessels and aircraft.

The construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

Funds for payments to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigable waters of the United States.

The establishment of a vessel traffic system in the New York Harbor.

The establishment of the vessel traffic system in the New York Harbor is very important to me; the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 did not call for any such traffic system. Corps of Engineers statistics show 350,465 vessel transits of New York Harbor in 1971. Coast Guard casualty data for 1971 cite 34 collisions and 21 groundings. New York Port Authority estimates that in 1970 every fourth vessel entering was a tanker.

The project will be a phased approach to providing an integrated traffic system using VHF–FM communications, improved aids to navigation, limited electronic surveillance, and a manned traffic center for coordination of traffic movements on the waterways around New York. The traffic center will be located on Governor's Island. New York, and the service will be available 24 hours a day.

I was also happy that men and money for long range navigational systems that had been eliminated by the Office of Management and Budget were restored by Congress as a result of subcommittee hearings. The restoration of these funds will correct a major foul-up by the administration that would have jeopardized the navigational needs of the United States major nuclear weapons system, and international air and maritime commerce.

Currently, I am working to pass H.R. 5384, a safety measure which would change loadline standards from a ship's weight to its length. This bill would also make it a criminal offense to permit an overloaded vessel to depart from a port in violation of a detention order or alter prescribed loadline marks.

It is not only the activities of the Coast Guard which concern me; I also am interested in the continued modernization of the organization of our Armed Services which would provide for fair and equal treatment to all personnel. For this reason, I am sponsoring legislation to provide for the full integration of women into the Coast Guard Reserve. The service no longer needs a segregated Women's Reserve functioning outside the mainstream of the Coast Guard. This legislation would allow women to both train and serve on active and inactive duty as an integral and equal part of the Coast Guard team.

The Coast Guard Reserve was first authorized in 1941, with membership limited to males. In 1942, the Women's Reserve—termed SPARS, an acronym for the Coast Guard motto, Semper Paratus—was set up as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve. In 1943, the act was repealed, and all of the women then in the Coast Guard Reserve were separated from the Service. In 1949, the Women's Reserve was re-established as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve. My proposal, which will afford equal treatment to all members of the Coast Guard regardless of their sex, is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a list of bills that will come before the Coast Guard Subcommittee in September and the months to follow after our August recess:

LIST OF BILLS

H.R. 8175—To amend title 14 of the United States Code in order to require prior congressional approval of any action by the Commandant of the Coast Guard to change the location of, consolidate or discontinue any Coast Guard establishment.

Coast Guard Medical Care—An Administration bill to transfer authority for medical care of Coast Guard members from the Public Health Service to the Coast Guard and authorizes use of physicians and other medical and dental personnel and facilities from other Federal agencies and the civilian sector on a reimbursable basis.

Omnibus Coast Guard Bill—Contains numerous minor amendments dealing with personnel benefits and clarifying Coast Guard's authority.

H.R. 5975—High Seas Intervention in Oil Pollution Casualties. Implements the 1969 Brussels Convention concerning the right of a coastal state to take remedial action when threatened by oil pollution originating from a casualty occurring beyond the jurisdiction of the coastal state.

H.R. 5384—Load Line Convention. Implements provisions of International Convention on Load Lines, 1966, which entered into force on July 21, 1968. Requires load lines on American vessels engaged in foreign trade and on foreign vessels on the Navigable Waters of the United States.

H.R. 7269—Deduction from Gross Tonnage for Slop Oil and Vessel Sewage. Permits vessels to deduct tank space used for carriage of slop oil and sewage and spaces containing machinery used exclusively for processing such materials from calculation of gross tonnage.

H.R. 735—Vessel Documentation Act. Enables owners of U.S.-flag vessels to register vessels economically and expeditiously.

Amendments to R.S. 4433 (46 U.S.C. 411) Concerning Boiler Pressure—Revises statutory control of standard boilers to keep pace with developments in the analysis and testing of materials which allow for safety protection at standards more liberal than in existing law.

H.R. 6120—A bill to permit the vessel MANATRA II to be inspected, licensed, and operated as a passenger-carrying vessel and for other purposes.

H.R. 4553—A bill to amend section 4171 of the Revised Statutes to allow the endorsement of certificates of registry of alternate masters.

H.R. 6262—A bill to strengthen the penalties for violation of the Great Lakes Pilotage Act of 1960.

H.R. 7308—A bill to amend the Great Lakes Pilotage Act of 1960 to limit the liability of Great Lakes pilots.

H.R. 1902 and H.R. 3141—To transfer the Coast Guard to the Department of Defense.

I believe that the 93d Congress will take action on some of the most significant Coast Guard bills of our time. It is gratifying for me to be working with an organization whose programs are rapidly expanding to meet the needs of the modern era.

At this point, I would also like to mention the important Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—IMCO—conference on maritime safety to be held in London from October 8 to November 2. This conference will bring together the 23 IMCO participant nations to update and coordinate the efforts to eradicate the pollution of our oceans and seas.

The London convention is an outgrowth of the September 1970 Committee on the Concerns of Modern Society meeting of NATO held in Brussels. The committee set forth the goal of cleaning our oceans by 1975, if possible, or at the latest by 1980. During the past months, the Marine Safety Committee of IMCO has drafted and approved the final text of a resolution which calls for the prevention of pollution from ships. I look forward to attending the Conference with U.S. Coast Guard representatives and wholeheartedly believe that global cooperation among those nations who have major maritime concerns will help us to attain our goal of preventing ocean and sea pollution.

Before I conclude, I would like to cite Adm. Willard J. Smith, former Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard.

I see the Coast Guard of the future continuing its present roles, probably on an expanded basis and certainly with a greater degree of public recognition. We are no strangers to marine sciences, Arctic development or the battle against pollution. Each of these fields seems destined to receive an increasing share of our national efforts. As they do, the work of the Coast Guard will become better known and we are likely to be given additional responsibilities.

I, myself, am confident that the Coast Guard will be fully capable of meeting the challenges that the future brings. Today, on the 183d anniversary of the Coast Guard, I salute those dedicated men and women who have served and continue to serve the best interests of our Nation in time of war and peace. The Coast Guard is truly one of the most valuable sectors of our armed services. It has been rewarding to work with "the Humanitarian Branch" and I look forward to helping the Coast Guard achieve its goals in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF AID TO LIBRARIES AND FREE FLOW OF EDUCATION AND CULTURAL MAIL ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill entitled "Aid to Libraries and Free Flow of Educational and Cultural Mail Act of 1973."

This bill corrects an anomaly in the Postal Reorganization Act and places the shipments of books and other educational materials to libraries, educational institutions and individuals in the United States under the so-called library rate.

At the time of passage of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, shipments

between libraries were pegged at the "library rate" and shipments to libraries and educational institutions were placed in the special fourth-class rate. The act also provided that within 5 years the rates for shipments of books and educational materials to libraries and other educational institutions would be at a level that would recover all costs incurred by such shipments.

This bill provides for 10-year phasing, rather than 5-year phasing, and provides further that the preferential treatment of books and other educational materials shall be continued for shipments not only between libraries but to and from libraries, educational institutions, and individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary because the major victims affected by "special fourth-class" rate increases are schools and libraries. At least 75 percent of the materials shipped under the special fourth-class rate are books. Libraries and educational institutions receive approximately 50 percent of their books through the mail, and the postal charges are paid by the recipient—the schools and libraries. Within this group, the major victims are the small and rural libraries, which receive almost 90 percent of their books and educational materials through the mail.

Congress had determined that books as a class have a high educational, cultural, and scientific value no matter how they are distributed. The very same books may be purchased by an individual through a book club or in a book store, or he may have access to them through a public school or a college library, but under the existing law the postage rate to individuals and public libraries is the same and will reach fully attributable costs within the next 4 years. This bill stretches out the payment of the full rate for an additional 4 years.

Every dollar saved in postage is critical to the maintenance and quality of library service. Every dollar spent by libraries and schools on postage results in a dollar decrease in the amount of funds applicable for books and other educational materials. Because of this, and in light of the drastic cutbacks in the current budget for libraries, it is imperative that we give relief to the libraries and schools of our country by passage of this legislation.

The amount involved in this particular bill is a minimal amount as far as the Postal Service is concerned, but if it should not be passed, it will have a major affect on libraries and educational institutions in this country.

In times such as these, our Nation needs, and indeed must have, an educated citizenry. As Madison put it so succinctly:

> Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the full text of this bill into the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code, with respect to financing the cost of mailing certain matter at reduced rates of postage, and other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, This act may be cited as the "Aid to Libraries and Free Flow of Educational and Cultural Mail Act of 1973."

SEC. 2(a). section 3626 of Title 39, United States Code, paragraphs (1) and (2) are amended to read as follows:

(1) the revenues received from rates for mail under former sections 4358, 4452(b) and (c), and 4554 shall not, on or after the first day of the ninth year following the effective date of the first rate decision applicable to this class or kind, exceed the direct and indirect postal cost attributable to mail of such class or kind (excluding all other costs of the Postal Service); and

(2) the rates for mail under sections 4359, 4421, 4422 and 4452(a) shall be equal, on and after the first day of the fifth year following the effective date of the first rate decision applicable to that class or kind, to the rates that would have been in effect for such mail if this subsection had not been enacted.

SEC. (3) section 3622 of Title 39, United States Code, is amended

(1) by renumbering subsection "(8)" as "(9)" and inserting a new subsection "(8)" as follows:

"(8)" the educational, cultural, scientific and informational value to the recipient of mailed materials; and".

CARL GREENBERG—EMINENT POLITICAL JOURNALIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, Carl Greenberg, the distinguished, incisive political writer for the Los Angeles Times and former political editor of the Los Angeles Examiner, will be honored at a retirement dinner at the Century Plaza Hotel on August 14.

I do not think Carl is really retiring, but the rumor that he might be is certainly a welcome excuse to honor him, something that many of us who know Carl have wanted to do for years.

My reason for not believing that Carl is really retiring is based on the fact that before joining the Times Carl was with the Examiner for 30 years, and everyone knows that Hearst newspaper reporters, especially veterans of the police desk and the political beat, do not retire until at least their 80th birthdays. Carl will be 65 on August 19 and will probably keep writing for at least another 15 years—that old Hearst service feeling is too strong in his blood.

I first met Carl after my election to the California Assembly in 1954 when he was covering the Los Angeles and Sacramento political beat for the Los Angeles Examiner. When I found out, as a freshman assemblyman, that Carl had been a veteran police reporter before being assigned to politics, I became suspicious of the legislature, wondering why a police reporter was covering the workings of California's distinguished statesmen of the legislative branch.

Everything turned out all right. The qualities which Carl developed sitting in the press room of the Los Angeles Police Department—a nose for the facts, a sense of fairness, and a mental toughness to see through the shams of life—made him one of California's greatest political reporters.

Perhaps my most difficult election was my first reelection campaign in 1956. I was not expected to win. I had won 2 years before in a grueling door-to-door campaign intermixed with brilliant speeches and also, according to some cynics, because my opponent had been convicted of bribery 2 weeks before the election. The opposition wanted the seat back and acted like it all through the election. Other than the work of dedicated precinct volunteers, everything seemed to be going the wrong way. Carl interviewed me about his paper's endorsement, an endorsement I did not expect to receive. But, much to my surprise, the weekend before the election, I received the Examiner's endorsement. I won the election, after a recount, by 162 votes. Thank you, Carl. I know that the pressure you received from the Examiner was all the other way.

Those of us who have served with Carl, whether in Sacramento, Los Angeles, or on the campaign trail, will miss him if the rumors of his retirement are true. He represents the finest traditions in journalism, and his career has been such that it reinforces our historic concept and belief in the freedom of the press in this country.

My best wishes to you, Carl, and your lovely wife, Gladys—and thank you for your contributions toward making our society a better one in which to live.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 14 of this year the many friends of Carl Greenberg will honor him. His outstanding abilities as a political journalist and equally outstanding qualities as a human being are more than ample reason for this tribute. Carl's acumen for the best in political reportage has given him an unparalleled place in the political milieu of California and the Nation.

As a reporter for the Los Angeles Examiner and the Los Angeles Times over the past 40 years Carl has expressed his knowledge and insight into politics for many grateful Angelenos. As a Congressman I know how important it is for all Americans to understand the complex yet intriguing aspects of politics. Carl's incisive articles and political editorship have given both the papers he worked for and simultaneously the field of journalism new heights of excellence in enlarging such understanding.

Carl Greenberg will be retiring soon and his columns in the Times will be missed by all of us who have come to depend on his perceptive analysis. I can think of no greater honor for a member of the fourth estate than to be respected and admired by his colleagues as well as those who have at times been the subject of his writings. Carl Greenberg enjoys this singular honor. As his friend and respectfully admirer, I extend my best

wishes for a well-earned rest and for many years of health and continued success.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 14 Carl Greenberg, an old and dear friend of mine, will retire as political writer for the Los Angeles Times. His execution of responsible newspaper reporting has gained him many devoted friends throughout California and elsewhere. As a token of my esteem for Carl, I request that the following letter I have prepared to be read at Carl's retirement dinner be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AUGUST 14, 1973.

Mr. CARL GREENBERG,
Los Angeles Times,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CARL: Somehow we all know in the back of our minds that tempus fugits, but only does it come to the forefront when someone like yourself decides to retire, which, in cases such as yours, turns out to be an occasion which rightfully drips with affection and nostalgia.

One of the good things about my career in politics has been the occasional opportunity over the years to enjoy your friendship and political acumen. Frankly, I doubt that things will really change very much after your retirement because I anticipate that you will manage to be as active in some way as you have always been which, of course, will continue to be a great job to your friends.

Nonetheless, on this occasion I must retread the usual and extend my best wishes to you for a long, happy, healthy and enjoyable retirement—which I know you are going to have anyway.

With fond regards,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Mr. Carl Greenberg who is retiring at the end of a distinguished career in journalism. Carl Greenberg has reported on politics for both the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Examiner.

A well informed citizenry is a prerequisite for any republic. If our Nation is to thrive, there must be an uninhibited flow of information. Conscientious, hard working newsmen like Carl Greenberg are essential to this process; they have made it work.

I welcome this opportunity to add my congratulations on Mr. Greenberg's fine career to the many I am sure he will receive when he leaves the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for over a quarter of a century, I have both respected and enjoyed the talent of the distinguished political writer, Carl Greenberg.

His interest in news reporting started at a young age, when he was a student at Los Angeles High School. He worked on the high school's daily, Blue and White, until he graduated in 1926. Three months later he began his professional career in reporting at the Los Angeles Express and the Los Angeles City News Service as a general assignment reporter. In 1943, Mr. Greenberg joined the Los Angeles Examiner where he was assigned to cover politics. Soon after the Los Angeles Examiner ceased publication in 1962, he joined the staff of the Los Angeles Times.

When I was in the California Assembly and then as lieutenant governor, I began to know Carl personally, as well as professionally, and I soon learned to appreciate the problems inherent in gathering news. I felt then, as I do now, that he was an extremely fair and objective journalist.

Throughout his career, Carl Greenberg has received numerous awards and honors. In 1957, the California Assembly adopted concurrent resolution No. 12 commending him for his "outstanding work as a political editor." Other honors include: the Associated Press Writing Contest Silver Award, an award by the Los Angeles Chapter of Theta Sigma Phi for best metropolitan news reporting, and a "resolution of commendation" from the directors of the California Newspapers Association. In addition, Carl Greenberg has been listed in Who's Who in America and Who's Who in the West.

Besides his noted activity in political journalism, Mr. Greenberg has been active in community affairs. Among the organizations of which he is a member are the Los Angeles Press Club, Los Angeles Lodge 487 of B'nai B'rith, Sigma Delta Chi, and Kappa Tau Alpha.

In addition to achieving success in the field of journalism, Carl Greenberg is a devoted family man to his wife of 43 years, Gladys, and their son, Howard.

Mr. Speaker, Carl Greenberg has truly done a great service to the Los Angeles community. Both the journalistic fraternity and the public will miss the incisive comments and critical analyses of this gifted writer.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that a distinguished writer for the Los Angeles Times is soon to retire. Carl Greenberg has written stimulating essays for many years, and I, along with many of his readers, will miss his interesting comments.

Mr. Greenberg contributed to the Los Angeles Examiner before joining the staff of the Times. His thought-provoking commentaries have done much to enlighten the readers of those newspapers. Today, when many political issues are covered by the press, the commentators provide invaluable insights into the important issues.

Mr. Greenberg's contributions will be long remembered by his reading public, and I want to take this opportunity to send him my best wishes and compliments on his fine work.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American press is an institution of inestimable value to the freedoms of the American people. There have been few who have served that profession and the people of California better than the distinguished political writer Carl Greenberg.

Mr. Greenberg has been at the very heart of the major events in contemporary history. For 19 years, he covered the rise of Earl Warren from his days as attorney general through his years as Governor and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He had the opportunity to interview Presidents Richard Nixon, Lyndon Johnson, John Kennedy, and Harry Truman.

His in-depth stories have been honored by his colleagues in awarding him a "resolution of commendation" from the California Newspaper Association, and the Silver Award from the Associated Press. His many accomplishments have been acknowledged by the California Assembly which passed a resolution honoring his "outstanding work."

It is an honor to have known and been associated with a man of Mr. Greenberg's character and expertise. Carl Greenberg must be very proud to look back on such a successful and useful phase of his life. Now, with deadlines over, he can pursue his interests at his own pace.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times and its vast readership will lose a fine political writer when Carl Greenberg retires later this year.

Carl, whom I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with throughout my tenure in public office, leaves behind him a remarkable 47-year career in journalism. For, immediately after graduating from Los Angeles High School, Carl began his newspaper apprenticeship in the classic way—as a copyboy and reporter for the Los Angeles Evening News.

From that time on, Carl Greenberg single-mindedly pursued his chosen profession, serving the city news service of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Examiner before joining the Times in 1962. Because of his thorough orientation in the Los Angeles area and his extensive background in the newspaper field, the Times was indeed lucky to attract Carl's by-line.

Carl, who covered the California State Legislature for 19 years—and numbers among his many honors an award by the California assembly for "outstanding work as a political editor—is knowledgeable not only about State politics but possesses equal acuity on the national level. He has personally interviewed four Presidents: Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, and is widely respected in Washington as well as in Sacramento and Los Angeles.

Carl Greenberg's unquenchable curiosity and diligence, combined with his imposing reportorial skills, have won him the friendship and respect of his peers. The press community will turn out en masse on August 14 at a dinner in his honor where Gov. Ronald Reagan and former Gov. Pat Brown, both Greenberg fans, will co-host the festivities.

While we will miss Carl in his professional role, we thank him for serving the public so well in providing that "first rough draft of a history" which is the focus of responsible news reporting. I join with my California colleagues in wishing him and his wife, Gladys, many rewarding and happy retirement years.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues are aware of the impending retirement of Carl Greenberg from his duties as the political writer for the Los Angeles Times. Mr. Greenberg has been deeply involved in the world of journalism since he began working as a copyboy for the Los Angeles Evening Express in 1926. Needless to say, he has acquired an awesome amount of experience over the years and has been given

numerous awards for his outstanding work.

Carl Greenberg has played an important part in the political scene in southern California ever since I returned from World War II. His contributions to the political life of the Southwest have been many and great, and his fine writing will be sorely missed by devoted readers throughout the region and the country.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD for July 30, 1973, lists me as not voting on roll No. 402, the vote on final passage of H.R. 9474, providing increases in the rates of disability and death pensions for veterans. I would like the RECORD to show that I am a cosponsor of this bill, that I was, in fact, present and voting in favor of this legislation, and cannot explain why I am listed as absent other than to assume there was a failure in the electronic voting device.

On August 1, 1973, important duties delayed me just long enough to make me miss the vote on Roll No. 415. If present, I would have voted in favor of the amendment to reduce the funds for salaries and expenses for the Office of Management and Budget by 5 percent.

DR. IRVING BENNETT NAMED OPTOMETRIST OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to commend a constituent of mine upon his being named optometrist of the year by the American Optometric Association at its recent congress. Dr. Irving Bennett of Beaver Falls, Pa., has served in community as an outstanding health care practitioner and has served his community in a civic sense as well, as a man who cares what course his home charts in its person-to-person relationships.

As Dr. J. C. Tumblin, outgoing president of the 17,800-member association, said in presenting the award to Dr. Bennett—

> He is a kind of person who is not satisfied with superficial volunteerism. His life of public services does not overflow with 1 year terms of office. Rather it is built solidly with years of the steadfast determination needed to accomplish worthwhile endeavors.

This concerned optometrist has not set about to compile a long impressive list of committee memberships and trusteeships. His contributions are impressive, nonetheless, for their impact upon the community life of Beaver Falls.

For 17 years, including 10 as president, Dr. Bennett has served on the citys board of education. During this period, the community built two new school buildings, merged school districts for more efficient operation, instituted a revolutionary merit system for teacher pay increases.

Dr. Bennett's 10-year tenure on the recreation commission, including 5 years as chairman, also was a period of accomplishment for Beaver Falls. The community swimming pool was desegregated, three new city playgrounds were built, as well as a city ice skating rink. He played a significant part in uniting the local Jewish community to build a community center.

He has been a prime organizer and president of the Beaver Falls human relations commission. He has served as vice president of the local community action committee of the Office of Economic Opportunity; member of the policy advisory committee for the local Headstart program; profession division chairman for the local United Fund; chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.

Dr. Bennett has served the interests of constantly updating and upgrading his profession. He has served as president of his county branch of the State association for the blind. He has been active in the movement of optometrists, eye physicians and the local Parent-Teacher Association working for a 6-year school vision screening program.

During his 25 years of service to optometry, Dr. Bennett has served for 5 years as volunteer executive secretary of the Pennsylvania Optometric Association. He worked to develop and served as secretary of the Society of Optometric Association Executives. Former editor of the Journal of the American Optometric Association, Dr. Bennett now edits Optometric Management.

This long record, with meaningful accomplishments, is hard to match. Dr. Bennett epitomizes concern for his profession and for his home community. He has not sought out glamor jobs. He has seen what needed to be done and set about doing just that. My congratulations to him on this national recognition as optometrist of the year.

NATIONAL HOME AND NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Miss HOLTZMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district has experienced serious housing problems. Sixty percent of the housing units are over 40 years old. Thousands of homeowners and tenants live in these aged buildings, but are unable to finance necessary repairs and improvements. Moreover, many of my constituents are elderly persons, who must watch the homes they have already paid for deteriorate because they cannot afford to make repairs out of small, fixed incomes. Many are living in apartments owned by landlords who would like to make repairs on their properties, but cannot derive enough rental income to finance the costs. The problem of deterioration and abandonment has infected the Federal programs administered in my district. FHA now owns over 200 abandoned, and, in many instances, dilapidated properties. There is every indication that this is a problem in urban areas throughout the country. In Detroit, for example, FHA owns over 15,000 of these abandoned properties.

We must develop methods to preserve and improve the Nation's housing, otherwise housing quality will erode, houses will be abandoned, and neighborhoods will decline. I am introducing a bill designed to correct this problem which would create three ways to enable present owners to repair, preserve and maintain their properties—and our neighborhoods.

First, my bill provides for Federal insurance of mortgages to enable property owners with sound or near sound properties to refinance their mortgages at existing levels of monthly payment, in order to make repairs necessary to keep the property in sound condition. Property owners may also use this program to refinance often disastrous "balloon payment" provisions in older, conventional mortgages. In order to guarantee that tenants in buildings insured under this section will enjoy the benefits of sound housing without incurring unreasonable rent increases, the bill provides that the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development must consider tenants' comments on the condition of the property and the effect of any proposed rent increase.

Second, my bill provides for direct Government loans and grants to elderly or handicapped homeowners, to enable them to make repairs necessary to maintain the basic livability of their homes. In this regard, it provides flexible cost limits on the amount of loans and grants available, so that a homeowner in New York City could receive up to $6,000 in loans or grants.

Finally, the bill provides for emergency loans to homeowners who, because of temporary unemployment or illness, would otherwise be unable to meet existing mortgage payments or repair requirements.

It is crucial to the health of our cities and the housing needs of our citizenry that our existing housing is neither destroyed nor allowed to deteriorate by governmental action or inaction. I hope this legislation will be seriously considered and quickly adopted by this Congress.

STOCKPILING OF NERVE GAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in past weeks I have become increasingly concerned about our national policy of stockpiling nerve gas. Some of my colleagues and I are today submitting a resolution and a bill which focus on the problem. Although I just sought cosponsors 2 days ago, already 26 Members have joined. Others, I hope, will do so later. In a colloquy on the floor earlier this week, Chairman HÉBERT of the House Armed Services Committee agreed that hearings would be held this fall on the bill.

This Nation needs to continue to maintain a strong defensive posture in the world. I realize this as well as all other Members and we see this need reflected

and supported in our Defense Department budget. It is not my intention in calling for this renewed attention to the problem of chemical warfare to suggest that our defense posture should be weakened unnecessarily at the very time when a strong position is needed during this period of international disarmament negotiations.

However, much of what I read on the topic of chemical warfare suggests to me that there are considerable political disadvantages inherent not only in any use of chemical weapons but also in the position of any nation which has the capability to use these weapons on a large scale. One of the major political issues which evolved from our actions in South Vietnam concerned our use of herbicides. If there had been a definite and positive advantage which had accrued from such use which contributed significantly to the saving of American and allied lives and a humane shortening of that unfortunate war, much of the concern about the use of these chemicals might not have appeared. But this does not seem to have been the case. The United States has suffered severe disadvantages politically in the international arena in discussions of chemical disarmament as a result of such use and the military reports on the effectiveness of this chemical appear, at the very least, to be conflicting. Since these military reports are classified I have only the public discussions to guide me in this comment and these reports indicate that the military found only limited advantage in such use.

Other analyses of the effectiveness of chemical weapons suggest that the real advantage will accrue to the nation which first uses the weapons. Since we have already indicated that we will not initiate the use of such weapons, we seem to have already acknowledged that we do not need the advantage of a first use—and retaliatory uses would have less advantage. Again, I admit that I am not a tactical expert concerning the use of chemical weapons but the continuing arguments of analysts in this field suggest very strongly that the political consequences of initiating chemical warfare would be quite severe while the risks of escalating to nuclear warfare would be equally great in the event of such use.

In the interests of progress in our international negotiations on the control of chemical weapons as well as in the interest of resolving our current domestic dilemma concerning stockpiling, storage, and shipment of toxic chemical nerve agents, it seems to me that we need some immediate attention toward the completion of the task of formulating policies concerning the use of nerve agents. This task was only partially resolved during the President's examination in 1969 which led to the banning of biological weapons. The promise of ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 has foundered in the semantics of definitions of chemical agents and the involvement of the United States in the Vietnam war. We are essentially out of that war—and it seems to me that 4 years is a long enough time to wait for the resolution of the definition of terms which seems to be blocking our first step toward the adoption of a treaty on chemical warfare, a step which will surely strengthen our further negotiations at Geneva on this subject.

What we are calling for in this resolution and this bill is not an attack on a news issue but a call for the completion of old business which should not be left undone any longer. If we do not resolve this question, openly in the public forum, we are going to continue to be subjected to isolated instances of hazard as are now occurring in Denver, where the Army is far behind schedule in eliminating a serious threat to the public health, and to the postponement of decisions on national policies, as in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where we have been waiting for over a year for the resolution of the President's position on certain chemical agents.

Here, reprinted, are the bill and the resolution for Members to read.

RESOLUTION

A resolution to move forward toward immediate ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, to request a public re-evaluation of the U.S. Policy which requires nerve gas stockpiles, and to require the Department of Defense to detoxify obsolete nerve gas presently stored near Denver, Colorado.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning use of chemical and biological warfare, authored by the United States, has never been ratified by the Senate because the question of whether herbicides and tear gas are covered by the Protocol has never been resolved, and

Whereas, the United States has conducted intensive and fruitful disarmament negotiations with other nations since 1969, and the United States position in negotiations to ban chemical weapons currently underway in Geneva is not clear because the United States has never ratified the Geneva Protocol of 1925, and

Whereas, adequate methods of inspection for possible violations in production of nerve gas not available in 1969, are being developed, and

Whereas, the Department of Defense did not detoxify the 463,000 gallons of nerve gas by 1973 stored at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal in Denver as pledged in 1969, and the Secretary of the Army has recommended that large stockpiles of nerve gas stored there be moved to the Tooele Army Depot in Utah, therefore,

Be it resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that both the President and Congress should resolve the position of the United States on the status of herbicides and tear gas so that the Senate may move forward toward immediate ratification of the Protocol, and

Be it resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that a public re-evaluation of the necessity for stockpiling nerve gas is needed at this time, and

Be it further resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Department of Defense should detoxify that amount of nerve gas which was to have been destroyed by now, and keep Congress informed of progress in meeting its timetable.

A bill to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of the Congress to do so

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a new section following Sec. 409 (b) of the Act of Nov. 19, 1969 (50 U.S.C.C. 1512) is inserted as follows:

"None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any Act may be obligated or expended hereafter for the purpose of transport of chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless the President has (a) made known to the Congress his position on the status of herbicides and tear gas under the Geneva protocol of 1925; (b) provided Congress with a reevaluation of the necessity for the United States policy of stockpiling chemical nerve agents, and (c) certified to the Armed Services Committees of Congress that such transportation is necessary in the interest of national security and that its disposal by detoxification would be seriously detrimental to the chemical weapon deterrent capability of the United States."

PROFITS BEFORE PATRIOTISM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a number of times about the dangers inherent in the current energy crisis, not only to the standard of living we enjoy in the United States, but to America's position in the world community. As long as the United States continues to purchase vast amounts of oil from the Arab nations, we will be susceptible to the worst sort of political blackmail from them.

Time and again, Arab leaders in Libya and Saudi Arabia have intimated that, unless the United States abandons her traditional support for Israel, we face the risk of having our oil supply curtailed, and even cut off completely. While to date this has not happened, the Arab States are quite adept at striking fear into the hearts of American oil executives by their nationalization and price-raising schemes.

Apparently, one oil company has taken to heart the warnings constantly issued by the Middle Eastern oil producers. Standard Oil of California, it was reported in yesterday's New York Post, has sent a letter to its stockholders and employees, urging them to "support the aspirations of the Arab people and their efforts toward peace in the Middle East." This letter urged American support of the Arabs because Middle Eastern oil is vital to "the future welfare of the Western World."

This oil is not only vital to the welfare of our society; it is even more vital to the welfare of Standard Oil of California. At present the United States is importing some 5 million barrels a day of oil that is produced in the Middle East. This seems like a huge amount at first glance but, in fact, it is merely 7 percent of the U.S. consumption of crude oil. Last year, and this year until Canada herself began to run short, we imported more oil from Canada than we did from all the Middle Eastern oil producing nations combined.

What Standard Oil did not mention in its letter was that they are far more dependent on Middle Eastern oil than is the United States. In 1972, Saudi Arabia and Iran supplied a total of 61 percent of Standard's worldwide crude oil production, and Saudi Arabia alone sup-

plied more than three times the crude oil Standard produced in the United States. Given figures like these, it becomes immediately apparent why Standard Oil is so concerned about U.S.-Arab relations.

Mr. Speaker, I think this behavior on the part of a major American corporation is unconscionable. Standard Oil of California is one of the eight largest oil producers in the United States, and one of the largest corporations in America. As such, it has a responsibility to more than making larger dividends for its stockholders. It has the responsibility of acting in the best interests of the United States. And a letter such as this can by no stretch of the imagination be in America's best interests.

What Standard Oil has done is to tell the Arab States that their political blackmail has found a willing victim, and that they can now continue in pressing their outrageous demands for the destruction of Israel without fearing an adverse reaction by the American Government. As long as the U.S. Government continues to operate under the policy that we must do everything possible to keep oil flowing from the Middle East, we will continue to be subject to such high-handed tactics from the Arab oil producers and their American customers.

We all are aware of the political clout a corporation such as Standard Oil of California has, particularly in the White House. That is what makes this letter even more damaging. At a time when Standard Oil of California has been named as a party to an FTC antitrust action, I find this action appalling. Standard Oil has a very capable body of lobbyists. Surely it need not turn its 240,000 stockholders into flag-wavers for the Arabs.

I think that this action underscores the need in this day and age to rethink our traditional assumptions about regulation of the energy industry and our consumption of energy. I would strongly support the divestiture of drilling and transportation from marketing in the oil industry. Incidents such as this convince me of the necessity for administering oil and refined petroleum products as a public utility. Such matters have become too important to be left entirely to private enterprise, particularly when private enterprise seeks to undermine a longstanding American policy of support for Israel.

JEWISH CEMETERIES DESECRATED IN WORLD WAR II

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I inserted some remarks on the work of Rabbi M. J. Rubin and his organization, Geder Avot, in the finding and restoration of Jewish cemeteries in Eastern Europe which had been desecrated by the Nazis during World War II. Reports are still coming out of Eastern Europe of cemeteries which were plundered, of Jewish headstones being used as paving for streets.

Rabbi Rubin and Geder Avot are carrying on their work under the dictates of the Torah, which sets strict requirements for the proper interment of the dead. Laying the dead to rest properly is a commandment which must be fulfilled by all Jews. He is on a holy mission, and I wish him and Geder Avot the greatest success in their efforts.

I would like to take this opportunity to correct an error in my earlier statement. At that time, I stated that Lvov, a city which had had its Jewish cemetery almost totally destroyed, was in Poland. This was in fact the case prior to World War II. But in the postwar settlements, Lvov became a part of the Soviet Union, under whose rule it remains today. This error in locating Lvov was inadvertent, and I thank those who were thoughtful enough to bring it to my attention.

There are, however, more than 2,000 Jewish cemeteries in Eastern Europe in a state of disrepair, if not total destruction. I would hope that the nations in which these cemeteries are located will assist Rabbi Rubin and Geder Avot in the work of restoration of Eastern Europe's Jewish heritage.

THE RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT OF 1973

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, today the Honorable CLAIR BURGENER, my colleague from California, and I have introduced a bill entitled, "The Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1973."

This bill is designed to protect the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States, and to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prescribing procedures and standards governing the disclosure of financial information by financial institutions to Federal officials or agencies. CLAIR BURGENER and I, as members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, believe this legislation is necessary to preserve the confidential relationship between financial institutions and their customers and the constitutional rights of these customers. Enactment of this bill would insure that the individual has the same rights of protection against unwarranted disclosure of records maintained in the financial institution as he would have if these records were maintained in his own possession.

The bill we have introduced today would allow the disclosure of a customer's records only if: the customer specifically authorizes the disclosure; the financial records are disclosed in response to an administrative subpena or summons providing the individual is notified by certified mail and directs the financial institution to comply, or the financial institution is served with a court order directing it to comply which is issued after the customer has been notified and has an opportunity to challenge the subpena or summons; a search warrant is obtained by the Federal official or agency which is served on both the customer and the financial institution; or a judicial subpena is issued with a copy being served on the customer and 10 days pass without notice that the customer has moved to quash the subpena.

A similar bill has been introduced by our colleague from northern California, the Honorable FORTNEY STARK, but the Rousselot-Burgener bill differs in that it does not preempt State and local laws regulating disclosure of customer information. Like legislation to govern actions by State and local officials and agencies has been introduced in California's State assembly, and it is entirely possible that other State legislative bodies might also wish to establish such regulatory controls as are appropriate to their individual requirements. The bill introduced by Mr. BURGENER and myself regulates only those actions of Federal officials and agencies.

Other financial privacy bills extend the regulating provisions to also govern actions by State and local officials and could possibly be in conflict with States rights. Also, other versions would only allow a financial institution to notify law enforcement officials of violations of criminal law suspected of being committed against the financial institution itself. The Rousselot-Burgener bill recognizes that in some rare instances the financial institution could have reason to suspect other violations of criminal law.

I urge that my colleagues review this important piece of legislation and consider it favorably when it comes before this House for a vote.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to protect the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States and to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prescribing procedures and standards governing the disclosure of certain financial information by financial institutions to governmental agencies, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1973".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) procedures and policies governing the relationship between financial institutions and government agencies have in some cases developed without due regard to citizens' constitutional rights;

(2) the confidential relationships between financial institutions and their customers are built on trust and must be preserved and protected; and

(3) certain reporting and recordkeeping requirements imposed on financial institutions by government agencies constitute a burden on interstate commerce.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to protect and preserve the confidential relationship between financial institutions and their customers and the constitutional rights of those customers and to promote commerce by prescribing policies and procedures to insure that customers have the same right of protection against unwarranted disclosure of customer records as they would have if the records were in their possession.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) "financial institution" means——

(A) a bank or trust company organized under the laws of any State or of the United States;

(B) a savings and loan association or building and loan association organized under the laws of any State or of the United States;

(C) a credit union organized under the laws of any State or of the United States; or

(D) any other organization chartered under the banking laws of any State and subject to the supervision of the bank supervisory authorities of a State.

(2) "financial records" means any original or any copy of—

(A) any debit or credit to a customer's deposit or share account with a financial institution; or

(B) any record held by a financial institution containing information pertaining to a customer's relationship with the financial institution.

(3) "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, trust, or any other legal entity organized under the laws of a State or the United States.

(4) "customer" means any person patronizing a financial institution and utilizing service offered by that financial institution.

(5) "supervisory agency" means—

(A) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(B) the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;

(C) the Federal Home Loan Bank Board;

(D) the National Credit Union Administration;

(E) the Federal Reserve Board;

(F) the Comptroller of the Currency;

(G) any State department or agency which is required by law to perform periodic examination or audit of the financial records of non-Federal financial institutions; or

(H) any authority of any State or local government which the Secretary of the Treasury determines by regulation exercises supervisory functions substantially similar to those exercised by the agencies referred to in clauses (1) through (7) of this paragraph.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS—GOVERNMENT

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided by section 10, no officer, employee, or agent of the United States, or any agency or department thereof, may obtain copies of, or the information contained in, the financial records of any customer from a financial institution unless the financial records are described with particularity and—

(1) such customer has authorized such disclosure in accordance with section 6;

(2) such financial records are disclosed in response to an administrative subpoena or summons which meet the requirements of section 7;

(3) such financial records are disclosed in response to a court order which meets the requirements of section 8; or

(4) such financial records are disclosed in response to a judicial subpoena which meets the requirements of section 9.

(b) In any proceeding relating to such subpoenas, summons, and court orders, the customer shall have the same rights as he would have if the records were in his possession.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS—FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No financial institution, or any officer, employee or agent of a financial institution, may provide to any officer, employee or agent of the United States, or any agency or department thereof, copies of, or the information contained in, the financial records of any customer except in accordance with the requirements of sections 6, 7, 8, and 9.

(b) This section shall not preclude a financial institution from notifying law enforcement officials of violations of the criminal law suspected of being committed: *Provided,* That any access to customer records shall be governed by sections 4 and 5(a) of this Act.

CUSTOMER AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 6. (a) A customer may authorize disclosure under section 4(a)(1) if he furnishes to the financial institution or to those seeking a disclosure a signed and dated statement which—

(1) authorizes such disclosure for a period not in excess of three months;

(2) identifies the financial records which are authorized to be disclosed; and

(3) specifies the purposes for which, and the agencies to which, such records may be disclosed.

(b) No such authorizatiton shall be required as a condition of doing business with such financial institution.

(c) The financial institution shall notify the customer that he has the right to revoke such authorization at any time and the right to obtain a copy of the record which the financial institution shall keep of all examinations of the customer's record, including the identity and purpose of the person examining the record.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENA AND SUMMONS

SEC. 7. (a) An officer, employee, or agent of the United States or any department or agency thereof, may obtain financial records under section 4(a)(2) pursuant to an administrative subpoena or summons otherwise authorized by law only if:

(1) those serving such administrative summons or subpoena have first served a copy of the subpoena or summons on the customer in person or by certified mail, return receipt requested;

(2) the subpoena or summons includes the name of the intended recipient and, if applicable, the statutory purpose for which the information is to be obtained; and

(3)(A) the customer directs the financial institution to comply; or

(B) the financial institutional is served with a court order directing it to comply, issued after notice to and opportunity for the customer to challenge such subpoena or summons.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall preclude a financial institution from notifying a customer of the receipt of an administrative summons or subpoena.

SEARCH WARRANTS

SEC. 8. An officer, employee, or agent of the United States or any agency or department thereof, may obtain financial records under section 4(a)(3) only if he obtains a search warrant pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The search warrants shall be served upon both the customer and the financial institution. Examination of financial records may occur as soon as the warrant is served on the financial institution and the customer.

JUDICIAL SUBPOENA

SEC. 9. An officer, employee, or agent of the United States or any department or agency thereof may obtain financial records under section 4(a)(4) pursuant to a judicial subpoena only if—

(1) the supoena specifies—

(A) that the subpoena is issued for good cause and is material to the inquiry pursuant to which the subpoena has been issued; and

(B) that a copy has been served on the customer, in person or by certified mail, return receipt requested; and

(2) ten days pass without notice to the financial institution that the customer has moved to quash the subpoena. Where so notified, the financial institution may comply with the subpoena only when it is served with a court order directing it to comply, issued after determination of the customer's motion.

ACCESS

SEC. 10. Copies of, or the information contained in, financial records obtained pursuant to section 4 shall not be used or retained in any form for any purpose other than the specific statutory purpose for which the information was originally obtained, nor shall such information or records be provided to any other governmental department or agency or other person except where the transfer of such information is specifically authorized by statute.

EXCEPTIONS

SEC. 11. (a) Nothing in this Act prohibits the dissemination of any financial information which is not identified with or identifiable as being derived from the financial records of a particular customer.

(b) Subject to the limitations in section 10, nothing in this Act prohibits examination by or disclosure to any supervisory agency of financial records solely in the exercise of its supervisory function or the making of reports or returns required under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Treasury may not require an institution to maintain any financial records or to transmit any reports relating to customers unless—

(1) such records are required for use by a supervisory agency in the supervision of that institution; and

(2) such records are required to be maintained by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

JURISDICTION

SEC. 13. An action to enforce any provision of this Act may be brought in any appropriate United States District Court without regard to the amount in conroversy or in any other court of competent jurisdiction within three years from the date on which the violation occurs or the date of discovery of such violation whichever is later.

CIVIL PENALTIES

SEC. 14. (a) Any person, financial institution, or any officer, employee or agent of a financial institution, of the United States or any agency or department thereof, who obtains or discloses financial records in violation of this Act is liable to the customer to whom such records relate in an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) $100 for each violation;

(2) any actual damages sustained by the customer as a result of the disclosure;

(3) such punitive damages as the court may allow, where the violation is found to have been knowing or willful; and

(4) in the case of any successful action to enforce liability under this section, the cost of the action together with reasonable attorney's fees as determined by the court.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

SEC. 15. (a) Any person, officer, employee, or agent of a financial institution, of the United States, or any agency or department thereof, who willfully and knowingly participates in a violation of this Act shall be imprisoned for not more than one year, or fined not more than $5,000, or both.

(b) Any person, officer, employee, or agent of a financial institution, the United States or any agency or department thereof, who induces or attempts to induce a violation of this Act shall be imprisoned for not more than one year, or fined not more than $5,000 or both.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

SEC. 16. In addition to any other remedy contained in this Act or otherwise available,

injunctive relief shall be available to any person aggrieved by a violation or threatened violation of this Act. In the event of any successful action, costs together with reasonable attorney's fees as determined by the court may be recovered.

WAIVER OF RIGHTS

SEC. 17. No waiver of any right hereunder shall be valid, whether oral or written, and whether with or without consideration.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 18. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on the one hundred and eightieth day beginning after the date of its enactment.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL SALARY ACT OF 1967

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to repeal the present procedures for adjusting the pay of Members of Congress, Federal judges, and top Federal executives. The bill repeals the quadrennial commission concept and provides two separate mechanisms for approval of salary increases for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Under this legislation, the Civil Service Commission would conduct a review taking into account the pay comparability of these positions as well as the appropriate level of pay, and report recommended rates of pay for Members of Congress, legislative branch employees, Federal judges, and high-level Federal officials. By July 1 of each year, the Civil Service Commission is required to make recommendations to the President on its salary review of top-level executives, and the Commission would also tender its recommendations for salary adjustments for Members, legislative branch employees, and Federal judges directly to Congress on the same date, July 1. The President would submit to Congress only those recommendations with respect to the rates of pay for executive schedule positions, and Congress would review those recommendations that apply to the judicial and legislative branch. The President's recommendations shall be considered in each House not later than 30 calendar days of continuous session of Congress. If each House adopts by a yea-and-nay vote, a resolution of approval, the recommendations shall become effective. The bill specifies that it is the intent of Congress that any increase should not exceed the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the period since the preceding pay adjustment, and that the Congress shall act as soon as possible on the Commission's recommendations.

The new procedures for the studies and recommendations with respect to pay will begin January 1, 1974.

In addition the bill provides for a pay increase for Members of Congress, Federal judges, and top executive officials this year in the same amount as that which will be given to other Federal employees and effective on the same date. This amount is unofficially estimated to be 5.5 percent effective January 1, 1974.

I urge that my colleagues review this bill for favorable consideration when it is brought before the full House for vote of the membership.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 225 of the of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 225(a). Each year the Civil Service Commission shall conduct a review of the rates of pay of—

"(A) Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates to the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico;

"(B) offices and positions in the legislative branch referred to in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 203 of the Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 415; Public Law 88–426);

"(C) justices, judges, and other personnel in the judicial branch referred to in section 402(d) and 403 of the Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 434; Public Law 88–426); and

"(D) offices and positions under the Executive Schedule in subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

"Such review by the Commission shall be made for the purpose of determining and providing—

"(i) the appropriate pay levels and relationships between and among the respective offices and positions covered by such review, and

"(ii) the appropriate pay relationships between such offices and positions and the offices and positions subject to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

"(b) REPORTS BY COMMISSION TO CONGRESS AND TO THE PRESIDENT.—(1) The Commission shall submit to Congress by July 1 of each year a report of the results of each review conducted by the Commission of the offices and positions within the purview of paragraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (a) of this section, together with its recommendations. It is the intent of Congress that in no event shall the rates of pay be increased to levels higher than the then existing rates of pay increased by the percent rise in the Consumer Price Index (United States city average—all items) during the period beginning with the month during which the then last preceding pay raise was enacted and ending with the month preceding the month during which the current recommendations were submitted by the Civil Service Commission to Congress. It is the further intent of Congress that the recommendations be acted upon as soon as possible after submission to Congress.

"(2) The Commission shall submit to the President by July 1 of each year a report of the results of each review conducted by the Commission of the offices and positions within the purview of paragraph (D) of subsection (a) of this section, together with its recommendations.

"(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT WITH RESPECT TO PAY.—The President shall transmit to Congress not later than August 31 his recommendations with respect to the exact rates of pay which he deems advisable for those offices and positions within the purview of paragraph (D) of subsection (a) of this section. In no event shall the recommendations of the President propose rates of pay which exceed the then existing rates of pay increased by the percent rise in the Consumer Price Index (United States city average—all cities) during the period beginning with the month during which the then last preceding pay raise was approved by the Congress and ending with the month preceding the month during which the current recommendations were submitted by the President.

"(d) APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT.—(1) The recommendations of the President transmitted to the Congress under subsection (c) of this section shall be considered in each House not later than the thirtieth calendar day of continuous session of Congress following the date of transmittal of such recommendations. If each House adopts a resolution of approval of such recommendations, the recommendations shall become effective. In all such cases the vote of each House shall be determined by the yeas and nays. For the purpose of this paragraph the continuity of a session is broken only by 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 are excluded in the computation of the thirty-day period.

"(2) The rates of pay contained in the recommendations so approved shall become effective on the date or dates fixed by the President in the recommendations transmitted under subsection (c) of this section.".

SEC. 2(a). The first section of this Act shall be effective January 1, 1974.

(b) The rates of pay for those offices and positions within the purview of subsection (a) of section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, as amended, shall be adjusted to an amount equal to such rates increased by the average percent of increases in the 1973 pay adjustments under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be effective on the first day of the first pay period that begins on or after the effective date of such 1973 pay adjustments.

AID TO LIBRARIES

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I join in introducing a bill entitled "Aid to Libraries and Free Flow of Educational and Cultural Mail Act of 1973."

Briefly stated, the bill seeks to insure the long-standing precedent of congressional intent in its determination that books as a class of mail have a high educational, cultural, and scientific value.

The bill provides for a stretchout of the full rate increase for books and other educational materials to a period of 10 years rather than 5.

Further and importantly, it seeks a redress of an oversight in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 by including in the library rate the shipment of books and educational materials to libraries, educational institutions, and individuals. Presently the statute only applies to shipments of materials between libraries.

At a time when schools and libraries face an ever-worsening budget crisis, this bill represents a considerable savings to those institutions and individuals. The facts clearly show that at least 75 percent of the volume of materials shipped now by special fourth-class rate consists of books, of which half go to libraries and educational institutions—thus making the students of the Nation, both young and old, among the prime beneficiaries of this legislation.

I want to state clearly that the pur-

pose of this legislation is not to set rates but merely to reaffirm a long-standing congressional policy to insure the free flow of ideas through the mails. In 1901, then Postmaster General Charles Smith summarized this in these words:

Our free institutions rest on popular intelligence, and it has from the beginning been our fixed and enlightened policy to foster and promote the general diffusion of public information. Congress has wisely framed the postal laws with this just and liberal conception. It has uniformly sought to encourage intercommunication and the exchange of intelligence.

The Congress has since that time sought to carry out the mandate of fostering the dissemination of educational, cultural, and scientific informational matter through favorable postal rates and special mail classifications. I believe we would be remiss if we were to turn our backs on this long-standing congressional policy.

GOOD CHOICE FOR EPA

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, it was recently announced that the President has appointed Mr. Russell E. Train, former Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, to be the new Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. I would like to first offer my sincere congratulations to Mr. Train, and know that my colleagues join me in wishing him much success in his new position.

Russell Train has a long and proven record of leadership in working to improve our environment. The President deserves special commendation for his considered appointment of Mr. Train to what is surely one of the most important positions in Government—to the extent that the decisions which that Agency must make so directly affect the everyday lives of every American citizen. I am certain that Russell Train will bring with him the same strong voice on behalf of a cleaner environment to EPA that he so frequently demonstrated in his position at CEQ.

The Washington Star-News of August 2, 1973, ran an editorial on Mr. Train's appointment. I would like to share with my colleagues the well deserved praise the Star has given him:

GOOD CHOICE FOR EPA

All available evidence suggests that President Nixon made an excellent choice the other day in selecting a new chief for the Environmental Protection Agency. It's true that Russell E. Train has no experience in administration on the large scale he now must grapple with, but neither does anyone else we know of who holds high credentials as an environmental leader. And these Train certainly has, along with a good deal of talent and persuasive ability.

The latter has been exercised lately in his strong contention—voiced to businessmen and others—that environmentalism is getting an unfair rap as a creator of economic and energy problems. Such claims are vastly exaggerated, he argues, with some rather impressive documentation.

His leadership of the Council on Environmental Quality, since its formation in 1970, has produced highly valuable results, in studies, recommendations and legislation. But his most striking achievements have been in mobilizing international action to curb ocean pollution, and protect endangered species of animal, marine and plant life all over the world. Progress in these areas has been truly remarkable in the past year, and Train was in the forefront as this country's representative at international conferences.

As head of the private Conservation Foundation, he was defending the environmental ideal for several years before entering government. Now comes his supreme test, for the EPA faces a severe dilemma in applying some difficult provisions of the Clean Air Act. Modifications in the law are proposed, and there will be pressures for more flexibility in other fields of pollution control as the pinch becomes more painful here and there. Train will occupy the position at which environmentalism and economics collide, as they surely will in some major instances. The question is, how much will he bend? To the very minimum that's required, we hope.

That seems to be the message, too, in his statement that the EPA will continue to operate with the same independence assumed under its able first administrator, William D. Ruckelshaus. And Train emphasizes that the burden of proof will be on those who want to ease the environmental restrictions fixed by law. These are encouraging assurances, and we hope he proves equal to the pressures of politics, and divergent interests, that surely will converge with increasing momentum upon his agency.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States has issued a statement in observance of the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Information Agency. With the unanimous consent of the House, I would like to include Vice President AGNEW's statement at this point in the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

It gives me great pleasure to join in celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the United States Information Agency.

The activities of the USIA have imparted to people throughout the nations of the world a better understanding of the way of life we Americans treasure. Through the Agency's publications, libraries, educational and cultural programs; through the person-to-person contacts provided by USIA officers; and through the broadcasts of the internationally respected Voice of America, our message has been transmitted clearly to hundreds of millions who might otherwise never have received it.

Today, as confrontation gives way to negotiation, clear communication becomes even more imperative. Paradoxically, as the world shrinks it becomes more complex, and as old animosities abate, subtle distinctions become increasingly significant. In such a period, our policies and goals must be communicated with special precision to the other peoples of the world. I am confident that USIA will continue to carry out this task with distinction.

THE DELAWARE RIVER

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to include a portion of the Delaware River, which flows between the States of New York and Pennsylvania, in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I am honored that the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Interior Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR); the distinguished chairman of the House Interior Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROY TAYLOR); the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) are joining with me as cosponsors of this legislation.

In 1968 the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. This landmark legislation provided that it is "the policy of the United States that certain selected rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, cultural, or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they and their immediate environments shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations."

The act established a National Wild and Scenic Rivers System administered by the Department of the Interior and designated eight rivers in the West and Midwest for immdiate inclusion in the System. In addition, 27 rivers, among them the upper Delaware River between Hancock, N.Y. and the Matamoras, Pa., were listed for detailed study as potential additions to the system.

The segment of the Delaware River which was studied flows about 76 miles between the States of New York and Pennsylvania, dividing New York's Catskill Mountains from Pennsylvania's Pocono Mountains. The area surrounding the river, in Wayne and Pike counties in Pennsylvania and Delaware, Sullivan, and Orange counties in New York, is characterized by wooded, rolling or rugged hills with scatterings of small settlements, farms, and clearings. Numerous streams feed into the Delaware River, and some stretches of "white water" are found along the river's course. The overall impression created by this twisting, gleaming river and its verdant valley is one of scenic and tranquil beauty.

Amazingly, although the river area is still relatively undeveloped and sparsely inhabited, about 57 million people, one-fourth of our Nation's population, live within 250 miles of it.

The major urban centers of New York City and Philadelphia are located within 120 miles of the river. Inclusion of the upper Delaware in the national Wild and Scenic Rivers System with proper Federal management and development of recreational facilities would offer generations of urban, suburban and rural residents the opportunity to utilize an excellent national resource.

Pursuant to the 1968 act's directive to

study the Delaware for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, an interagency task force was organized in 1969 to carry out that task. Under the leadership of the Department of the Interior, representatives of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the National Forest Service, the Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—the Army Corps of Engineers, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Conservation, and the New York Department of Environmental Conservation, initiated a 4-year study of the river and its potential for Federal management.

The final report of this task force, which has not yet been released publicly, will reportedly recommend that the upper Delaware River be included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and accordingly I am introducing this legislation. The Governors of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, all of whom are members of the Delaware River Basin Commission, have unanimously endorsed the project.

The bill provides that the upper Delaware would be immediately included in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Within one year of enactment, the Secretary of the Interior would be required to establish detailed boundaries and development plans for the river unit which would be presented to the Congress for final approval. The basic guidelines to be followed by the Secretary are the conservation of the natural and scenic values of the river in coordination with the use and enjoyment of the river for all time by the American public.

Mr. Speaker, the encroachment of civilization, industrialization, pollution, and land development have struck the scenic areas of the East harder than any other portion of the country. In light of this and the fact that the upper Delaware is a priceless, vibrant resource which offers so much to the residents of our Northeastern United States, I urge the Congress to approve this legislation as quickly as possible.

GOVERNMENT IN THE SUNSHINE

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "freedom of information" takes on greater importance daily as the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities continues to delve into the Watergate incident and related activities of the 1972 Presidential campaign. The claim of executive privilege, which clearly denies information not only to the Congress but to the Nation as well, has become a major tool for the withholding of Government material. The propriety of certain actions by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in negotiating last year's grain agreement with the Soviet Union has been questioned with respect to those who perhaps had advance knowledge of the sale while the vast majority of Americans were kept in the dark. Furthermore, indictments have been brought against former Government officials who are charged with exercising improper influence in proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission.

These are only a few of the issues and incidents which seem to point to a growing inclination on the part of Government to pursue a course dedicated to letting the people know only that information which the Government feels they should know. Decisionmaking in the Government clearly follows a closed-door, need-to-know policy, weighted in favor of a select few.

Early in the 93d Congress I introduced legislation called the Federal Government in the sunshine bill with the bipartisan support of more than 50 Members of the House. Patterned after the State "sunshine law" in Florida, that bill was designed to eliminate secrecy in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government by making deliberative processes in both branches open to public scrutiny.

With the initial, strong support of the Democratic caucus, a major objective of the "sunshine" bill was achieved early in March when the House adopted House Resolution 259. That resolution, which I sponsored, amended the Rules of the House to strengthen the presumption that all committee meetings—including those for the marking up of bills, which have traditionally been held in executive or closed session—should be open unless action is taken in open session by a recorded vote to close such meetings.

Prior to the adoption of this rule, Congressional Quarterly reported that 42 percent of the meetings held in the House during the 1972 session were closed to the public and the press. A study by Common Cause following adoption of the rule change, from March 7 through June 15, showed that of 284 meetings to draft bills, 47 were held in closed session, or approximately 16 percent.

I am hopeful that the positive experience of many committees which have held open markup sessions will lead to an even better record in future months. Of particular concern is the way Federal funds are allocated. With one exception, all House Appropriations Committee and subcommittee markup sessions have, I understand, been held in closed session. While I am sure the committee faces unique problems, I also feel that the public has a right to know what factors lead to congressional decisions on how to spend the public's money.

Today, however, I am introducing legislation to focus singularly on executive branch deliberations and agency procedures.

Following the introduction of S. 3881 in the 92d Congress by Senator LAWTON CHILES, he worked with interested parties in redrafting the "sunshine" bill to make certain provisions more specific and to include additional requirements including a prohibition on all ex parte communications in cases of rulemaking or adjudication by an agency. The bill I am introducing today is identical to the provisions contained in title II—Agency Procedures—of the redrafted bill introduced in the 93d Congress as S. 260 by Senator CHILES.

This bill would require that all meetings of multimember Federal agencies—at which any official action is discussed, considered, or taken—must normally be open to the public. These meetings could be closed only if their proceedings fell within one or more of the specific exemptions as prescribed by this act and only if a majority of the membership, in a public vote, decided to close the meeting. These exemptions are offered in the form of broad categories. They would include matters relating to national defense and security; items required by statute to be kept confidential; meetings related to internal management of an agency or committee; and disciplinary proceedings which could adversely affect the reputation of an individual. I am confident that these broad categories can be improved upon greatly with the full benefit of public input and committee consideration.

Furthermore, the bill provides that any citizen could challenge an agency's implementing regulations or decision to close a particular meeting. In such cases the courts would decide whether the material in question conforms to the spirit of this act and whether it falls within the domain of that specific exemption as enacted in the law.

Of particular importance I feel is the provision of the bill regarding ex parte communications between an interested person and a member or employee of the agency in the following types of proceedings:

Any case of agency adjudication or rulemaking on the record which under the Administrative Procedure Act is subject to a requirement of trial-type procedures;

Any agency rulemaking proceeding with respect to which the agency is required by the Administrative Procedure Act to afford public notice and opportunity for comment by interested persons;

Any proceedings to prepare an environmental impact statement required under the National Environmental Protection Act.

The agency involved would be required to publish any such ex parte communications on the public record.

This is an issue which I have been concerned with since 1960 when I first introduced legislation entitled the "Agency Hearing Standards of Conduct Act." That bill proposed a mandatory requirement that all communications with an agency, direct or indirect, regarding matters adversary in nature, be made openly and as a part of the agency proceeding in question. As proposed, it would have applied to all agency hearing proceedings which by law are subject to notice and opportunity for hearing—just as the sunshine bill requires. After notice of hearing, it would have been unlawful for any agency employee connected with the case

to permit, entertain, or consider any interview, argument or communication concerning the case except through official hearing procedures. Any such attempts would be required to be disclosed as the sunshine bill requires.

Very stringent ex parte provisions were included in the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 with respect to the Postal Rate Commission proceedings. In addition, I notice that the Attorney General has indicated that the Department of Justice will keep a record of all contacts and communications by persons outside the Department.

These are admirable steps, but I believe that the prohibition should apply uniformly to all agency proceedings involving adjudication or rulemaking. This is a very critical issue which has had the full support of the American Bar Association since at least 1956. Since that time the ABA has endorsed and supported efforts to enact the necessary Federal legislation. In a resolution adopted by the ABA House of Delegates in 1958, the Association stated:

The American Bar Association has repeatedly urged that the organization and procedure of federal administrative agencies in the exercise of adjudicatory powers provide (1) that hearing officers be assured independence of judgment and impartiality in the trial of agency cases, (2) that the integrity of the judicial process at all levels in the agency be protected by confining decisions to the public hearing record in an environment totally free from any *ex parte* off-the-record representations, influences or pressures from any source.

In addition to making sure that all agency proceedings are free from "influence peddling," it is equally important that agency deliberations be conducted in open session. Instances of Federal administrative agencies conducting closed meetings on matters of substantial public concern are not uncommon. Oftentimes, closed meetings are such well-kept secrets that the public is not even aware that meetings are being held. The first contact that the public might have with the regulations promulgated by the agency could very well be at the point of administration.

I offer as an example of this practice the Federal Power Commission's proposed rulemaking to establish a uniform national rate for natural gas—docket No. R–389B. The FPC in proposing this rulemaking has sought little public input for its consideration. No public hearings were planned on these measures. Furthermore, there is little reason to think that the FPC would open up its meetings on this proposal as it has been FPC policy to keep Commission meetings closed.

The problem of natural gas pricing is one of great concern to the general public. The proposal under consideration by the FPC would have a tremendous impact on the availability and allocation of this very important energy resource. The "energy crisis" is not a private problem but a public one. As such, consideration of this rulemaking which will contribute to the determination of our national energy policy must be debated and scrutinized in a public forum.

Common Cause, a strong advocate of eliminating secrecy in government, has FPC's plans on the ratesetting proposals. In recent weeks they have pressed the FPC to fully open up its consideration of this proposal to the public. In response to Common Cause's efforts, the FPC has promised to "consider" opening up its proceedings on this issue. Not surprisingly, this consideration will take place behind closed doors.

In January, I spoke of the fundamental challenge facing the 93d Congress:

That challenge is whether the Congress will meaningfully reassert its initiative in the policymaking process, reestablish its role as a viable force for leadership and change, and assume its constitutional responsibility and authority.

Six months later this challenge still remains for the Congress to confront, and the stakes are even higher than I had envisioned. The unprecedented secrecy within the executive branch continues to subvert a proper balance within our Government by denying both the Congress and the public access to information which is rightfully theirs. This is justified by extraordinary interpretations of such loosely defined principles as "Executive privilege" and "national security."

The results are unmistakable. The executive branch has sought to centralize all policymaking functions; and, I am sorry to say, it has been all too successful in this quest. This success is in no small part due to the proliferation of secrecy at all levels of Government operations. Secrecy and covert operations have served to distort the perspective of too many elements of our Government. A democratic government must remain accountable to the public which it is serving. Congress must take the initiative and remove the veil of secrecy from our Government and reestablish its link of accountability with the people.

I hope that consideration can be given to the "sunshine" proposal in ongoing efforts to strengthen and expand the Freedom of Information Act. I urge our colleagues to join in support of this important measure.

SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE who was referred to as "that little Jap" needs no defense from this or any other Member of Congress. And I would not rise in this House except that I cannot let pass without comment such a racial slur because it is an insult to all Japanese Americans. Japanese-American organizations have been working for years toward the goal of eradicating this verbal denigration, as well as all ethnic derogations.

To resurrect the "Jap" slur in connection with Senator INOUYE is patently even more absurd in view of his outstanding record of heroism in World War II, including having his arm shot off in the service of his country. His current service as a member of the Senate Watergate Investigating Committee has catapulted him again into the national limelight as a truly great American.

The member of the legal profession who would stoop to name calling impeached only himself by his remark. By his betrayal of this attitude, he has joined the ranks of those whose activities are being scrutinized for attempting to subvert our ideals of individual liberty and justice.

I call upon the White House to remove this man as counsel for its former aides. His retention as counsel is a national disgrace.

ANOTHER CALLOUS VETO

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment and regret over President Nixon's decision to veto S. 504, the Emergency Medical Services System Act of 1973. This House expressed its overwhelming support for the bill in a recent 306 to 111 floor vote.

I am most distressed because this is not an isolated instance of a health bill meeting with Executive displeasure. HEW recently admitted that over $1 billion in appropriated and desperately needed health funds never reached the intended recipients in fiscal year 1973. Health programs and particularly the Health Services and Mental Health Administration—HSMHA—are presently in reorganizational flux and few assurances are given that the end product will be a substantive improvement or even in line with the categorical health programs administered. Finally, the administration has submitted fiscal year 1974 budget requests that ask for the abrupt termination of services and training programs with not the slightest indication that consideration has been given to the long-range, serious impact of these cuts.

President Nixon has simply ceased to give leadership to our Nation's health programs. Studies which his administration has initiated and which were carried out within the executive departments have identified areas of continuing and in many cases intensified need. President Nixon has largely ignored these studies and continues to impound funds and seek new regulations and other means through which to evade congressional intent.

I am deeply disturbed by the continuing absence of strong, innovative, and effective health leadership. We have all, I think, come to recognize that the nature of our health care system is undergoing drastic and rapid change. We need direction from a concerned Executive.

The administration has identified certain needs; it has pointed to the need for coordinated emergency medical service systems. The administration has, however, failed to take the crucial step from pinpointing a need to meeting it. The Nixon administration has faltered be-

tween identifying health needs and implementing innovative health policy.

The original emergency medical services bill provided for demonstration centers; it provided time, the opportunity, and the funding for experimentation.

This Congress is aware of the need that exists; it has learned from the demonstration program efforts that coordinated emergency medical services can save lives as well as time and money. Through improved communications and greater cooperation between facilities and fuller utilization of our resources, we can offer a higher quality emergency health care to all our citizens.

What Congress has done is what the administration has failed to do. It has taken the initiative and offered what we have learned from our demonstration efforts to all our people.

In vetoing S. 504, President Nixon reaffirmed a pattern of administering health programs through rhetoric and dealing with health needs through neglect. President Nixon suggests that these systems be set up at local initiative with the Federal Government confining its responsibility to demonstration centers. I suggest that this is not decentralization but default.

I am deeply distressed that President Nixon has failed to provide the leadership necessary to implement this innovative and highly successful program. The Senate voted yesterday to override the President's veto; I am hopeful that the House will reaffirm its support for the bill and likewise vote to override when Congress returns in September.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE FOR RIVERSIDE UNIVERSITY

(Mr. PETTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced private legislation for the relief of certain students whose academic and financial interests were disrupted when Riverside University in Riverside, Calif., went into bankruptcy.

Those students attending this institution who, in good faith, participated in various Federal student assistance programs, found themselves with none or very few academic credits which could be transferred to other schools. Their obligation to repay educational assistance was not as easily wiped out. Understandably reluctant to pay for something that was not received, many refused to honor their contracts. Independent lending institutions who had advanced the money—also in good faith—turned their claims over to the Office of Education for collection. Settlement attempts are still underway.

The private bill I introduced today will resolve the situation for affected students from Riverside University. Unfortunately, the problem is much larger than this one isolated case.

I am working now with my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. BELL) to draft general legislation which will correct the oversights in Federal law that allow incidents such as I have just cited to occur. We hope to offer a comprehensive bill soon after the August recess. In the interim, I would like to invite those of my colleagues who are interested to contact my office if they would like to offer suggestions or illustrations with which they have had experience that can help in these efforts.

TRIBUTE TO REV. MSGR. WILLIAM J. SHANNON

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the late Rev. Msgr. William J. Shannon, administrator and rector of the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception in Syracuse, N.Y.

Msgr. Shannon, a native Syracusan and a close personal friend, passed away in May of this year. We mourn his death but we are grateful for his life. His was a life of selfless dedication to the principles for which he stood and the people whom he served.

Prior to entering the priesthood in 1943 "Jackie" Shannon made his fame as a radio personality and an entertainer in Syracuse. As a priest he single-handedly directed the renovation of the cathedral which stands as a monument to the tenacious drive that characterized his entire life. His contribution to the world extends far beyond the walls of the cathedral into the hearts of all those whom he met. He enjoyed the love and affection of people of all faiths throughout the community—an admiration that is singular in itself.

Rev. David F. Cunningham, Bishop of Syracuse, eulogized Msgr. Shannon in this way:

> If one were to look for a distinctive mark of Msgr. Shannon's ministry in the priesthood, one would say it was the wonderful rapport he had with people—he loved being with people and enjoying them.

He was a success in life because he gave completely of himself; the mark he has made on the diocese cannot be erased.

I am reminded of a quote by the Lebanese author, Kahlil Gibran:

> When you part from your friend you grieve not, for that which you love most in him will be clearer in his absence, as the mountain is clearer from the plain.

It is my sincere hope that Msgr. Shannon's legacy of personal warmth, exemplary leadership and religious devotion will live forever as an inspiration to all of us whose lives were blessed in being touched by his own.

ADMINISTRATION ENJOINED ON HELIUM CONTRACTS

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1973, the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas, in the case entitled *National Helium Corporation, et al.* v. *Morton, et al.*, civil action No. W–4568, ordered that the preliminary injunction issued on March 27, 1971, enjoining the Secretary of the Interior, his agents, and employees, from taking any action leading to the final termination of the Federal helium program and the implementing contracts to be continued in full force and effect pending further order of the court.

The importance of this farsighted decision is that it continues the existence of a Federal helium conservation program as enacted by Congress. The significance of the decision is that it illustrates, once again, the ineptness of this administration in their failure to understand the importance of protecting and conserving our precious natural resources.

The decision of the U.S. district court in Kansas enjoining the Secretary of the Interior from terminating the helium purchase contracts results from the dullard, neurotic, approach adopted by the Office of Management and Budget, in the early days of this administration, to cut back and stop the plethora of Federal programs. The Office of Management and Budget in their random survey of Federal programs to cut in order to achieve a reduction in Government spending stumbled to the unintelligent decision to terminate the helium purchase contracts which were authorized by Congress in the Helium Act Amendments of 1960.

If the all-knowing Office of Management and Budget had bothered to take a look at the legislative history concerning the establishment of the Federal helium conservation program, a different decision concerning the future of this program should have resulted. Such a decision would have saved the American taxpayers the tremendous expense required by this litigation, not to mention the possible expense to the taxpayers should the final decision in this case go against the United States.

In the 1950's President Eisenhower became concerned over the irresponsible wasting of our natural resources. He foresaw the time when new technological developments could not be commercialized because we literally threw away the minerals which would be needed. The one element which came into view then was helium. Shortages of helium had caused some problems for our country, and the President appointed a Cabinet-level task force to study the problem. The then Under Secretary of the Interior, now the Honorable Judge Chilson, was the chairman of that task force. Many departments were represented and after 2 years of work, President Eisenhower enthusiastically adopted their report and declared a new national helium conservation policy, with the observation that historians of the future would record this action of his administration as one of his greatest contributions. The Congress heard the results of this study, carefully deliberated all aspects, after consideration in the Interior Committees of both Houses, and almost unanimously passed the Helium Act of 1960 requiring the conservation of our helium resources. President Kennedy's administration im-

plemented the program, and five plants producing 3½ billion cubic feet of helium per year were built and this vital natural resource saved.

We are now facing an energy crisis. We are on a crash program to utilize fully our coal resources, oil, gas, and other energy sources. These will meet our needs for some time. What does technology promise? We can now foresee the development of new energy sources. MHD can increase the production of electricity from coal by 50 percent. Electricity can be shipped hundreds of miles without loss in underground pipes with no effect on the environment, fusion power is within sight and can be an unlimited source of power in the distant future, and pollution-free mass transit at high speed can be achieved. All of these things will be available only because President Eisenhower's program to save a wasting asset—helium—was made the law of the land.

What has the Watergate mentality of the present administration's whiz kids done with this program?

Ignored the purpose of the Helium Act.

Violated the law designed to protect the environment.

Vented helium to the atmosphere with the high probability of paying full price for it.

Purchased 120 million cubic feet of helium from private producers during 1972 destroying the financing plan designed to pay for the conservation of helium and in violation of the existing law.

Urged spending hundreds of millions of dollars for fusion research while throwing helium away, the one material we must have to gain the results of such research.

Refused to bring to the Interior Committee a plan for the solution of the financial problems confronting the Federal helium conservation program.

Ignored the comments of scientists working on super-conducting transmission of power who warned that the abandonment of this helium conservation program would be a disaster.

When the American people living in the middle of the next century, with complete dependence on new energy forms requiring helium, long since exhausted from natural deposits by past generations bent on burning all the natural gas they could find, they will record two facts—President Eisenhower and the members of the 86th Congress will rank among the great men of foresight in history; this administration's termination of the Federal helium conservation program will rank below the level of Watergate.

Mr. Speaker, I am incorporating by reference at the conclusion of these remarks the opinion of the Kansas U.S. District Court for the benefit of my colleagues who have not had the opportunity to read the decision, and hopefully, to provide the administration a similar, if not, the initial opportunity to reassess the administration position on the Federal helium conservation program.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas—Civil Action No. W-4568]

DECISION AND OPINION OF THE COURT

National Helium Corporation, Plaintiff, and Phillips Petroleum Company and Cities Service Helex, Inc., Intervenor-Plaintiffs, vs. Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, and Elburt F. Osborn, Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, Defendants

On March 27, 1971, this Court temporarily enjoined the Secretary of the Interior from terminating the National Helium Conservation Program as implemented by three helium procurement contracts entered into with the plaintiffs prior to a hearing on the merits or, alternatively, a reconsideration by the Department of Interior of its action in the light of the applicable substantive and procedural requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 83 Stat. 852, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, et seq.; the Helium Act, as amended by the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, 74 Stat. 918, 50 U.S.C. §§ 167, et seq.; and the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551, et seq., *National Helium Corporation v. Morton*, 326 F. Supp. 151 (D. Kan. 1971), aff'd. 455 F. 2d 650 (10th Cir. 1971). Of particular concern to the Court was the failure of the Department of Interior to prepare a final environmental impact statement prior to taking the contemplated action. On February 2, 1973, the Secretary of Interior again determined that the helium procurement contracts should be terminated, since the purposes of the Helium Act of 1960 had been satisfied and, accordingly, notices were sent to the plaintiffs that termination would occur on April 4, 1973, at 8:00 a.m., C.S.T. Having prepared a final environmental impact statement in accordance with § 4332 (a) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C., the Secretary immediately moved for dissolution of the preliminary injunction.

In response to the defendants' notices of termination and motion for dissolution, the plaintiffs filed verified amended complaints seeking, *inter alia*, the continuation of the preliminary injunction pending a full hearing on the merits of the case. They alleged that: (1) the defendants had not complied with the procedural and substantive requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321, et seq. (hereinafter referred to as "NEPA"), the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, 50 U.S.C. §§ 167, et seq. (hereinafter referred to as the "Helium Act"); and the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551, et seq., prior to the termination of the contracts; (2) the necessary conditions precedent for termination of the implementing contracts and the National Helium Conservation Program had not in fact occurred; and (3) the proposed agency action was otherwise arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance with law. In support of their allegations, the plaintiffs submitted documents, briefs, and a number of affidavits.

On March 14, 1973, the Court heard oral argument on the defendants' motion to dissolve the preliminary injunction. The defendants contended that since a comprehensive final environmental impact statement had been prepared, upon which the Secretary of Interior had determined to terminate the helium contracts, the Secretary's decision was entitled to a presumption of regularity, and the preliminary injunction should accordingly be dissolved. After a careful examination of the defendants' draft and final environmental statements and the pertinent comments attached thereto, the plaintiffs' amended complaint and supporting affidavits and documents, and the applicable law, the Court overruled the defendants' motion.

The Court had already ruled that it had jurisdiction of the suit by virtue of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, 2201 and 2202, and 5 U.S.C. §§ 701–706; that the plaintiffs had standing to raise the issues herein involved; that the termination of these contracts was a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment and posing serious environmental consequences within the meaning of § 4332(2)(C) of NEPA, 42 U.S.C.; that the requirements of NEPA were applicable to the Department of Interior "to the fullest extent possible" in the administration of the Helium Act by virtue of 42 U.S.C. § 4332; that there had been a sufficient showing of a likelihood of irreparable injury to the plaintiffs and the public if the Secretary's action was not enjoined; and that the Secretary's decision was subject to limited judicial review pursuant to § 706(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C., *National Helium Corporation v. Morton*, supra. Although the Secretary's decision was entitled to a presumption of regularity, "that presumption [was] not to shield his action from a thorough, probing, in-depth review." *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 416, 91 S.Ct. 814, 823, 28 L.Ed.2d 136 (1971).

Since the plaintiffs' amended complaints and supporting documents presented a substantial controversy involving complex factual and legal issues justifying the maintenance of the status quo pending further hearings, and the Court was convinced that the plaintiffs had established a probability of ultimate success, thereby justifying the issuance of a preliminary injunction in the first instance in accordance with the standards enunciated in *Crowther v. Seaborg*, 415 F.2d 437 (10th Cir. 1969), the Court determined that the dissolution of the previous injunction would be a futile gesture. See *Environmental Defense Fund v. Corps of Engineers of the United States Army*, 325 F. Supp. 749 (E.D.Ark. 1971). The Court did, however, require the plaintiffs to post a bond in the sum of $2,000,000 for the payment of such costs and damages as might be incurred by defendants if they were found to have been wrongfully restrained, and determined that this bond, along with the twenty-eight million dollars owed by the Government to the contractors, gave it a thirty million dollar security cushion.

The defendants immediately perfected an appeal of this Court's order denying their motion for dissolution of the preliminary injunction to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. In response to the defendants' request, this Court also certified its subsequent orders denying the defendants' motions for summary judgment on the pleadings pursuant to Rule 56, F.R.C.P. and, in the alternative, dismissal of the amended complaints, in part, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1), F.R.C.P. The Tenth Circuit did not rule on any of the orders, but it did direct that the trial on the merits should be held within thirty days on the administrative record, rather than by trial *de novo*, in conformity with the recent United States Supreme Court decision, in *Camp v. Pitts*, — U.S. — (No. 72–864, March 26, 1973). Having resolved the preliminary matters, reviewed the administrative record as supplemented by the plaintiffs, and heard oral argument, this case is ripe for final disposition.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This is a case of considerable complexity and moment. A basic review of the characteristics of helium and the history and development of this country's helium conservation program, including the role played by the implementing helium procurement contracts herein involved, consequently serves as an instructive prelude to its resolution. The summary which follows was gleaned from the administrative record submitted by the Department of Interior, including numerous departmental studies, compilations, and reports, and is supported by the findings of facts in related litigation in *Northern Natural Gas Company v. Grounds*, 292 F.Supp. 619, 624–680 (D.Kan.1968), aff'd. 441 F.2d 704

(10th Cir. 1971); *Air Reduction v. Hickel*, 420 F.2d 592 (D.C. Cir. 1969); and *Northern Helex Co. v. United States*, 445 F.2d 546 (Ct. Cl. 1972).

Helium is a colorless, odorless, and tasteless gas which, in the present state of scientific knowledge, will not react chemically or physically with any other element, except under laboratory conditions. Helium is noncombustible. It is the second lightest element found on earth next to hydrogen, which is highly combustible. Helium does not liquefy at standard atmospheric pressure until it reaches −452.1 degrees Fahrenheit, almost absolute zero and lower than any other gas. It is the only known gas which can develop superconductivity in metals. It is the best known transmitter of sound and the best conductor of heat at near absolute zero of any gas. It becomes a super fluid near absolute zero. Helium is non-toxic to man and it does not become radioactive.

Since its discovery on the sun by Sir Norman Lockyear in 1868, helium has grown from a laboratory curiosity with no practical applications to one of the most valuable, yet rapidly wasting, elements on earth. As measured by its demand, helium has established itself as a tool in shielded arc welding and other metallurgical applications, lighter-than-air applications, chromatography as a carrier gas, leak detection, heat transfer medium in nuclear power reactors, pressurizing and purging liquid propellants for space boosters, under sea work as a breathing gas when mixed with oxygen, medical research and therapeutic treatment, cryogenics, and in low temperature research. Helium is also presently being used as a coolant in high-temperature gas-cooled reactors.

Future uses of helium for which research is presently being carried on by the Government and private industry include its application in such areas as power generation by helium-cooled fission reactors, nuclear fusion reactors, superconducting systems of generation and transmission of power, magnetohydrodynamics, and transportation by superconducting magnetic levitation systems, to name a few. In the future, uses of helium are expected to develop which are now unforeseen or unknown.

Before 1960, with minor exceptions, the production and marketing of helium was accomplished by the Bureau of Mines, pursuant to the Helium Act of 1925, 50 U.S.C. § 161, et seq.:

"An act authorizing the conservation, production, and exploitation of helium gas, a mineral resource pertaining to the national defense, and to the development of commercial aeronautics, and for other purposes." 43 Stat. 1110.

The Act authorized the Bureau of Mines to operate plants, to store and care for helium, and to conduct exploration. The Secretary of Interior was authorized to acquire land or interest in land by purchase, lease or condemnation where necessary, to provide helium to supply the needs of the Army, Navy, and other branches of the Government. 50 U.S.C. § 161. Other than a minor amendment of the Act in 1927 in order to permit the limited leasing or selling of helium to aid scientific and commercial development, 44 Stat. 1387, the Act remained essentially the same until 1937. By amendment in 1937, Ch. 895, 50 Stat. 885, to the Helium Act of 1925, Ch. 426, 43 Stat. 1110, the Secretary was directed to purchase, if possible, all properties developed or constructed by private parties for helium production prior to the passage of the amendment.

Until the advent of World War II, the uses of helium outside the laboratory were in lighter-than-air-craft and, when mixed with oxygen, in medicine and deep-sea diving. Since the Government was the predominant consumer of helium, the emphasis of the helium program was accordingly upon meeting current and short-range helium needs. At the commencement of World War II, all helium extraction facilities were owned by the United States, and consisted solely of the Amarillo Plant, located at the Cliffside Field in Potter County, Texas, which had been purchased in 1933.

During World War II, the usefulness of helium was broadened considerably. Four plants were built to meet the greatly increased military need for helium, and during the 1950's demand for helium rose spectacularly due to the development of new uses, including atomic weapons, nuclear energy plants, military and civilian rocketry, exploration of outer space, cryogenics, and other uses connected with both science and industry. As increasing helium demands threatened to outstrip the production capacity of the Bureau of Mines, concern arose regarding the future ability to meet mobilization needs and the casual wastage of the natural resource. In 1957, the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, recommended to the Secretary of Interior that a working group be established to determine the feasibility of making the conservation aspect of the helium program the primary, rather than incidental, objective of the Department of Interior.

A working group was subsequently established, comprised of representatives from the Departments of Commerce, Defense and Interior, Atomic Energy Commission, Office of Defense Mobilization, Bureau of the Budget, and Federal Power Commission. Headed by then Undersecretary of Interior, O. Hatfield Chilson, now our esteemed colleague on the federal bench in the District of Colorado, the group compiled a study entitled "Cost and Implementation of a National Helium Conservation Policy." (The Chilson Report, January 24, 1958).

As a result of the study, a national helium conservation policy was subsequently recommended to President Eisenhower and formally approved on April 25, 1958.

The Report noted that approximately 99% of the known helium-bearing natural gas resources in the United States was concentrated in four fields containing approximately 119 billion cubic feet of potentially recoverable helium: (1) the Hugoton Field of Texas, Oklahoma and Kansas; (2) the Panhandle Field of Texas; (3) the Keyes Field of Oklahoma; and (4) the Greenwood Field of Kansas. The Report further noted that these fields had been developed by private companies to supply natural gas to fuel markets, and that since the companies merely considered the helium to be a minor impurity no effort was being made to remove it; consequently, the helium was merely passing into the atmosphere without serving any useful purpose.

The study group recognized a number of significant factors suggesting the need for a long term helium conservation program. First, although the demand for helium had been consistently rising, the emphasis of the helium program was on meeting current, short term needs. Second, helium was essential to the country's missile and atomic energy programs, and an invaluable industrial tool. Third, the helium supply being conserved by the Bureau of Mines, although sufficient to meet current foreseeable governmental needs, would likely not be sufficient to meet future governmental and private demands resulting from expected and unforeseeable developments in new and expanding technologies. Fourth, natural gas was the only known commercial source of helium, since recovery from the atmosphere and other sources was impracticable due to the economic and environmental barriers. Fifth, the world's largest helium-bearing gas fields were located in the United States, yet the helium was being allowed to vent into the air without serving any useful purpose and would probably be totally depleted by 1985. Sixth, due to the inability to place a "value" on helium as a result of the speculative nature of its future demand and the predominant government utilization, there was no economic incentive for private industry to extract and store the helium for future use. Seventh, if nothing was done, the nation's richest source of helium would be least available at a time when it was needed the most. Finally, that present legislation did not permit the implementation of a long-range conservation program as envisioned.

In order that an effective long-range helium conservation program might be implemented, the Report recommended that the Helium Act, 50 U.S.C. § 161, et seq., be amended in such a way so as to give the Secretary of Interior the authority to build up to thirteen new helium production plants to extract the helium prior to transmission of the natural gas to fuel markets, and to store the helium thus conserved in the government-owned Cliffside gas field or in some other suitable underground reservoir. In addition, the Report suggested that it might be feasible to augment this basic conservation plan by acquiring and shutting in relatively small isolated helium-bearing gas fields, although the acquisition of *all* of the fields was thought to be impracticable.

Since it was not certain that private companies would be willing or able to participate in the program, however, and in light of the current and unforeseeable importance of helium to the national welfare, the Report suggested that the legislation be drafted in such a way so as to authorize the Secretary to condemn the helium-bearing natural gas after its removal from place of deposit in nature. Furthermore, although suggesting an end to the long-standing governmental monopoly on the *production* of helium, the Report recommended that the Secretary retain control over the *sale* and *use* of helium produced by private companies not participating in the program, and thus be able to control the price of the gas and determine its end uses.

Due to the magnitude of the expense involved in accomplishing the conservation program, the Report recommended that: (1) private industry be encouraged to participate in the program by entering long-term contracts with the Government which would give the companies a reasonable return on their capital investment and, at the same time, help to defray the overall costs of the program; (2) the Secretary be authorized to set the price for the helium at a level which would enable the Department of Interior to cover all costs incurred in carrying out the provisions of the program; (3) all federal agencies and contractors purchase all major requirements of helium from the Secretary; and (4) the private companies participating in the program be prohibited from selling any helium to any purchaser other than the Secretary at a price lower than the lowest price paid by any government agency.

In 1958 the Department of the Interior proposed legislation to Congress for the implementation of the recommended conservation program. This was not acted upon, however, and redrafted proposals were subsequently submitted to Congress on July 27, 1959. After lengthy hearings and incidental revisions and amendments of the proposed bill, a legislative amendment was adopted on September 13, 1960, to be known as "An Act to amend the Helium Act of March 3, 1925, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States."[1] 50 U.S.C. § 167, et seq. The Act became effective on March 1, 1961, and a limitation on the annual contracting authority of 47.5 million dollars was established by the Act of August 3, 1961, 75 Stat. 246, 253.

The 1960 Helium Act Amendments authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into long-term contracts for the acquisition, processing, transportation, or conservation of helium, not exceeding twenty-five years. 50 U.S.C. § 167a(a)(2). In addition, he was

See footnotes at end of article.

given the power to acquire, by eminent domain, helium contained in helium-bearing natural gas and so much of such gas as was necessarily removed in the extraction process, if he were unable to acquire helium otherwise upon reasonable terms and at the fair market value. 50 U.S.C. § 167a(a)(2). In an attempt to make the program self-liquidating, the Act provided for a comprehensive system similar to that recommended by the Chilson Report. 50 U.S.C. §§ 167a(c), 167c, 167d and 167j. The Secretary was given authority to set his own price for the helium that he sold (50 U.S.C. § 167d(c)), and to establish and promulgate such rules and regulations, consistent with the directions of the Act, which were necessary to carry out its provisions. 50 U.S.C. § 167g.

Pursuant to the authority given the Secretary by the Helium Act Amendments, the the Secretary of Interior entered into helium procurement contracts with the plaintiff companies and with Northern Helex Company in August, October, and November, 1961. These companies were chosen due to the large amount of helium which they could assure, and their ability to accomplish the necessary production assemblage and perform the underlying contracts. The award of the contracts to these four companies obligated all of the available 47.5 million dollars contracting authority and thus completed that phase of the helium conservation program, unless and until the contracting authority was increased. That authority has not been increased by Congress.

Each contract provided for the sale and delivery to the United States of a helium-gas mixture for a term of twenty-two years. The companies were required to construct at their own risk and expense helium extraction plants and necessary facilities capable of processing at least 500 million cubic feet of Hugoton area gas per day (in the case of National Helium, approximately 840 million cubic feet of natural gas per day). The contracts followed a general pattern, although they varied in detail. Each contract contained an initial price per MCF of contained helium varying from $10.30 to $11.78. The prices were broken down into two parts, one related to the cost of gas and the other related to other costs. The companies have at all times fully met their obligations under the contracts.

Subsequent to the implementation of the expanded helium conservation program, numerous studies and reports concerning the program were prepared by federal agencies and by interested private groups and, in accordance with § 167n of the Helium Act Amendments, the Secretary of Interior made annual reports to advise Congress of the current status of the government's helium program. Generally, these reports contained financial, statistical, and operating information concerning the program for each fiscal year that it was in operation.

The helium conservation program apparently ran smoothly until some time in 1968. After the passage of the 1960 Act, however, several private companies had begun their own helium extraction outside of the government program. Because the Secretary's price for helium reflected not only direct extraction costs, but also a portion of the costs involved in the administration of the conservation program, the Secretary's price for helium exceeded the private producers' price. As the private companies' sales increased, the Secretary's sales decreased, despite increased overall demand.

In response to this situation, the Secretary proposed regulations in 33 Fed. Reg. 5219–20 (1968), which were later revised and officially published on October 18, 1968, in 33 Fed. Reg. 15478–80, to become effective December 2, 1968. The regulations would have forbidden government agencies *and their contractors* from purchasing their major requirements of helium from any source other than the Secretary, or private companies "eligible" under the regulations.

In *Air Reduction Company* v. *Hickel*, supra, these regulations were stricken down. The Court held that, although Congress had intended that the Secretary not lose his market because of private competition, it had not provided statutory authority to require government contractors to purchase their helium from the Secretary. The Court noted, however, that the Secretary's purpose could be accomplished by obtaining an Executive Order requiring that such provisions be included in all contracts entered into by government agencies. *Air Reduction Company* v. *Hickel*, supra, at p. 597. An Executive Order was never obtained.

It became increasingly evident that the costs of the program were not diminishing according to expectations and that the program was being adversely affected by the intrusion into what had been a virtually exclusive government market of private producers of helium. Moreover, the program was suffering financially from a temporary lull in sales occasioned principally by the large cuts in the space program. Consequently, the Department of Interior started negotiations with the four helium conservation contractors in an attempt to modify the contracts in a way that would reduce the costs of the program to the Government and still fulfill the goals of the program.

Due to diminished sales, however, the Department of Interior had fallen into arrears in making payments to the four helium contractors. Partial payments were made for a while, but payments ceased entirely in November, 1969, notwithstanding the continuance of deliveries. At the close of the calendar year of 1970, the Government owed large sums to the helium contractors for delivered helium. Consequently, on December 24, 1970, one of the helium contractors, Northern Helex Company, brought an action in the Court of Claims against the United States for breach of contract. In *Northern Helex Company v. United States*, 455 F. 2d 546 (Ct. Cl. 1972), the Court of Claims held that the Government was liable for anticipatory breach of the contract, but the issue of damages is still pending.

On January 26, 1971, and while negotiations were still in progress with at least one of the remaining contractors, the Department of Interior advised plaintiffs that, pursuant to paragraph 12.1 of the contracts, the contracts would be terminated effectively sixty days thereafter. Although specific language varied, each contract provided for termination as follows:

"12.1. Buyer [Federal Government] may, at its option, terminate this contract at any time if, (1) in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, the discovery of large new helium resources or a substantial diminution in helium requirements or any circumstance of similar nature should occur which would make the continued operation of Seller's plant and the continued purchase of helium gas mixture extracted therein unnecessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act or any amendment thereto, or (2) a material circumstance of force majeure making it impracticable or impossible for either Buyer or Seller to carry out its obligations under this contract which circumstance cannot be remedied with reasonable dispatch."

The President's Budget, issued on January 29, 1971, coincidentally, did not include a request for appropriations for the continued funding of the contracts.

On March 17, 1971, the plaintiffs filed the instant action against the defendants, and on March 26, 1971, this Court issued a preliminary injunction enjoining the termination of the contracts. Following the decision of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in *National Helium Corporation v. Morton*, 455 F. 2d 650 (10 Cir. 1971), affirming this Court's holding, the decision to terminate the contracts was remanded to the Secretary for reconsideration in light of the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 4331, et seq.

A draft environmental impact statement was subsequently prepared by the Department of Interior, and its availability was officially announced in the Federal Register on May 23, 1972. A final environmental impact statement entitled "Termination of Helium Purchase Contracts—United States Department of Interior—Bureau of Mines" was issued on November 13, 1972. On February 2, 1973, the Secretary of Interior gave notice of termination to the plaintiffs, to become effective sixty days thereafter. Accompanying the notices was a statement prepared by the Secretary justifying the termination of the helium conservation program in terms of the termination clauses of each of the helium purchase contracts.

The Secretary's termination statement, which is based on the Department's final environmental statement and the comments received from the private contractors, recognizes that: (1) the direct result of the decision to terminate the contracts will be that the Government will forego the storage of an estimated 20 billion cubic feet of helium which will be "wasted" or "depleted" if the contractors do not continue to extract and store the helium, prior to delivery of the natural gas to fuel markets; (2) natural gas—primarily fuel gas—is the only known source of helium other than the atmosphere, an environmentally and economically inferior source; (3) the currently proved "helium-rich" natural gas reserves (containing at least 0.3% helium) will probably be exhausted before the turn of the century; (4) it is known exactly how much, if any, "lean" helium-bearing natural gas will be available after the year 2000; (5) present studies predict large demands for helium for environmentally beneficial uses beginning around the turn of the century which *could* rapidly deplete the helium supply then in storage; and (6) assuming a lack of supply at a later time, future environmentally beneficial technological advancements *might* be precluded due to unacceptably adverse environmental effects of recovery from other sources.

In contrast to the above possibilities, the Secretary's statement notes that: (1) government demand for helium has decreased consistently since 1966, and is presently below the 1961 level; (2) present technological advancement enables recovery of helium from "lean" sources of helium-bearing natural gas *expected* to be available in large quantities in the future; (3) the Bureau of Mines estimates a total of 17 to 24 billion cubic feet of *probable* shut-in "helium-rich" reserves (i.e., found in natural gas fields not being exploited for present fuel purposes); (4) including the helium currently in storage, in shut-in government reserves, and expected to be recoverable from government-owned plants, total reserves approximate 44.5 billion cubic feet; (5) storage of recoverable helium at today's costs does not necessarily assure "low-cost" helium in the future; (6) the forecasted large demands for the future are "speculative" and of *questionable* reliability; (7) government agencies' estimates for future helium demands would not require removal of helium presently in storage "to meet essential government needs" until well into the next century; and (8) assuming the estimated total future demands were to materialize at the beginning of the next century, as predicted, the storage now of an additional 20 billion cubic feet of helium would merely delay, rather than foreclose, the necessity of obtaining helium from presently unknown or environmentally disadvantageous sources.

On the basis of the above *assumptions*, the Secretary determined that there had been a substantial diminution in helium requirements for essential government activities and that the termination was therefore authorized under Section 12.1 of the contracts, since the purposes of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 had been satisfied, citing § 167m of the Act, 50 U.S.C.:

"It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage individual enterprise in the development and distribution of supplies of helium, and at the same time provide, within economic limits, through the administration of this chapter, a sustained supply of helium which, together with supplies available or expected to become available otherwise, will be sufficient to provide for essential Government activities."

In their amended complaints, the plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief setting aside the Secretary's decision to terminate the helium procurement contracts. In summary, the complaints allege that: (1) the Secretary's termination decision was not preceded by full compliance with the procedural and substantive requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1331, et seq., and the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701, et seq.; (2) the Secretary's termination decision was not warranted by the terms of the contracts, constituting the helium conservation program, and was accordingly inconsistent with the purpose of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, 50 U.S.C. § 167, et seq.; and (3) the Secretary's termination decision was otherwise "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, and not in accordance with law."

JURISDICTION

The plaintiffs' amended complaints not only challenge agency compliance with NEPA, but also seek review of agency action under the Helium Act Amendments of 1960, 50 U.S.C. § 167, et seq. The plaintiffs contend that the Secretary is, in effect, terminating the entire helium program authorized by Congress, and that this Court should review his action under the Administrative Procedure Act as authorized by Congress in 50 U.S.C. § 167h(a) in order to determine whether such action is "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not otherwise in accordance with law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

The defendants concede this Court's jurisdiction to review procedural compliance with NEPA, but contend that the Court lacks jurisdiction to review the Secretary's decision on any other basis. The defendants assert three bases for this contention.

First, the defendants contend that assuming full agency compliance with NEPA, all other claims sound solely in contract; that since the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of $10,000, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over such claims by virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 1346(a)(2); that the proper forum for the relief sought by the plaintiffs is the Court of Claims in an action brought under the Tucked Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491; and that neither this Court nor the Court of Claims is authorized to grant equitable or declaratory relief under such contracts, as dictated by *United States v. King*, 395 U.S. 401, 89 S.Ct. 1813, 23 L.Ed.2 396 (1969), and *Richardson v. Morris*, — U.S. ——, 93 S.Ct. 629, 34 L.Ed.2d 647 (1973).

The Court does not quarrel with the basic proposition that it lacks jurisdiction to grant declaratory relief to private individuals or companies merely seeking to obtain specific performance of government contracts, but it categorically rejects such a characterization of this action. As is evident from only a cursory examination of the pleadings in this case, the plaintiffs are not suing for breach of government contracts and seeking damages or specific performance—they are requesting the Court to enjoin the improper termination of practically an entire helium conservation program created by Congress to prevent the unnecessary depletion of a vital natural resource.

Although the plaintiffs are admittedly motivated by private pecuniary considerations, which fact gives them standing to sue (*Association of Data Processing Service Organization, Inc. v. Camp.*, 397 U.S. 150, 153, 90 S.Ct. 827, 830, 25 L.Ed.2d 192 (1970)), the plaintiffs are also seeking vindication of the public's interest in protection of a vital wasting natural resource and the propagation of an important Congressional program. Viewing the plaintiffs' cause of action in this perspective, the Court will not permit the Secretary to shield his actions from judicial scrutiny and relegate the "public interest" to an impotent Court of Claims remedy "merely because it sounds in contract." *National Helium Corporation v. Morton*, 455 F.2d 650, 654 (10th Cir. 1971).

Second, the defendants contend that this is not in action solely against a government official, but is rather a suit against the United States, since the relief sought would expend itself upon the public treasury and preclude authorized government action, and that it is accordingly barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity in accordance with *Wells v. Roper*, 246 U.S. 335, 38 S.Ct. 317 (1918); *Land v. Dollar*, 330 U.S. 731, 67 S.Ct. 1009, 91 L.Ed. 1209 (1947); *Larson v. Domestic & Foreign Commerce Corporation*, 337 U.S. 682, 69 S.Ct. 1457, 93 L.Ed. 1628 (1949); and *Dugan v. Rank*, 372 U.S. 609, 83 S.Ct. 999, 10 L.Ed. 2d 15 (1963). Although impliedly admitting that the Secretary's action in this case was "agency action" under the terms of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 551(13) and 701(b)(2), the defendants assert that that Act does not act as a waiver of sovereign immunity.

It must be recognized at the outset that the plethora of cases dealing with the nebulous and sometimes oppressive concept of sovereign immunity cannot be completely reconciled. As Mr. Justice Stewart noted in *Malone v. Bowdoin*, 369 U.S. 643, 82 S.Ct. 980, 8 L.Ed. 2d 168 (1962):

"While it is possible to differentiate many of these cases upon their individual facts, it is fair to say that to reconcile completely all of the decisions of the Court in this field prior to 1949 would be a Procrustean task." 369 U.S. at 646; 82 S. Ct. at 983.

Since the Court is convinced that this action is clearly not barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity, it will waive embarkment. See *Little v. Morton*, 445 F. 2d 1207 (4th Cir. 1971).

The defendants are correct in their assertion that the Administrative Procedure Act does not act as a waiver of sovereign immunity, *in and of itself*. *Motah* v. *United States*, 402 F. 2d 1 (10th Cir. 1968), *contra Scanwell Laboratories, Inc. v. Shaffer*, 424 F. 2d 859, 874 (D.C. Cir. 1970). Here, however, Congress itself implicitly waived sovereign immunity as a bar to review of "agency action" under the Helium Act Amendments of 1960. Section 167h specifically provides that:

". . . provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946, as amended, shall apply to *any agency proceeding and any agency action taken under this chapter* . . . and the terms 'agency action' shall have the meaning specified in the Administrative Procedure Act." (Emphasis added.)

It would indeed be anomolous for this Court to hold that sovereign immunity barred review of action specifically made subject to review by the sovereign, simply because such review might eventually expend itself upon the public treasury. Since the Secretary's action of terminating the helium procurement contracts was clearly "agency action," the doctrine of sovereign immunity is accordingly inapplicable.

Finally, the defendants contend that even if the doctrine of sovereign immunity is not applicable to the plaintiffs' non-NEPA claims, the Secretary's action of terminating the helium procurement contracts is not subject to review under the Administrative Procedure Act, since it is agency action "committed to agency discretion by law." 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2). There is simply no question but that the Secretary's action is action of an "authority of the Government of the United States," and that review is not prohibited by the Helium Act Amendments. 50 U.S.C. § 167h.

As noted by the Supreme Court in *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 91 S. Ct. 814, 28 L. Ed. 2d 136 (1971), the exception to the general rule that all agency actions are subject to judicial review, *unless* "committed to agency discretion by law," is a very narrow one. Referring to the legislative history of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Court noted that the exception is applicable only "in those rare instances where 'statutes are drawn in such broad terms that in a given case there is no law to apply.'" S. Rept. No. 752, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., 26 (1945):

"The statutes of Congress are not merely advisory when they relate to administrative agencies, any more than in other cases. To preclude judicial review under this bill a statute, if not specific in withholding such review, must upon its face give clear and convincing evidence of an intent to withhold it. The mere failure to provide specially by statute for judicial review is certainly no evidence of intent to withhold review." H.R. Rep. No. 1980, 79th Cong., 2d Sess., 41 (1945).

In determining whether in a particular case agency action is "committed to agency discretion by law," there is no presumption against review and in favor of administrative absolutism absent "a clear and convincing" showing of a contrary legislative intent or unless such purpose is fairly discernible in the statutory scheme. *Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner*, 387 U.S. 136, 141, 87 S. Ct. 1507, 1510–1511, 18 L. Ed. 2d 681 (1967). The inquiry is not limited to merely whether the agency was given discretion to act, but also whether: (1) Congress intended that the exercise of that discretion be left *solely* to the expertise of the agency; and (2) the exercise of that discretion in a particular case involves the resolution of matters within the special administrative competence of the agency. *Barlow v. Collins*, 397 U.S. 159, 166, 90 S. Ct. 832, 837, 25 L. Ed. 2d 192 (1970). The Court cannot indulge in broad generalizations, but rather must review each individual agency action complained of in the light of the specific statutory scheme provided by Congress.

An examination of the legislative scheme provided by Congress in the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 reveals that the Secretary was given broad discretion in choosing an appropriate method of implementing a national helium conservation program. In the exercise of that discretion, the Secretary chose to enter into long-term contracts with the plaintiffs, and within those contracts he provided a method by which they could be terminated in the event that further helium procurement was unnecessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act. On February 2, 1973, the Secretary again exercised his discretion when he determined that the continuation of the contracts was unnecessary, *since the purposes of the Helium Act had been satisfied*. That determination was necessarily predicated on the Secretary's interpretation of the intended scope and purposes of the helium conservation program as envisioned by Congress in the promulgation of the Helium Act, and in particular Section 167m, 50 U.S.C.

Implicit in the Secretary's determination to terminate these contracts was the Secretary's realization that, although he was given wide discretion in choosing the means of implementing the Helium Act, his actions were to conform to the overall objectives of the Act; that he was not given unfettered discretion to, in effect, change the underlying purpose of the Act itself. The plaintiffs contend that the Secretary's determination that the objective of the Act was to conserve helium for foreseeable and "essential government activities" was clearly erroneous and constituted an abuse of discretion. They do no request the Court to substitute its judgment for that of the Secre-

tary in areas clearly intended to be left solely to his special administrative expertise, but they do assert that the Court is obliged to review the Secretary's decision insofar as it involves an interpretation of the underlying statute. The Court agrees.

The principal dispute in this case, beyond the agency's compliance with NEPA, clearly involves the Secretary's interpretation of the provisions of the Helium Act. Section 4332 (1) directs that "to the fullest extent possible . . . the public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies" therein set forth. If in determining to terminate the helium procurement contracts the Secretary interpreted the objectives of the Helium Act in an erroneous or unnecessarily restrictive manner, his action would be contrary to not only the Helium Act, but NEPA as well; the statutes themselves clearly provide "law to apply." This statutory dispute must ultimately be resolved, not on the basis of matters within the special competence of the Secretary, but by judicial application of canons of statutory construction. *Barlow* v. *Collins*, 397 U.S. 159, 90 S.Ct. 832, 25 L.Ed.2d 192 (1970). As Justice Harlan so aptly noted in his dissent in *Hardin* v. *Kentucky Utilities Co.*, 390 U.S. 1, 14, 88 S. Ct. 651, 658–659, 19 L.Ed.2d 787 (1968):

"The role of the courts should, in particular, be viewed hospitably where . . . the question sought to be reviewed does not significantly engage the agency's expertise. 'Where the only or principal dispute relates to the meaning of the statutory term' . . . [the controversy] presents issues on which courts, and not [administrators], are relatively more expert."

In light of the nature of the specific agency action involved in this suit and the clear congressional intention to permit review of agency action taken pursuant to the Helium Act Amendment of 1960 (50 U.S.C. § 167h (a)), this Court will not preclude review merely because the statute is written in broad and permissive language, although such fact necessarily limits the *scope* of the review. See *Zuber v. Allen*, 396 U.S. 168, 90 S.Ct. 314, 24 L.Ed.2d 345 (1969), and *Mulloy v. United States*, 398 U.S. 410, 90 S.Ct. 1766, 26 L.Ed.2d 362 (1970).

Although it is unnecessary to reach the Secretary's ultimate decision in this case, since compliance with NEPA is a necessary prerequisite to taking any major federal action and the Court is convinced that the Secretary did not comply with the procedural or substantive requirements of NEPA, the Court would advise the Secretary to carefully review the Helium Act, *as a whole*, and especially in the light of its legislative history.

The Court has reviewed that history, and it has been unable to find any mention of limiting the scope of the program to satisfying only "essential government activities." On the contrary, the Chilson Report (which was the technical foundation underlying the legislative amendment), the remarks of Mr. Bennett[2] (Undersecretary of Interior who was the major agency representative encouraging passage of the Act), the repeated statements of Senator Allott[3] (the major sponsor of the Bill in the Senate), and the statements of those appearing before the Insular Committee, all repeatedly refer to the need to conserve the helium from being wasted "without serving any useful purpose." They all reflect deep concern that helium is wasting that might be needed at some future time for unforeseen needs of the entire nation. In the words of Senator Allott:

"The measure now awaiting final action by this body is, as we all must know by now, for the purpose of taking care of the reserves of helium for future use, both civilian and defense requirements. Although it is estimated that present reserves are adequate to meet forecast requirements for some time, these reserves are being depleted. . . . Mr. President, if we do not act promptly to halt this negligent, careless waste, we shall have little helium left for the future when, perhaps, we shall need it most." 106 Cong. Rec. 17855 (Aug. 26, 1960).

In reviewing the Helium Act itself, the only mention of any possible limitation on the conservation program which could even remotely be considered as limiting the purpose to conserving helium only for "essential government activities" is found in Section 15, 50 U.S.C. § 167m. The Court has reviewed that section in light of the overall purpose of the statute, and it would encourage the Secretary to do the same. It *appears* to the Court that the section was intended to insure that the federal government would not interfere with private production, development, and sale of helium *unless* such activity interfered with the Government's need to make its own program self-liquidating or to provide for "essential government activities," and that it was not intended as a limitation on the conservation program itself.

SCOPE AND STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

Having resolved these preliminary jurisdictional issues, the Court will now turn to the resolution of the plaintiffs' claims. As previously noted, the Court views the Secretary's compliance or non-compliance with NEPA to be the central issue of this case at this time. The plaintiffs assert that the procedural and substantive requirements of NEPA were not satisfied, and that the Secretary's termination of the helium procurement contracts must be enjoined and the matter remanded to the Department of Interior.

The general rules regarding the scope and standards for review of agency action pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act were only recently set out in detail by the Supreme Court in *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, supra. In reviewing agency action, the Court is initially confronted with three questions: (1) what is the standard for review; (2) what is the scope of review; and (3) upon what evidentiary basis is the action to be judged.

First, the standard for review to be applied in this case is readily apparent. Section 706 of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C., provides that in *all* cases, a reviewing court must set aside agency action found to be "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law," or which fails to meet statutory, procedural, or constitutional requirements. 5 U.S.C. §§ 706(a) (A), (B), (C), (D). Since the Secretary's action in this case was not taken pursuant to a rule-making provision of the Administrative Procedure Act or based on a public adjudicatory hearing, neither the "substantial evidence" nor *de novo* review standards are applicable.

Second, the scope of review of agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act was clearly expressed by the Supreme Court in *Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe*, supra, where the Court noted:

"Even through there is no *de novo* review . . . the generally applicable standards of § 706 require the reviewing court to engage in a substantial inquiry. Certainly, the Secretary's decision is entitled to a presumption of regularity, . . . but that presumption is not to shield his action from a thorough, probing, in-depth review." 91 S.Ct. at 823–824.

Although this Court does not have the authority to substitute its judgement for that of the Secretary in areas of administrative expertise, it clearly does have the authority and obligation to engage in a careful scrutiny of the agency's action to determine whether such action was "arbitrary, capricious, and abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law." This careful review is especially appropriate in a case such as this involving alleged non-compliance with the procedural and substantive requirements of NEPA. See *Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee v. Atomic Energy Commission*, 449 F.2d 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1971); *Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference v. Federal Power Commission*, 453, F.2d 463 (2d Cir. 1971), cert. denied 407 U.S. 926, 92 S.Ct. 2453, 32 L.Ed.2d 813 (1972); *Environmental Defense Fund v. Corps of Engineers*, 470 F.2d 289 (8th Cir. 1972); and *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Morton*, 458 F.2d 827 (D.C. Cir. 1972).

Finally, a more difficult problem arises when determining upon what evidentiary basis an agency's action is to be judged in reviewing its propriety. Section 706 of the Administrative Procedure Act provides that "in making the . . . determination, the court shall review the *whole record*." The defendants have persistently maintained that the administrative record in this case consists solely of: (1) the information relied upon by the Secretary in reaching his decision; (2) the comments received from agencies and interested parties responding to the draft environmental impact statement; and (3) the information brought to the attention of the agencies by the plaintiffs. The Court categorically rejects that position.

The National Environmental Policy Act places a positive duty on federal agencies to prepare a comprehensive environmental impact statement prior to taking any major federal action (§ 4332). Prior to the preparation of the statement, the Act directs that the agency *shall* "consult with and obtain the comments of any federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to *any* environmental impact involved," and "initiate and utilize ecological information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment" (§ 4332 (C) and (G)). In this case the plaintiffs have proffered numerous documents and reports which were either prepared by the Department of Interior itself or other federal agencies, or readily available to any member of the public bearing directly upon the enivronmental impact of the Secretary's action. The defendants' pat response is that the documents were not brought to their attention by the plaintiffs prior to the preparaion of the final enviornmental statement or the Secretary's decision so they are not relevant. The fallacy inherent in this reasoning is that it assumes that it is the burden of others outside the agency to bring pertinent material to the attention of the agency—*it is not*. The duty to unearth and utilize all relevant and available information lies directly and unequivocally with the agency.

In reviewing agency compliance with NEPA, the Court is obliged to consider *all* relevant material bearing directly or indirectly on the environmental aspects of the action under consideration which were either (1) in the agency's files, but not disclosed in the final environmental statement; or (2) readily available to the agency had it fulfilled its statutory responsibilities. *Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee v. United States Atomic Energy Commission*, supra, at p. 1119.

After having reviewed the administrative record submitted to the Court by the Department of Interior, and as supplemented by the plaintiffs, the Court is convinced that the Secretary's attempted compliance with NEPA, which is a necessary condition precedent to any major federal action, falls woefully short of the Act's requirements in a number of significant respects, primarily, the shortcomings of the Department's final environmental impact statement. Consequently, the Court does not reach the plaintiffs' remaining claims, but rather, remands this matter to the Department of Interior for further consideration in light of this opinion.

NEPA

In response to growing national concern about the state of the environment, Congress passed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1969. In so acting, Congress

See footnotes at end of article.

specifically recognized the need for a national policy which would encourage the productive and enjoyable harmony of man with his environment (§ 4321). Although the Act does not create any substantive rights to a clean and productive environment or establish environmental protection as the *exclusive* goal of federal agencies, it does assure that environmental amenities are carefully considered along with other considerations so that a proper balance is ultimately reached. Section 101, 42 U.S.C. § 4331, requires the federal government to use "all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate federal plans, functions programs, and resources." Furthermore, in order to assure that the national policy is implemented and that all federal agencies plan and work toward meeting the challenge of a better environment, Congress specifically include certain "action-forcing" provisions. See S. Rep. No. 91-296, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 9 (1969).

Section 102, 42 U.S.C. § 4332, provides, among other things, that each federal agency shall, "to the fullest extent possible," include in every recommendation or report on major federal actions a "detailed statement" on:

"(C)

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposed be implemented.

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented."

In addition, the section requires that "officials consult with and obtain the comments of any federal agency which . . . has special expertise with respect to the environmental impact involved," prior to the preparation of the statement (§ 4332(2)(C)); that the agency "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources" (§ 4332(D)); and that the agency "initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects (§ 4332(G)).

In furtherance of this congressional purpose, the Council on Environmental Quality has issued comprehensive guidelines for federal agencies to follow in conforming to the mandates of NEPA (36 Fed. Reg. 7724, 7727 (1971)), Executive Orders have been issued directing federal agencies to develop procedures for implementing and enforcing the Act (Executive Order 11514, 35 Fed. Reg. 4247 (1970)), and the Department of Interior has itself issued guidelines to be followed within its department in conforming with NEPA (36 Fed. Reg. 19,343-19,347 (1971)).

Based upon the clear language of NEPA, its implementing provisions, its legislative history, the many cases interpreting its import, and the underlying policy which it was intended to foster, it is clear that the mere formal filing of a document, in and of itself does not satisfy the Act's substantive and procedural mandates or preclude further inquiry by judicial review. As noted in the recent Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals decision in *Davis v. Morton,* 469 F.2d 593 (1972):

"Reading the Act and its legislative history together, there is little doubt that Congress intended all agencies under their authority to follow the *substantive and procedural mandates of NEPA.*" 469 F.2d at 569. (Emphasis added.)

Compliance with NEPA is more than a mere ritual—it requires thorough research, investigation, corroboration, and consideration of the environmental effects attending a given agency action.

In determining whether an agency has complied with NEPA prior to taking major federal action, the focal point of attention is the impact statement. As noted by Judge Leventhal in *Natural Resource Defense Council, Inc. v. Morton,* 458 F.2d 827 (D.C. Cir. 1972), at page 833:

"Congress contemplated that the Impact Statement would constitute the environmental source material for the information of the Congress as well as the Executive, in connection with the making of relevant decisions, and would be available to enhance enlightenment of—and by—the public. The impact statement provides a basis for (a) evaluation of the benefits of the proposed project in light of its environmental risks; and (b) comparison of the net balance for the proposed project with the environmental risks presented by alternative courses of action."

Assuming that the agency has fulfilled its responsibilities by consulting with other agencies and utilizing available ecological and technical information, the statement should constitute a full-bodied record upon which Congress, the Executive, the public and the agency can adequately judge the wisdom of the proposed action. *Calvert Cliffs' Coordinating Committee* v. *Atomic Energy Commission,* supra (purpose of statement is to aid agency in its decision and to fully inform other interested agencies and the public of environmental consequences); *Environmental Defense Fund* v. *Corps of Engineers,* 325 F. Supp. 749 (E.D. Ark. 1971) (statement must alert President, Council on Environmental Quality, the public, and Congress to all known or possible environmental consequences); *Ely* v. *Velde,* 451 F. 2d 1130, 1138 (4th Cir. 1971) (genuine, rather than perfunctory compliance with NEPA requires agency to explicate fully its course of inquiry, its analysis, and its reasoning); *Greene County* v. *Federal Power Commission,* 455 F. 2d 412 (2d Cir. 1972), cert. denied, —— U.S. ——, —— S. Ct. ——, 34 L. Ed. 2d 90 (1972) (statement must present a single coherent and comprehensive environmental analysis).

Before turning to the final environmental impact statement compiled by the Department of Interior in this case, it is first instructive to note that this is not the run-of-the-mill NEPA case. Normally, a federal agency is proposing to take affirmative action—such as the building of a dam, nuclear power facility, or pipeline—which is likely to have certain adverse environmental effects, yet which will also benefit society in some appreciable manner. The courts are consequently involved in the acrimonious imbroglio of assuring that the agency has adequately weighed the possible adverse environmental effects against the likely beneficial goals of the action, and that a thorough cost-benefit analysis has, in fact, preceded the action.

In this case, however, the Department of Interior is not proposing to take any affirmative action—rather, the Department is recommending the abandonment of a comprehensive conservation program authorized by Congress to save a vital natural resource which was being needlessly frittered away without first serving any useful purpose. It is clear beyond peradventure that the recommended action will not benefit society, except perhaps economically, and then only temporarily. The question is—will it injure society?

The Department of Interior has consistently maintained from the beginning of this litigation nearly two years ago that the Secretary's action does not constitute major federal action—that it merely involves the termination of three contracts. An examination of the final environmental impact statement prepared by the Department of Interior in this case demonstrates that the Department of Interior continues to harbor that crabbed conception of this action.

THE IMPACT STATEMENT

On November 13, 1972, the Department of Interior issued a document entitled "Final Environmental Statement—Termination of Helium Purchase Contracts—United States Department of Interior—Bureau of Mines." The statement is comprised of eighty pages, excluding the comments received from other federal agencies and interested parties. It contains: (1) a general description of the proposed action (4 pages); (2) a general description of the environment (43 pages) including: the characteristics of helium (1 page); its current (9 pages) and prospective future uses (11 pages); its current proved, provable, possible, and speculative supply (11 pages); and its present and future demand to the year 2000 (9 pages); (3) a discussion of the environmental impact of the proposed action (11 pages); (4) a one-paragraph discussion of the possible unavoidable adverse environmental effects; (5) a two-paragraph discussion of the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; (6) a one-paragraph discussion of the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources involved in the termination; (7) a discussion of the alternatives to the proposed action (6 paragraphs); and (8) a description of the consultation which preceded the issuance of the statement, and a reply to the comments received.

The Department's final impact statement is far from a coherent and comprehensive environmental analysis. It consists primarily of a narrative description of helium's characteristics and present and future uses, supply, and demand. After reviewing it, however, certain basic facts are evident: (1) these contracts involve the largest *known* source of helium-rich natural gas in the world, and if the helium is not extracted and stored it will be irretrievably lost; (2) present uses of helium indicate it is a most important or even indispensable element in our existing science, industry and ecology; (3) helium holds considerable promise as a necessary tool in the development of many environmentally beneficial technological advancements in such areas as exploration and future development of the sea, underground transmission of large blocks of electrical energy, virtually pollution free generation of energy, and efficient high speed ground mass-transportation systems; (4) of the proven sources of helium-rich natural gas, most will probably be totally depleted some time between 1985-2000; (5) if the expected technological breakthroughs, many of which are now in the experimental stage, come to pass, helium will either have to be recovered from low content helium-bearing natural gas or the atmosphere; and (6) if these contracts are terminated, the future availability of helium will be totally dependent upon the actions of the private companies.

After reviewing this portion of the statement, a number of questions beg answering: What is to be gained by terminating the contracts? Assuming that we will eventually have to rely on low content helium-bearing natural gas, how much is expected to be available at the turn of the century? Will recovery of helium from the atmosphere be economically feasible, and if so, will there be any adverse environmental effects? What effect will a future shortage of helium have on the ability to go forward with research in the areas holding considerable environmental promise? If these technological advancements are precluded due to a lack of helium and we are forced to rely upon more conventional systems, what will be the environmental effects? If the program is working as envisioned by Congress and is, or could be, self-liquidating, why terminate it? Would it be economically feasible to expand the program? Is there any

economic incentive for the private companies to extract and store the helium? These and other questions go completely unanswered in the impact statement.

The entire discussion of the environmental impact of the proposed action can be quickly summarized as follows: (1) the Government will forego the purchase and storage of approximately 20 bcf of a non-renewable resource; (2) whether this helium is extracted and stored is completely up to the companies; (3) there will be no immediate direct environmental effects to either continuation or termination of the contracts, besides a possibility of some unemployment within the contractors' corporate structures; (4) in the event that large demands should materialize due to the development of new technological advancements, the storage now of 20 bcf of helium would only extend, rather than foreclose, the necessity of turning to other sources of helium; (5) alternatives include variations of the recommended action or further expansion of the conservation program; and (6) although further expansion of the program could provide for additional helium and extend the period when helium will have to be obtained from unknown or environmentally disadvantageous sources, legislation does not presently allow for expansion so it is not a pertinent alternative.

In examining the final environmental impact statement to determine whether it complied with the substantive and procedural requirements of NEPA, it was unnecessary for the Court to substitute its judgment for that of the Secretary in matters within his special expertise. The statement is appallingly deficient in a number of respects *on its face*.

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

One of the most important aspects of any final environmental impact statement is the clarity with which it sets forth the exact purpose of the proposed action—why the action is being recommended and what is to be gained from it. Once the purpose of the action is clearly in focus the decision-maker, Congress, the Executive, and the public are in a position to balance the possible adverse environmental effects against the benefits to be gained from the action and reach a balanced and knowledgeable decision on its merits.

In its final environmental impact statement, the Department of Interior states that the purpose of the action is the termination of three helium procurement contracts. Since it is clear that the termination will likely result in the wastage of approximately 20 bcf of a non-renewable natural resource, is the reader to conclude that the purpose of the action is to commit the helium to waste for no apparent reason? Regardless of Interior's interpretation of the Helium Act as not *requiring* the purchase and storage of this helium, there is no doubt but that it clearly has the *authority* to so act. What then is the purpose of the action?

Although it cannot be gleaned from the statement itself, a perusal of the administrative record shows that the primary reasons for the action are: (1) the fact that the program is not as financially sound as it was expected to be; and (2) the desire to save approximately forty million dollars annually for helium purchases during the life of the helium procurement contracts. If one or both of these reasons motivated the recommended action, then the final environmental statement should so state. Otherwise, there is no method by which to balance the interests and determine the proper course of action.

In addition, the statement not only fails to set forth the purpose for the action, but it also blatantly misdescribes the actual effect of the proposed action. The decision to terminate these contracts represents more than merely a decision to forego the purchase and storage of 20 bcf of helium. It means the effective withdrawal from the farsighted federal commitment to helium conservation made by Congress over a decade ago. It represents a return to the same situation that prevailed before the contracts were entered into—the needless and useless wastage of a vital natural resource before it serves *any* useful purpose—and a decision to essentially turn our backs on the future generations of Americans who are likely to be acutely confronted with a bankruptcy of resources.

B. SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT

Section 4332(2)(C)(iv) of NEPA requires that each environmental impact statement set forth "the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity. . . ." The Council on Environmental Quality's Guidelines provide that "this in essence requires the agency to assess the action for cumulative and long-term effects from the perspective that each generation is trustee of the environment for succeeding generations."

In a feeble attempt to comply with this requirement the Department's statement merely notes that it will forego the purchase and storage of 20 bcf of helium, and that the extent to which this helium could thereafter be recovered is conjectural. Although the statement recognizes the possibility that future demand may outrun then available supplies, it merely notes that the storage of an additional 20 bcf of helium now would only extend the period when it would have to be obtained from unknown sources by 4–15 years. The Department's conclusion—since present storage will not prevent recourse to other sources forever, there is no need to consider conservation—is a non sequitur.

From the information contained in the comments received by the Department of Interior and the administrative record, there is little doubt but that large supplies of helium will be needed in order to assure the eventual realization of many environmentally beneficial technological breakthroughs expected to blossom around the turn of the century. The statement totally fails to consider the possible effects of termination on the ability to go forward with research, development, and the eventual application of these techniques. As noted in the Court's previous orders, some of the more important areas include electrical power generation by helium-cooled fission reactors, nuclear fusion reactors, superconducting systems of generation and transmission of power, magnetohydrodynamics, and transportation by superconducting magnetic leviation systems.

Although the statement makes no attempt to quantify the importance of 20 bcf of helium in these areas, the comments do. The Atomic Energy Commission opined that 20 bcf of helium would be sufficient to supply the necessary inventory for all of the nation's high-temperature gas-cooled reactors built through the year 2010. Union Carbide expressed the opinion that 20 bcf of helium would only supply one-third of the needed inventory for these reactors. Clyde E. Taylor, of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, estimated that 20 bcf of helium would provide the inventory for all of the nuclear fusion reactors built within the next fifty years. It is unknown how much helium will be needed in the other areas previously mentioned. Apparently, the Department did not feel it was important enough to look into.

In his recent message on the energy crisis, President Nixon stated that "if present trends continue unchecked, we could face a genuine energy crisis." But he added:

"The crisis can and should be averted, for we have the capacity and the resources to meet our energy needs if only we take the proper steps—and take them now."

There is no question but that new technological breakthroughs in techniques involving the use of large amounts of helium hold the promise of solving at least some of our future energy needs. In his message, the President recommended the development of a "more comprehensive, integrated national energy policy to meet the emerging energy challenge." He noted that he had proposed a 35% increase in the funding of the nation's nuclear fusion research and development effort to accelerate experimental programs and to initiate preliminary reactor design studies, including the development of MHD. There is no doubt that the energy research effort stands high on the nation's list of priorities. In fact, the country is spending over fifty million dollars annually for research in cryogenics and superconductivity. Any action now to terminate these contracts must, therefore, thoroughly consider the possible effect which might ultimately ensue. The statement totally fails in that regard.

C. POSSIBLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Due to the failure of the statement to adequately consider the possible effect of the termination of the contracts on the future development and application of the technological advancements mentioned above, the statement is obviously incomplete in this regard. Section 4332(2)(C) requires that each statement include a discussion of the environmental impact of the proposed action. The specific treatment given to this subject in the final statement is startling in its brevity and lack of depth.

In one paragraph, the statement points out that termination of these contracts would have no direct effect on the physical environment; that the Government would merely forego the purchase and storage of an additional 20 bcf of helium; and that some unemployment might result. The section concludes with the statement that if it should become necessary or desirable to extract helium from the atmosphere:

"It has been estimated that the power requirements to produce one billion cubic feet would be 26,000 megawatts. The generation of this amount of power using coal for fuel would add about 670,000 pounds per hour of pollutants to the atmosphere and increase thermal pollution by 3.5 times 10^2 Btu per day."

This scientific description of the effects of obtaining helium from the atmosphere was translated into understandable terms by the comments of Union Carbide Corporation. The 26,000 megawatts of power required to produce one billion cubic feet of helium is about one-tenth of the present United States power capacity. To obtain from the atmosphere the 20.7 billion cubic feet of helium which is proposed to be abandoned would require the equivalent of two years of the United States' total power output with the consequent inevitable air and thermal pollution:

"To illustrate the impact upon thermal pollution, applying [the] logic of supplying 3.8 billion cubic feet of helium in the year 2000, if the total heat produced from all of the required helium-from-air plants were cooled by the water from the Mississippi River, the river temperature would be raised approximately 10 degrees Fahrenheit. If, as another example, the heat were discharged to the air in atmospheric (wet type) cooling towers, over 40 million barrels of water would be evaporated each day. This is about 125% of New York City's average daily water consumption of 30 million barrels." (Contractors joint response to DES pp. 13–14.)

Although the Court cannot understand why the Department's final statement did not phrase the discussion of the environmental effects of obtaining helium from the atmosphere in more commonly understood terms, it does alert the reader to the problem.

The Court's major complaint regarding the Department's discussion of possible adverse environmental effects of the proposed action is, as previously alluded to, the failure to discuss *any* secondary and indirect environmental effects likely to arise in the future. The Council on Environmental Quality's

Guidelines specifically state that "both primary and secondary significant consequences for the environment should be included in the analysis." 36 Fed. Reg. 7725 (April 23, 1971). It further provides that:

"The Act (NEPA) also indicates that adverse significant effects include those that degrade the quality of the environment, *curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment, and serve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.* . . . Significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment include both those that directly affect human beings and those that indirectly affect human beings through adverse effects on the environment." (Emphasis added.)

In analyzing the statement's discussion of adverse environmental effects, two questions immediately come to mind: (1) what effect will the possible inability to go forward with research and development in the areas previously specified, due to the lack of an adequate supply of helium, have upon the future standard of living for Americans and the beneficial range of choices at the turn of the century; and (2) what will be the environmental effects of the necessity to utilize more conventional means of producing and transmitting energy and transporting large numbers of citizens to and from our cities? Although the statement does not even attempt to answer either question, the latter is somewhat answered by the comments to the statement.

Union Carbide estimated that 3,000,000 mw of nuclear powered electric generators would have to be built between 1980 and 2010. Assuming that helium was not available to supply (i.e., cool) these reactors, it noted:

"The environmental impact of being forced to choose a less desirable reactor because of inability to obtain the required helium supply would be very large indeed. One thousand 1,200 mw electric stations using pressurized or boiling water reactors instead would increase waste heat rejection by 1,000,000 mw. This much waste heat is sufficient to heat the Niagara River enough to cook any fish or other living creatures and make Lake Ontario a dead sea. If this amount of waste heat were rejected in conventional cooling towers, it would vaporize over a million tons of water per hour, or the equivalent of one hundred acre ponds ten feet deep every day."

The response of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company concurred with Union Carbide's conclusion, noting that if it should later become necessary to rely upon steam-cooled reactors it could have a "staggering environmental impact." The statement does not even mention these possible adverse environmental effects. What additional adverse environmental effects are likely to result from the present termination of these contracts is not discussed. The Court is aware of the speculative nature of these future projections, but the future supply of helium is likewise speculative. Complete analysis demands further attention to this area.

D. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS

Section 4332(2)(C) of NEPA requires that each statement contain a discussion of "any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented." In discussing this aspect of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, the Department of Interior merely notes that if the helium is not extracted from the natural gas streams, it will escape to the atmosphere. It then states that:

"Upon termination of the helium purchase contracts, the extent to which each of the companies would continue to recover helium from the natural gas available to it and the extent to which it would store such helium . . . would rest entirely with each of the companies."

NEPA requires that federal agencies "use all practical means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate federal plans, functions, programs, and *resources*, to the end that the nation may—

(1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

* * * * *

(5) achieve a balance between population and *resource* use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

(b) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the *maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.*" § 4331(b). (Emphasis added.)

In addition to these requirements of NEPA, the Helium Act clearly places the responsibility for assuring that the helium conservation program is carried out in conformity with the Congressional objective squarely on the shoulders of the Secretary of Interior.

The Department of Interior cannot meet these responsibilities by merely recognizing that the future availability of helium will rest upon the companies' decisions. The impact statement should thoroughly examine what is likely to happen in the event that the contracts are terminated. Ever since the inception of the helium conservation program in 1960, the Government has operated on the assumption that current demands for helium, when coupled with the speculative nature of future helium demands, made it highly improbable that private companies would bear the economic burden of sorting the helium for future use. If this situation still prevails, and in light of the diminished current demand for helium it would appear that it does, then the statement should so admit. In that event, the inadequacies of the discussion of irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources are self-evident. If, on the other hand, it is certain that the companies will continue to extract the helium, then such a discussion would be unwarranted. In either event, the statement should reveal the facts as they are so that the reader is not left hopelessly in the dark.

E. ALTERNATIVES TO THE RECOMMENDED ACTION

Section 4332(2)(D) of NEPA requires each federal agency to "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources." In addition, Section 4332(2)(C)(iii) provides that the statement shall include a discussion of "alternatives to the proposed action." As noted by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in *Monroe County Conservation Council Inc.* v. *Volpe*, 472 F.2d 693, 697–698 (2d Cir. 1972):

"The requirements for a thorough study and a detailed description of alternatives, which was given further Congressional emphasis in § 4332(2)(D) is the linchpin of the entire impact statement."

Besides a short discussion of the alternatives available to the private companies if the contracts are terminated, the final environmental impact statement lists the following alternatives: (1) variations in the proposed action, such as termination of one or two of the contracts, which would only vary the action in degree; (2) continuation of the contracts coupled with extension of their terms and an expansion of the amount to be purchased, which would extend the period when helium would have to be recovered from other sources by 7–24 years; and (3) various alternative methods of obtaining additional helium from other sources. Insofar as the latter two alternatives are concerned, the statement notes that the Department presently lacks statutory authority to implement them.

Assuming the exact nature of and reasons for the proposed action had previously been stated, and the possible environmental effects of the action had been thoroughly explored, the discussion of alternatives to termination could rationally be judged. As previously noted, however, the statement at no time tells the reader why the contracts are being terminated. If future needs and future supplies of helium gas are speculative, as all parties admit, then an examination of the statement itself would lead the reader to believe that the reason was either: (1) to casually waste a vital natural resource for the monetary savings; or (2) to terminate the contracts because the amount of helium being conserved would only extend the time when helium would have to either be ignored as a natural resource or obtained from less environmentally advantageous sources, rather than preclude such occurrence. Obviously, this action is not motivated by either of these reasons, but what is the reason? The Department's discussion of alternatives epitomizes its attitude in the entire matter.

Decisions of this magnitude simply cannot be made in conference rooms behind closed doors. NEPA requires full disclosure of the exact nature of and reasons for a given action. It is only in this manner that an action can be judged on its merits and a reasoned choice between alternatives can be reached. When Congress passed the Helium Act in 1960, it provided a method by which the helium conservation program could be made self-liquidating—a method by which helium could be preserved for future generations at little or no cost to this generation. They realized that the loss of a natural resource before it served any useful purpose, in and of itself, constituted a needless and unwarranted environmental impact.

There is no question but that the termination of these contracts involves "unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources." It is also clear from an examination of the administrative record in this case that the reason for the termination of the helium procurement contracts is the failure of the conservation program to become fiscally self-sufficient. The obvious alternative to cancelling these contracts is to make the program self-sustaining, yet the impact statement does not even consider this aspect. The Court finds this omission fatal.

The many documents and reports found in the administrative record and the comments received in response to the issuance of the draft environmental statement list a number of financial and legislative alternatives which could make the program financially sound. They include: (1) negotiation with the contractors in an attempt to obtain a lower purchase price (a tentative agreement with National Helium Corporation would have reduced the Government's cost for helium-gas mixture by nearly 40%); (2) requiring all Government contractors to purchase their helium requirements from the Department by Executive Order, as suggested in *Air Reduction Company* v. *Hickel*, 420 F. 2d 592 (D.C. Cir. 1969); (3) varying the sale price of the helium (Congress had originally recommended that the helium be sold for $40–$45, while the Department is presently selling it for $35); (4) placing a federal tax on the sale of helium not produced by the Government; (5) giving foreign governments a preferential right to purchase some of the helium and store it in the Cliffside facility; (6) lowering or eliminating the interest charge on borrowed money now used to operate the program; (7) treating the helium stored in Cliffside as a stockpile (materials and supplies now stockpiled such as copper, zinc, cobalt, and manganese, do not have interest added to current market price when sold, as helium does); and (8) prepayment to the Government by public utility companies ordering nuclear power stations, i.e., high temperature helium gas-cooled reactors (HTGR) for

a future supply of stored helium to insure operation during the life of the reactor (see Appendix to Response of Union Carbide Corporation to Environmental Statement). Are any of these alternatives feasible? Would they individually or in combination assure a self-liquidating program or even an expanded conservation program which would take care of the needs of future generations? The statement's discussion does not even mention these alternatives, let alone analyze them in relation to the overall goals of the conservation program, but merely leaves the matter to the imagination of the reader.

In addition to the failure of the statement to discuss alternatives to the termination of the contracts which could make the present program self-sustaining—alternatives recommended by many of the officials within the Department of Interior itself—the statement is wholly lacking in a meaningful discussion of alternatives which could at least minimize, if not avoid, the future necessity of either going without helium, and consequently the technological advancements expected to be derived from its availability, or obtaining it from sources posing serious environmental effects. Although the statement lists the possibility of expanding the program in order to obtain additional sources of helium, it at no time analyzes the feasibility of such expansion or the overall minimization of possible adverse environmental effects attending such expansion.

The Council on Environmental Quality's Guidelines provides that in any action involving unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources the statement must engage in a rigorous evaluation of alternatives:

"A rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of alternative actions that might avoid *some or all* of the adverse environmental effects is essential. *Sufficient analysis of such alternatives and their costs and impact on the environment should accompany the proposed action through the agency review process in order not to foreclose prematurely options which might have less detrimental effects.*" 36 Fed. Reg. 7725 (April 23, 1971) (Emphasis added.)

There is absolutely no question but that the proposed action of the Department of Interior poses serious possible adverse environmental effects, despite the failures of the statement to elucidate them, and that the future availability of helium poses unresolved conflicts. If the continuation of these contracts alone will only *extend* the period within which helium might be scarce, then a full discussion of alternative methods of minimizing the eventual scarcity is demanded. The statement's discussion of these alternatives is simply too vague, general, and conclusionary. See *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. Froehlke,* 4 E.R.C. 1829 (8th Cir. 1972), and *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. Morton,* 458 F. 2d 827, 834 (D.C. Cir. 1972).

The Court is aware of the defendants' contention that a vigorous analysis of alternatives requiring changes in legislation is normally not required of agencies. If this case merely involved the termination of three contracts the Court would fully agree with the contention that a rigorous examination of alternatives beyond the Department's legislative authority would be unnecessary. The Court *does not* agree. As has been previously noted, the Court views the Department's proposed action in this case as, *in effect,* a decision that a comprehensive program authorized by Congress is either unworkable, unwarranted, or unnecessary. It is more than a decision to terminate these three contracts, it is a decision to totally abandon a farsighted concept of present conservation for future utilization, and it could very well have the effect of precluding future expansion of the program.

As Senator Jackson noted prior to the passage of NEPA:

"The needs and aspirations of future generations make it our duty to build a sound and operable foundation of national objectives for the management of our resources for our children and their children. The future of succeeding generations in this country is in our hands. It will be shaped by the choices we make. *We will not, and they cannot escape the consequences of our choices.*" 115 Cong. Rec. volume 115, part 30, page 404116. (Emphasis added.)

If we are to make the necessary choices today, we must first be fully aware of the available range of alternatives. The Congressional decision to implement the conservation program was preceded by a thorough analysis and consideration of the broad long-range effects attending the present wastage of helium and the available alternatives. A decision to terminate the program now must likewise be preceded by such an analysis—it simply has not been.

F. PROCEDURE

There are a number of unresolved conflicts involved in the Department's proposed termination of the helium procurement contracts. Some of the more outstanding ones are: (1) Will there be any appreciable natural gas available at the turn of the century to serve as a source for future helium demands? (2) What effect will a future helium shortage have on this country's growing inability to meet its energy needs? (3) What effect will the possible inadequacy of helium at the turn of the century have on the ability to go forward with the development of such promising technological advancements as nuclear fusion, undersea exploration and development, outerspace exploration, and mass transportation? (4) What effect will a helium shortage have on the development of similar technologies in other countries of the world that are not blessed with such plentiful supplies of helium as this country? Although NEPA does not require "crystal ball" accuracy or the discussion of remote or speculative possibilities, it does require the agencies to take a "hard look" at the possible environmental impact of a given action and discuss reasonably foreseeable effects with a thoroughness commensurate with their severity and the significance of the action. The Court is convinced that the Department's attempted compliance with NEPA in this case falls far short of these responsibilities.

Section 4332(2)(C) of NEPA requires that before making the required detailed statement on environmental impact, the federal officials responsible for the statement "shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved." The extent of consultation by the Department of Interior in this case is indicated at the end of the text of the statement. The Department merely sent copies of the draft environmental statement to the federal agencies and invited, within a forty-five day time structure, comments and estimates of future helium requirements. Although several agencies expressed the desirability of more time and further consultation, there apparently was none.

In 1970, Congress passed the National Materials Policy Act of 1970, 84 Stat. 1234, 42 U.S.C. § 3251, et seq. Section 202 of that statute states that it is the purpose of the Act:

"To enhance environmental quality and conserve materials by developing a national materials policy to utilize present resources and technology more efficiently, to anticipate the future materials requirements of the nation and the world, and to make recommendations on the supply, use, recovery, and disposal of materials."

In furtherance of this policy, the Act created a National Commission on Materials Policy to look into the nation's and the world's resources (including energy), make long-range predictions as to their availabilities, and provide recommendations in such broad areas as maximization of resource use; conservation and environmental protection; preferred technologies and research priorities; waste management and recycling; the use of incentive, penalties, and other control techniques; public education and the reshaping of values. On June 20, 1973, the Commission is due to submit their report to the White House and Congress. Although the work of the Commission is obviously related to the proposed termination, and despite the suggestion of the Environmental Protection Agency that the Secretary confer with it, the Department did not even send them a copy of the draft statement.

Section 4332(2)(G) of NEPA, requires that agencies "initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects." The National Science Foundation advised the Department of Interior that it was considering funding a "detailed study of helium needs and reserves through our Research Applied to National Needs Program." Such a study is, in fact, in progress at this time. The Department was urged to participate in the study, but it declined, due to the pending litigation.

In response to the plaintiffs' contention that the Department's failure to either consult with or actively participate in these comprehensive studies constitutes a clear violation of the requirements of NEPA, the defendants reply that either: (1) they were not brought to their attention by the plaintiffs, an observation of dubious validity; or (2) the Department's participation in such studies might have jeopardized their status in pending litigation. A response to this reasoning is unnecessary.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Due to the failure of the Department of Interior to comply with either the procedural or substantive requirements of NEPA, the Court is remanding this matter to the Department for further consideration in light of this opinion. The plaintiffs have asserted that upon remand the Department should be ordered to hold public hearings, due to the large number of unresolved conflicts inherent in the proposed action. The great majority of the scientists, industry officials, and Congressmen responding to the Department's final environmental impact statement also requested public hearings. The response of the Department of Interior to such requests was:

"It is felt that the material accumulated in the draft environment impact statement and the responses thereto is more than adequate for the purposes of preparing a final environmental statement and of informing the public, and that hearings would not develop new material of a substantive nature which would materially aid in meeting these objectives. Therefore, public hearings were not scheduled."

As noted by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in affirming this Court's order granting a preliminary hearing in this case, "neither NEPA nor APA compels [the Secretary] to appoint an examiner and conduct hearings." *National Helium Corporation* v. *Morton,* 455 F. 2d 650, 656 (10th Cir. 1971). The Council on Environmental Quality's Guidelines (36 Fed. Reg. 7724–7725), the Executive Order implementing NEPA (Executive Order 11514, 35 Fed. Reg. 4247), and the Department's own guidelines (36 Fed. Reg. 18343, 19346, October 2, 1971), do, however, provide that public hearings shall be held "whenever appropriate." It is clear, therefore, that the Department's failure to hold public hearings was not contrary to law. The question is—was it an abuse of discretion? See *Jacarilla Apache Tribe of Indiana* v. *Morton,* 471 F. 2d 1275, 1285–1286 (9th Cir. 1973).

In light of the large number of unresolved issues extant in this case, the deep public concern expressed by those responding to the Department's draft statement, the need for public enlightenment in areas involving the future availability of natural resources such

as this, and the overriding national policy issue, involved in this proposed action, the Court is convinced that the Department's failure to hold public hearings did constitute an abuse of discretion. The Court simply cannot envision a more "appropriate" case. Although the Court does not agree with the plaintiffs' contention that such hearings must necessarily be adversary in nature, the Court does believe that some type of formal hearings would materially advance the public interest and improve the overall quality of the Department's statement. The resulting final environmental statement would then serve as an instructive base for national action, administrative or legislative, or both.

ORDER

This Court has already ruled that the proposed action of the Department of Interior threatens irreparable injury to the plaintiffs and the public interest. A preliminary injunction is now in effect. For the reasons herein stated, the Court finds that the Secretary of Interior has not complied with either the procedural or substantive requirements of NEPA. Since compliance with NEPA is a necessary condition precedent to taking any major federal action, the Court does not reach the propriety of the Secretary's actual decision to terminate these contracts. To reiterate, the purpose for requiring strict compliance with NEPA is to assure that the decision-maker does, in fact, take a "hard look" at possible environmental impacts of a given action, balance those impacts against the benefits to be derived from the action, and reach an ultimate decision which gives fair consideration to environmental amenities.

Due to the many inadequacies of the final environmental impact statement prepared by the Department of Interior, and before the Secretary when he made his final decision, such balancing process simply could not have occurred. Assuming that the Secretary had been fully apprised of the environmental impacts involved in the termination of these contracts, his decision might have been different. This matter must, therefore, be remanded to the Department of Interior for further consideration in light of this opinion.

It is therefore ordered that the preliminary injunction issued by this Court on March 27, 1971, enjoining the defendants, their agents and employees, from taking any action leading to the final termination of the National Helium Program and the implementing Contracts No. 14–09–0060–2429, No. 24–09–0060–2434, and No. 14–09–0060–2424, be, and the same hereby is, continued in full force and effect pending further order of this Court.

It is further ordered that the bond previously set as payment of such costs and damages as may be incurred by defendants if they are found to have been wrongfully restrained, shall continue in full force and effect pending further order of this Court.

At Wichita, Kansas, this 11th day of June, 1973.

FRANK G. THEIS,
U.S. District Judge.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Pub. L. 86–777, 74 Stat. 920. All proceedings were before the 86th Congress. The bill which became the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 was H.R. 10548. Other bills which were considered are S. 827, S. 2567, S. 3376, H.R. 8440, H.R. 8451 and H.R. 11030. The Reports of the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, on H.R. 10548 and S. 3376, June 1 and 15, 1960, and the Report of Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives on H.R. 8440, H.R. 8451, H.R. 10548 and H.R. 11030, February 19, March 10 and 11, 1960, are printed. The Report of the House Committee is designated H. Rptr. No. 1552 and of the Senate, S. Rptr. No. 1814, with a minority report by Senator Carroll designated Part 2. Debate in the House and Senate is reported in 106 Cong. Rec., pp. 9089–9095, 15119–15125, 17855, 18936–18538, 18544–18546, 18602–18609 and 18902–18904.

[2] See, *Hearings on H.R.* 8440, 8451, 10548, 11030 *before the U.S. Senate Comm. on Interior and Insular Affairs,* 86th Cong., 2d Sess. (1960).

[3] See, 106 Cong. Rec. 17855, 18544–45, 18546, 18602 (1960).

TRIBUTE TO A GOOD SCOUT

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as I always welcome news of citizen efforts to inspire a greater knowledge of and confidence in the responsibilities of the American experience, I was thrilled to read of Mr. M. E. Dobbins of Durant, Okla., and his 41-year commitment to the Boy Scouts of America. As described in an excellent article by Mr. Bob Swearengin in the July 26, 1973, Byran County Star, Mr. Dobbins' close association with the Scouts is highlighted by an enthusiastic participation in activities which encourage both self-reliance and cooperative citizenship. As a result of his dedication, this venerable troop leader has helped an impressive number of young men achieve Scouting's highest individual honor, the Eagle Scout Award. I insert the following article to share my pride and appreciation for the devotion of this fine Oklahoman and American:

GOOD SCOUT STILL TRAILS EAGLE AT AGE 68

(By Bob Swearengin)

It was a bright sunny Sunday—a perfect day to leave for camp.

Boy Scouts of assorted shapes and sizes were sprinkled on the green lawn, amid cots, packs and various camping gear. Soon the bus would leave.

I unloaded the 11-year-old and stopped to chat for a few minutes with some of the other parents. Gosh . . . it seemed like only yesterday I was sitting on that grass with the other kids, anxiously awaiting a week in the woods. A quarter of a century sure can zip by in a hurry.

I realized that one thing hadn't changed during all that time when someone put a hand on my shoulder and said "hello." Because there was M. E. Dobbins, my old scoutmaster, getting ready to take my youngster to camp. Still helping kids trail the Eagle at age 68.

And after 41 years of service and 61 Eagle Scouts, Dobbins is as enthusastic about the program as ever. "Kids still need citizenship training," he said. "Maybe more so now than ever before."

The basic program hasn't changed much through the years, Dobbins said. It still emphasizes duty to God, country, others and self, in that order. A young man who is willing to work will grow in citizenship, leadership, self-confidence, and responsibility.

"The approach is different nowdays, though," said Dobbins. "A boy used to have to pass the Tenderfoot test before he was registered. But now the philosophy is that we can't teach scouting if we don't have him in. So a boy must be a Scout two months before he becomes a Tenderfoot. In that time he has to learn the Scout oath and law, demonstrate that he practices these ideals, and demonstrate Scout spirit. He has to earn citizenship and one other skill award, earn a merit badge, and take part in a personal growth agreement with one of the leaders.

"We're trying to develop more responsibility. A boy sits down with a leader, talks about his plans, and outlines his goals in scouting. He keeps this in his record book for future reference."

There's more emphasis on responsibility nowdays, but a Scout has more freedom to pursue his interests, too. In the old day, requirements up through first class rank were pretty well fixed. Nowdays the first class scout must earn eight skill awards, but only citizenship is on the required list. For the other seven, he can choose from all kinds of interesting areas: first aid, conservation, swimming, camping, family living, environment, community living, physical fitness, communications, cooking and hiking.

Merit badges work the same way. Five are required for first class and two of these must be citizenship in the community and first aid. But the other three can be any of a hundred, ranging from fish and wildlife management to reading to machinery. A youngster nowdays can do his thing and advance in rank too.

Dobbins thinks this is a good thing. He remembers one Scout who didn't make it to Eagle because he had a weight problem; he couldn't do the chinups on the personal fitness merit badge. A boy with that problem today could still earn his Eagle if he could pass one of the alternate badges: swimming and sports.

Incidentally, Eagles often run in families, All three of the Haskell Taylor's boys made Eagle Scout. Durant families with two are M. E. Dobbins, Weldon Lasater, G. P. Gentry, Oscar Borin, Troy Scoggins, Bill Steger (formerly of Durant), and Clyde Parker. The Parkers, Ron and Don, are twins. There's one father-son combination, to—Eugene Smith and his son. For 19 of Dobbins' 61 Eagles, it was a family affair.

Dobbins said kids haven't changed much through the years, although some of them spend too much time indoors with the television and not enough time outdoors with nature. The biggest change, he added, has been pressure from the increase in activities for youngsters. "Kids have so many other things to do nowdays that it's hard to give them the Scouting program," he said. "Unless a boy really budgets his time, it's hard to work it all in.

"I'm not opposed to the other activities, but I am sold on Scouting because a boy gets something he won't get anywhere else. Scouting develops more than one phase of a boy's life.

"In a program like this, you're going to keep a boy out of trouble, too. And my theory is that it's a whole lot better to keep him out than to try to remodel him after he gets in."

The funniest incident Dobbins remembers was early one morning at camp. It was just about daybreak and the kids were flopped out on their cots asleep when a big owl swooped out of the trees and narrowly missed the boys. They woke up in a hurry. "I don't know what that old owl was thinking about," said Dobbins, "but he created a lot of commotion there for awhile. Boys were scattering everywhere."

Dobbins says you can take a boy to camp and teach him more in a week than the rest of the year put together. Most important: "He learns to live with others, get along, and respect their rights."

Dobbins never was a Scout himself and got his training in a course at East Central State College. He was a teacher at Fletcher, Oklahoma, and the Methodist preacher there decided to start a troop. "I offered to be an assistant," he said. "The next year he turned it over to me and I've been at it ever since."

It's been a busy 41 years since then and Dobbins has no doubts about whether it's worth it. "If it's meant a thing in the world to half the boys I've had in my troops, it's been worth my time," he said.

"And another thing. One of my scouting boys saved another kid's life one time with

artificial respiration he learned in the troop. That one thing made it all worthwhile."

"Then too, it's such a joy to see kids do right and really get something out of the program."

What makes a good scoutmaster? "You've got to love boys in spite of all that meanness," Dobbins said with a grin. "And a fellow should put in three days a week and throw in nights and Sundays—and have a good wife, too. One man can't put the program over, though, without help from the parents and everybody else."

That "everybody else" includes some able hands down at Troop 618 at the First Baptist Church in Durant. They include Dr. Claude Stuteville, Dr. Gordon Wright, Max McClendon, and David Barker, an SSC student who is one of Dobbins' Eagle Scouts.

Mr. and Mrs. Dobbins have two grown sons. Bob is a major with the Green Berets in the Canal Zone, and James is working on his master's degree in youth work at the Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky.

EXTENDING FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY TO MEDICAL DEVICES

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to extend and expand the Food and Drug Administration's authority in an area in which consumers are significantly unprotected—medical devices. I am joined in introduction by the following members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment: Mr. KYROS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT. Senate Health Subcommittee Chairman KENNEDY and several members of that subcommittee are introducing a virtually identical bill today.

Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I introduced H.R. 1545, a medical device bill which embodied the recommendations of a distinguished HEW study group on medical devices chaired by Theodore Cooper, M.D., the director of the National Heart and Lung Institute. The administration also has proposed legislation in this area, which has been introduced recently as H.R. 6073. I think this new bill combines the best of both proposals.

This bill calls for the Food and Drug Administration to provide for inventory of all devices and separation of them into three categories—First, devices for which adequate evidence does not exist to assure safety and effectiveness or to insure that exposure thereto will not cause unreasonable risk of illness or injury and for which standards may be inappropriate and which should therefore be subject to premarket review; second those for which, in order to reduce or eliminate unreasonable risk of illness or injury, it is appropriate to establish a reasonable standard to assure safety and efficacy; third those devices having a generally accepted medical use, which are safe and effective when used according to instruction, which present a minimum risk and which should be exempt from standards or premarket scientific review.

The job of classifying the devices is to be done by various panels appointed by the FDA. Panels will be composed of members skilled in development or utilization of devices.

The end result will be that all devices will be placed in one of the three categories based on the complexities of the device and what type of review the panels feel is necessary for protection of the public.

The work by the panels will then trigger action by the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA is to develop standards determined by the panels to be appropriate for certain devices. It also is to issue declarations with respect to devices for which it will be necessary to conduct scientific review.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked that a detailed section-by-section analysis of the bill be made available to the public at the offices of the full committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce within the next few days, and I will not go into every detail of the bill being introduced today. It is appropriate only to mention at this time the major differences between the subcommittee bill and the administration's recommendation. Included in our bill, for example, and absent from the administration measure are—

First. A provision mandating classification of medical devices already on the market, by panels of qualified nongovernment experts, into three groups: those requiring standards; those requiring premarket safety clearance through expert outside scientific panels; and those requiring no clearance or standards because they are considered safe and effective as labeled. This is one of the principal recommendations of the Cooper study.

Second. A clear and easy-to-understand definition of medical device. Recent court decisions have demonstrated that considerable confusion exists over the high degree of similarity between the present statutory definitions for the terms "drugs" and "device." Indeed, the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory history in attempting to regulate devices is replete with examples of battles over phraseology, definition, and prosecution. A definition that will clearly define what is a device as opposed to a drug is of concern not only to the Food and Drug Administration but to the device manufacturers who must comply with the law; and it is obvious that to have the kind of consistent enforcement that will protect the consumer, there must be a consistent, legally sound definition.

Third. Authority to authorize temporary permits permitting a device to vary from an established standard so new products can be investigated without unnecessary and time-delaying red tape. Flexibility is vitally important in this field. We must avoid rigidly uniform regulation which would stifle technological advances. This provision is intended to expedite the availability of useful, reliable and safe devices, and to restrict availability of dangerous or unsafe devices.

Fourth. Establishment of a product development protocol or plan of investigation in lieu of the scentific review requirements to regulate devices subject to frequent change and modification. Here again, we are trying to eliminate as much as possible delays in approving device changes which would benefit the consumer in order to get these improvements and changes to the consumer or patient quickly.

Fifth. A provision that Federal standards for devices will override differing State regulations. This is essential, I believe, if we are to have uniformity, rather than a hodge-podge of State regulations. If local conditions require differing standards a waiver is authorized upon application to the Secretary.

Sixth. Exemptions for custom devices from both the standard and scientific review provisions. These would involve special devices developed by physicians to meet a particular patient's needs. These devices normally would not be in widespread use, yet if a physician were required to undergo clearance or meet special standards for each custom device, it would stifle innovation, initiative, and progress. Moreover, and even more important, the patient involved could not be treated properly because the device he would need would not be on the market because of Government controls.

Mr. Speaker, in the last decade, six Presidential messages from both Democrats and Republicans have requested legislation to give the FDA specific authority to require all devices to be safe, reliable and effective before marketing. Hearings—and action—are past due. The Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment will move on this legislation just as soon as its schedule will permit.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation has been evident for some time. Plastic heart valves have caused toxic reactions, endangering patients. Kidney dialysis machines have malfunctioned because of electric failures. Monitoring devices such as heart probes, have exposed patients to the hazards of electrical shock.

Medical literature between 1963 and 1969 turned up reports of 89 deaths from pacemakers; 512 deaths from heart valves; 28 deaths from catheters; and an estimated 1,200 deaths every year from electrical shock.

Then there are the thousands of patients injured, many of them permanently, because of badly designed and ill-functioning devices. Many additional injuries are not reported either by hospitals or doctors because of the threat of malpractice suits.

Handicapped by a lack of adequate authority, the Food and Drug Administration has been hard pressed to cope with these problems, which have reached alarming proportions. In my view, the bill being introduced today will give to the FDA proper authority to insure public protection, and authorizes the agency to do it quickly and efficiently without discouraging innovation. I look forward to bringing this legislation to the floor of the House soon.

COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I,

Chairman STAGGERS of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, along with nine other members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT, are introducing the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rebabilitation Act Amendments of 1973.

Alcoholism, drug abuse and mental health problems directly afflict 10 percent of our population and the social and psychological ramifications for the families and friends of the afflicted affect millions more. These problems are national problems and need to be attacked with a bipartisan front. Thus, I am extremely pleased that 10 of the 11 subcommittee members and our distinguished full committee chairman have coauthored this bill.

The bill has two principal features, Mr. Speaker. First, it establishes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a new Administration, the Addiction and Mental Health Administration. This new governmental unit will consist of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism—NIAAA—the National Institute of Mental Health—NIMH—and the National Institute on Drug Abuse—NIDA—when established pursuant to the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972. Existing statutory language which establishes the NIAAA and the NIDA is amended by this bill so that the organizational structures and authorities are virtually identical. Statutory authority for NIMH is established for the first time by this legislation, and it too sets up an Institute with the same organizational structure and authority.

The new Administration would bring all three programs under a common Director, yet all would be considered on an equal footing. I want to stress that it is the firm intention of the sponsors of this bill that all three institutes would be equal units within this new Administration, each with its own Director. To further emphasize the equal status, a panel, the National Panel on Addiction and Mental Health, composed of one public member from each of the advisory councils to the Institutes, is established which shall advise, consult with and make recommendations to the Director of the Administration concerning the functions and responsibilities of the Administration.

The bill also revises the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 in several ways. It increases the amounts authorized for special project grants and reduces the authorizations for formula grants to the States to reflect budget realities. It provides special project moneys to States that will implement the Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act which would remove public intoxication from the criminal justice system. It revises and improves sections of the existing law with respect to confidentiality and admission of patients to hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the reorganization of the presently existing offices which have responsibility for programs of treatment and research in the fields of alcoholism, drug abuse and mental health deserves special attention. This reorganization places Federal authority for alcohol programs where it belongs: under the Assistant Secretary for Health. It makes equal and separate programs of alcoholism, drug abuse, and mental health, yet assures their coordination. I would ask my colleagues and others interested in Federal health programs to review this proposal carefully and let the subcommittee have their comments.

NOVEMBER 3 THROUGH 10—NATIONAL HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE WEEK

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I and nine of the other members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment are introducing a joint resolution to designate the week of November 3 through 10 of this year as National High Blood Pressure Week. Cosponsors of this legislation are Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, high blood pressure, or hypertension, is an underlying cause of heart attack, stroke, and kidney failure. Although at least 10 percent of our population, 23 million people, suffer from this disease, most are unaware of the threat to their lives. I think it is necessary to focus public attention on the problem of hypertension in an effort to reach those who have the disease and do not know it as well as stimulate those who are aware of their illness to follow a proper course of treatment. This measure is a good beginning, and I hope it will receive prompt consideration by the appropriate House committee.

BEEF PRICE FREEZE

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker over the last week, I have received many telephone calls and telegrams from constituents in the 14th District about the impact of the beef price freeze.

As the distinguished majority leader pointed out yesterday, this is not just a consumer problem but is developing rapidly into a major labor problem.

Hundreds of workers in the meat industry in Akron are already out of work. Over half of the meatpacking houses in the area are shut down, and the remainder expect to close their doors by this weekend.

These lay-offs naturally spill over into other industries, affecting the jobs of hundreds of other workers in Akron and thousands of workers around the country. For example, B. F. Goodrich in Akron uses tallow, a byproduct of meat slaughtering, in the production of tires. According to a Wall Street Journal article yesterday:

The company said tallow is so critical to the rubber-making process that a shortage "could force production curtailments" throughout the industry.

In passing the economic stabilization legislation last April, Congress gave the President the authority to deal with the problem of high food prices. He obviously can lift the beef price ceiling whenever he wishes, but for some reason which remains a mystery to me, the administration is holding fast to the September 12 date. If this policy is not reversed, the situation which is serious today will be disastrous by September 12.

The President has the authority to act, and I have urged him to do so both in a telegram to him personally and in a telegram to Melvin Laird, Counselor to the President for Domestic Affairs.

With the vote in the House Rules Committee yesterday to defer action on this issue until September, any chance of congressional action prior to the recess was lost—although any such action might have been futile since the President has been quick to veto anything he does not agree with.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the administration will look at what is happening around the country, will be sensitive to the tremendous human dislocation and suffering which holding to this arbitrary date of September 12 is causing, and will lift the freeze immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Wall Street Journal article in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

CURB ON RUBBER FIRMS' PRODUCTION LOOMS AS BEEF SCARCITY CUTS VITAL TALLOW SUPPLY

(By Everett Groseclose and Jeffrey A. Tannenbaum)

For want of tallow—the simple fatty substance that has been used to make candles since time began—a huge chunk of American industry may soon be grinding to a halt.

That's the specter raised yesterday by B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron. In an announcement that took by surprise even long-time insiders of the rubber industry, the company said tallow is so critical to the rubber-making process that a shortage "could force production curtailments" throughout the industry.

The shortage is so severe, Goodrich said, that if it goes on very long and isn't solved "within a matter of weeks" the job security "of thousands of U.S. rubber workers is threatened."

Goodrich had barely mentioned the word tallow before other rubber companies began to report that their tallow situation, too, is getting to the crucial point. "Nobody is more amazed than me," said one industry insider, "because I didn't even know we used the stuff." He added, "But I'm told that tallow is ever so critical—it's a critical rubber processing aid—and the shortage is already bad."

To help correct the shrinking supply situation, Goodrich said it is urging the federal government to impose an immediate embargo on tallow exports.

Tallow, as every school child knows, is a beef by-product used to make candles. What every school child doesn't know is that it's also used in a number of other things, such as industrial lubricants, for the making of animal feeds and for the manufacture of soap.

By one industry estimate, about 40% of the tallow is used in animal feed. About 27% goes into the making of fatty acids; about 23% goes into soap and about 10% goes for industrial lubricants and other applications.

The importance of tallow is illustrated by a partial list of business interests using fatty acids alone. The list ranges from the rubber industry, the vinyl plastics industry, the de-

tergent industry, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, toiletries, ointments, shaving cream and textile chemicals.

The shortage arises, of course, largely because the slaughter of beef is almost at a standstill. In addition, Goodrich said tallow suppliers are able to obtain higher prices from overseas customers because government price controls are holding down the price U.S. buyers can pay.

There are two basic sources of tallow—meat packers, who slaughter cattle, and renderers, who collect beef scraps and make protein for animal feed. Many meat packers and renderers are holding back tallow from the market in anticipation of higher prices later, said David R. Eagleson, vice president of the oleochemical group of Emery Industries Inc., Cincinnati, a buyer of tallow. "There's been very little tallow moving on the market for the last two weeks," he said.

Under Phase 4 rules, Mr. Eagleson said, many renderers expect to post higher prices in about two weeks. "Even though there'll be some freeing up of tallow by the renderers as of Aug. 12 or so," he warned, "the packers will still be in a dire situation, and the tallow supply from the packers will continue to go downhill until Sept. 12" (when the meat price freeze is expected to end).

The government recently moved to limit tallow exports to 90% of the 1972 level, Mr. Eagleson said, but the decline in tallow production, coupled with the withholding of tallow from the market, has more than offset any benefit from the export restriction. He added that, in any case, exports must be restricted further, probably to 75 of the 1972 level. However, he said the total ban on exports proposed by Goodrich isn't necessary.

Ashland Chemical Co., a division of Ashland Oil Inc. that makes fatty acids, has been able to purchase only about 10% of its tallow needs for the past month, said Charles A. Aldag, vice president and general manager of the chemical products division of Ashland Chemical. "I've been in this business 17 years and I've never seen a shortage of tallow before," Mr. Aldag said.

Ashland Chemical has started allocations of various grades of industrial stearic acids as a result of the tallow shortage, Mr. Aldag said. "We're confronted with eventually running out of inventory" of products made from tallow, he added.

DRUG ABUSE THERAPY PROGRAMS IN THE SCHOOLS

(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, on June 22, 1973, the Select Committee on Crime approved and adopted a report entitled "Drugs in Our Schools." A copy of this report was sent to each Member of the House and the Senate so that they might be aware of the seriousness of this problem among the youth of our Nation. Today, I am introducing a bill with the cosponsorship of 54 of my colleagues, to create a program to deal with drug abuses in our Nation's schools. As chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime, I found that our drug abuse education efforts were not enough and in some cases merely give students information on how to use drugs rather than discouraging them from using them. I am convinced that the Federal Government must give substantial support to the schools to enable them to train teachers, counselors, and parents and to institute group therapy and peer pressure group programs to rehabilitate these young people who often get their introduction to drugs in the schools.

Unfortunately, all of us are waiting for somebody to do something about the problem. We are losing the war against drug abuses because we have failed in our efforts to combat it at its source. Our committee's preliminary investigation of the matter revealed the problem was severe but our investigation demonstrated the drug crisis in our schools clearly exceeded our worst expectations. To assist State and local school agencies to effectuate drug abuse programs, the committee recommend a massive program of Federal funding, as set forth in my bills, H.R. 9899, H.R. 9900, and H.R. 9901 to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for drug abuse therapy programs in schools, which I introduced today.

As a result of our hearings on the drug problems in our schools, the Select Committee on Crime recommended that every school board in the country should develop a well-conceived plan directed at ending drug abuse in the schools. Each school district should institute programs of instruction for its teachers whereby the teachers are thoroughly educated in the drug abuse problems germane to the school district and school at which the teacher is employed. Schools should be encouraged to condition promotions and salary increases on attendance at such drug abuse programs. In addition, there should be drug abuse counselors for every school which requires them. We are dealing with a problem of great magnitude and I am convinced that the $500 million a year for the next 5 years as provided in my bill is necessary and a lesser sum cannot do the job of protecting students from becoming drug abusers.

While there are many programs throughout the country doing a splendid job in dealing with this problem, they can only make a small dent in the overall problem. Our committee report on the subject discusses these programs but points up clearly the need for further help for our young people through the schools, particularly when we know that 80 to 90 percent of all high school students have been introduced to drugs and that the problem is now serious among elementary school children. The best place to start to avert an even larger addict population is with the young people who are acquiring the habit and the schools are where the action is.

To further bring the seriousness of this matter to the attention of my colleagues in the House, I should like to include a typical article appearing in the Texarkana, Ark., Gazette, of July 7, 1973, titled, "Drug Crisis in the Schools." The article referred to follows:

[From the Texarkana (Ark.) Gazette, July 7, 1973]

DRUG CRISIS IN THE SCHOOLS

There is a frightening air of emergency about a newly issued congressional report on drug abuse in the nation's schools. The House Select Committee on Crime says the problem has reached "crisis proportions," adding that "drug abuse in our schools has become so extensive and pervasive that it is only the uniquely gifted and self-possessed child who is capable of avoiding involvement. . . ."

This assessment echoes and confirms many parents' worst fears about the dangers their children face. We are now told that few are likely to escape them.

Indeed, says the report, "our investigation demonstrated that the drug crisis in our schools greatly exceeded our worst expectations. It is infecting our youth and contaminating our schools and leaving a trail of devastation that will take a decade to remedy." Well, then, the remedial program should begin at once, without question, and on a massive scale.

We say this not merely on the strength of the House Crime Committee report, but in awareness that other assessments have given essentially the same picture. The public school system is seriously poisoned by this phenomenon, which requires a response of major proportions.

Just such a response is recommended by the House committee. It would earmark two billion dollars of federal money to help local school boards deal with the problem over the next four years. That is a lot of money, but the drug abuse sickness in our schools requires heroic counter measures.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident all of my colleagues in the House share my concern about the grave problem of drug abuse in our schools and I hope they will join me in pressing for enactment of this legislation for the prevention and correction of drug abuse. If given the opportunity and support, we believe the school authorities will find the most effective ways to curb drug abuse by students. A determined effort is necessary not only because of the serious impact on the lives of youthful abusers but also because of the well-known relationship between drug abuse and crime. It has been widely estimated that 50 percent of all serious crime is related to drug abuse. Consequently, curbing drug abuse will not only have an enormous impact on the lives of student drug abusers, but it should be one of the most significant ways of reducing crime. Any reasonable expenditure to reduce crime is not only desirable but a public necessity.

I am privileged to have the following list of Members of the House as cosponsors on this legislation:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.), Bill Alexander (D-Ark.), Glenn Anderson (D-Calif.), L. A. Bafalis (R-Fla.).

Bob Bergland (D-Minn.), Frank Brasco (D-N.Y.), James Burke (D-Mass.), Yvonne Burke (D-Calif.).

Bill Chappell (D-Fla.), Shirley Chisholm (D-N.Y.), William Clay (D-Mo.).

James Collins (R.-Tex.), John Conyers (D-Mich.), Thaddeus Dulski (D-N.Y.), Bob Eckhardt (D-Tex.).

Jack Edwards (R-Ala.), Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), Donald Fraser (D-Minn.).

Don Fuqua (D-Fla.), William Green (D-Pa.), Bill Gunter (D-Fla.), Michael Harrington (D-Mass.).

Augustus Hawkins (D-Calif.), Ken Hechler (D-W. Va.), Henry Helstoski (D-N.J.).

Lawrence Hogan (R-Md.), James Howard (D-N.J.), Harold Johnson (D-Calif.), William Keating (R-Ohio).

Edward Koch (D-N.Y.), John Kluczynski (D-Ill.), William Lehman (D-Fla.).

John McFall (D-Calif.), Ray Madden (D-Ind.), Edward Madigan (R-Ill.), James Mann (D-S.C.).

John Melcher (D-Mont.), Parren Mitchell (D-Md.), Robert Mollohan (D-W. Va.), William Moorhead (D-Pa.).

John Murphy (D-N.Y.), Morgan Murphy (D-Ill.), J. J. Pickle (D-Tex.), Bertram Podell (D-N.Y.), Robert Price (R-Tex.), Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.), Fortney Stark (D-Calif.).

Charles Thone (R-Nebr.), Victor Veysey (R-Calif.), Joseph Vigorito (D-Pa.), Joe Waggonner (D-La.).

Jerome Waldie (D-Calif.), Antonio Won Pat (Guam), Andrew Young (D-Ga.).

"DIARIO LAS AMERICAS"

(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, the evening of July 29 at the Fontainebleau Hotel on Miami Beach on the occasion of a great testimonial tribute, where more than 1,200 were present to honor Dr. Horacio Aguirre and the "Diario Las Americas" on the 20th anniversary of the newspaper, the principal address was delivered by Dr. Manolo Reyes, distinguished news editor and commentator of Television WTVJ, Channel 4, the CBS outlet in Greater Miami. My distinguished colleagues, Honorable DANTE FASCELL with his lovely wife, and Honorable WILLIAM LEHMAN with his lovely wife, and my wife and I were present on this inspiring occasion. Also present were distinguished news editors from Latin America as well as from many parts of the United States. It was a great outpouring to Dr. Horacio Aguirre for having with his distinguished brother, Dr. Francisco Aguirre, 20 years ago established a great newspaper published in Spanish to serve not only the Spanish speaking people of the Greater Miami area and Florida but Spanish speaking people throughout the United States and Latin America.

Throughout its eminent life the "Diario Las Americas" has been the voice of freedom, liberty, and human dignity. It has fought tyranny, communism, and every sort of restraint upon the freedom of the mind or the body of man. Dr. Manolo Reyes, in his inspiring address, has eloquently described the importance of the "Diario Las Americas" in protecting and perpetuating democracy and freedom in the Western Hemisphere. Dr. Reyes, a former distinguished editor, television station proprietor, lawyer, civic leader, and citizen of Cuba until he was forced out of Cuba by threatened arrest by Castro and his cruel communistic regime, knows how to appreciate freedom. He left Cuba on 2 hours notice to his wife and family, abandoning a successful business, a distinguished professional career, beautiful home with all of its lovely furnishings and environment, and came to the United States with his family with nothing. His own has been a great and eloquent voice for freedom and human dignity on station WTVJ and in the civic councils of the Greater Miami area. He has appeared before House and Senate Committees in the Congress pointing out the dangers Castro and communism from Cuba constitute to the United States.

So Dr. Reyes was particularly fitted to be chosen to deliver the principal address at this exciting testimonial dinner for Dr. Horacio Aguirre and the "Diario Las Americas" on the 20th anniversary of this great publication. My distinguished colleagues, DANTE FASCELL and WILLIAM LEHMAN, and I were thrilled at the stirring words that Dr. Manolo Reyes delivered and the audience gave him a rising ovation when he concluded.

As long as there are great voices like that of the "Diario Las Americas" and Dr. Horacio Aguirre and Dr. Manolo Reyes holding aloft the cause of liberty and fighting for the cause of freedom, freedom will be more secure for the enjoyment of free men.

In order that our colleagues may have an opportunity to appreciate the great address of Dr. Manolo Reyes, on behalf of my colleagues, DANTE FASCELL and WILLIAM LEHMAN, and myself, I insert the address of Dr. Reyes in the RECORD following my remarks:

ADDRESS OF DR. MANOLO REYES

I stand at this podium fulfilling an honored duty, probably the largest in the American Continent. I say the largest, because before us tonight, the Americas will embrace to pay tribute to their very own newspaper, "Diario las Americas".

There are many others—with a greater capacity—who should be exercising this privilege which I am now endeavoring to fulfill. But I was chosen by God's will and His wishes are commands which I follow. We all have to agree that our lives belong to Him and only by following His Divine wishes, may our lives gain their full meaning.

This essential spirit of religion is the foundation upon which this great newspaper stands. Its pages are forever open to different roads leading to faith and hope.

There is an historical event which enriched the United States in the year 1953.

On July 4th of that year . . . the "Diario las Americas" was founded by the brothers Horacio and Francisco Aguirre. Their outstanding view of the future was one of the most important factors contributing to "El Diario's" success.

For over thirty years, Miami has been called "The Gateway to the Americas" by all the countries South of the border. Now, in the Space age, it has been made a reality.

Today, Miami is a unique city in itself, known not only in the United States but throughout the Western Hemisphere. It is a city where both the cultures and traditions of every country in North, Central and South America meet.

Presently, for every one hundred people walking through the streets of Miami, most likely fifty of them will speak Spanish. This sociological phenomenon has not occurred overnight, though "El Diarrio" has been a bridge of communication and understanding among them and has offered through its pages the appropriate social climate in which everybody can live as neighbors and brothers.

These are times in which sometimes fear or incapacity are disguised by assuming positions which lack strength of principles.

Principles are not exercised because it's stylish or because one might obtain prestige by being in the public eye. Principles are above what people might say, above human respect and those interests acquired. Principles are exercised and defended by beliefs and convictions, because to lead a life without principles is not worth living.

A leader is a product of sound principles. Today, we pay tribute to a man of this caliber . . . a true leader, not only in these areas but in Panamerican dimensions too: Dr. Horacio Aguirre.

In his case, we can cite a very true proverb: "Behind every great man there is a woman". We are also paying tribute to his constant companion, his distinguished wife: Helen Aguirre.

"Diario las Americas", under the expert direction of Dr. Aguirre has grown enormously. It started in 1953 with only 8 pages and at present has added up to 84 pages with special editions.

National Geographic Magazine published in its last issue that "Diario las Americas" is circulating 63,000 issues daily. This impressive amount is due largely to the fact that it is a newspaper which uses journalistic "objectivity", refusing to use any type of party controversy.

Today, "El Diario", is read by not only businessmen and laborers alike, but is present at the White House and on Presidential desks throughout the continent.

Diario las Americas has refused on many occasions to use political advertisements and reports, that would otherwise boost circulation by the thousands and bring a large increase in its assets. To its director, journalism represents a form of priesthood. He would rather sell less but have the integrity of huge sectors of the community respected.

"Diario las Americas" practices 2 rules applying to the countries of America . . . they are: adding and multiplying, but never subtracting or dividing.

On its pages, the truth of a Continent is reflected. Its penetrating power is strong and firm to the American family. This is why reading "el Diario" for a short time, many average citizens are inspired to become involved in fighting American's problems.

There is a golden chapter in the history of el Diario las Americas. A chapter I'm going to emphasize here . . . as a Cuban and with the honor it conveys.

There are not many occasions in the history of mankind in which an exiled community has had to represent its country oppressed in chains. The task is a heavy one, but only God will entrust it to those who can fulfill it.

The martyred Island is captive and silenced. My brothers who are behind cannot speak with liberty. It is the duty of those born in Cuba, now living in exile, to convey their messages. Since the start of the Cuban exodus to this friendly land, Diario las Americas opened its pages to those who were fleeing oppression and tyranny. Its pages have always been opened for the Cuban's objective information and have been far from using destructive criticism.

"Diario las Americas" has made clear its position as a fortress for liberty.

Its task has been a great one. It is impossible to summarize them in a few simple words.

When a Cuban exile is relocated to any other area in this nation where very little is said regarding the Cuban situation, they anxiously wait the arrival of "Diario las Americas". To them it is like a breath of fresh air from their beloved country.

It is the inspiration of every Cuban living in exile to have their children learn the names of Cuba's six provinces as well as knowing the names of this nation's fifty States. And if they know the history of Jefferson, Lincoln and Washington; they should also know Marti, Maceo, Agramonte and Bolivar.

There are people that say that the Cubans in exile are not united in the fight for freedom; precisely "Diario las Americas" is the best tool to quell their disbeliefs. Through its pages Cubans of all times merge in a solid embrace and with their opinions they enlighten the future of the exiles.

In its social sections it relates the prestigious events happening in the community and in this way points out the help the exiles give to community affairs. In its sport pages it gives detailed desscriptions of the best of our sports-minded youth. And in its editorials it tirelessly repeats that Cuba's liberty means peace and security for the Americas.

Ladies and gentlemen . . . the best rebuff for those who think that we Cubans are divided, is this historical meeting here tonight, where Cubans from all walks of life are gathered to tell Dr. Horacio Aguirre "you are one of us".

Even if you were born in Nicaragua but are living in the United States, you are as Cuban as we because you've earned it through your unselfish task for the freedom of Cuba.

Dr. Aguirre, speaking for our exiled countrymen and our brothers still held captive on the martyred island, we gather here tonight to tell you, from the bottom of our hearts . . . thank you. Cuba will never forget you.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

July 13, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Permanent staff:		
Christine S. Gallagher	Chief clerk (through Mar. 31, 1973).	$8,413.56
Hyde H. Murray	Associate counsel	17,985.72
John F. O'Neal	General counsel (effective Feb. 15, 1973).	13,600.00
Lacey C. Sharp	General counsel (through Jan. 15, 1973).	1,402.29
John V. Rainbolt	Associate counsel (effective Jan. 3, 1973).	12,361.09
Fowler C. West	Staff director	15,000.00
Louis T. Easley	Press assistant	13,650.06
George F. Missibeck	Printing editor	11,299.92
Betty M. Prezioso	Staff assistant	8,998.08
Lydia Vacin	do	8,998.08
Martha S. Hannah	do	8,998.08
Marjorie B. Johnson	Secretary to associate counsel.	8,998.08
Peggy L. Pecore	Calendar clerk	8,998.08
Investigative staff:		
Bertha W. Maginniss	Staff assistant (January 1–2).	72.20
Mildred P. Baxley	Staff assistant	8,998.08
Doris Lucile Farmarco	do	7,318.08
Mary Perry Shaw	do	7,318.08
Doris R. Swischer	Staff assistant (January 1–2).	77.34
Nan Strohmenger Hunger.	Staff assistant (effective February 26, 1973).	2,771.83
Julia W. Kogut	Staff assistant (effective January 3, 1973).	7,500.00
Glenda L. Temple	Secretary to general counsel (effective February 15, 1973).	5,000.00
Steven Allen	Staff consultant (effective Apr. 1, 1973).	3,999.99
Janet Jaenke	Staff assistant (effective May 23, 1973).	591.12
Nancy Gail Glass	Staff assistant (effective June 1, 1973).	466.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None.
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1973	45,444.88
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1972	104,555.12

W. R. POAGE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Keith F. Mainland	Clerk and staff director	$18,000.00
Paul M. Wilson	(Reemployed annuitant).	3,780.00
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	18,000.00
Robert M. Moyer	Staff assistant (to Mar. 30).	9,000.00
G. Homer Skarin	Staff assistant	18,000.00
ugene B. Wilhelm	do	18,000.00
amuel R. Preston	do	18,000.00
unter L. Spillan	do	18,000.00
enry A. Neil, Jr	do	18,000.00
ubrey A. Gunnels	do	18,000.00
George E. Evans	do	$18,000.00
Earl C. Silsby	do	18,000.00
Peter J. Murphy, Jr	do	18,000.00
John M. Garrity	do	14,719.62
Robert B. Foster	do	14,719.62
Milton B. Meredith	do	14,982.48
Thomas J. Kingfield	do	12,616.80
Donald E. Richbourg	do	12,616.80
Robert C. Nicholas, III	do	12,459.12
George A. Urian	do	11,355.12
Dempsey B. Mizelle	do	11,670.54
Charles W. Snodgrass	do	11,565.42
John G. Plashal	do	9,199.74
Byron S. Nielson	do	8,805.48
J. David Willson	do	11,535.96
Americo S. Miconi	do	11,565.42
Derek J. Vander Schaaf	do	14,351.64
Robert L. Knisely	do	7,727.82
Richard N. Malow	do	12,353.95
Frederick F. Pfluger	do	15,665.88
John G. Osthaus	do	9,666.69
Paul E. Thomson	do	8,936.88
Charles G. Hardin	Staff assistant (from Mar. 1).	6,666.66
Edwin F. Powers	Staff assistant (from Apr. 23).	5,345.55
Lawrence C. Miller	Editor	14,309.04
Paul V. Farmer	Assistant editor	10,146.00
Gerald J. Chouinard	Administrative assistant.	8,936.88
Austin G. Smith	Clerical assistant	8,411.22
Dale M. Shulaw	do	7,038.46
Gemma M. Weiblinger	do	5,187.13
Virginia M. Keyser	do	6,150.72
Jane A. Meredith	do	4,836.42
Betty Swanson	do	7,622.64
Eva K. Harris	do	4,678.74
Marcia Matts	do	5,519.88
Helen Murphy	Clerical assistant (to Mar. 31).	2,759.94
Sandra A. Gilbert	Clerical assistant (from Mar. 25).	3,733.34
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	6,369.36
Harold Griffin	Minority clerk (to Jan. 31).	2,373.75
Francis M. Hugo	Minority clerk (from Feb. 1).	12,500.00
Enid Morrison	Staff assistant to minority.	12,161.86
Mary H. Smallwood	Clerical assistant (majority).	7,764.60
Samuel A. Mabry	do	7,764.60
Catherine M. Voytko	do	7,452.00
T. Robert Garretson	do	7,452.00
Naomi A. Rich	do	7,282.38
Laura E. Lineberry	do	7,055.04
Susan L. Shaw	do	7,452.00
George F. Allen	do	7,764.60
Linda Steele	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Feb. 28).	2,362.58
David H. Kehl	Clerical assistant (minority).	7,333.34
Carolyn J. Johnston	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Feb. 28).	2,218.46
Thomas H. Hardy	Clerical assistant (minority).	7,764.60
Rachel Shugars	Clerical assistant	7,125.00
Diane Dillon	Clerical assistant (majority) (to Apr. 30).	4,968.00
James W. Dyer	Clerical assistant (minority).	9,254.88
Mary Ann Bond	do	6,045.30
Barbara C. Wallace	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Jan. 31).	924.36
Patience S. Vaccaro	Clerical assistant (minority).	7,350.00
Anna L. Lamendola	do	6,599.88
William Martin	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Mar. 31).	3,875.01
Paul Imse	Clerical assistant (minority).	9,150.68
Lawrence E. Siegel	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Feb. 1).	6,458.33
Peggy Ehringhaus	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Jan. 3).	78.75
Linwood Bolles	Clerical assistant (minority) (to Jan. 3).	82.06
Valsin Marmillion	Clerical assistant (minority) (for March only).	933.40
Charles M. Seeger	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Mar. 7).	6,333.35
Stephen T. Adams	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Mar. 1).	7,333.32
Robert McConnell	Clerical assistant (minority) (to June 16).	6,625.00
Douglas Mulligan	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Apr. 1).	$2,949.99
Karen S. Vagley	Clerical assistant (minority) (from Apr. 1).	5,000.01

Amount of expenditures previously reported	$693,312.52
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1973	742,796.08
Total amount expended from July 1, 1972, to June 30, 1973	1,436,108.60

GEORGE H. MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Cornelius R. Anderson	Chief, surveys and investigations staff.	$17,757.80
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick	Director, surveys and investigations.	17,232.30
David A. Schmidt	1st assistant director, surveys and investigative staff (from May 1).	5,666.66
Dennis F. Creedon, Jr	2d assistant director, surveys and investigative staff (from June 1).	2,733.33
Willie C. Law	2d assistant director, surveys and investigative staff (to May 31).	13,357.15
Mary Alice Sauer	Administrative assistant.	8,152.80
Frances May	Clerical assistant	7,055.04
Beatrice V. Dew	Clerical assistant (to Mar. 9).	2,232.31
Sharon Tinsley	Clerical assistant	4,468.44
Genevieve A. Mealy	Clerical assistant (from Apr. 21).	1,901.67
Hirsch, Arnold H	Consultant	8,000.00
Agriculture, Department of:		
Brannon, R. W	Investigator	18,689.90
Johnston, Harry	do	12,632.25
Robison, John S	do	11,741.64
Air Force Audit Agency:		
Gibb, Donald J	do	6,485.98
Army Audit Agency:		
Brockington, Solomon E.	do	2,508.96
Civil Service Commission:		
DeSipio, Jack A	do	7,060.18
Commerce, Department of:		
Lombard, Edward	do	2,415.90
Defense Contract Audit Agency:		
Herron, Maurice A	do	14,442.84
Federal Aviation Administration:		
Simpson, Thompson J.	do	15,808.56
General Services Administration:		
Flanagan, Kevin F	do	19,859.88
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Carey, Bernard F	do	11,198.91
Habib, Edmund J	do	13,787.20
Perry, John J	do	9,350.65
Stepka, Francis	do	2,963.47
Vojvodich, Nick S	do	6,825.88
Naval Audit Service:		
Wyte, David M	do	4,192.00
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Angevine, Stuart W	do	13,722.80
Baber, John R	do	2,491.44
Bennett, Carl L	do	14,376.80
Bennett, Willis, Jr	do	13,400.80
Berge, Thomas W	do	10,500.40
Bosko, Andrew P	do	12,736.80
Brummitt, Donald A	do	13,400.80
Carroll, Gerard C	do	13,722.80

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carson, W. Dana	do	$14,376.80
Creedon, Dennis F., Jr	do	13,720.24
Delp, Warren P	do	7,438.80
Franklin, Robert M	do	13,722.80
Goedtel, John G	do	13,722.80
Geer, James H	do	11,441.60
Haynes, William P., Jr	do	12,082.80
Kamin, Russell N	do	9,547.60
Leffler, Raymond P	do	10,922.08
Maher, Martin F	do	14,092.00
Malyniak, Joseph 'Jr	do	13,209.60
Mansfield, James P	do	13,722.80
McCreight, Allen H	do	10,548.00
McEliece, Richard F	do	13,722.80
McGahey, Hugh B	do	14,376.80
Michalski, Joseph E	do	13,722.80
Morris, Earle J	do	13,400.80
Nash, William C	do	13,722.80
Radican, John J	do	13,400.80
Ramey, Marion S	do	2,503.20
Schaum, Edward V	do	13,722.80
Schmidt, David A	do	10,818.56
Schwant, C. Dale	do	8,236.80
Shannon, Andrew J	do	14,376.80
Szoka, Charles E	do	13,722.80
Talley, Raymond E	do	12,736.80
Theisen, Lyle J	do	8,032.80
Van Wagenen, John A	do	11,760.80
Welch, William H., Jr	do	14,376.80
Wood, H. Branch	do	14,376.80
Strittmatter, Marie L	Clerical assistant	2,444.80
Stull, Ann K	do	3,364.40
Health benefits (FBI)		4,350.42
Life insurance (FBI)		1,631.98
Retirement (FBI)		28,344.15
FICA (FBI)		339.86
Travel expenses		158,187.55
Miscellaneous expenses		3,436.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,722,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	640,450.27
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	924,529.54
Total amount expended from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973	1,564,979.81
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	157,520.19

GEORGE H. MAHON, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

July 5, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank M. Slatinshek	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member.	17,950.00
William H. Cook	Counsel	17,950.00
John J. Ford	Professional staff member.	17,747.64
Ralph Marshall	do	16,083.78
George Norris	Counsel	15,445.98
James F. Shumate, Jr	do	15,445.98
William H. Hogan, Jr	do	12,756.12
H. Hollister Cantus	Professional staff member.	11,262.48
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	13,865.34
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	10,121.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	10,121.70
Edna E. Johnson	do	10,121.70
Dorothy R. Britton	do	10,121.70
Innis E. McDonald	do	7,598.22
Ann R. Willett	do	6,322.62
Emma M. Brown	do	6,322.66
Nancy S. Jones	do	5,775.00
Diane W. Bowman	Secretary (from Feb. 1).	$4,390.70
Mary Ann McKibben	Secretary (from May 22).	1,140.64
Brenda J. Gore	Secretary (through May 21).	4,952.72
Sally A. Moore	Secretary (through Jan. 31).	878.14
William B. Short, Jr	Clerical staff assistant	8,319.18
James A. Deakins	Clerical staff assistant	7,653.66
Issiah Hardy	Messenger	5,490.66
Staff, Armed Services investigating Subcommittee (from Jan. 3, 1973) (pursuant to H. Res. 185 and H. Res. 264, 93d Cong.):		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	17,750.41
John F. Lally	Assistant counsel	15,904.88
Richard A. Ransom	Professional staff member.	14,588.83
Rose C. Beck	Secretary	7,513.70
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	6,581.44
Joyce C. Bova	Secretary	5,477.52
Diane Bowman	Secretary (through Jan. 31).	819.44
Mary Ann McKibben	Secretary (Apr. 27 through May 21).	729.17

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures H. Res. 185 and H. Res. 264	$225,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1973	73,194.61
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1973	73,194.61
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1973	151,805.39

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Standing committee:		
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director	$17,800.00
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff director	17,800.00
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	17,800.00
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member.	17,800.00
Benet D. Gellman	Counsel	17,800.00
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff member.	17,800.00
Graham T. Northup	do	17,800.00
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority members.	15,773.21
Donald G. Vaughn	Administrative assistant.	10,198.80
Total		150,572.01
Investigative staff:		
Rose Marie Allen	Assistant clerk	4,406.09
Deborah Ann Amburgey.	Secretary	4,678.73
Annette M. Bouchard	do	1,888.88
Richard C. Barnes	Professional staff member.	10,969.01
James P. Caldwell	do	1,666.67
L. Marie Chaillet	Secretary, minority	3,999.99
Eileen Cooper	do	3,341.13
Davis O'Connell Couch	Counsel	11,403.10
Jane N. D'Arista	Professional staff member.	7,106.73
Dolores K. Dougherty	Research associate	9,604.64
Michael Paul Flaherty	Assistant counsel	10,397.16
John P. Hollihan, III	Assistant clerk, minority.	450.00
Lucia Gonzales	Secretary	$1,709.11
Stuart Halpert	Counsel	7,025.11
Helen Hitz	Administrative assistant.	11,229.07
Linda L. Hoff	Secretary	4,473.58
Lorraine G. Inman	do	3,116.68
Joseph J. Janinski	Professional staff member.	16,066.46
Mary E. Kirk	Assistant clerk	6,748.28
Ellen Marie Larkin	Research assistant	800.00
Joel V. Lumer	do	1,222.22
Mary-Helen McGrath	Secretary	5,764.29
Kelsay R. Meek	Professional staff member.	15,082.41
Mildred S. Mitchell	Assistant clerk	10,113.78
Clifford E. Payne	do	4,742.04
Margaret M. Rayhawk	Research associate	9,900.46
Yan Michael Ross	Counsel, minority	14,342.10
Merrill Stevenson	Assistant clerk	8,317.76
Jeanne Carolyn Smith	Secretary	6,142.66
Richard L. Still	Professional staff member.	8,218.07
Barbara Ann Thompson	Secretary	5,718.43
Robert E. Weintraub	Staff economist	1,600.00
Donald J. Winn	Professional staff member.	4,825.16
Miles MacIntyre	Assistant clerk	138.88
Total		217,208.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 306—General)	$818,800.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	232,446.36
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	232,446.36
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	586,353.64

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Brent B. Barriere	Assistant clerk	$716.67
M. Wendell Belew, Jr	do	716.67
Terrence Boyle	Minority counsel	2,569.12
Marie L. Chaillet	Minority secretary	3,641.11
Wanda Jean Clarkson	Secretary	7,410.61
Marilyn Donahue	Minority secretafy	2,233.33
Patricia A. Eley	Assistant clerk	6,596.44
Jane Carey Enger	Secretary	10,113.79
David Glick	Counsel	17,800.00
George Gross	do	17,800.00
Emily M. Hightower	Secretary	9,266.51
Casey Ireland	Minority staff member	17,800.00
Benjamin B. McKeever	Assistant counsel	16,115.65
Gerald R. McMurray	Staff director	17,800.00
Carolyn Sheredy	Secretary	500.00
Catherine M. Smith	Minority secretary	5,675.14
Anthony Valanzano	Minority counsel	9,441.67
Doris M. Young	Assistant clerk	10,388.14
Total		156,584.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 306—Housing)	$407,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to to June 30, 1973	166,152.48
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	166,152.48
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	241,347.52

WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

July 17, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Dorothy E. Quarker	Chief of staff (P)	$17,800.00
Robert B. Washington	Chief counsel (P)	17,800.00
John E. Hogan	Minority counsel (P)	17,195.75
Ruby G. Martin	Counsel (P), effective Feb. 5, 1973.	10,138.86
Daniel Martin Freeman.	Counsel (P), effective Apr. 23, 1973.	4,344.45
James T. Clark	Staff assistant (C)	14,810.97
Dale MacIver	Staff assistant (C), effective Feb. 1, 1973.	9,583.33
Mary B. Wyatt	Staff assistant (C), effective Apr. 1, 1973.	6,750.00
Jacqueline E. Wells	Staff assistant (C), effective Apr. 9, 1973.	5,011.10
Linda L. Smith	Staff assistant (C), effective Apr. 16, 1973.	4,104.17
Maria L. Otero	Office administrator (C), effective Feb. 5, 1973.	6,083.33
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator (Jan. 3, 1973 to Jan. 31, 1973) minority research assistant, effective May 1, 1973.	5,776.41
Edith Booker	Secretary, from Mar. 5, 1973 to Apr. 5, 1973.	1,119.45
Jacques Depuy	Subcommittee counsel, Subcommittee on Government Operations, from Feb. 5, 1973 to Mar. 31, 1973 (transferred to investigative committee Apr. 1, 1973).	3,111.12
Ann Darneille	Subcommittee research assistant, Subcommittee on Government Operations (transferred to investigative commission Mar. 1, 1973).	416.67
Carolyn Emigh	Subcommittee research assistant, Subcommittee on Business, Commerce and Taxation (transferred to investigative commission Feb. 15, 1973).	388.89
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel, (terminated Jan. 31, 1973).	2,195.75
Othello Steinkuller	Secretary (terminated Jan 31, 1973).	1,436.99
Betty Alexander	do	1,328.54
Witney Turley	Investigator (terminated Jan. 31, 1973).	1,487.72
Patrick Kelley	Assistant Counsel, (terminated Jan. 31, 1973).	1,230.83
Terry D. Hill	Clerk, (terminated Jan. 31, 1973).	902.61
La Vonne Manley	Secretary, (transferred to investigative committee Feb. 1, 1973).	272.22
Total		133,289.16
Investigative committee:		
La Vonne Manley	Secretary, (effective Feb. 1, 1973).	5,833.35
Wanda Worsham	Minority secretary	6,307.97
Lorraine McDaniels	Secretary (effective Apr. 1, 1973) Investigative Committee.	3,000.00
Jean Stultz	do	3,500.01
Grace DeMaio	Secretary (effective Apr. 26, 1973).	1,715.29
Joan Middleton	Secretary (effective May 14, 1973).	1,566.67
Theodore Richardson	Clerk, (effective Apr. 16, 1973)	$1,979.18
Louise Winston	Receptionist (effective Mar. 1, 1973).	3,166.68
Wilbur Hughes	Investigator (effective May 2, 1973).	2,458.33
Joyce Gantt	Secretary (effective May 29, 1973).	1,054.16
David Salmon	Clerk, (effective Jan. 1973, terminated Apr. 15, 1973).	2,861.11
Mary Schuler	Clerk, (effective: Mar. 1, 1973, terminated Apr. 20, 1973).	444.45
Browardine Broyhill	Clerk, (terminated Jan. 31, 1973).	902.61
Rebecca Moore	Subcommittee consultant, Subcommittee on Business, Commerce, and Taxation.	7,416.67
Carolyn Emigh	Subcommittee research assistant, Subcommittee on Business, Commerce, and Taxation, effective Feb 15, 1973; terminated Apr. 30, 1973.	2,111.10
Margaret Hoffmann	Legislative Assistant, (Jan. 3, to 31, 1973), subcommittee research asistant, subcommittee on Business, Commerce, and Taxation, (effective May 1, 1973).	2,833.
Joseph Clair	Subcommittee counsel, Subcommittee on Education, effective Apr. 1, 1973.	5,133.32
Michal Duberstein	Subcommittee research assistant, subcommittee on Education, effective Apr. 1, 1973.	750.00
Jacques Depuy	Subcommittee counsel, Subcommittee on Government Operations, effective Apr. 1, 1973.	5,000.01
Ann Darneille	Subcommittee research assistant, Subcommittee on Government Operations, effective Mar. 1, 1973.	1,666.68
Harley J. Daniels	Subcommittee counsel, Subcommittee on Judiciary, effective Apr. 1, 1973.	6,249.99
Stephen Swaim	Subcommittee consultant, Subcommittee on Revenue and Financial Affairs, effective Apr. 1, 1973.	4,250.01
Margi Mosbaek	Subcommittee research assistant, Subcommittee on Revenue and Financial Affairs, effective May 1, 1973.	1,166.66
Joseph D. Kirschten	Subcommittee consultant, Subcommittee on Labor, Social Services and International Community, effective May 1, 1973.	3,683.34
Hilma Lou Ivey	Subcommittee research assstant, Subcommittee on Labor, etc., , from May 1 to 31, , 1973.	241.67
Karen Fleischer	Subcommittee research assistant, Subcommittee on Labor, etc., , effective June 1, 1973.	241.67
Total		75,534.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$275,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	77,991.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	77,991.96
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	197,008.04

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—STANDING COMMITTEE

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald M. Baker	Chief clerk and associate counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	$18,000.00
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	13,643.52
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Research director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
William F. Gaul	Associate general counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr	General counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
Benjamin F. Reeves	Assistant to chairman and assistant clerk (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
Austin P. Sullivan, Jr	Legislative director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	14,822.10
Marian R. Wyman	Special assistant to chairman (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	17,676.66
Minority staff:		
Robert C. Andringa	Minority staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	18,000.00
Louise W. Finke	Assistant to minority Staff director (from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973).	8,674.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	Contingent fund
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	$198,816.36
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	198,816.36
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	Contingent fund

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF

July 15, 1973

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carole J. Ansheles	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$3,119.15
Portia A. Battle	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 16 to June 30, 1973).	266.67
Patricia R. Bowley	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	6,498.25
William H. Cable	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	12,164.70

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Katherine Kennedy Clark (Gibbons).	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$9,607.02
Ron M. Constine	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 21 to June 30, 1973).	166.67
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	9,604.47
Lelia T. Cornwell	do	8,555.87
Karen Y. Foley	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 1 to June 30, 1973).	500.00
Eydie Gaskins	Administrative assistant (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 31, 1973).	4,471.95
Katherine Gaudette	Secretary (from Apr. 17 to June 30, 1973).	1,726.67
Marilyn L. Hargett	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 18 to June 30, 1973).	216.67
Kevin J. Jennier	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from May 29 to June 30, 1973).	533.33
Douglas P. Katcher	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,158.85
Richard Lim	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	5,146.63
Mattie Maynard	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to Feb. 28, 1973).	214.45
Shirley R. Mills	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	8,555.87
Lewis D. Morris, Jr.	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 1 to June 30, 1973).	500.00
David S. Putnam	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	5,327.66
Timothy T. Reese	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	3,119.15
Peter Schott	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,343.73
W. Thornton Scott	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from May 21 to June 30, 1973).	666.67
Michael D. Sherman	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 11 to June 30, 1973).	333.33
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	7,797.88
Jeanne E. Thompson	Legislative assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	10,472.69
Ronald F. Tucker	Research assistant (temporary) (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 23, 1973).	367.99
Robert H. Van Meter, III	Assistant clerk (temporary) (summer) (from June 18 to June 30, 1973).	216.67
John E. Warren	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	5,432.45
Minority: Kim Allinger	Secretary (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1973).	2,150.01
Cynthia Dean Banzer	Minority legislative assistant (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	1,226.63
Edith C. Baum	Minority counsel for labor (from March 29 to June 30, 1973).	7,411.12
Mildred S. Blumel	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,158.85
Cecilia C. Broughton	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 31, 1973).	2,317.60
Christopher T. Cross	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	15,959.66
Susan Connolly DeMarr.	Secretary (from April 20 to June 30, 1973).	1,873.62
Janet Craig Haddesheimer.	Minority research assistant (from June 1 to June 30, 1973).	$875.00
Karen L. Huester	Minority clerk-typist (from June 29 to June 30, 1973).	40.00
Martin L. LaVor	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	14,999.05
Jo Anne Pierson	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,470.77
Silvia J. Rodriguez	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	5,634.67
John Charles Sheerlin	Minority counsel for labor (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1973).	9,000.00
Yvonne Franklin Smith.	Minority legislative associate (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	9,357.46
Dorothy L. Strunk	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	6,708.64
Dennis J. Taylor	Minority associate counsel (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 14, 1973).	4,962.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$720,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	217,669.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	217,669.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	502,330.37

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 1

(Representative Carl D. Perkins, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Eydie Gaskins	Special assistant (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1973).	$4,573.59
John F. Jennings	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	16,560.40
Alexandra J. Kisla	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	1,292.05
Toni E. Painter	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	3,467.85
Ivan Swift	Legislative assistant (from June 1 to June 30, 1973).	1,750.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	33,268.13
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	33,268.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	56,731.87

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 2

(Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeunesse M. Beaumont	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$8,832.84
A. Jefferson Dodds	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30 1973).	433.33
Hugh G. Duffy	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 15, 1973).	1,137.50
Donald J. Kaniewski	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	2,919.63
Cheryl G. Matcho	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,815.51
Robert E. Moss	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	12,638.61
Daniel H. Pollitt	Special counsel (from Jan. 3 to May 31, 1973).	3,288.90
Richard Shaffer	Research assistant (from Apr. 2 to June 30, 1973).	1,606.96
Judith Simmons	Assistant clerk (from Apr. 1 to Apr. 30, 1973).	125.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	39,716.16
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	39,716.16
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	50,283.84

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 3

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Barbara A. Dinuson	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$3,708.34
Adrienne Fields	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	9,097.52
Karen L. Heck	Assistant clerk (from June 18 to June 30, 1973).	140.83
Julie M. Nichols	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 17, 1973).	1,562.50
Robert E. Vagley	Director (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	16,996.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	32,993.32
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	32,993.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	57,006.68

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, NO. 4

(Representative Dominick V. Daniels, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Loretta A. Bowen	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$7,960.57
Alexandra J. Kisla	Research staff assistant (from April 2 to June 30, 1973).	3,213.88
Daniel H. Krivit	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	15,525.57
Catherine R. Romano	Research staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to Mar. 31, 1973).	2,615.57
Laura Wells Stanton	Research assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,301.67
Charles R. Zappala	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to May 31, 1973).	1,480.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	35,570.63
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	35,570.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	54,429.37

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 5

(Representative John Brademas, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack G. Duncan	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$13,600.00
Eleanor M. Finver	Secretary (from Apr. 9 to June 30, 1973).	1,822.23
Marianne Frederick	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	1,466.66
James Harvey	Deputy assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	7,416.67
Alice Koller	Researcher (from Feb. 9 to Apr. 30, 1973).	2,277.77
Christine M. Orth	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,516.67
Gladys Marie Walker	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,477.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	41,449.06
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	41,449.06
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	48,550.94

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, NO. 6

(Representative James G. O'Hara, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Rosanne Aceto	Assistant clerk (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1973).	$3,548.50
Suzanne L. Black	Research assistant Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	1,226.65
Maxienne L. Brown	Secretary (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	981.31
Alfred C. Franklin	Counsel (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1972).	9,287.35
James B. Harrison	Staff director (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1972).	12,310.15
Sally K. Kirkgasler	Director (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973.)	1,349.30
Bernard M. Murphy, Jr.	Research assistant (from June 1 to June 30, 1973).	433.33
Elnora Helen Teets	Clerk (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1973).	5,519.85

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	36,790.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	36,790.40
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	53,209.60

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES, NO. 7

(Augustus F. Hawkins, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William J. Beckham, Jr.	Director (from Feb. 21 to June 30, 1973).	$10,875.01
Patricia S. Fleming	Research assistant (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1973).	6,333.35
Susan Durkee Grayson	Special assistant (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1973).	3,500.01
Natile Meyer	Receptionist (from Apr. 9 to June 30, 1973).	455.57
Carole M. Schanzer	Clerk (from Jan. 29 to June 30, 1973).	4,361.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	33,605.95
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	33,605.95
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	56,394.05

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR, NO. 8

(Representative William D. Ford, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Rosanne Aceto	Assistant clerk (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	$662.39
Meredith P. Branson	Clerk (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1973).	6,333.35
Roy P. Dyson	Research aid (from Mar. 1 to June 30, 1973).	2,383.34
Alfred C. Franklin	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	1,733.64
James B. Harrison	Staff director (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	2,297.89
Thomas R. Jolly	Counsel (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1973).	7,916.67
Patricia R. Morse	Clerk (from May 1 to June 30, 1973).	2,208.34
Daniel H. Pollitt	Assistant clerk (from Feb. 1 to June 30, 1973).	2,083.35
William Simmons	Assistant clerk (from May 1 to June 30, 1973).	1,300.00
Elnora Helen Teets	Clerk (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	1,030.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	32,315.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	32,315.02
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	57,684.98

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman

TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS, NO. 9
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vance J. Anderson	Counsel (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	$11,759.35
Carol L. Barbero	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to April 15, 1973).	4,981.51
Patrice C. Connerton	Clerk-typist (from May 8 to June 30, 1973).	1,060.00
Thomas J. Hart	Assistant counsel (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973).	1,063.09
Suzanne Hays	Staff assistant (from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973).	4,433.92
Leonard Kelley	Assistant clerk (from June 1 to June 30, 1973).	325.00
Russell J. Mueller	Actuary and minority legislative associate (from Apr. 2 to June 30. 1973).	6,922.21

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

TASK FORCE ON WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS, NO. 9
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR—Continued

(Representative John H. Dent, Chairman)

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robin Reid	Minority secretary (from Apr. 1 to June 30, 1973).	$2,199.99
Frances M. Turk	Clerk (from Apr. 21 June 30, 1973).	2,527.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$220,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	54,276.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 1973	54,276.51
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	165,723.49

CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

July 9, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marian A. Czarnecki	Chief of staff	$18,000.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	18,000.00
Franklin J. Schupp	do	9,000.00
Harry C. Cromer	do	18,000.00
Melvin O. Benson	do	5,500.34
Everett E. Bierman	do	15,703.68
John J. Brady, Jr.	do	14,419.98
John H. Sullivan	do	14,419.98
Robert K. Boyer	do	12,030.74
John Chapman Chester	do	14,419.98
Peter Anthony Abbruzzese.	do	13,310.70
Lewis Gulick	do	9,000.00
George R. Berdes	Subcommittee staff consultant.	13,865.34
Robert B. Boettcher	do	13,403.16
Goler T. Butcher	do	13,865.34
R. Michael Finley	do	12,160.16
Clifford P. Hackett	do	13,865.34
Charles S. Levy	do	11,837.98
Henry M. Lloyd	do	146.53
Michael H. Van Dusen	do	12,030.74
Thomas R. Kennedy	do	8,925.00
Helen C. Mattas	Senior staff assistant	12,983.28
Mary Louise O'Brien	Staff assistant	11,586.18
Paula L. Peak	do	9,571.92
Ray Sparks	do	9,998.22
Thelma H. Shirkey	do	6,349.14
Arlene M. Atwater	do	6,296.58
Shirley A. McManus	do	7,209.96
Bernadette M. Jenkins	do	6,349.14
Audray Lee Clement	do	3,673.01
Donna Gail Wynn	do	5,187.36
Prudence Verby	do	247.22
Andrew B. Vanyo	Clerical assistant	5,324.28
Jalayne R. Bruce	Staff assistant	5,257.02
Jeanne M. Salvia	do	5,519.88
Arlene M. Hennessey	do	5,608.92
Robert A. Stoner	Clerical assistant	4,288.87
Karen J. Patterson	Staff assistant	2,833.32
Josephine R. Weber	do	2,638.88
Dona Sims	Special assistant	444.45
Theana C. Yatron	do	444.45
Diane Lyn Miesel	Staff assistant	341.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$607,500.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	231,415.71
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	376,084.29

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Expenses, Jan. 3, through June 30, 1973:		
Full committee		$8,998.62
Special investigative staff.		46,805.57
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee.		42,426.35
Government Activities Subcommittee.		48,564.56
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.		58,732.18
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee.		65,988.11
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.		66,353.87
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.		44,803.82
Special Studies Subcommittee.		54,206.53
Total		436,879.70
Standing Committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Herbert Roback	Staff director	18,000.00
Elmer W. Henderson	General counsel	18,000.00
Miles Q. Romney	Counsel-administrator	18,000.00
Douglas G. Dahlin	Associate counsel (from June 1, 1973).	2,291.67
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto	Staff member	9,712.56
Ann E. McLachlan	Staff member	9,414.00
Catherine S. Cash	Staff member	8,214.86
Marilyn F. Jarvis	Staff member	8,349.90
Lilian M. Phillips	Staff member	7,675.80
John Philip Carlson	Minority counsel	18,000.00
William H. Copenhaver.	Minority professional staff member (through May 31, 1973).	13,272.00
Clara Katherine Armstrong.	Minority research assistant.	8,663.76
Standing Committee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Expenses		8,998.62
Special investigative staff, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Robert F. Carmody	Minority staff member (from Apr. 2, 1973).	5,933.33
Warren B. Buhler	Minority staff member	9,872.12
Stephen M. Daniels	Minority staff member (from Feb. 19, 1973).	7,004.93
Richard L. Thompson	Minority staff member (from Apr. 9, 1973).	4,351.55
Sheila G. Nathanson	Minority staff secretary (from Mar. 2, 1973).	3,116.61
Karen L. Tauber	Minority staff secretary (from May 14, 1973).	1,201.12
Eileen W. Theim	Staff member	6,498.25
Ralph T. Doty	Clerical staff	4,668.81
Paul N. Nelson	Clerical staff	4,158.85
Total		46,805.57
Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Charles Goodwin	Subcommittee counsel (from June 1, 1973).	1,435.00
John Paul Ridgely	Investigator	11,422.62
Michael T. McGinn	Defense analyst (from June 25, 1973).	283.33
Catherine L. Koeberlein.	Research assistant	8,792.01
Mary Etta Haga	Stenographer	$5,484.54
Joseph C. Luman	Defense analyst (through February 28).	4,020.95
Douglas G. Dahlin	Staff attorney (through May 31, 1973).	10,652.89
Expenses		335.01
Total		42,426.35
Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman:		
William M. Jones	Subcommittee staff director.	14,556.07
William H. Copenhaver.	Counsel (from June 1, 1973).	2,333.33
C. Don Stephens	Research analyst	11,405.23
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer	7,629.14
Kathryn J. Ruksenos	Secretary (from Mar. 9, 1973	2,644.4
Paul A. Mutino	Counsel (through June 3, 1973).	8,607.31
Expenses		1,389.14
Total		48,564.65
Intergovernmental Relations, Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:		
James R. Naughton	Counsel	17,033.41
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member	17,033.41
Gilbert S. Goldhammer	Consultant	11,103.52
Pamela R. Horsmon	Clerk-stenographer	5,484.54
Margaret M. Goldhammer.	Secretary	4,603.49
Expenses		3,473.81
Total		58,732.18
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Henry S. Reuss, chairman:		
Phineas Indritz	Counsel	17,033.41
David B. Finnegan	Associate counsel	14,260.13
David H. Baris	Legal assistant	8,312.84
Josephine Scheiber	Research analyst	8,772.49
Ruth M. Wallick	Stenographer	6,444.73
Frances B. Lee	do	4,619.07
Expenses		6,545.44
Total		65,988.11
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. William S. Moorhead, chairman:		
William G. Phillips	Subcommittee staff director.	17,033.41
Norman G. Cornish	Deputy subcommittee staff director.	17,033.41
Harold F. Whittington	Professional staff member.	13,080.39
L. James Kronfeld	Counsel (from Apr. 1, 1973).	6,249.99
Martha M. Doty	Clerk	5,315.29
Almeda J. Harley	Secretary	4,113.40
Expenses		3,527.98
Total		66,353.87
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Wm. J. Randall, chairman:		
Erskine Stewart	Subcommittee staff director (from Mar. 1, 1973).	8,904.59
William G. Lawrence	Associate counsel (from Mar. 26, 1973).	5,277.79
Jeremiah S. Buckley	Assistant counsel	7,964.55
D. Faye Taylor	Clerk (from Apr. 19, 1973).	2,299.99
Eleanor M. Vanyo	Secretary (from June 11, 1973).	555.55
Charles A. Intriago	Assistant counsel (through Feb. 15, 1973).	2,740.48
Richard L. Still	Counsel (through Mar. 23, 1973).	6,863.35
Frances M. Turk	Clerk (through Apr. 20, 1973).	3,627.33

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Helena A. Grady	Secretary (through June 8, 1973).	$3,644.83
Expenses		2,925.36
Total		44,803.82
Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. Floyd V. Hicks, chairman:		
Joseph C. Luman	Subcommittee staff director (from March 1, 1973).	9,079.79
Jacob N. Wasserman	Counsel	15,666.85
Dean S. Kalivas	Professional staff member (from Apr. 1, 1973).	5,000.01
James L. Gyory	Investigator	7,952.56
Wileen O. Moore	Clerk	4,921.76
Geraldine A. Fitzgerald.	Secretary	4,158.85
Erskine Stewart	Subcommittee staff director (through Feb. 28, 1973).	4,234.81
Expenses		3,191.90
Total		54,206.53

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures H. Res. 277, 93d Congress — $1,219,700.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported — None
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973 — 436,879.70

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973 — 436,879.70

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973 — 782,820.30

CHET HOLIFIELD, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

July 13, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John Walker	Staff director	$18,000.00
Frank B. Ryan	Director, information systems.	18,000.00
Louis Freed	Assistant clerk	18,000.00
Robert Gray	Chief auditor	17,638.68
Melvin Miller	Minority clerk	5,819.26
John Blair	Assistant to the staff director.	14,419.98
Ralph Murphy	Minority's assistant clerk.	13,142.52
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	10,666.80
Mary Stolle	do	7,885.50
Evelyn H. Wilson	Office manager	7,885.50
Judith Vargas	Assistant cerk (minority).	4,710.27
Robert Anton	Assistant legal counsel.	1,875.01
Ralph Smith	Minority clerk	2,900.00
Thomas S. Foster	Election clerk	4,030.36
William Sudow	Printing clerk	10,000.02
John Boos	Library and memorials clerk.	10,154.98
Rose Wooden	Assistant legal counsel	9,462.60
Joseph Ventura	Personnel clerk	8,683.77
Gurney S. Jaynes	Assistant clerk	6,932.70
Judith Simmons	Accounts assistant clerk.	6,254.38
Gerald Wygoda	Assistant clerk	2,110.00
V. Tomlinson Youngblood.	do	6,308.40
Johanna Lucas	do	6,308.40
John Paul Tolson	do	6,308.40
Lynne E. Pattridge	do	5,519.88
Vickie S. Moser	do	5,257.02
Linda Hoffman	Printing assistant clerk	$4,324.98
Barbara Giaimo	E. & M. assistant clerk	4,619.75
Judith Rigby	Assistant clerk	3,504.65
Pamela Bussen	Personnel assistant clerk.	4,187.72
Cheryl J. Peck	E. & M. assistant clerk	3,374.90
David Carlton, Jr.	Police clerk	8,125.00
Shirley L. Harris	Assistant clerk	4,216.65
Eric Honick	Elections clerk	6,000.00
Tony Pappas	Accounts clerk	8,822.23
Thomas Hart	E. & M. clerk	1,484.17
Donna Craig	Police assistant clerk	750.00
Ronald Merenbach	Assistant clerk	4,200.00
Cathy McMaster	Police assistant clerk	2,225.00
Natile Meyer	E. & M. assistant clerk	1,298.33
Deborah Liggett	Assistant clerk	940.00
Olliovia Frasier	do	920.00
Charlene Brimmer	Assistant clerk (minority).	855.56
Margaret Dinneen	Assistant clerk	450.00
Sebastian Tom	E. & M. clerk	1,375.00
Gregory Gill	Assistant clerk	450.00
Robert Byrd, Jr.	do	450.00
Paul DiLorenzo	do	500.00
John Maxwell	do	325.00
Colette Bohatch	do	183.33
Cynthia Cortese	do	273.33
John Ford	do	130.00
James Burnes	do	300.00
Thomas Latham	Accounts clerk	95.00
Wyatt L. Overton	Assistant clerk	60.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures — $450,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported — None
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1973 — 174,781.55

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1973. — 174,781.5

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973 — 275,218.45

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

(House Information Systems)

July 13, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles Graham	Deputy director	$16,812.28
Sheldon Grosberg	Management assistant.	11,453.33
Howard Ulep	Technical assistant	10,253.32
Kathy August	System factors specialist.	6,761.23
Mary Frye	Executive secretary	5,266.96
Margaret Hyland	Secretary	4,211.52
John Stiegelmair	Head (planning and analysis).	11,132.67
Paula Weirather	Secretary	4,679.15
Dwight Pfaehler	Senior information systems specialist.	11,136.68
Edmond S. Mesko	Information systems specialist.	9,917.28
Jean Walker	System factors analyst	1,300.00
Stuart M. Robinson	Senior information system specialist.	11,612.81
Edward R. Mills	Information systems specialist.	10,785.85
Charles Arrowsmith	do	10,011.27
Don F. Anderson	System factors analyst	8,284.18
Kathryn Smith	Assistant information systems specialist.	840.27
Antoinette Gauther	Communications terminal operator.	4,313.67
Diane Franklin	do	4,342.48
Patricia Costlow	do	4,426.02
Ada Taylor	do	4,184.79
Carol L. Rich	do	4,086.67
Marsha Madden	do	4,448.52
Barbara Pittman	Clerk-typist	2,640.19
Stephen Stofko	Senior information system specialist.	12,104.02
Earl D. Watterson	Information system specialist.	$8,343.10
Don L. Robinson	System factors specialist.	6,296.54
Robert W. Garrett	Information system specialist.	11,136.68
Lynn Alcock	Coordinator	5,230.59
Cherie Barnes	Communication terminal operator.	3,652.25
Betty Gill	do	708.08
Martha Crouse	do	4,184.79
Frank Robertson	Computer service (head).	12,930.10
Betty Sharp	Secretary	375.11
Dianne Sisson	do	260.00
Norman Young	Application development (manager).	11,331.19
Jasper Wagliardo	Senior systems analyst	10,002.03
William Freeman	Systems analyst	9,667.48
Robert Klukas	Senior systems analyst	9,251.41
William Hill	Systems analyst	8,826.52
Jimmy Powell	Programer	7,540.40
David Brazeal	Programer analyst	7,845.51
Vernon Walters	do	6,986.61
Ann Wightman	Programer	5,489.16
Curtis Merrick	Systems operation (manager).	10,814.06
Robert Cohen	Senior systems analyst	9,708.50
John T. Reed	Systems analyst	9,579.21
Harold W. Harding	Systems programer	5,045.72
John Wunderlich	do	8,830.82
Noah St. Clair	Senior systems programer.	8,456.28
Diana Lee Yudiskas	Programer analyst	6,860.36
Benjamin Candler	do	7,351.93
Timothy Gunter	Programer	5,896.19
Kerry M. Frazier	do	5,747.72
Waites J. Ward	Data processing (supervisor).	7,637.90
Robert Mumma	Computer operation coordinator.	5,196.2
Frank W. Byrd	Computer operator	4,840.02
Gerald Barnes	do	4,756.11
Thomas J. Hawk	do	4,756.11
James Guthrie	Programer	2,114.16
Barbara Burda	Data preparation coordinator.	4,442.56
Mary Conroy	Production control specialist.	3,609.68
Deloris Gilliam	Data preparation trainee.	3,053.35
Berthine Washington	do	3,053.35
Steve Newman	Courier	3,570.79
Elmer Whiting	Computer operator	4,581.11
Linda Hall	Secretary	2,650.73
Dianne L. Oshetski	do	3,309.73
Kathleen Fleege	Communication terminal operator.	2,291.31
Francine Cromwell	Receptionist-secretary	2,876.98
Katherine Diamond	Data preparation specialist.	1,701.38
Ed Fairleigh	Data control specialist	1,615.86
Samuel Rogers	Computer operator	1,964.57
Donald Morris	Administrative application.	4,296.93
Louis Johannes	Courier	1,350.19
Lewis duBusc	Information systems specialist.	3,349.21
Barbara Swart	Communication terminal operator.	1,066.64
Susan Starr	System factors analyst	2,323.10
David Underwood	Systems analyst	2,613.47
Marie Williams	Information systems specialist.	2,344.73
Sandra Levine	Communication terminal operator.	790.11
Geoffrey White	Junior research assistant.	516.67
Stephanie Everett	Communication terminal operator.	863.65
Wilburn Smith	Senior information systems specialist.	2,227.30
Kendall Free	Systems analyst	1,532.27
Gerald Murphy	Information systems specialist.	1,867.91
Katherine Bye	Technical research	714.00
Francis Jones	Secretary, junior	605.69
Paul Pritchett	Communication terminal operator.	596.32
Hettie K. Prater	Technical aide	990.07
Ruth Wauters	Programer analyst	881.11
Stuart Edwards	do	623.21
Jeremy Frey	Research intern	30.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures — 2,400,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported — None
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973 — 480,958.01

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973 — 480,958.01

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973 — 1,697,803.24

WAYNE L. HAYS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

July 17, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Staff director and chief clerk.	$18,000.00
Lewis A. Sigler	General counsel	18,000.00
William L. Shafer	Consultant on mines, minerals, and public lands.	18,000.00
Charles Leppert, Jr.	Minority counsel	17,738.00
Lee McElvain	Assistant counsel and consultant on National Parks and Recreation.	16,658.15
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on water and power resources.	[1] 2,856.16
Charles Conklin	Special counsel on public lands and environmental matters.	[2] 14,789.70
Patricia A. Murray	Full committee clerk	11,086.23
Patricia B. Freeman	Administrative assistant.	9,977.62
Miriam L. Waddell	Secretary-clerk	7,760.3
Marsha Lane DeGon	Clerk, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation.	7,483.2
Jack Daum	Staff consultant (minority) (as of Apr. 1, 1973).	5,625.0
Joanne Marie Suter	Secretary-clerk (minority) (as of Apr. 16, 1973).	2,291.6 8
Salaries paid pursuant to H. Res. 291, 93d Cong.:		
Charles Conklin	Special consultant on public lands and environmental matters (from Jan. 3 to Jan. 31, 1973.	$2,760.74
Adrian P. Winkel	Consultant on Territories and Insular Affairs (term. Jan. 31, 1973; reep (Mar. 1, 1973).	13,224.44
Edward Weidenfeld	Special counsel on energy matters (term. Jan. 31, 1973).	2,379.61
Bertha D. Drotos	Secretary-clerk (minority).	6,133.33
Edward Gaddis	Staff assistant	5,484.54
Marston L. Becker	Printing clerk	9,323.70
Inez Jarvis	Secretary-clerk	8,226.75
Nancy Lou Larson	Clerk, Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs.	8,160.45
Mary Lee Gennari	Clerk, Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources.	5,945.31
Kathy C. Loeffler	Clerk-receptionist	4,684.56
Therese M. Mariner	Clerk (term. Apr. 30, 1973).	3,273.95
David W. Luken	Staff consultant (minority) (as of Feb. 1, 1973).	5,833.35
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on water and power resources (as of Feb. 1, 1973).	14,327.50
Maurice J. Shean	Consultant on Territories and Insular affairs, (as of Feb. 1, 1973).	13,403.15
Rebecca D. Shapiro	Clerk, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs (as of Mar. 1, 1973).	3,166.68
Pamela Warfield	Clerk, Subcommittee on the Environment (as of Mar. 1, 1973).	3,625.01
Michael S. Alonge	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Environment (from Mar. 1, to Mar. 31, 1973).	1,139.00
Stanley E. Scoville	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Environment (as of Mar. 1, 1973).	5,500.00
James J. McCusker	Consultant on mines and mining (as of Mar. 16, 1973).	7,291.65
Franklin Ducheneaux	Consultant on Indian affairs (as of Mar. 15, 1973).	7,361.10
Carol L. Hall	Staff assistant, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining (as of Mar. 26, 1973).	$3,166.67
Robert A. Hunt	Consultant on public land (as of Apr. 1, 1973).	6,500.01
Elizabeth K. Medeiros	Clerk, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining (as of Apr. 1, 1973).	2,000.01
James A. Rock	Staff consultant (minority) (as of Apr. 15, 1973).	4,222.23
Nancy G. Drake	Clerk Subcommittee on Public Lands (as of Apr. 16, 1973).	2,812.50
Clay E. Peters	Staff consultant (minority) (as of Apr. 16, 1973).	4,166.68
Thomas S. Dunmire	Staff consultant (minority) (as of Apr. 4, 1973).	2,358.22
Bruce Driver	do	4,229.16
Sharon Peck	Secretary-clerk (minority) (as of May 1, 1973).	1,583.34
Mark Panitch	Staff assistant Subcommittee on Environment (from May 15, 1973 to June 14, 1973).	1,250.00
Jay Parker	Staff assistant Subcommittee on Environment (as of June 15, 19/3).	511.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$694,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	200,315.70
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	200,315.70
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	493,684.30

JAMES A. HALEY, Chairman.

[1] Appointed to investigating staff as of Feb. 1, 1973.
[2] Appointed to standing committee staff as of Feb. 1, 1973

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

July 5, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing commttee (majority):		
Donald G. Sanders (P)	Chief counsel (resigned Mar. 31, 1973).	$8,800.00
Robert M. Horner (P)	Staff director	11,932.00
Richard L. Schultz (P)	Counsel	15,377.78
William H. Hecht (P)	Executive staff assistant.	16,462.20
Alfred M. Nittle (P)	Legislative counsel	16,280.53
Richard A. Shaw (C)	Chief investigator (to standing Apr. 16, 1973).	5,000.00
William G. Shaw (C)	Research director	12,649.85
V. Bernice King (C)	Financial secretary	9,605.46
Mary M. Valente (C)	Administrative secretary.	10,019.32
John F. Lewis (P)	Professional staff assistant (to standing Apr. 1, 1973).	7,643.10
Anniel Cunningham (C).	Chief files section (terminated Apr. 15, 1973).	5,437.75
Standing Committee (minority):		
DeWitt White (P)	Legal counsel	16,923.79
Herbert Romerstein (C).	Minority chief investigator.	15,905.07
James L. Gallagher (C)	Research analyst	12,996.49
Investigative committee (majority):		
Margie D. Biggerstaff	Secretary	5,535.80
Charles Bonneville	Investigator (resigned Apr. 7, 1973).	4,655.89
Daniel Butler	Documents clerk	$5,740.78
Joseph A. Campbell III.	Assistant documents clerk (terminated May 23, 1973).	2,676.70
S. Janice Coil	Secretary	6,287.32
Anniel Cunningham	Chief files section (to investigative Apr. 16, 1973).	3,959.53
Florence P. Doyle	Secretary	5,252.19
Karen Sue Dring	Information classifier	3,909.04
Elizabeth Edinger	Editor (resigned Mar. 31, 1973).	4,201.81
Daniel R. Ferry	Assistant counsel	10,179.92
Andrea Foy	Information classifier (resigned Jan. 11, 1973).	180.25
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	9,779.32
Elizabeth Goltra	Information classifier (appointed Feb. 1, 1973—resigned Mar. 31, 1973).	1,166.66
S. Diana Hardin	Information classifier (appointed June 1, 1973).	569.51
Doris Jaeck	Information analyst	5,547.25
Mildred V. James	Clerk-typist	3,890.43
John F. Lewis	Professional staff assistant (terminated Mar. 31, 1973).	7,473.25
Norma H. Lewis	Secretary	5,644.68
Tina V. Markey	Information classifier (appointed Feb. 12, 1973).	2,638.73
Virginia Masino	Receptionist	4,659.86
Anita Maggio	Clerk	3,564.92
Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst	4,876.13
Alma T. Pfaff	Research analyst	6,152.63
Peggy Pixley	Editorial clerk (resigned Mar. 31, 1973).	2,742.46
Robert Poos	Research analyst (terminated June 30, 1973).	10,439.81
Stuart Pott	Investigator	7,601.85
Audrey Rollins	Secretary	5,211.24
Richard A. Shaw	Chief investigator (terminated Apr. 15, 1973).	5,569.21
Albert H. Solomon, Jr.	Investigator	10,969.01
Nancy M. Stankus	Information classifier (resigned Jan. 12, 1973).	189.83
John N. Stratton	Investigator	8,723.66
Barbara C. Sweeny	Clerk-stenographer	4,800.90
Josehph Thach, Jr.	Information analyst (terminated June 30, 1973).	9,554.98
Susan K. Tonkinson	Information analyst	4,838.50
Investigatve committee (minority):		
George C. Armstrong	Investigator	7,952.56
Richard Norusis	do	8,500.98
William T. Poole	Research analyst	7,550.17
Linda Spirt	Secretary	6,024.35
Browardine Broyhill	Research assistant (appointed Apr. 1, 1973).	1,125.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$475,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	235,623.05
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	235,623.05
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	239,376.95

RICHARD H. ICHORD, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

July 13, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$18,000.00
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	16,679.64
Marcella F. Johnson	Assistant clerk	10,882.02
Frank W. Mahon	Printing editor	10,975.86
Eleanor A. Dinkins	Clerical assistant	8,726.64
Mary Ryan	do	8,726.64
Edwin E. Thomas	Staff assistant	7,744.20

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—Con-

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marion M. Burson (minority).	Staff assistant (Jan. 1, 2 1973).	$176.27
Lewis E. Berry (minority).	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Professional staff:		
William J. Dixon	Professional staff member.	18,000.00
Robert F. Guthrie	do	18,000.00
Charles B. Curtis	do	18,000.00
Lee S. Hyde	do	16,500.00
Jeffrey H. Schwartz	Professional staff member (from Apr. 1, 1973).	6,249.99
Elizabeth Harrison	do	6,249.99
John Gamble	Counsel	12,476.3
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 182 and 303:		
A. Bennet Schram	Staff assistant (minority) (to May 31, 1973).	9,243.55
Henry Thomas Greene	Staff assistant (minority).	11,796.12
Barbara L. Bullard	Clerical assistant (minority).	7,445.22
Darlene G. McMullen	do	5,287.32
Jan B. Vlcek	Staff assistant (minority) (from May 7, 1973).	3,327.61
Bertram J. Levine	Staff assistant (minority) (from Apr. 1, 1973).	5,546.01
Thomas C. Sawyer	Staff assistant (minority) (from Apr. 23, 1973).	4,190.32
Joanne E. Bell	Clerical assistant	5,257.02
Violet M. McCarthy	do	7,359.78
Ann P. Jordan	do	4,936.08
Barboura C. Flues	do	6,100.74
Helen M. Dubino	Clerical assistant (to June 17, 1973).	14,289.41
Clarence E. Martin III	Clerical assistant (from May 14, 1973).	1,044.45
Michael J. Barrett	Clerical assistant (from Mar. 28, 1973).	2,325.00
William C. Barnich	Clerical assistant (to Jan. 31, 1973).	876.17
Laura F. Elder	Clerical assistant (from Jan. 8, 1973).	6,127.08
Lucye L. Summers	Clerical assistant (from Feb. 1, 1973).	5,208.35
Jo Anne Glisson	Clerical assistant (from Apr. 1, 1973).	2,499.90
John L. Duncan	Staff assistant (from Apr. 16, 1973).	3,125.00
Susan Tomasky	Clerical assistant (from June 4, 1973).	525.00
Walter J. Graham, Jr.	Staff assistant	14,278.50
Steve Lawton	do	14,27
Michael R. Lemov	do	14,278.5
Richard Krolik	do	14,278.5
Louise D. Wilmer	Clerical assistant (from June 1, 1973).	500.0
Special subcommittee on Investigations:		
Daniel J. Manelli	Chief counsel	17,747.64
William T. Druhan	Staff assistant	15,629.46
James F. Broder	do	14,974.56
James R. Connor	do	14,492.40
Benjamin J. Smethurst.	do	15,629.46
Mark J. Raabe	Staff attorney	14,419.98
Michael J. Parker	do	12,201.48
Albert J. McGrath	Special assistant	7,875.54
Raymond C. Cole	do	10,513.98
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	8,726.64
Russel D. Mosher	Staff assistant	5,811.06
Diane G. Kirchenbauer.	Clerical assistant	6,378.06
Michael F. Barrett	Staff attorney	14,419.98
Elizabeth A. Eastman	Clerical assistant	7,355.16
Special securities study group:		
Robert L. Stern	Special consultant	15,251.88
Harvey Rowan	Staff attorney	13,668.18
Judith Ann Quinn	Clerical assistant	4,991.52
Jean F. Zofcin	Clerical assistant (from Apr. 9, 1973).	2,273.23
Marion S. Ryan	Clerical assistant (from June 4, 1973).	748.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,180,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	384,639.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	384,639.96
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1973	795,360.04

HARLEY O. STAGGERS, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

July 13, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Herbert Fuchs	Counsel	$18,000.00
Garner J. Cline	Associate general counsel.	17,730.46
Jerome M. Zeifman	General counsel	17,720.83
William P. Shattuck	Counsel	17,191.38
Donald G. Benn	Associate counsel	16,312.50
Frances Christy	Legislative analyst	11,108.46
Jane C. Caldwell	Clerical staff	9,600.24
Gertrude Clara Burak	do	8,540.64
Franklin G. Polk	Associate counsel (from Apr. 1, 1973).	8,400.00
Roberta E. Eisenberg	Clerical staff	8,081.10
Alan A. Parker	Counsel (from Apr. 1, 1973).	7,500.00
Roger A. Pauley	Associate counsel (from Apr. 1, 1973).	7,500.00
R. Frederick Jett	Counsel (through Mar. 31, 1973).	7,467.99
Bess E. Dick	Staff director (through Mar. 9, 1973).	6,900.00
Thomas E. Mooney	Associate counsel (from Apr. 1, 1973).	6,900.00
Alma B. Haardt	Clerical staff (from Feb. 7, 1973).	5,559.69
Ann P. Sartori	do	4,592.49
Daniel L. Cohen	Assistant counsel (from Feb. 1, 1973 through Mar. 31, 1973).	3,333.34
Salaries paid Jan. 3, 1973, through June 30, 1973, pursuant to H. Res. 74 and 265, 93d Cong.:		
Frank H. Addonizio	Clerical staff (through June 1, 1973).	1,313.34
Maurice A. Barboza	Counsel (from Mar. 1, 1973).	7,000.00
Michael W. Blommer	Associate counsel (from Feb. 13, 1973).	10,120.00
Sharon L. Borg	Clerical staff (from June 18, 1973).	325.00
Pearl L. Chellman	Clerical staff	6,306.10
Daniel L. Cohen	Assistant counsel (through Jan. 31, 1973; from Apr. 1, 1973).	6,249.90
Alexander B. Cook	Associate counsel (from Mar. 26, 1973).	5,541.67
Lois D'Andre	Legislative assistant (from June 1, 1973).	1,250.00
Howard C. Eglit	Assistant counsel (through May 11, 1973).	8,363.35
Arthur P. Endres, Jr.	Assistant counsel	9,583.24
James F. Falco	Counsel (from June 10, 1973).	1,400.00
James B. Farr	Messenger-clerk	4,268.83
Mary Shea Gaffney	Clerical staff	5,539.19
Linda C. Gersten	Staff analyst	8,131.11
Alma B. Haardt	Clerical staff (through Feb. 6, 1973).	1,269.22
Herbert E. Hoffman	Special counsel for Federal criminal law reform (through Mar. 31, 1973).	8,800.00
Alice M. Jackson	Clerical staff	5,015.39
R. Frederick Jett	Counsel (from Apr. 1, 1973).	300.00
Michael Kelemonick	Clerical staff	7,008.99
B. Dianne McConnell	do	3,588.91
Florence T. McGrady	do	7,008.99
Betty Jean McKay	Clerical staff (from Mar. 20, 1973).	2,468.88
Thomas E. Mooney	Associate counsel (through Mar. 31, 1973).	5,415.67
Mary Louise Morrison	Clerical staff (from May 1, 1973, through June 14, 1973).	1,173.33
Nancy L. Parke	Clerical staff (from Feb. 21, 1973).	3,466.67
Alan A. Parker	Counsel (from Feb. 1, 1973, through Mar. 31, 1973).	5,000.00
Roger A. Pauley	Associate counsel (from Feb. 6, 1973, through Mar. 31, 1973).	4,666.67
Franklin G. Polk	Associate counsel (through Mar. 31, 1973).	7,736.68
Joan Porter	Clerical staff (from May 14, 1973).	$1,148.88
Ruth T. Pratt	Clerical staff (through Jan. 31, 1973).	902.61
Ruth O. Robinson	Assistant counsel (from Apr. 2, 1973).	5,686.12
Ann P. Sartori	Clerical staff (through Feb. 6, 1973).	1,048.33
Arden B. Schell	Assistant counsel (from Mar. 13, 1973).	4,799.99
Alice M. Smith	Clerical staff (from Jan. 2, 1973).	5,013.66
Mary G. Sourwine	Clerical staff	7,368.80
Jared B. Stamell	Assistant counsel (from Mar. 6, 1973).	6,388.90
Peter T. Straub	Associate counsel (from Feb. 19, 1973).	9,716.65
Annelie Tischbein	Clerical staff (through Apr. 30, 1973).	3,603.33
Louis S. Vance	Messenger-clerk	5,213.29
Dorothy C. Wadley	Clerical staff (from Mar. 7, 1973).	3,483.35
Priscilla A. Welsh	Clerical staff (from Jan. 2, 1973, through Mar. 30, 1973).	2,688.90
Minne White	Clerical staff	8,900.00
Janice A. Zarro	Assistant counsel (from May 14, 1973).	1,893.05

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$536,217.75
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973, through June 30, 1973	211,251.29
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	324,966.46

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1972	$94,960.05
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	26,900.42
Balance June 30, 1973	68,059.63
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1972	197,636.08
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	28,898.43
Balance June 30, 1973	168,737.65
C. Revision of the Laws, 1973:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1972	21,980.00
Expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	18,000.00
Balance June 30, 1973	3,980.00

PETER W. RODINO, JR., Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

July 9, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Ernest J. Corrado	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Neb P. Everett	Counsel	15,917.56
Francis D. Heyward	Counsel (February-June).	9,181.25
Leonard L. Sutter	Counsel	14,000.00
Robert J. McElroy	Chief clerk (January)	2,997.19
Frances P. Still	Clerk (January), chief clerk (February-June).	5,140.51
W. Bernard Winfield	Clerk	11,867.77
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	9,625.00
Albert J. Dennis	Investigator (January)	1,916.67
Terrence W. Modglin	Clerk (February)	708.33
Richard N. Sharood	Minority counsel	15,000.00
William C. Rountree	do	10,500.00
Virginia L. Noah	Minority clerk	9,500.00
Investigative committee staff:		
Francis D. Heyward	Counsel (January)	2,285.83
A. Ronald Santo	do	1,666.67
Gus Bakas	do	1,666.67
Mary C. McDonnell	Counsel (February-June).	8,750.00
Frank M. Potter, Jr.	Counsel (March-June)	5,700.00

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—Con.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carl L. Perian	Professional staff member.	$13,000.00
William H. Hamilton	Professional staff member (April–June).	4,666.67
Donald A. Watt	Editor	10,108.98
Terrence W. Modglin	Clerk (March–June)	3,208.32
Ruth I. Hoffman	Assistant clerk	7,000.00
Ronald W. C. Watt	Assistant clerk (January).	833.33
Jacquelyn M. Westcott	Stenographer-clerk (February–June).	5,416.65
Eleanor P. Mohler	Secretary	6,250.00
Betty Ann Nevitt	do	6,111.11
Pauline M. Dickerson	Secretary (January)	1,367.11
Lucye L. Summers	do	1,083.06
Jane C. Wojcik	do	1,298.83
Gwendolyn H. Lockhart.	Assistant minority clerk.	6,500.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$291,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended— from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	89,588.7
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	89,588.77
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	201,911.23

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

July 10, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Martiny, John H	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Smiroldo, Victor C	Staff director and counsel.	17,749.98
Irvine, William A	Assistant staff director	17,749.98
Kazy, Theodore J	Senior staff assistant	17,749.98
Mesker, Roy C	Staff assistant (from Mar. 15).	10,452.77
Fortune, Francis C	Coordinator	14,800.02
Lockhart, Robert E	Assistant counsel	15,049.98
Devlin, Ralph J	Staff assistant	14,599.98
Thornton, Elsie E	Chief clerk	12,750.00
Wells, Barbara M	Executive secretary	9,480.00
Simons, Blanche M	Secretary	8,755.02
Investigative staff, pursuant to H. Res. 180 and 261 of the 93d Cong., 1st sess.:		
Full committee:		
Andrews, Julia L	Junior staff assistant (Mar. 5–16).	150.00
Barry, Margaret	Secretary (minority)	5,438.91
Bates, Kathryn E	do	6,526.67
Brown, Lorraine L	Secretary (to Jan. 31)	812.91
Bakall, Diane A	Intern (from May 21)	600.00
Coultrap, Ray H	Staff assistant (minority).	7,441.41
Gabusi, John B	Staff assistant	12,476.75
Gustafson, Tanya A.	Intern (minority) (from June 25).	80.00
Harding, Delois	Secretary (to Feb. 28)	1,682.73
Howard, Alton M	Printing editor	9,987.76
Hugler, Edward T	Investigator	14,091.67
Kennedy, Thomas R.	Staff assistant (to Feb. 28).	4,154.11
Napier, Margaret G.	Secretary	5,878.92
Pendleton, Maria R	Document clerk	8,855.50
Peters, Dorothy L	Secretary	7,802.33
Raymond, Anthony J.	Staff assistant (minority).	12,262.24
Scoville, Stanley E.	Research assistant (to Feb. 28).	2,416.68
Thomas, Catharin	Assistant document clerk.	4,885.09
Warfield, Pamela T.	Secretary (Feb. 1–28)	908.33
Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee:		
Campbell, Austin B.	Assistant counsel (to Apr. 30).	$5,736.10
Snipes, Justine P	Secretary	7,628.20
Bethea, Barbara F	Junior staff assistant	3,857.78
Pankonin, Patricia G.	Secretary (from May 6).	1,604.17
Holton, Ann C	Intern (from May 21)	533.33
Postal Service Subcommittee:		
Barton, Richard A	Staff assistant	12,475.13
Cox, Cassandra L	Secretary (from May 1).	1,416.66
Hatcherson, Jane W.	Secretary (to May 15)	3,621.67
Gates, Gregory A	Intern (from June 1)	300.00
Burwell, Robert J	do	300.00
Postal Facilities, Mail, and Labor Management Subcommittee:		
Gould, George B	Staff assistant	13,453.68
Mahoney, Joseph T.	Associate staff assistant (from Mar. 1).	3,833.32
Ciaravella, Jo Ann	Secretary	5,456.47
Brand, Hugh McGuire, Jr.	Intern (from June 1)	400.00
Stetler, Mary Catherine.	Intern (from June 11)	266.67
Retirement and Employee Benefits Subcommittee:		
Neuman, Robert A	Staff assistant (to Mar. 31).	5,622.23
Terry, Donald F	Staff assistant	6,319.44
Lumb, Carol P	Secretary (to Feb. 11)	891.81
Gwinn, Mansel Bruce.	Clerk (from Feb. 12)	3,088.90
Schreiber, Ann F	Staff assistant (from Apr. 1).	6,125.01
Lee ,Clifford Thomas.	Intern (from June 25)	60.00
Census and Statistics Subcommittee:		
Bullock, Richard D	Staff assistant (from May 24).	2,775.00
Bray, Austin C. Jr	Assistant counsel (from Mar. 1).	5,000.00
LaMotte, Bettie J	Secretary (from Mar. 1).	4,000.00
Kerry, Linda Louise.	Intern (from June 12)	190.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$638,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	235,285.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	402,714.87

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

June 30, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	$18,000.00
Lester Edelman	Counsel	17,789.70
Lloyd A. Rivard	Engineer consultant	17,789.70
Carl H. Schwartz, Jr.	Consultant—projects and programs.	6,864.00
James L. Oberstar	Administrator	17,795.25
Dorothy A. Beam	Executive staff assistant.	12,228.12
Meriam R. Buckley	Calendar clerk	10,198.80
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Staff assistant	8,524.44
Ruth Costello	do	9,094.62
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	18,000.00
Richard C. Peet	Associate minority counsel.	17,716.08
Erla S. Youmans	Minority executive staff assistant.	10,260.36
Investigating staff:		
Phyllis Beall	Staff assistant	4,202.76
Steven H. Bourke	do	9,597.88
Peggy Lynn Clements	do	$6,675.00
William M. Corcoran	do	4,944.42
Patricia Carol Cross	Staff assistant (effective Mar. 15, 1973).	1,794.44
Catherine A. Evans	Staff assistant	4,964.66
Roger B. Furey	Staff assistant (effective Jan. 18, 1973).	2,248.61
Karen Maria Gilbert	Staff assistant	5,582.26
Anne Louise Howard	Staff assistant (effective May 29, 1973).	777.78
Ann J. Joseph	Staff assistant	4,301.67
Diana L. Juarez	Staff assistant (effective June 18, 1973).	216.67
Elizabeth Hall Kiley	Staff assistant (terminated Apr. 30, 1973).	2,181.47
Mary Kathryn Leonard	Staff assistant	4,568.79
Margaret McCarthy	do	4,673.51
Machele Miller	do	4,723.51
Shirley Ruhe	do	5,841.84
Robert F. Spence	do	9,465.56
Toby J. Stein	do	4,107.88
Clyde E. Woodle, Jr	Staff assistant (effective Jan. 29, 1973).	7,008.87
Olga Wynnyk	Staff assistant (effective Mar. 12, 1973).	2,422.23
Patricia A. Hill	Minority staff assistant.	6,427.76
Richard C. Barnett	do	7,278.00
Brenda G. Jones	do	4,936.06
Pauline L. DeCourcy	Minority staff assistant (terminated Mar. 31, 1973).	2,570.10
Alexandra R. Sassoon	Minority staff assistant (effective Mar. 1, 1973).	3,333.32
Joanne Marie Morrone	Minority staff assistant (effective Mar. 19, 1973).	2,833.32
Cheryl Ann Meyers	Minority staff assistant (effective Apr. 5, 1973).	2,269.45
Errol Lee Tyler	Associate counsel (effective Mar. 10, 1973).	9,250.00
Joseph A. Italiano	Editorial assistant	11,009.60
Robert F. Loftus	Technical staff assistant.	15,905.07
Henry G. Edler	Project coordinator (transferred to subcommittee on energy Mar. 1, 1973).	5,609.08
Ruth Constandy	Technical consultant (terminated Feb. 12, 1972).	2,578.89
Gordon E. Wood	Assistant minority counsel.	13,688.87
Marie M. Lynch	Clerk, Subcommittee on Water Resources.	7,025.90
Nancy B. Vitali	Clerk, Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.	6,423.85
Carl J. Lorenz	Counsel, Subcommittee on Economic Development (effective Mar. 1, 1973).	11,092.28
Subcommittee on Energy:		
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Counsel (effective Mar. 1, 1973).	11,172.54
Henry G. Edler	Technical adviser (effective Mar. 1, 1973).	11,605.00
Carole Dahlstedt	Clerk (effective Apr. 1, 1973).	3,999.99
Stephanie G. Negley	Staff assistant (effective Mar. 26, 1973).	3,166.67
June M. O'Connell	Staff assistant (effective May 14, 1973).	1,357.78
Subcommittee on Investigations and Review:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	17,800.00
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Associate counsel (transferred to Subcommittee on Energy Mar. 1, 1973).	5,361.27
John P. O'Hara	Associate counsel	16,453.55
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr	Associate counsel (transferred to Subcommittee on EDA Mar. 1, 1973).	5,361.27
Robert G. Lawrence	Associate counsel	17,096.31
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	17,800.00
Sherman S. Willse	Professional staff member (terminated Feb. 28, 1973).	5,361.27
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	10,397.19

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Betty Hay Wright	Administrative assistant.	$9,877.34
Shirley B. Novotny	Staff assistant	6,855.67
Carol Dahlstedt	Staff assistant (transferred to Subcommittee on Energy, Apr. 1, 1973).	3,389.32
William O. Nolen	Investigator	10,969.01
George P. Karseboom	Professional staff member.	14,808.17
Charles A. Krouse	do	14,426.52
Agnes M. Ganun	Staff assistant	7,101.13
Virginia Middledorf	Staff assistant (effective Apr. 15, 1973).	2,660.00
Sheldon Gilbert	Minority counsel	15,595.77
Paul R. S. Yates	Professional minority staff member.	16,635.46
Martha F. Downie	Minority staff assistant	7,404.09
F. Robert Edman	Consultant	8,300.00
Richard C. Royce	do	4,200.00
Max Taher	do	4,300.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 285)	$1,519,700.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	483,037.05
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	1,036,662.95

JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

July 18, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurie C. Battle	Staff director and counsel (P).	$18,000.00
Margaret Anne Bundick	Staff assistant (C)	7,864.55
William D. Crosby, Jr	Minority counsel (P)	12,598.83
Jonna Lynne Cullen	Assistant minority counsel (P).	9,529.86
Donald Gregory Nicosia	Research analyst (C)	7,797.88
Winifred L. Watts	Administrative assistant (P).	10,497.99
Dorothy Ballenger	Secretary (C)	5,458.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	1,239.36
Balance unexpended	3,760.64

RAY J. MADDEN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

July 10, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John L. Swigert, Jr	Staff director (from April 29).	$6,200.00
Charles F. Ducander	Chief counsel	18,000.00
James E. Wilson, Jr	Deputy director	18,000.00
John A. Carstarphen, Jr	Chief clerk and counsel	$18,000.00
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	18,000.00
Frank R. Hammill, Jr	do	18,000.00
Carl Swartz	Minority staff	12,857.62
Joseph Del Riego	do	12,469.11
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	7,964.51
Emily Dodson	do	7,632.58
Carol F. Rodgers	do	7,447.95
June C. Stafford	do	7,447.95
Theresa M. Gallo	do	5,506.55
Investigative staff (H. Res. 270):		
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant	18,000.00
William G. Wells, Jr	do	16,198.52
J. Thomas Ratchford	Science consultant	16,510.89
John D. Holmfeld	Science policy consultant.	13,303.47
Thomas N. Tate	Technical consultant and counsel (from May 12).	3,675.00
Richard P. Hines	Technical consultant (to Mar. 31).	8,992.44
Philip P. Dickinson	do	7,885.03
Frank J. Giroux	Printing clerk	9,707.28
George W. Fisher	Clerk (from Apr. 1)	9,000.00
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant.	4,760.87
Martha N. Rees	Secretary	7,128.63
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	8,406.65
Patricia J. Schwartz	Secretary	5,619.23
Hazel R. Justice	Secretary (to Jan. 31)	785.98
Garnette Benton	Secretary (to Feb. 12)	1,855.07
Rita W. Schwall	Secretary (from Apr. 17).	3,031.95
Judith Ann Everett	Secretary (from May 1).	1,416.66
Don Cooper	Publications clerk (from June 1).	958.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$380,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	161,252.29
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	161,252.29
Balance unexpended as of June 3, 1973	218,747.71

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

July 3, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Swanner	Staff director	$18,000.0
Bennett Wolfe	Assistant staff director.	16,670.22
Robert G. Allett	Senior staff member	18,000.00
Mariann R. Mackenzie	Secretary	11,697.42
Tempie W. Whittington	Assistant clerk	6,648.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures H. Res. 219 (Mar. 20, 1973)	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	0
Amount expended from Jan. 3, to June 30, 1973	1,033.35
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	1,033.35
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	23,966.65

MELVIN PRICE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

July 13, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	$18,000.00
Donald C. Knapp	Counsel	18,000.00
John R. Holden	Professional staff member (minority).	17,177.90
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide	17,177.90
Arthur M. Gottschalk	Professional aide (minority).	11,640.57
George W. Fisher	Clerk (through Mar. 31, 1973).	9,000.00
Helen A. Biondi	Clerk (from May 1, 1973).	12,170.82
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	8,296.55
Morvie Ann Colby	do	8,062.20
Marjorie J. Kidd	do	7,710.67
Diana Sue Gaujot	Clerk-Stenographer (minority) from June 1, 1973.	833.33
Patricia J. Wilton	Clerk-stenographer (minority) (through May 31, 1973).	5,063.15
Investigative staff:		
Audrey A. Powelson	Clerk-stenographer	6,076.44
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	17,065.16
Candis L. Graves	Clerk-stenographer	4,975.73
Vance L. Gilliam	Records clerk	4,804.70
Barbara Price Daniel	Clerk-stenographer	5,516.88
Sylvia Meadows	do	1,033.34
Margaret Boswell	do	792.23
Susan Dawkins	do	516.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	49,785.67
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	49,785.67
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	100,214.33

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

July 1, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
John M. Martin, Jr	Chief Counsel (P)	$18,000.00
Richard C. Wilbur	Minority Counsel (P)	18,000.00
John Patrick Baker	Assistant Chief Counsel (P).	17,749.98
Robert B. Hill	Professional Staff (P)	14,040.42
William Kane	do	17,457.78
James W. Kelley	do	17,749.98
Harold Lamar	do	17,749.98
A. L. Singleton, Jr	do	16,556.78
Florence Burkett	Staff Assistant (C)	8,202.72
Virginia Butler	do	9,750.12
William C. Byrd	do	6,613.80
Marie Crane	do	8,064.54
William Fullerton	do	17,749.98
Charles Hawkins	do	17,749.98
Grace Kagan	do	9,750.12
June Kendall	do	11,623.74
Elizabeth Lieblich	do	4,625.76
Danna Palmer	do	5,130.18
Doris Parker	do	5,125.56
Marsha Powell	do	4,994.16
Jean Ratliff	do	5,950.38
Karen Schwarz	do	6,045.54
Gloria Shaver	do	9,456.18
Margo Shildkret	do	4,468.44
Carole Vazis	do	7,555.12
Kaye Anne Weinstein	Staff assistant (C) to June 15.	6,493.71
Hughlon Greene	Document Clerk (C)	8,202.72
Walter Little	do	8,202.72
Under H. Res. 263, 93d Congress:		
John Meagher		17,348.10
Connie Faulkner (from April 6).		2,243.07

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Don Johnson (from June 15).		$400.00
Donald Whistler (from June 1).		200.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None.
Amount expended from Janaury 1 to June 30, 1973	32,480.92
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	92,519.08

WIBUR D. MILLS, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

July 2, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 31 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Sheldon II	Chief of staff	$9,000.00
Melvin M. Miller	Deputy chief of staff	12,000.00
Gerald J. Grady	Professional staff member.	7,540.29
Spencer M. Beresford	Counsel	10,300.00
Linda H. Kamm	do	9,266.67
Robert C. Ketcham	Special counsel	9,250.00
Roger H. Davidson	Professional staff member.	5,168.06
Terence T. Finn	Staff consultant	6,500.00
Dennis J. Taylor	Associate counsel	7,655.57
Mary E. Zalar	Chief clerk	5,000.00
Linda G. Stephenson	Assistant clerk	3,800.00
Shirley A. Kalich	Secretary	4,033.35
Rose M. Sanko	do	3,366.67
Carmen T. Bagherzadeh	do	3,333.32
C. Carleda Broughton	do	2,625.00
Joan Bannon Bachula	Research assistant	200.0

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$1,500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 31 to June 30, 1973	99,038.93
Total amount expended from Jan. 31 to June 30, 1973	99,038.93
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	1,400,961.07

RICHARD BOLLING, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

August 3, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 31 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Appleby, M. Irene	Secretary	$5,742.39
Bass, Avanell K.	Office manager	8,358.58
Beccaccio, Livio A.	Investigator	11,618.80
Bedell, Leroy C., Jr.	Investigator, to Mar. 31 and investigator-hearings officer, from Apr. 1 to Apr. 30 and investigator, from May 1.	11,030.88
Blommer, Michael W.	Associate chief counsel, to Feb. 12.	3,583.52
Boysen, Mary R.	Secretary to associate counsel, to Jan. 15.	514.32
Canty, Marian	Secretary to chairman	$7,824.11
Collison, Frederick B.	Investigator	9,427.50
Collison, Judith Ann	Secretary, from Apr. 11.	2,305.55
Cook, Martha A.	Secretary, to Mar. 31 and press officer, from Apr. 1.	6,316.04
Douglass, Miriam E.	Secretary, to June 19	5,509.98
Downey, Mary Faye	Secretary to Apr. 2	2,409.48
Duran, Lina Mabel	Staff executive secretary, to Mar. 31 and secretary-deputy chief counsel, from Apr. 1.	7,266.01
Dweck, Jacob	Research assistant, from May 25.	822.60
Englander, Patti	Research assistant, from June 1.	495.00
Fisher, Judith B.	Secretary, to Feb. 28	2,083.34
Garrigan, Leah	Secretary, from Mar. 5	3,812.50
Goulart, Mary M.	Finance officer	8,799.50
Grey, Evelyn Savage	Researcher	6,826.02
Henley, Martha S.	Research assistant, from June 1.	428.40
Lynch, Richard P.	Assistant counsel, to Feb. 28 and deputy chief counsel, from Mar. 1.	15,538.92
Madden, Raphael J.	Research assistant	4,532.86
McDonald, James E.	Investigator, to Mar. 31 and Assistant counsel, from Apr. 1.	11,030.88
McKenna, Robert E.	Investigator	11,425.60
Nolde H. Christopher	Associate counsel, to Feb. 28 and chief counsel, from Mar. 1.	17,119.32
O'Halloran, F. Thomas	Assistant counsel, from Apr. 16 to May 11.	1,906.84
Otters, N. Ross	Investigator, to Feb. 22.	3,047.77
Petit, Michael D.	Press officer, to Mar. 31 and information director, from Apr. 1.	11,618.80
Phillips, Joseph A.	Chief counsel, to Jan. 31.	3,000.00
Reeping, Pauline B.	Secretary to chief counsel, to Feb. 28 and secretary to the chief counsel, from Mar. 1.	8,082.46
Riggins, Evelyn	Secretary, from May 1	1,120.00
Roth, Caroline	Secretary, from Jan. 2 to Jan. 2.	30.56
Schauer, Margaret M.	Research assistant	6,711.38
Seal, Betty B.	Secretary to associate chief counsel, to Apr. 9.	2,891.36
Seidman, Ellen Shapiro	Research assistant, from May 21 to June 2.	171.36
Sullivan, Thomas K.	Investigator	11,618.80
Trainor, Robert J.	Assistant counsel, from Mar. 25.	5,429.16
Wales, Heathcote W.	Special counsel, from June 19.	900.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$331,620.20
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	263,623.31
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973.	263,623.31
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	67,996.89

CLAUDE PEPPER, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

July 9, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell	Staff director	$117.68
Barbara E. Cousins	Secretary	46.32
Total		164.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (92d Cong.)	$44,141.98
Amount of expenditures previously reported	28,713.37
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to Jan. 2, 1973	213.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1972 to Jan. 2, 1973	28,927.27
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 2, 1973 (92d Cong.)	15,214.72

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

July 9, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell	Staff director	$10,472.68
Barbara E. Cousins	Secretary	4,123.26
Total		14,595.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (93d Cong.)	$33,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Jan. 3, 1973 to June 30, 1973	14,820.99
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	18,679.01

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Chairman.

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

July 14, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Emilia E. Parrish	Secretary	$6,349.98
Brenda H. Napier	do	4,583.34
William A. Keel, Jr.	Research analyst	18,000.00
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	11,500.00
Donna M. Watson	Secretary	4,702.50
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	17,500.02
Leslie A. Glick	do	4,416.67
Leslie R. Pennington (Resigned June 30, 1973).	Printing editor	9,900.00
Thomas G. Powers	Counsel	8,749.98
Elizabeth Turlington	Secretary	3,791.67
Justinus Gould	Counsel	17,291.67
Donald B. Roe (resigned Mar. 31, 1973).	do	5,000.01
Mary Eileen Hohman	Secretary	3,750.00
Howard Greenberg	Staff director	18,000.00
Lucille C. Hicks	Secretary	6,750.00
Millard V. Oakley (resigned Apr. 30, 1973).	General counsel	12,000.00
Charles E. O'Connor (resigned May 31, 1973).	Counsel	7,910.00
Christine Ann Stewart	Secretary	3,541.65
Michael J. Ward	Counsel	3,125.01
Robert M. Walker	Staff assistant	4,750.00
Linda Louise Spakes	Secretary	5,583.34
Charles D. Loyd	General counsel	1,600.00
Bernadette O. Romanesk	Secretary, minority	5,749.98
James R. Phalen	Minority counsel	13,000.02
Susan Pearce	Secretary, minority	4,999.98

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—Continued

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul Kritzer	Assistant minority counsel.	$11,250.00
Elmira R. Stewart	Secretary, minority	4,099.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$563,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	221,969.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1973	221,969.90
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	341,030.10

JOE L. EVINS, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

July 12, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Eugene F. Peters	Executive director	$18,000.00
Raymond L. Gooch	Staff counsel	15,250.02
Cynthia K. Watkins	Office manager	6,833.33
Donald G. Tacheron	Director of research	17,749.98
George Meader	Staff counsel	17,920.47
Ann Holoka	Research assistant	8,500.00
Reta Orem	Receptionist/clerk	2,141.66
Beverly Jean Muncy	Stenographer	2,866.67
Robert J. Kelley	Administrative Officer	9,624.98
Richard M. Bates	Placement clerk	3,791.67
James F. McAllister	Administrative Officer	13,750.02
Anne Garrett Burfield	Temporary clerk	222.22
Gerard C. Snow	Administrative Officer	4,791.68
Laura Reed	Temporary clerk	252.78
James S. Machowski	Placement clerk	4,249.98
Raul Robert Tapia	Temporary clerk	1,500.00
Sally Katherine Murphy	Placement clerk	311.11
Stephen E. Markovich	Temporary clerk	375.00
Robert David Agree	do	1,000.00
March E. Dyer	Placement clerk	4,166.66
Betty A. Franklin	do	3,688.88
Lee A. Riedel	do	2,766.66
Ingrid V. Percival	Temporary clerk	369.44
Jerrie Lynne Warthan	do	208.33
Peggy L. Thornton	do	186.67
Mary Catherine Pugh	do	1,372.24
John R. Spear	Placement clerk	895.83
Mark L. Greenberg	do	1,594.43
Karen B. Graham	do	2,057.78
Grace Seckler	do	1,594.43
Terrell M. Tannen	do	979.17
Gerald P. McCartin	Temporary clerk	1,875.00
Denise Ann West	Placement clerk	711.11
J. E. Vandelly	Temporary clerk	3,000.00
Jerome N. Eller	do	1,000.00
Marguerite E. West	do	330.55
Diane Spiegel	Placement clerk	256.67
Peter B. Crouch	Temporary clerk	1,500.00
Janice Kay Casner	Stenographer	1,875.00
Fay C. Hilterbrick	Temporary clerk	766.67
Mooney A. Stotesbury	Stenographer	330.55
Ernest Lee Dugas	Clerk	1,399.99
Barbara S. Hoffman	Temporary clerk	1,200.00
Susan B. Perry	do	3,166.67
Robert W. Witt	do	3,430.55
William F. Walsh	do	5,450.00
Richard T. Galgay	do	3,461.12
John Gilman Stewart	do	2,000.00
Paul W. McKee	do	2,966.67
William B. Blacklow	do	3,034.71
Martha Grundman	do	222.22
Joan M. Porter	do	111.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$460,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	143,297.69
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1973	231,111.06
Total amount expended from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973	374,408.75
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	85,591.25

LEE METCALF, Chairman.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period

JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

July 31, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross 6-month salary during period
Harold J. Warren	Staff director and and counsel.	$17,244.80
Charles S. Brewton	General counsel	17,916.31
Cary H. Copeland	Assistant staff director.	12,899.64
Mattie I. Echols	Secretary	6,070.14
Charles H. Liner, Jr	Professional staff	3,500.00
Robert S. Riggs	Staff assistant	4,205.58
J. Michael Hemphill	Professional staff	9,772.50
Robert B. Geddie, Jr	Staff assistant	4,611.09
Linda Mace McKee	Clerk	788.55
Adrienne Ann Hampton	do	657.13

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$143,530.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	65,771.76
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1973 to June 30, 1973	77,711.78
Total amount expended from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973	143,483.54
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1973	46.46

JOHN SPARKMAN, Chairman.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

July 15, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to July 1, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurence N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	$19,999.98
Lincoln Arnold	Deputy chief of staff	18,000.00
Arthur Fefferman	Chief economist	18,000.00
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Legislation counsel	18,000.00
Herbert L. Chabot	Assistant legislation counsel.	17,895.00
Harrison B. McCawley	Refund counsel	14,714.17
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	18,000.00
John Germanis	do	14,937.48
Albert Buckberg	Economist	16,633.33
Michael D. Bird	do	16,935.42
Leon Klud	do	11,141.67
Bernard M. Shapiro	Legislation attorney	15,757.08
Mark L. McConaghy	do	12,461.67
Donald C. Evans	do	12,436.67
Howard J. Silverstone	do	15,068.73
Robert A. Warden	do	15,068.73
Robert A. Blum	do	12,545.00
James Billinger	do	12,436.67
Joseph P. Spellman	Refund attorney	11,469.98
Carl E. Bates	do	11,469.98
Anastasia Connaughton	Statistical clerk	11,586.48
Joseph E. Fink	do	11,638.73
Allan Rosenbaum	Accountant	12,159.33
Joanne McDermott	Secretary	9,283.32
Linda Savage	do	7,262.90
Blanche Nagro	Secretary (refund)	7,037.50
Jamie L. Daley	Secretary	6,543.73
June Matthews	do	5,979.57
Marcia B. Rowzie	do	6,365.43
Amelia Del Carmen	do	5,871.23
Sharon Malcom	Secretary (refund)	4,691.68
Jacqueline S. Pfeiffer	Secretary	6,409.18
Ellen I. Woodriff	do	5,045.43
Alexa Gage	do	5,470.83
Theresa Sbarra	do	5,045.43
Elizabeth Freret	Legislation attorney (Jan. 2, to May 4, 1973).	8,541.65
Maria L. Winter	Secretary (as of Feb. 20, 1973).	$3,879.16
Richard Eigenbrode	Clerk (as of May 10, 1973).	850.00
Michael Cook	Clerk (as of Mar. 1, 1973).	2,541.67
Cynthia F. Wallace	Statistical clerk (as of June 25, 1973).	216.67
Herman H. Wommack	Clerk (as of June 19, 1973).	266.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$937,720.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	401,680.15
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1973	441,882.92
Total amount expended from July 1, 1972, to July 1, 1973	843,563.07
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1973	94,156.93

WILBUR D. MILLS, Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

July 18, 1973.

To the Clerk of the House:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1 to June 30, 1973, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John Warren McGarry	Chief counsel	$12,600.00
David H. Bodiker	Minority counsel	11,039.70
Jeanette E. White	Secretary	5,467.28
Mary Patricia Kelly	do	2,368.76
Susan Thompson	Secretary (Apr. 1 to June 6).	693.92
Louise M. Hallahan	Secretary (2 months)	630.84
Kathy Sandy	Secretary (2 days)	73.34
Jeanne Vertner	do	50.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$45,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (special committee)	
Amount expended from Jan. 2 to June 6	39,262.76
Balance unexpended as of June 6	5,737.24

NEAL SMITH, Chairman.

GENERAL LEAVE

All Members (at the request of Mr. LITTON) to extend their remarks on the subject of the special order of (Mr REES) today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DU PONT) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter):

Mr. BIESTER for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BAKER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RUPPE, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LITTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REES, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Miss HOLTZMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HÉBERT, and to include extraneous material immediately following the vote today on the conference report on H.R. 8214.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,933.25.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin to extend his remarks during debate on the conference report on S. 502 today.

Mr. RHODES and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $522.50.

Mr. MILLER to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD just prior to the vote on the conference report on S. 502 today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, relating to his remarks made earlier today on S. 592.

Mr. HUNGATE to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter during debate on conference report on H.R. 7935.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DU PONT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. BELL in two instances.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. MIZELL in 10 instances.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. KETCHUM in two instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. DELLENBACK in four instances.

Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.

Mr. KEATING in six instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in four instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. FROEHLICH.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois in four instances

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. MYERS in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. REGULA in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. MCKINNEY in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio in four instances.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mr. SARASIN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD in five instances.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. BUCHANAN in five instances.

Mr. CRANE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LITTON) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. STEED in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. GAYDOS in two instances.

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.

Mr. REES in five instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in 10 instances.

Mr. MOAKLEY in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. BYRON in five instances.

Mr. DIGGS in two instances.

Mr. HICKS.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in five instances.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. HUNGATE in three instances.

Mr. BURTON in two instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. FISHER in two instances.

Mr. ROE in four instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. GETTYS.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

Mr. BIAGGI in 10 instances.

Mr. KYROS in five instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. PREYER.

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. DULSKI in five instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Miss JORDAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1980. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2058. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for the regulation of clearing agencies and transfer agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3630. An act to extend until September 30, 1975, the suspension of duty on certain dyeing and tanning products and to include logwood among such products;

H.R. 4083. An act to improve the laws relating to the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5649. An act to extend until November 1, 1978, the existing exemption of the steamboat *Delta Queen* from certain vessel laws;

H.R. 6370. An act to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividend is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6676. An act to continue until July 1, 1976, the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6713. An act to amend the District of Columbia Election Act regarding the times for filing certain petitions, regulating the primary electon for Delegate from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7935. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates under that act, to expand the coverage of that act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8152. An act to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve law enforcement and criminal justice, and for other purposes;

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

H.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 26, 1973, as "Women's Equality Day"; and

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second full week in October 1973 as "National Legal Secretaries' Court Observance Week".

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1410. To amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for three months the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury;

S. 1887. An act to provide for the appointment of alternates for the governors of the International Monetary Fund and of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, 93d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on September 5, 1973.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 5, 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:

1210. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Administration, transmitting a report on the use of appropriated funds by the Department of Commerce during fiscal year 1973 for the support of executive dining rooms, pursuant to Public Law 92–607; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1211. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, pursuant to Public Law 92–403; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1212. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the U.S. Government Comptroller for the Virgin Islands for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to Public Law 90–496; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1213. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket Nos. 217, 15–K, and 29–J, *Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma and Potawatomi Nation represented by Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, et al.; The Prairie Band of the Potawatomi Tribe of Indians, et al.; and Hannahville Indian Community, et al., plaintiffs*, v. *The United States of America, defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1214. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determination of the Commission in docket No. 304, *The Ottawa Tribe and Guy Jennison, Bronson Edwards and Gene Jennison, as representatives of the Ottawa Tribe, plaintiffs*, v. *The United States of America, defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1215. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the annual report on the cost of clean air, pursuant to section 312(a) of the Clean Air Act, as amended by Public Law 91–604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1216. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on scientific and engineering positions established in NASA as of June 30, 1973, under the provision of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 426, 429), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2473(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1217. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the use of appropriated funds by the General Accounting Office during fiscal year 1973 for the support of executive dining rooms, pursuant to Public Law 92–607; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1218. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the use of revenue sharing funds by the 50 State governments and the District of Columbia; 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. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6274. A bill to grant relief to payees and special indorsees of fraudulently negotiated checks drawn on designated depositaries of the United States by extending the availability of the check forgery insurance fund, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1376. A bill for the relief of J. B. Riddle: with amendment (Rept. No. 93–445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2207. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Leeba; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MANN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 396. An act for the relief of Harold C. and Vera L. Adler, doing business as the Adler Construction Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. MAILLIARD):

H.R. 9862. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUBER, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 9863. A bill to amend section 1951, title 18, United States Code, act of July 3, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 9864. A bill to amend section 1951, title 18, United States Code, act of July 3, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAFALIS:

H.R. 9865. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 9866. A bill to deauthorize permanently the recently halted Cross-Florida Barge Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WARE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 9867. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Mifflin National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9868. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital in the Bronx, N.Y., as the Henry A. Whalen Memorial Veterans' Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 9869. A bill to amend the Duck Stamp Act with respect to the treatment of moneys received from the sale of migratory-bird hunting stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 9870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a tax credit for certain expenses of providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGENER (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. YOUNG of Illinois, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 9871. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a reduced retirement annuity for a Member of Congress who remains in office after becoming 70 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 9872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer or his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education, and an additional credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE (for himself, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WINN, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. GUYER, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 9873. A bill to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State to be known as the U.S. Passport Service, to establish a Passport Service Fund to finance the operations of the U.S. Passport Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 9874. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and to strengthen and improve the private retirement system by establishing minimum standards for participation in and for vesting of benefits under pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9875. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 9876. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code increasing income limitations relating to payment of disability and death pension, and dependency and indemnity compensation and to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility for pensions under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 9877. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to substitute a single subsidy housing program for the existing plethora of programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9878. A bill to provide long-term custodial care and home care to the chronically ill; to the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 9879. A bill to require the President to include in the budget transmitted to Congress additional information showing the regional impact of the budget proposals by State and congressional districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. NIX, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. STARK, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. MCCORMACK):

H.R. 9880. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit, and to make certain changes with respect to the civil liability provisions of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. DON CLAUSEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. JONES of Oklahoma):

H.R. 9881. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of credit, and to make certain changes with respect to the civil liability provisions of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 9882. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9883. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9884. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9885. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income taxes or a payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9886. A bill to amend the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $3,000 of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9888. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain retroactive changes in qualified pension plans and change certain provisions concerning qualification of pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETCHUM:

H.R. 9889. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangement shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9890. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of tuition, in addition to educational assistance allowances, for veterans pursuing educational programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9891. A bill to increase veterans education assistance rates by 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9892. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to grant to veterans 45 months of educational assistance entitlement and to extend the limitation on such assistance under two or more programs to 55 months; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9893. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to repeal the delimiting period for completing programs of education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9894. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to prohibit the importation of agricultural commodities when pesticides are used in conection with such commodities in a manner which is prohibited in the United States by any Federal law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9895. A bill to provide Federal programs of educational, employment, and other assistance to areas with heavy concentrations of foreign-born persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 9896. A bill to amend section 412(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit approval of certain air carrier agreements by the Civil Aeronautics Board, except in case of an emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9898. A bill to authorize recomputation at age 60 of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect prior to January 1, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 9899. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for drug abuse therapy programs in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 9900. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for drug abuse therapy programs in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. THONE, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 9901. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for drug abuse therapy programs in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 9902. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to require pension plan termination insurance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. BURKE of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. REES, Mr. RANGEL Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 9903. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to make it clear that an individual who is not working because of a strike or other labor dispute will be considered unemployed for purposes of aid with respect to dependent children of unemployed

fathers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 9904. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide grants to States and units of local government for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the national emergency telephone No. 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 9905. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for voluntary agreements between ministers and their employers to treat ministers as employed persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9906. A bill to amend titles 39 and 5, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 9907. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9908. A bill to provide for project grants for the development and demonstration of programs for rehabilitative, habilitative, personal support, residential, medical, dental, and mental health services for the chronically ill residents of identified population areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9909. A bill to establish an equitable private retirement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H.R. 9910. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to make available to Nevada the Red Rock Recreation Lands, located in Clark County, Nev., for use for park and recreation purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BELL, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. COLLIER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FREY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 9911. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 9912. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAGGONNER (for himself, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. ICHORD):

H.R. 9913. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON of New York, and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 9914. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that remarriage of the widow of a veteran after age 60 shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9915. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," with respect to determining when the cost of certain articles, materials, or supplies is unreasonable; to define when articles, materials, and supplies have been mined, produced or manufactured in the United States; to make clear the right of any State to give preference to domestically produced goods in purchasing for public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina:

H.R. 9916. A bill to establish in the State of South Carolina the Snow Island National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina (for himself, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Ms. ABZUG and Ms. HOLTZMAN):

H.R. 9918. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 9919. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BELL (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. ROE, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WINN, and Mr. CRONIN):

H.R. 9920. A bill to direct the National Science Foundation to undertake an expanded program of earthquake prevention and prediction research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9921. A bill to authorize recomputation at age 60 of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect prior to January 1, 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9922. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9923. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the recrediting of sick leave of employees previously separated from the service for not more than 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9924. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. REES, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 9925. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend the Horizontal Property Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. BELL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. STUDDS, Ms. ABZUG, Ms. SCHROEDER, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. NIX, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 9927. A bill to reorganize the governmental structure of the District of Columbia, to provide a charter for local government in the District of Columbia subject to acceptance by a majority of the registered qualified electors in the District of Columbia, to delegate certain legislative powers to the local government, to implement certain recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 9928. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. COTTER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. SARASIN, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 9929. A bill to provide for the identification of a restructured rail transportation system in the Midwest and Northeast regions of the Nation in order to meet the present and future needs of commerce, the national defense, and the environment; the service requirements of passengers, mail, shippers, States, communities, and the consuming public; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9930. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a Federal death benefit to the surviving dependents of public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 9931. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to require that advertising expenses of any public utility regulated by such act be no more than research and development expenditures for purposes of determining rates and charges of any such public utility; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (by request):

H.R. 9932, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may become entitled to widow's or widower's insurance benefits at age 45 whether or not disabled, subject to the existing actuarial reduction but with a benefit amount no lower than 80 percent of the decreased reduction but with a benefit amount no lower than 80 percent of the deceased worker's primary insurance amount, and to provide for the payment of widow's and widower's insurance benefits equal to 100 percent of such amount where initial entitlement is at or after age 60 (rather than only

at or after age 65); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 9933. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities, to provide public financing for such campaigns, and to establish limitations on spending with respect to such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself and Mr. BOLAND):

H.R. 9934. A bill to amend the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 with respect to recycled wool; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. ROUSH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WHITE, Mr. PICKLE, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SISK, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. GINN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. NIX, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. YATES, Mr. CULVER, Mr. LANDGREBE, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 9935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of income tax returns by, and the disclosure of information therein to, Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKAY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 9936. A bill to facilitate the incorporation of the reclamation townsite of Page, Ariz., Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, as a municipality under the laws of the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 9937. A bill to amend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to provide for the disclosure of fuel consumption by certain automobiles, under rules prescribed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. PODELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. SMITH of New York, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 9938. A bill to provide for a national educational campaign to combat the lack of consciousness on the public as to the danger of improper uses of motor vehicles on the highways, and to impose an additional tax of one-tenth of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and other motor fuels to pay for the costs of such campaign; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9939. A bill to establish a U.S. Fire Administration and a National Fire Academy in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of death, personal injury, and property damage from fire, to increase the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control agencies at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 9940. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to improve the administration of that act with respect to small businesses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 9941. A bill to prohibit certain acts with respect to petroleum, petroleum products, and natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. BLATNIK):

H.R. 9942. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REES, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. VEYSEY, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 9943. A bill to establish a national program for research, development, and demonstration in energy technologies and energy conservation and for the coordination and financial supplementation of Federal energy research and development; to conduct a thorough review and assessment of the current status of research and development in energy technologies and energy conservation in both the public and the private sector; to increase efficiencies of energy production and utilization, reduce environmental impacts, develop new sources of clean energy, demonstrate specific technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9944. A bill to establish fishing zones of the United States beyond its territorial seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 9945. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the boundaries of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 9946. A bill to abolish the U.S. Postal Service, to repeal the Postal Reorganization Act, to reenact the former provisions of title 39, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 9947. A bill to reform consent decree procedures, to increase penalties for violation of the Sherman Act, and to revise the Expediting Act as it pertains to Appellate Review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 9948. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, with respect to determining when the cost of certain articles, materials, or supplies is unreasonable; to define when articles, materials, and supplies have been mined, produced or manufactured in the United States; to make clear the right of any State to give preference to domestically produced goods in purchasing for public use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9949. A bill to clarify the meaning of certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to unlawful interception of communications and other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois:

H.R. 9950. A bill to increase the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by two members who shall be elected town or township officials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 9951. A bill to designate a segment of the Delaware River flowing between the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. GUNTER, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 9952. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to encourage competition in the production, refining, and marketing branches of the petroleum industry by prohibiting any oil company from engaging in more than one such branch of the industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BURKE of California:

H.R. 9953. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to provide for adequate outpatient care in medically underserved areas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 9954. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain rights in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VEYSEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 9955. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has 40 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. ROE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 9956. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has 40 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRONIN (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9957. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize reduced fare transportation on a space-available basis for persons who are 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9958. A bill to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENHOLM (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. Melcher, Mr. RARICK, Mr. SISK, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 9959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of income tax returns by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN,

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. REES, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. WINN, Mr. WARE, Mr. BEARD, and Mr. STEELMAN):

H.R. 9960. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College and the Rayburn Library; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9961. A bill to authorize the disposal of approximately 258,700 short tons of copper from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself and Mr. QUILLEN):

H.R. 9962. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code, with respect to financing the cost of mailing certain matter at reduced rates of postage, and other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 9963. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that no pipeline company engaged in the transportation of oil may transport oil through its pipelines if that company has an interest in such oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 9964. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FROEHLICH:

H.R. 9965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide relief to certain individuals 62 or more years of age, or disabled and 60 or more years of age, who own or rent their homes, through a system of income tax credits and refunds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FROEHLICH (for himself and Mr. SYMMS):

H.R. 9966. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for sewer charges in the same manner as the deduction allowed for real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 9967. A bill to designate certain lands in the Blackbeard Island National Wildlife Refuge, McIntosh County, Ga., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 9968. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit the disclosure of an individual's social security number or related records for any purpose without his consent unless specifically required by law, and to provide that (unless so required) no individual may be compelled to disclose or furnish his social security number for any purpose not directly related to the operation of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. STARK and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 9969. A bill to provide for posting information in post offices with respect to registration, voting, and communicating with lawmakers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 9970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain retroactive amendments in qualified pension plans and to change certain provisions concerning qualification of pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTON:

H.R. 9971. A bill to repeal the authority of State officials to inspect corporate tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Ms. GRIFFITHS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. MELCHER, Ms. MINK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. ROY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas and Mrs. BOGGS):

H.R. 9972. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 to provide seminars to freshmen Members of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. LEGGETT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 9973. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to require the consent of all persons whose communications are intercepted under certain provisions relating to certain types of eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. BELL, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. WINN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ESCH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROE, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. GUNTER, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 9974. A bill to establish a Department of Energy, to transfer to such department appropriate responsibilities from other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9975. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 9976. A bill to amend and improve the Adult Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9977. A bill to establish within the Peace Corps a special program to be known as the Vietnam assistance volunteers program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 9978. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship on certain Vietnamese children and to provide for the adoption of such children by American families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9979. A bill to amend the rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate to improve congressional control over budgetary outlay and receipt totals, to provide for a Legislative Budget Director and staff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRITCHARD (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 9980. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 9981. A bill to amend section 19(g) of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9982. A bill to establish a municipal code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 9983. A bill to establish a Commission on Federal Elections to carry out the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and to recommend further reforms with respect to regulation of campaign activities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 9984. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 9985. A bill to extend the duties of the Executive Protective Service to include the protection of the United Nations buildings in New York City, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R 9986. A bill to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 9987. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide a substantial increase in the total amount authorized for assistance thereunder, to increase the portion of project cost which may be covered by a Federal grant, to authorize assistance for operating expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 9988. A bill to to provide for the establishment within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention, to provide financial assistance for a demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. REES, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. BURGENER and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 9989. A bill to further the national housing goal of encouraging home ownership by regulating certain lending practices and closing and settlement procedures in federally related mortgage transactions to the end that unnecessary costs and difficulties of purchasing housing are minimized, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9990. A bill to amend title 38, United

States Code, to increase the amount of veterans' benefits for burial and funeral expense allowances from the present $250 to $750; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 9991. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of health maintenance organizations in providing health care; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 9992. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed lawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 9993. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. MAYNE, and Mr. BUTLER):

H.R. 9994. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 9995. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURGENER (for himself, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, and Mr. REGULA):

H.R. 9996. A bill to amend the Truth-in-Lending-Act to protect consumers against inaccurate and unfair billings practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.R. 9997. A bill to provide income tax incentives for the modification of certain facilities so as to remove architectural and transportational barriers to the handicapped and elderly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. MINK, Ms. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. REID, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BIESTER, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BRADEMAS, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 9998. A bill to reorganize the governmental structure of the District of Columbia, to provide a charter for local government in the District of Columbia subject to acceptance by a majority of the registered qualified electors in the District of Columbia, to delegate certain legislative powers to the local government, to implement certain recommendations of the Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 9999. A bill to strengthen and improve the private retirement system by establishing minimum standards for participation in and for vesting of benefits under pension and profit-sharing plans and to improve the protection and interests of participants and beneficiaries, by increasing contributions for self-employed individuals and shareholders of electing small business corporations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 10000. A bill to provide that meetings of Government agencies shall be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H.R. 10001. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for the use of a passenger automobile in a carpool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

H.R. 10002. A bill to provide a standard of fair personal information practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 10003. A bill to establish within the Department of Labor a Railroad Reorganization Adjustment Assistance Administration, to transfer thereto certain functions and duties of other departments and agencies relating to railroad reorganization adjustment assistance, to establish a comprehensive program of railroad reorganization adjustment assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Ms. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 10004. A bill to help preserve and improve low- and moderate-income housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax incentives to improve the economics of recycling wastepaper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 10006. A bill to repeal the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. HINSHAW):

H.R. 10007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of income tax returns by, and the disclosure of information therein to, Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself and Ms. JORDAN):

H.R. 10008. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to require the consent of all persons whose communications are intercepted under certain provisions relating to certain types of eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. EVANS of Colorado and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 10009. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. ASHLEY, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DENT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NIX, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 10010. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. ULLMAN, and Ms. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 10011. A bill to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of the Congress to do so; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 10012. A bill to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of the Congress to do so; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 10013. A bill for the relief of certain students harmed by the insolvency of Riverside University of Riverside, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PREYER (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Caroline, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WARE, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 10014. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York:

H.R. 10015. A bill to authorize the President to call and conduct a White House Conference on Energy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 10016. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10017. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to direct the Clerk of the House of Representatives to provide each Member of the House with additional copies of his individual voting record for distribution by that Member for public inspection in his congressional district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10018. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 10019. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 and other related acts to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; to establish tion within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and for the other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 10020. A bill for the relief of New York City, to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT (for himself and Mr. BURGENER):

H.R. 10021. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States and to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prescribing procedures and standards governing the disclosure of certain financial information by financial institutions to governmental agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 10022. A bill to amend section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 to reform the procedures for adjusting certain executive, legislative, and judicial salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 10023. A bill to continue the community development program as a part of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 10024. A bill to establish the Nantucket Sound Islands Trust in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to declare certain national policies essential to the preservation and conservation of the lands and waters in the trust area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 10025. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 10026. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress by providing for public disclosure of Federal income tax returns by Members of Congress and candidates for that office; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MCCLORY):

H.R. 10027. A bill to amend the act of October 12, 1968, to increase from $5 million to $15 million the amount authorized for grants to Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, N.Y.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 705. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the period beginning October 14, 1973, and ending October 20, 1973, as National Machine Tool Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRONIN (for himself, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOSMER, and Mr. KETCHUM):

H.J. Res. 706. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Congress, by three-fourths vote of both Houses, to override decisions of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 707. Joint resolution to authorize the return of the remains of Pocahontas to the United States and the establishment of an appropriate memorial commemorating her place in American history; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BELL, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD):

H.J. Res. 708. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the strengthening of the system of checks and balances between the legislative and executive branches of the Government as envisioned by the Constitution with respect to the enactment and execution of the laws and the accountability to the people of the executive as well as the legislative branches of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.J. Res. 709. Joint resolution, a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. MCSPADDEN, and Mr. STEED):

H.J. Res. 710. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of June 17, 1974, as "National Right of Way Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLISTER:

H.J. Res. 711. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 3 through 10, 1973, as "National High Blood Pressure Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 713. Joint resolution relating to sudden infant death syndrome; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FROEHLICH (for himself, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. ROUSSELOT):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim January 14 through January 20, 1974, as "National Snowmobiling Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that our NATO allies should contribute more to the cost of their own defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ROE):

H. Res. 523. Resolution to express the sense of the House regarding diplomatic relations between the United States and Sweden; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H. Res. 524. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the U.S. Government should seek agreement with other members of the United Nations on prohibition of weather modification activity as a weapon of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. Res. 525. Resolution of inquiry into the bombing of Cambodia and Laos, January 20, 1969, through April 30, 1970, by U.S. forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 526. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H. Res. 527. Resolution for the creation of congressional senior citizen internships; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H. Res. 528. Resolution to move forward toward immediate ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, to request a public reevaluation of the U.S. policy which requires nerve gas stockpiles, and to require the Department of Defense to detoxify obsolete nerve gas presently stored near Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. OBEY):

H. Res. 529. Resolution to move forward toward immediate ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, to request a public reevaluation of the U.S. policy which requires nerve gas stockpiles, and to require the Department of Defense to detoxify obsolete nerve gas presently stored near Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. STARK):

H. Res. 530. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of matter affecting, influencing, and pertaining to the cost and availability of food to the American consumer; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 10028. A bill for the relief of certain Korean orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 10029. A bill for the relief of Kim Yong Soon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 10031. A bill for the relief of Thomas S. Leonhard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARRIS (by request):

H.R. 10032. A bill for the relief of James B. McGuire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.