

California prison hospital where brain surgery, massive drug doses and other controversial techniques were used on prisoners.

The uneasiness over the Butner project has prompted inquiries by Sen. Edward Brooke, R-Mass., Rep. Ronald Dellums, D-Calif., and the Senate subcommittee on constitutional rights headed by Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C.

Dr. Martin Groder, who organized the Asklepieion program and who will head the Butner facility when it is completed, and Dr. Robert B. Levinson, the bureau's mental-health coordinator, describe such fears and criticism as unwarranted.

Both men said that although program planning for Butner is still in its infancy, such controversial techniques are electroshock, massive drug dosage, psychosurgery, sensory deprivation, aversive conditioning and negative reinforcement therapy will have no part in the Butner correctional research.

Psychosurgery—which has been performed at Vacaville—means cutting out a portion of the brain to modify aggressive or other forms of undesirable behavior.

CURED AND MEEK

Sensory deprivation, aversive conditioning and negative reinforcement therapy were the techniques used on Alex in the movie "Clockwork Orange." Alex, who delighted in violence and sexual perversion, was given heavy forced doses of his avocations, along with drugs and other therapy, and emerged from prison "cured" and as meek as a lamb.

Said Groder: "In the research section, we will not use drugs, there will be no psychosurgery—it's obnoxious—and there will be no major aversive training like in 'Clockwork Orange.' We may do minor things with aversive conditioning. There will be no sensory deprivation (keeping inmates in total darkness or utter silence). That's old fashioned."

"As long as I am in charge," he stressed, "the work will be in the frame of a humanistic approach. We're going to avoid the Vacaville-type mistakes."

Butner, which was envisioned in 1961 but not funded by Congress until 1971, will be built close to three universities—Duke, North Carolina State and the University of North Carolina—with the idea of utilizing the academic talent on tap at these schools.

Originally it was called the "Behavioral Research Center" but the name was changed recently to the "Federal Center for Correctional Research." Groder said the change was not in response to the pejorative implications of "behavioral modification" but simply because the original title was not broad enough to encompass the work that will go on.

Groder envisions Butner as a facility where somebody with a good idea for improving some aspect of corrections can test it out under scientific conditions rather than simply implementing it piecemeal in a prison and hoping it will work out somehow.

"As long as we have had institutions," he said in an interview, "there has been no rapid process of taking bright ideas and testing them out. Take parole for example. There was a silly idea that if you promise a criminal that he will be out on the street in a short time, then he will be grateful and behave himself. It hasn't worked.

"We can test whether in fact institutional-

izing a person does any good at all. We can use modern psychotherapeutic techniques and try to apply them in a prison setting.

VOLUNTEERS PREFERRED

"Maybe we can demonstrate that two years served in a prison under certain conditions will be sufficient to rehabilitate an offender. We can test out ways of following released prisoners into the community and seeing whether they do better by returning to their home towns, or whether we can transplant them to North Carolina. Here we can do a close follow up of their cases."

Groder, who said he preferred volunteers for the research, did not rule out the possibility that inmates may be placed in the research programs.

One area where Groder clashes with other advocates of penal reform is "community corrections" which is now gaining support among the more liberal groups.

Groder contends that not enough is known yet about rehabilitation to allow legions of felons to return to the community after serving brief prison sentences, and he doubts that the community concept will receive wide public acceptance in the near future.

MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS

"If we can get a top-notch rehabilitation program within an institution," he says, "a prisoner will be better off than wandering around the streets."

Said Levinson, the bureau's mental health chief: "There are always going to be people in institutions even though more may be returned to the community. What are we gonna do with them? The idea of Butner is to determine more effective ways of dealing with the various types of people that will be imprisoned."

The view of Groder and Levinson counters the approach advocated by such groups as the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

NCCD director Milton Rector emphasizes that the traditional large penal institutions are proven failures in corrections and such programs as Butner only further uproot inmates who should be placed in their own community programs funded by federal money.

Groder and Levinson, who feel the bureau is "dammed if it does and damned if it doesn't" try new programs, are unhappy with the Federal Prisoners Coalition which has been nipping at the bureau's heels recently over the research programs in Marion and Springfield.

The coalition, in a treatise mailed in July to the United Nations, alleged that the Asklepieion program at Marion is based on techniques used to brainwash American POWs captured by the Chinese and North Koreans during the Korean war.

The document sees a conspiracy by the Bureau of Prisons to introduce brainwashing measures under the guise of accepted psychiatric practices and describes Asklepieion as "selective psychic-genocide."

Groder agrees that there are certain analogies between the program he founded at Marion and some of the techniques used by the Chinese to indoctrinate U.S. POWs. These include such things as removing prisoners to other cellblocks to break emotional ties, segregating natural leaders and punishing those who are uncooperative. But he calls the

charges of "brainwashing" ludicrous, a fabrication and an attempt by inmate radicals to create trouble.

Asklepieion, as described by Groder and outside observers who have examined the program at Marion, is a therapeutic community of volunteer inmates who live in a separate section of the prison.

It is a psychological program which seeks, in Groder's words, "to take losers and teach them how to win." The unwritten prison code dictates that a convict does his own time, doesn't owe anyone anything, and that society, here the prison administration, is the enemy.

In Asklepieion, convicts are taught to break the mold and induced to get out of the convict role by using several popular psychiatric techniques. Transactional analysis, set out in the best seller "Games People Play" by Dr. Eric Berne, gives inmates new guidelines for dealing with the pressure cooker living situation in a penitentiary.

Attack-therapy, a group game popularized by Synanon, the California-based drug rehabilitation organization, seeks to strip every facet of dishonesty and pretense.

The program was started three years ago and about 100 inmates have participated in some or all parts of it. The bureau sees it as an amazing success in bringing about major behavior changes among inmates in a penitentiary that is the end of the line in the federal prison system.

The shining example is a convict named Vic Taylor whose long escape record, 61 years of accumulated sentences for armed robberies and hard-core reputation labeled him one of the toughest in Marion.

Taylor, according to the bureau, had never read a book in prison. After joining Asklepieion, he started reading novels, began taking junior college courses inside Marion and last year received an honors degree in American studies from Southern Illinois University. He completed the four year B.A. degree work in 21 months, all inside the penitentiary.

Project START at Springfield, which also has prompted "brainwashing" charges from the Federal Prisoners Coalition, was begun in September. Unlike participants in Asklepieion which is voluntary, the inmates in START are transferred to Springfield from various prisons in the federal system because they are constant troublemakers and unresponsive to any form of discipline.

STEP-UP-SYSTEM

Simply stated, they are admitted to the START section at Springfield and placed in solitary confinement with no privileges. If they keep their cell clean and behave for a week, they move up one step and receive more privileges. By good behavior, they can continue to move up, working in the prison brush factory, earning money and receiving full privileges.

If they break the rules, they move back down the ladder, losing privileges as they go.

"In the past," explained Levinson, "we've been fast with the punishments and slow with the rewards. The inmates in START are not psychotic, but they are the absolute worst in the system. The emphasis in START is rewarding positive behavior. It's a simple behavior modification technique, but it seems to hold promise."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 11, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Billy Zeoli, Gospel Films, Muskegon, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we do not come just to pray

for a collective body of national leaders, although we do. God, we do not come just to pray for a special blessing upon our Nation, although we pray this. Our dear Father, we come to You to plead for each

of these gathered here as individual persons with individual needs.

Only You, dear God, know their personal and private needs.

But, God, there is one need in which we

all join, one great need we all crave after, the need that King Solomon faced and asked for from You. Your word says that if any of us lack wisdom let him ask of God.

Wisdom bathed in trust and truth—wisdom motivated by honesty and fairness. Wisdom that delivers us from a self-righteous demanding from others, a standard of conduct we do not apply to ourselves. Wisdom that teaches us the great lesson that Your Son Jesus Christ not only wants to be our personal Saviour but can help us cope with the issues of life.

Wisdom that allows us to feel more at home with ourselves and our own families and our colleagues, and wisdom that allows Christ to be more and more at home in our hearts. So, God, I do not ask for many things—no, God, not even for two. I ask for just one—one special attribute from You, my God, to each unique individual person in this room. Oh, God, I ask you for one thing for these people, I plead with you for one thing for these people—God, give them wisdom.

In the name of Jesus Christ, my risen Saviour. 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 315. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 8619.

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

H.R. 7446. An act to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7645) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the com-

mittee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8619) entitled "An act making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 12, 48, 64, 69, to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 542) entitled "Joint resolution concerning the war powers of Congress and the President."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1443) entitled "An act to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6768) entitled "An act to provide for participation by the United States in the United Nations environment program," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PELL, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2335) entitled "An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CASE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 425. An act to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the regulation of surface mining operations, and the acquisition and reclamation of abandoned mines, and for other purposes.

S. 2413. An act to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile and for other purposes;

S. 2463. An act to change the name of the Beaver Dam in the State of Arkansas to the James W. Trimble Dam;

S. 2486. An act to provide that the project referred to as the Trotters Shoals Dam and

Lake on the Savannah River, Ga. and S.C., shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake";

S. 2493. An act to authorize the disposal of silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

S. 2498. An act to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

S. 2556. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for eight months the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

TRIBUTE TO REV. BILLY ZEOLI

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege for me to have one of my dear friends and a man of outstanding talent offer the prayer in the House Chamber today. Rev. Billy Zeoli has done most effective missionary work with gospel films throughout the world in some 155 countries, and he has given the same fine message to many thousands of our fellow citizens in America.

For 10 years Reverend Zeoli has made a very special effort in a unique project with professional athletes in baseball and in football. His impact on them, individually and collectively, has been most significant.

Mr. Speaker, I say again it is a great privilege and a very high honor for me to have my friend, Rev. Billy Zeoli, offer the prayer for all of us. He is a dedicated citizen, a great parent with a wonderful family, and a religious leader of tremendous influence.

THE LATE CONGRESSMAN J. VAUGHAN GARY

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives in 1953, one of the first men to greet me was the late Congressman J. Vaughan Gary. He extended to me as to other freshmen, not only his hand, in a friendship which continued after his retirement, but also he gave the counsel and advice that a new Member of the Congress found so helpful.

Vaughan Gary was one of the most highly respected Members of the Congress, a man of great honor and integrity. He was an effective legislator and a true statesman. He served his beloved Virginia and our country well. With his passing, Virginia has lost one of her noblest sons and our Nation has lost a true patriot.

I am saddened by his loss. I express to Mrs. Gary and his family my deepest sympathy.

THE CASE OF YURI SOROKO

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

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, emigration from the Soviet Union is not free. Yuri Soroko is a 39-year-old civil engineer from Kiev, the Ukraine. The family first applied for emigration visas 2 years ago. The visas were denied on the grounds that Yuri's wife Basya possessed "secret information." Although Basya worked in a plant where secret work was performed, her work was of a nonsensitive nature, and allowed no access to secret information.

The Sorokos have suffered many hardships since they were denied emigration visas.

In January 1972, the KGB—Soviet Secret Police—"visited" the Soroko home and forbade Yuri from attending religious services at the synagogue in Kiev. Yuri disregarded their order and continued to go to the synagogue. For this act he was arrested and jailed for 15 days.

On two subsequent occasions Yuri was arrested and detained: First when he participated in a collective appeal for amnesty for the prisoners of conscience, and the second time at a meeting commemorating the slaughter of the Israeli athletes at Munich.

The Soroko family want to emigrate to Israel. They want their 9-year-old son to grow up in a society where Jewish cultural and religious life flourishes rather than in the Soviet Union where Jewish institutions are rapidly disappearing.

By passing the Mills-Vanik bill, Congress will enable the Sorokos and the growing number of young Soviet Jewish activists to emigrate and attain the freedom for which they have made great sacrifice.

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE FOR VICE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the pending vote on confirmation of the Presidential nominee for Vice President might be the most important vote ever made by any Member of the present House.

Therefore we ought not to assume that responsibility lightly. May I suggest several principles as we begin consideration of this difficult and important responsibility.

First, there is no crisis demanding immediate confirmation of the President's nominee. At no time in our history have we been more privileged or protected in having as the successor to the President, an individual as able and as qualified as is Speaker CARL ALBERT. Therefore, we need not hastily confirm for fear that succession is imperiled by inadequacy.

Second, the House should in no way defer to the Senate in this matter. I gather from press coverage last night, that the press, if not the Senate, believes only Senators will make the necessary judgments confronting Congress. That is not so and the House should quickly estab-

lish procedures to make that point quite clear.

Third, the judgment of the President in selecting people to fill high positions has been demonstrably defective—two former Cabinet members under indictment and a Vice President selected by him resigning because of criminal activity. Further, the President is under a cloud of suspicion involving his knowledge of or participation in Watergate. That suspicion must be removed before his selection can be approved.

The Congress should insist as a condition precedent to approval of his nominee, that the President reveal the contents of the disputed tapes. Only then can Congress and the country be reassured as to the integrity of the President as well as his nominee for Vice President.

OUTRAGEOUS ATTACK

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

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged by the perfidious attack launched by combined Arab armies against the people of the State of Israel. As an American, I cannot remain silent while the valiant citizens of Israel fight to preserve a land which is the bastion of freedom and democracy in the Middle East.

During the last 2 days we have received reports that the Soviet Union has been airlifting supplies and equipment to Egypt and Syria. At a time when the two superpowers were moving toward an era of international cooperation, the spirit of détente has been broken by Russia. It is to be hoped that the U.S.S.R. reverses itself and assists in settling, rather than exacerbating, problems in the Middle East.

An important decision faces America at this moment—in light of the Soviet airlift and the heavy losses of both men and material suffered by Israel. While the United States continues to call for a cease-fire and a return of the parties involved to lines and positions occupied by them prior to the outbreak of current hostilities, we must do everything possible to guarantee the survival of Israel with secure and defensible borders.

I am urging the President to expedite the supply of material and aircraft which Israel has contracted for and provide her with additional material which she may request, which will offset the losses sustained by the Israelis as a result of this ruthless aggression. If a lasting peace is to be acquired in the Middle East, Israel must be in a position to come to the negotiating table at least as an equal.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1443, MUTUAL DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION ACT OF 1973

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (S. 1443) to authorize the furnishing of defense articles and services to foreign countries and international organizations, with the House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, FASCELL, MAILIARD, FRELINGHUYSEN, and BROOMFIELD.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 727, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House on yesterday, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 727) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 10, 1973.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the present continuing resolution expires at midnight.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 513]

Aspin	Fraser	Powell, Ohio
Badillo	Frey	Rarick
Brasco	Fuqua	Regula
Breckinridge	Gray	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Sandman
Buchanan	Harsha	Stokes
Burke, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Stuckey
Chisholm	Holifield	Sullivan
Clark	Lent	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Long, Md.	Udall
Conyers	Mailiard	Wilson, Bob
Crane	Mills, Ark.	Wilson,
Dellenback	Moorhead, Pa.	Charles H., Calif.
Dellums	Nedzi	
Diggs	O'Hara	Yatron
Esch	Pickle	
Evins, Tenn.	Podell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 387 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further pro-

ceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 727 CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the continuing resolution which would make available funds for certain departments and agencies of Government until the respective appropriations bills are enacted into law or until sine die adjournment.

The present continuing resolution expires at midnight tonight. Members will recall that we passed a continuing resolution on September 25. We sent it over to the other body, and they took certain action. We met in conference and finally agreed on the conference report which is before us now.

OPERATION OF THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I think Members are generally aware of the nature of the continuing resolution and the necessity for the measure and therefore I do not believe it is necessary for me to go into it at length again today.

Briefly, the resolution provides for the continuation of programs and activities under the circumstances that obtained on June 30, 1973 based on the status of the respective appropriation bills at that time. This level of funding does not change until the appropriations bill is enacted into law. The sole exception to this rule is the Labor-HEW bill for which there is special provision to take into account Senate action. Under leave to extend I shall insert in the RECORD at this point a statement as to the general principles of the continuing resolution.

The material follows:

LEVELS OF FUNDING PERMITTED UNDER THE RESOLUTION

As has been the practice over a period of years, the continuing resolution establishes an appropriate rate of funding for the Departments and agencies until the respective regular annual appropriation bills can be enacted by Congress.

In summary, operations under the resolution are based on the status of each particular bill as of July 1, 1973, the date of passage of Public Law 93-52, is as follows:

1. Where the applicable bill had passed only one House, the rate for operations shall not exceed the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower (Sec. 101(a)(4)). Included in this category are:

Legislative appropriation bill;

Labor-HEW appropriation bill (see item number 2 under the heading "special provisions" outlined below); and

State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary appropriation bill.

2. Where the applicable bill had passed both Houses but had not cleared conference, and the amount as passed by the House is different from that passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amounts or the more restrictive authority (Sec. 101(a)(3)). Included in this category are:

Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection appropriation bill; and

HUD-Space-Science-Veterans appropriation bill.

3. Where the applicable bill had not been passed by either House, the rate for operations for continuing projects or activities shall not exceed the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority (Sec. 101(b)). Included in this category are:

Treasury-Postal Service-General Government appropriation bill;

Department of Defense appropriation bill; Foreign Assistance appropriation bill; and Military Construction appropriation bill.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. MAHON. We are presently making considerable progress with respect to handling appropriation bills. This is the status of the bills not yet signed by the President:

Legislative and Labor-HEW are in conference with agreement expected shortly.

The Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection conference report has been passed by both Houses but not yet signed by the President.

State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary is pending conference. Defense, foreign assistance, and military construction are not yet reported and are awaiting legislative authorization.

The Treasury-Postal Service conference was concluded yesterday and the conference report appears in the RECORD today. I expect that it will be considered soon.

In addition to these bills, the second HUD-Space-Science-Veterans' conference report will be before the House for consideration today.

The other regular annual appropriation bills—Public Works, Transportation, D.C., and Interior—have been enacted into law. We have also handled at this session two supplemental bills, two other continuing resolutions and the appropriation measure associated with the Par Value Modification Act.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Members will recall that in handling the continuing resolution which passed the House on September 25, I insisted we have no amendments, that this was the kind of vehicle that did not lend itself to general legislative procedures.

Nevertheless the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) offered an amendment in regard to petroleum marketing. Some of us, a very few of us, opposed the amendment on the grounds that it was unnecessary and that steps were being taken that would make the amendment unnecessary. I opposed all amendments to the resolution because as I stated this was not the vehicle to undertake such legislation. However, I certainly do not support any policies which would discriminate among petroleum marketers in establishing prices for petroleum products. The amendment was adopted. The other body concurred in the amendment, so it was not a subject of conference. The proviso is in the resolution.

In the other body an amendment was offered relating to the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank, as everyone knows, is engaged in trying to help American industry export American

products, the products of American labor and other sources. So the other body added an amendment which exempts the Export-Import Bank of the United States from the requirement that the funding rate for activities covered by the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Bill shall not exceed one quarter of the annual rate as provided by the first continuing resolution. In other words they could exceed for this quarter the rate which would otherwise be available to them. The House thought this was a good proviso and there was no objection to it in conference so it is before us.

The main thing that happened to us in the House when we considered this bill originally was that the Quie amendment was adopted. Many of us opposed it but nevertheless it was adopted. It did not have a State floor with respect to the allocation of funds for elementary and secondary schools. The Quie amendment in the continuing resolution went to the other body and the other body deleted the Quie amendment and inserted their own provision. In the conference agreement which is before us and upon which we will vote shortly we agreed to certain modifications of the House and Senate provisions as they relate to the distribution of ESEA funds.

Let me say that I think most of us understand that \$1,810,000,000 is appropriated. That is the top limit that is available for this program for this fiscal year.

So regardless of the way we distribute the money, the same total amount will be available. It is also understood I believe that about \$180 million of the total \$1,810,000,000 is not being made available to the States and local communities at the present time. We just do not know what the executive branch may do in regard to these spending levels.

Most congressional districts, to some extent, probably gain some and lose some, all depending upon those school districts and the towns and local communities.

This is not a conference report that satisfies completely anybody I know of, and I do not think it would be possible for anyone to write an absolutely satisfactory conference report on this highly complex issue in view of the various differences that exist in school districts and in States and communities throughout the Nation. So here is the agreed-to solution upon which we will vote, and we will have to vote the entire conference report up or we will have to vote it down.

First. No local educational agency will receive less than 90 percent of what it received in fiscal year 1973. No local educational agency, I repeat, will receive less than 90 percent of what it received in fiscal year 1973.

Second. No State—and I am moving from the local community agency now to the State—in the aggregate will receive less than 90 percent of what it received in fiscal year 1972.

Third. No local educational agency can receive more than 115 percent of what it received in fiscal year 1973.

So, this naturally is not going to please everybody. Indeed, there is no way to please everybody within our own districts. There are some elements that are, of course, disquieting to some areas of a Member's district which will be helped, and some school districts in a Member's district which will not fair as well as they might have. But this is the best we can work out at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would be able to agree on the conference report and send it to the other body, and the other body can concur and send it to the President so that the continuing resolution will become operative tomorrow.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has read 90 per centum and 115 per centum and so forth. Are there any present figures which will tell me how much New York State, or any State, will receive or will lose as a result of this conference report vis-a-vis the conference report which was passed by this House so overwhelmingly—not just passed, but overwhelmingly, by a vote of 286 to 94?

Mr. MAHON. We have figures from HEW which undertake to give a breakdown of how these funds would be distributed among the various States. There is some reason to believe that these figures are not absolutely accurate, but they probably are within the ball park.

The figures with respect to New York State are these: If HEW does not release all the funds, if HEW withholds \$180 million, which is now the policy, under this conference report New York would get \$9 million more than it received in 1973. If all of the funds are allocated including the entire \$1,810,000,000, then New York State would get \$30 million more under this conference report than it received in 1973. That does not seem too bad.

Mr. ADDABBO. Except that in relation to the bill which passed this House, which affected more than New York, affects adversely by this conference report 20 some States, New York would be receiving close to \$90 million and many of the other States who have lost population would get only a share and not a bonus, which they are getting under this conference report.

Mr. MAHON. Well, I must say the Quie amendment was not satisfactory in my opinion to many Members of the House, particularly after they learned of its full effects.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to my friend in just a moment. Under the Quie amendment, New York would have received \$33 million more instead of \$9 million more as it will get under the pending proposal, so New York will take a loss.

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

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how the gentleman can say that the Quie amendment did not re-

flect the desires of many people in the House when it passed 286 to 94. The Quie amendment was an amendment which was designed to cure an inequity in the allocations of moneys, which the conference committee has thwarted by not abiding by the will of the House.

Mr. MAHON. The Quie amendment was not the ultimate by way of a solution. It was the best the House could do under the parliamentary situation that existed at that time.

I would like to say with respect to the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut, that under this conference report his State will get \$1 million more than it received in 1973, and if all the funds are allocated, it would get \$2 million more.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I should like to point out that the Quie amendment did not deal with minimum State allocations; it dealt with minimum allocations to local school districts. So the total the State would receive is not really descriptive of the situation at all.

The Senate had 90 percent for a local minimum, and the Quie amendment had 85 percent. It is only a 5 percent difference we are talking about. It did not deal with the State totals the other gentlemen were talking about.

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

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

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

I believe the chairman of the conference and the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations is faced with a very difficult task. He has some figures before him. They have been given to him, evidently, by the Office of Education.

I must warn the distinguished chairman that he, like the rest of us, may be misled by the Office of Education, which is attempting to legislate on the floor of the House in the dark. We do not have those figures.

In all faith, Mr. Chairman, we question those figures, because while they do apply to States and to counties tentatively the best informed people, the educators in those States, have told us that these OE figures are not reliable.

The issue before the body now is, are we going to legislate in the dark on piecemeal figures that have been sent up here by HEW to get its version of this bill across? Why not wait and let them set forth exactly what this new contrived formula will do, so that we can tell our people what we voted on?

That is the issue here. Are we going to vote in the dark today, not knowing what we will get for the children, or are we to have these figures in black and white? That is the issue. The great Committee on Appropriations has never before asked this body to vote in the dark, where the children are concerned. Please do not ask us to do so today.

Mr. MAHON. The fact is that certain figures have been made available to any Member who may have requested the

figures or to any committee which may have requested the figures from HEW. These figures have been before various Members.

We worked out in the conference the best solution we could to this problem. The men who are most knowledgeable in the field, who serve on the HEW subcommittees in the House and the Senate, were present for that purpose.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) participated in this very heavily and was a dominant force in the conference in connection with this matter. I shall be glad to yield to him for any statement, but first I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I should like to point out, in response to the observations made by the gentleman from New York, that a very diligent effort was made to secure local education figures. They are not available and probably will not be available for several days or weeks. This resolution must be passed before that length of time has passed.

Mr. MAHON. We have to pass the resolution, as the gentleman says.

If the Committee on Education and Labor will bring out legislation settling these matters, that would be desirable. This is a stop-gap measure pending adjournment of the Congress or the enactment of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Of course, it may be governed somewhat by what may be done by the Legislative Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas has said exactly what the situation is. If ever there was a can of worms, this is it.

We have been in session the past few days on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill. We just left a session of the conference with the Senate. We are going back. We will be there on Monday, to try to get that fantastic Labor-HEW appropriation bill put together, including the education part of it.

I do not want to make a big speech about this thing, but I believe it is necessary to explain briefly the agreement reached between the conferees on the title I provision.

First, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the provision itself does not affect the total amount authorized for title I under the continuing resolution. It does affect the distribution of the funds to the State and local education agencies.

In considering the extension of the continuing resolution, both the House and the Senate have voted to change the title I provision that was contained in the first continuing resolution. That provision was based upon assuring that no State receive less than the total it received for the fiscal year 1972. But it did not protect the local school districts from receiving less under title I.

Now, we must remember that.

Both the House and the Senate have voted to make that provision apply to local educational agencies.

Now, I want the Members to hear this: The House version provided that no local agency receive less than 85 percent of

what it received in 1973. But the State total may be reduced.

Now, watch this. These are the two horns of the problem. The Senate version provides that no local educational agency and no State—that is the both of them—receive less than 90 percent nor more than 110 percent—let me repeat that—nor more than 110 percent of what it got in 1972. Do we understand that?

Let me repeat it. No local agency and no State to receive less than 90 percent nor more than 110 percent of their 1972 amount.

Now, listen to this: This relates to the compromise we reached in the conference. This is tough. As we know, some legislation is the art of compromise. Nobody is going to be happy with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what we did: We combined the basic features of the House version and the Senate version, of course, and this is what it provides: this is the deal. Now, we have all got big ears, so let us listen to this:

No local agency shall receive less than 90 percent. We went to 90 percent. No local agency will receive less than 90 percent, but not more than 115 percent of its 1973 amount.

Now, we are talking about the State. No State will get less in the aggregate than 90 percent of the amount received in 1972.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, there is no doubt about this as it concerns the House and the Senate bill. We have unlimited combinations that could be adopted. If any of the Members have

ever been to Las Vegas, they are amateurs compared to what we went through in that room. There were all kinds of combinations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. The one we took seemed to us the most equitable.

Now let me say this—and believe me I mean this, and I think you do, too—speaking for the Committee on Appropriations—and I said this a couple of weeks ago, also—we should not have to deal with this problem in the future. That basic organic law should be updated. For heaven's sake, make them do it so that we do not have to face this thing again. We know that the authorizing committee is working on this title I legislation. We should not have to bear in a continuing resolution—the responsibility of making up these deficiencies in this present basic law. That is not our job.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course I do. I have a lot of things to say, but I yield.

Mr. CAREY of New York. A point of information.

The gentleman quite correctly described it as a can of worms, and he is right.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAREY of New York. And now with that you are going to have to add spaghetti with or without flavor.

Mr. FLOOD. With or without sauce.

Mr. CAREY of New York. With or without sauce.

Mr. FLOOD. I am on a gall bladder diet. I have a problem.

Mr. CAREY of New York. And one of the arguments is, is it true that whatever we do with this continuing resolution, if we adopt this language, it will be brought over and brought back to us in the Labor-HEW bill?

Mr. FLOOD. That is right, we must include language of some kind in the Labor-HEW bill.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Then, we are voting twice on it.

Mr. FLOOD. The thing is this. It is 1 o'clock and at midnight tonight this thing has to take over. We are in conference now on the regular Labor-HEW bill.

By the way, these tables that you talked about from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are up here. I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert them following my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. They are HEW estimates on a State-by-State basis dollar for dollar.

The table follows:

ESTIMATED COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY GRANTS—PART A OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

	Appropriation fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973 operating level	House bill—local educational agency hold harmless at 85 percent of 1973 level	Senate bill—State and local educational agencies hold harm- less at 90/110 at 1972 level	Conference bill—State hold harmless at 90 percent of 1972 LEA hold harmless at 90/115 1973 level
Alabama	40,257,134	34,549,166	29,366,791	36,231,421	36,231,421
Alaska	2,054,974	2,415,064	3,112,266	2,260,471	2,777,324
Arizona	8,648,415	8,134,242	9,257,236	9,513,256	9,354,378
Arkansas	24,214,456	20,963,618	17,819,075	21,793,010	21,793,010
California	122,028,439	111,618,375	153,404,740	134,231,283	128,361,130
Colorado	10,100,532	10,237,378	12,368,915	11,110,585	11,772,985
Connecticut	11,813,005	11,747,931	16,324,230	12,994,306	13,510,121
Delaware	2,242,296	2,323,748	2,749,533	2,466,526	2,672,310
Florida	26,445,029	24,111,072	24,848,859	29,089,532	27,727,733
Georgia	39,947,788	40,573,812	34,487,740	43,942,567	36,516,431
Hawaii	3,250,665	3,715,263	4,704,115	3,575,736	4,272,552
Idaho	2,730,118	2,719,220	2,778,090	3,003,130	3,127,103
Illinois	63,243,090	69,554,901	85,026,804	69,567,399	79,988,136
Indiana	16,999,801	18,773,439	18,959,995	18,699,781	21,589,455
Iowa	15,464,659	14,601,661	12,411,412	17,011,125	13,918,193
Kansas	10,427,273	9,147,430	8,991,779	11,470,000	10,519,544
Kentucky	37,131,906	32,212,788	27,380,870	35,180,193	33,418,715
Louisiana	34,683,312	31,322,489	26,624,116	38,151,643	33,117,401
Maine	5,607,754	5,633,673	6,075,788	6,168,529	6,478,724
Maryland	19,423,141	19,380,669	24,059,507	21,365,455	22,287,769
Massachusetts	23,858,101	24,893,505	32,812,419	26,243,911	28,627,531
Michigan	47,708,517	51,768,916	61,617,453	52,479,369	59,534,253
Minnesota	21,120,043	20,897,155	18,307,236	23,232,047	23,204,280
Mississippi	42,074,152	35,922,629	30,534,235	37,866,737	37,866,737
Missouri	25,579,100	23,367,302	19,862,207	28,137,010	24,352,345
Montana	3,013,338	2,865,542	2,776,673	3,314,672	3,295,373
Nebraska	7,523,056	7,187,530	6,236,637	8,275,362	7,905,410
Nevada	883,771	923,899	1,390,428	972,148	1,062,484
New Hampshire	1,908,409	2,007,413	2,463,298	2,099,250	2,308,525
New Jersey	44,860,594	44,232,287	59,670,251	49,346,653	50,867,130
New Mexico	9,629,504	7,393,185	8,229,186	10,592,454	8,502,163
New York	193,459,929	196,835,764	266,054,680	212,805,922	226,361,130
North Carolina	56,260,988	51,556,663	43,823,164	50,634,889	50,634,889
North Dakota	4,271,181	4,101,267	3,486,077	4,698,299	3,844,063
Ohio	41,269,978	42,248,122	48,388,037	45,396,976	48,585,340
Oklahoma	18,199,914	16,649,246	14,151,859	20,019,905	17,243,236
Oregon	9,382,231	8,421,321	10,541,490	10,320,454	9,684,519
Pennsylvania	67,113,702	64,998,125	73,654,917	73,825,072	74,747,844
Rhode Island	5,189,238	4,873,849	5,940,772	5,708,162	5,604,926
South Carolina	34,313,120	29,853,231	25,375,246	30,881,808	30,881,808
South Dakota	6,266,048	5,470,551	4,649,968	6,433,549	5,639,443
Tennessee	36,288,395	31,273,191	26,582,212	32,659,556	32,659,556
Texas	69,566,731	67,675,754	57,524,391	76,523,404	67,124,681
Utah	3,593,198	3,894,921	4,909,818	3,952,518	4,479,159
Vermont	2,107,682	2,093,957	2,142,393	2,318,450	2,408,051

Footnotes at end of table.

ESTIMATED COMPARATIVE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY GRANTS—PART A OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—Continued

	Appropriation fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973 operating level	House bill—local educational agency hold harmless at 85 percent of 1973 level	Senate bill—State and local educational agencies hold harm- less at 90/110 at 1972 level	Fiscal year 1974 Conference bill—State hold harmless at 90 percent of 1972 LEA hold harmless at 90/115 1973 level
Virginia.....	33,803,541	31,522,692	26,794,288	37,183,895	30,423,187
Washington.....	12,255,022	13,445,639	17,638,391	13,480,524	15,462,485
West Virginia.....	20,524,496	17,319,813	14,721,841	18,472,046	18,472,046
Wisconsin.....	16,546,374	17,340,875	18,567,927	18,201,011	19,942,000
Wyoming.....	1,235,793	1,170,817	1,182,467	1,359,372	1,346,446
District of Columbia.....	8,187,278	10,096,368	13,301,211	9,006,006	11,610,823

¹ Fiscal year 1972 authorization for Public Law 89-10, Title I, Part A (\$2,000 p.a. income level and 50 percent State or National average current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance) (\$3,605,868,234; 50 States and D.C.) reduced to Title I, Part A allotment amount (\$1,489,919,683; 50 States and D.C.) with the State Agency amounts established at the fiscal year 1972 authorization amounts, and county LEA grants not less than the State received for LEA grants in fiscal year 1967.

Under Public Law 92-184 Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1972 LEA grants for 15 States were adjusted to the fiscal year 1971 funding level, with adjustment of administration amounts as necessary.

² Amended estimated allotment by State for county local educational agencies as ratably reduced from authorization under provisions of Public Law 93-9 and Public Law 89-10, Title I.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this formula is not going to be fully acceptable to everyone, in fact not many at all, and I do hope that when the committee goes back to work out the differences on the appropriation bill it will take into consideration the problem expressed on the floor.

However, I must say, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania did, that this continuing resolution expires at midnight tonight, and we had better have one. I think we had better live with this in the meantime, because I have counted the votes here and I cannot see that there are sufficient votes to overturn it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Let me finish my statement and I will yield to the gentlewoman on this matter.

It is my feeling that you should never go back until 1972 to hold harmless, because you have all of the figures from 1973 and 1973 is different from 1972. It is true it is different because of AFDC, but it is different. I think the committee made a mistake to go back to 1972 to hold harmless for the States.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) indicated that the table is not accurate. We do not really know what the situation is because the 115 percent affects the local educational agencies. We do not know really how it will affect the States because we do not have the information on the LEA's. It is the best estimate that the Office of Education could come up with, and I believe if we give them enough time, they can carry it all the way through.

What I tried to point out when this subject first came up is that there are school districts that have had a dramatic increase in the number of children on AFDC and from families of less than \$2,000 income. There have been others that have had very little increase in AFDC and a dramatic drop in the number of children from families with \$2,000 income or less.

So what you have done here is at least to hold LEA harmless at 90 percent of 1973. I think it is kind of high because of the shift in population, but it is what you agreed to.

I know the problems in trying to get figures and information. I do not like the 90 percent hold harmless to 1972 for the States because I think you are going back

a year too far since the States which had higher 1972 figures than 1973, are the ones which have lost the most poor children.

Then, lastly, this 115 percent of 1973 limit on LEA's. I do have some mixed emotions because on our committee we are trying to work out a formula, and if the States—using New York, for example—went to \$266 million, it may be higher than we would permit New York to go under the formula that we agreed to if the same amount of money was appropriated. That is the dilemma we are faced with. I think the committee on conference did us a good service by putting a limit on it, but we don't know exactly how it will turn out. I think that we will be voting in the dark here. You should have put the limit of 115 percent of 1973 on the States rather than the LEA's. You would have the information on that and permit the adjustments within the States.

My decision is that we had better pass the conference report on the continuing resolution, and then urge that the conference committee on appropriations take another look at this language and not just live with this, because I think there may be some serious mistakes being made. I would urge that we wait long enough for the Office of Education to carry this thing all the way through to the LEA's because, as far as the Members and I are concerned, in the House we are not as much concerned about the whole of the appropriations as we are about what happens to the school districts within our congressional districts. But right now we are voting in the dark.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to express my opinion that the various reports and various formulas that have been distributed are not based on facts. We do not have the necessary information to really know what the various local educational agencies will receive.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota. I was involved in other things yesterday, and I could not attend the conference on the Labor-HEW appropriations, but it is my understanding that an agreement was reached between the

House and the Senate yesterday on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for fiscal year 1974 that the action that was taken today on the continuing resolution would be incorporated in the conference report on appropriations for fiscal year 1974. It seems to me that puts a slightly different emphasis on what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is saying. And I agree with the gentleman, we ought to know what we are doing, we ought to have the facts and know where we are going, and not just say that whatever we decide today is it, without any real information, becomes effective for 1974. I am to the place where I am about to introduce a resolution to take away the census every 10 years if in 1974 we still use the 1960 figures, and it seems to me that is the trouble with the \$2,000 or \$3,000 figure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) is right. And I am saying to the chairman of the committee that I believe you are making a serious mistake if you have adopted this agreement for the full appropriation bill. I think you have done the best you could under the circumstances here. But I think you must come back with the information that we should have at our disposal. It is not possible to get that by midnight tonight. That will take some time to carry it out to the districts in the States, and find out what happens. Take New York, for example. I think that we need to know what is going to happen with the LEA's. Some had large increases in poor children, and now they are only going to get 115 percent of what they got in 1973.

I am sorry that the authorizing committee does not have its formula worked out. But we have got as tough a problem as you have in working out a formula, and it will take us time. We are working on the matter, but because of a whole lot of other things that are happening in the Government we have not been able to move ahead as we wanted to do, but you have got to use some latitude. The best I think is 85 percent hold harmless of 1973 for the LEA's and 115 percent limit per State compared to 1973.

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

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and I worked for many years on the Committee on Education and Labor to try and untangle this complex formula. And I can assure you that if this language which is in the continuing resolution is then Siamezed over into the HEW appropriation, that there will be no incentive to unravel that formula, and those who have been long looking for the Neanderthal formula that rewards people for being where they were 15 years ago will have won the battle. You are legislating here on an appropriation bill, there is no doubt, and I believe it is one of the most complex formulas that has ever taken place. No one will deny that we are legislating on an appropriation bill, and you are doing what the Committee on Education and Labor could not do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have agreed this is not a desirable situation, but I am sure that the gentleman from New York voted for the Quie amendment which was up here, which is what started the legislation on the appropriation.

Mr. QUIE. Could we find out right now if what we are doing here is binding on the appropriation bill?

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to direct myself to that question, because I was a member of the conference committee on the continuing resolution. I am not happy with the formula that came out last Tuesday, because we are going to lose some money as result of it; but under the circumstances, this is the best we could get out of that conference.

In a direct answer to the question that the gentlewoman from Oregon presented here, she is absolutely right. They did agree in conference on the HEW appropriation bill to accept this formula for that bill; but that bill is not completed yet.

We are going back Monday at 1 o'clock and I am certainly going to open it up.

The gentlewoman from Oregon is on that committee. I will join her in moving for reconsideration and see if we can come up with something different.

The members of the conference are different from the members on the continuing resolution. We may be able to come up with something different at that time.

Mr. QUIE. Could I ask the chairman of the committee, because I think this is a serious consideration that the Members are going to look at when they vote on this continuing resolution, whether by adopting this we are also indicating support for the same thing in the appropri-

ation bill, because I do not think we should do that.

Mr. MAHON. I think we should cross one bridge at a time and act on this bill and then act as we think best on the regular HEW appropriation bill.

The reason the Appropriations Committee brought back this compromise was because the Quie amendment had been adopted by the House and the Senate had rejected the Quie amendment and adopted another amendment. It was obvious that neither body would accept the other's amendment. Thus a compromise was necessary if we were to have a continuing resolution which would fund the Government past midnight tonight. If neither body had changed the original continuing resolution in this regard, then we would not be in this situation now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the problem is with the basic formula and the Education and Labor Committee for not having brought forward new legislation. In desperation we had to do something. When the continuing resolution extension was before the House, we legislated somewhat in the dark, in my judgment, in connection with this matter. So in conference we did everything we could to make the program operate as fairly as is possible for everybody concerned under these very difficult circumstances.

Mr. QUIE. The question is, by voting today are we binding ourselves in for the appropriation bill? Will the chairman go back and reconsider this formula for the appropriation bill?

Mr. MAHON. I will be glad to join in reconsidering it. I would not say we can bind ourselves on that bill. But today we are faced with the problem of the continuing resolution. This is the best we can do in the resolution.

Mr. QUIE. That is what I think we need to know, that the chairman will go back and reconsider it in the appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman think that there is any other alternative than accepting the conference report?

Mr. QUIE. In indicating our support for the appropriation bill, this is not the question. My question was, would the gentleman go back and reconsider, and the gentleman's answer was "Yes," he would go back and reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to complicate this question any further, but one thing that keeps coming up in talking about the States, the States being held harmless, is that everyone is going to get the same money. The real problem we are continually facing with title I is the fact, where are the kids who need this program, who need this money? The unfortunate thing is this formula that has now come out is that

it is not reaching out to where those kids are, and that is the real disturbing thing. I recognize the problems, but we are putting money out where the kids are not, and we are not getting enough money to where the kids are.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. This was the gentlewoman from Oregon's amendment, the Green amendment, which the gentleman did not support when we had it up here.

Mr. PEYSER. There were other factors in the gentlewoman's amendment that would have hurt school districts. The one thing we were fighting originally was that the school districts were originally being hurt with no advance notice, who had already done their planning, and we are now trying to fulfill an obligation where they were not going to get their money. What we are really dealing with here is that under this piece of legislation, this takes money away that the Quie amendment put in, that the House voted for, and it takes it away from the areas that have the children.

It just seems to me if we have to accept this as long as it is a temporary move that is what we have to do, but we have got to adjust this formula so that it does reach the kids.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY).

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman must be aware that there is a difficult choice before us here. There has been a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Labor-Health Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that if we adopt this formula today this is the formula we are going to get in the annual appropriation bill, and that statement was made in the well. The gentleman is a very valuable member of the Labor-HEW Subcommittee which has been working to improve the formula, but is it not true that if we adopt this formula this is exactly what those persons want on the committee who have been trying to keep the money going where the children have long since removed themselves? This does the job they could not do in the daylight.

Mr. PEYSER. This is exactly correct. We have been trying in our committee to move this forward because of the insistence on putting more money into the areas where the children no longer are present.

Mr. CAREY of New York. If we vote down this resolution, is it not true we will not receive one cent less than in the present existing year?

Mr. PEYSER. Yes.

I would like to reserve my time to make my own point on that if I may and ask the chairman a question.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) outside of myself, is probably the best

man in the House and I never made any statement in the well that we are binding anybody in this House to anything like that at all. I am amazed. I think the gentleman is an excellent orator but I never said that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I will begin by saying I certainly do not appreciate our Appropriations Committee being put in this kind of situation again today. We are not a legislative committee. I will be very frank to admit I supported the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), when this resolution was before the House. When it failed I supported the Quie amendment which was a compromise on my part and then in the conference to get agreement, I had to compromise further. I did not want to. I hated to go that far but there we were between a rock and a hard place. I felt there was no other alternative in view of the urgency of this continuing resolution passing by tonight. This is a holding operation and a poor one at that. I certainly do not like the idea of legislating over an extended period of time by way of this continuing resolution.

We did have a spirited discussion in the conference committee on what to do in the regular bill. It was felt that what we do here we probably ought to do there so that we do not end up with any more variables cranked into an already atrocious formula. This has not been finalized by any stretch of the imagination. There could be a move to reconsider, and then this discussion itself would be helpful when we go back to our conference on the regular bill. We will have to bring to the attention of our counterparts in the other body that this thing just will not fly in the regular bill unless we make some adjustments.

But the point is, as our good chairman has said, we are really again under the gun with a continuing resolution and with a need for doing something today and I had to make the choice of doing what we did or having no reference at all to title I in this continuing resolution.

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, we did have a report from the White House that if the HEW bill as it passed the House and the Senate was finally adopted with some variation but no major variation, it would be vetoed, so if that bill was vetoed then what we are doing here today would be very possibly legislating for the next full fiscal year.

Mr. MICHEL. I would surely hope not.

Mr. ADDABBO. But that is a very good possibility.

Mr. MICHEL. It is a possibility.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, of course my friend knows we have been through this four or five times. If the President sees fit to veto this bill, as last year and the year before, we will do as we did then, when we came back with another bill

which the President signed. We did it with HEW, and we have done this four times. There is no reason to think if this happened it would be something new.

Mr. MICHEL. Frankly I would say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, there are people downtown, the people who have to administer this thing, who are in total sympathy with what the gentleman has said.

They are in sympathy particularly with what the bigger States would like to have come about, and that is an adjustment to have this assistance for the students, and it is the right thing to do.

Therefore, I think most of us are in general agreement, if we can get the right kind of forum to work it out. The chairman of the Education Committee, (Mr. PERKINS) is here, and I would like to renew my plea that he get his committee to take us off the hook and do what is right.

We have no business legislating on an appropriation bill, much less a continuing resolution. I would hope that even though many Members are perfectly within their rights to raise objections to this thing today, that there would be a majority of the Members who will support the conference report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am asking this Chamber to vote down this resolution, and I think I speak for what was a 286 majority in this House on September 25, which said that it was dissatisfied with the formula under which this money has been allocated.

We have been hearing a great deal of language and percentages here. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls it a can of worms. I would like to put it in terms that maybe the American people can understand, that some of us here can, and that is that under the present formula and under the formula which is being perpetuated in this bill, we are paying States and local educational agencies, paying them educational moneys for children who do not reside in their States; and we are depriving States which have gained in population, which have gained in school enrollments, and their children are not being counted in the formula. Why?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 514]

Aspin	Diggs	Holifield
Boiling	Eilberg	Landrum
Breckinridge	Evins, Tenn.	Lent
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Mailliard
Buchanan	Fraser	Melcher
Clark	Frey	Mills, Ark.
Clay	Fuqua	Nedzi
Conlan	Gettys	Nichols
Conyers	Gray	Pickle
Crane	Hanna	Rarick

Riegle	Stephens	Udall
Sandman	Sullivan	Wiggins
Smith, Iowa	Teague, Tex.	Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 395 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 727 CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1974

The Speaker. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is recognized.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as I had begun to say prior to the quorum call, I object to this continuing resolution because of the educational formula which they have worked out. Forget all of the percentages and all of the language that we have heard here today, the fact is that it is an inequitable formula, one using 1960 figures. There have been mass migrations of our population in the United States. States with more children, with increasing numbers of children, are not having those children counted in the formula, and they are not getting reimbursed by the Federal Government for them. Whereas States which have lost children and therefore are not spending money on educating them are being reimbursed for children whom they are not educating. And because this continuing resolution perpetuates the old evil system, if we pass it today I can assure the Members it will be in the labor-HEW bill for this fiscal year, which means it will carry forward to 1975.

It is about time we clearly enunciated that we are tired of this inequitable formula. We did so in the House on September 25 with the Quie amendment where 286 Members of this body, to 94 against, declared that they were fed up with this inequitable formula. And yet our conference committee goes into conference with the other body and then comes back here with what they call a compromise. It is no compromise. It is a charade. It still perpetuates the old evil system. There is no one who can tell you what these States and local educational agencies are going to get under the compromise. But I will tell the Members this: They are going to get less money than they would have received under the Quie amendment which we passed several weeks ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me some additional time?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. Speaker, we have to get this matter clarified. If we do not do it here today—and this is the vehicle before us through which we should do it—we will be stuck for 2 more years.

We know what has been happening here. Year in and year out the Committee on Education and Labor has not come forth with a new formula. Many members of that committee would like to have a new formula. But I can assure the Mem-

bers that it is going to be a long, cold day in July before the Committee on Education and Labor cures the inequities in the present formula. The only way we are going to do it is to do it now.

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

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that there is a very responsible alternative before this body? It is that if this were to be recommitted, or voted down, that there is a meeting of the conferees on Education and Labor, and they have assured us they are going to look at this, and they can come up with a better proposal, and a fairer law, and we can have the figures before us, and not the continuing resolution that they call a compromise, and is not a compromise.

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman from New York is correct. The only remedy that we in the majority have here today is to vote down this continuing resolution. I am informed that the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) intends to file a motion to recommit, so that the committee can go back and restudy this, and get the figures and let us know what we will get in all of the States, and in all of the LEA's, and then we can decide this matter intelligently.

If the motion to recommit is submitted, I urge every Member to vote for it, and recommit the continuing resolution.

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

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything the gentleman says except what we should do now. As I said last September, these kinds of amendments have no place in a continuing resolution.

If we are going to be responsible, let us pass the continuing resolution. As one Member of the Congress, I am not for the formula.

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman supports the resolution even though it hurts the gentleman's State of New Jersey?

Mr. PATTEN. I say we should be responsible and adopt the continuing resolution.

Mr. GIAIMO. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I do not like continuing resolutions either. I think that this Congress should not use them so frequently, but that it should get its appropriation bills passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) a member of the Subcommittee on Labor and HEW.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the real culprit in this thing is the basic authorizing legislation. We hear a lot of talk about putting the money where the children are. The basic authorizing legislation does not put the money where the children from poor families are located.

Let me just use the State of New York, since it has come up here several times, as an example. The population increase for New York between 1960 and 1970 was less than 10 percent; but the increase under the title I formula is 33 percent.

Is that putting the money where the children are? Of course, it is not.

We are trying to temporarily deal with a screwball formula. What it does is to put the money where the largest welfare payments are. It excludes many, many of the children of the working poor while including the children of those who receive welfare payments in excess of the earned income of the working poor. The child of a couple which earns \$2,100 per year is not included in the formula, but if a couple receives \$3,900 per year in welfare payments, they are included under the formula. It is a bad formula.

Faced with this, in the expiring continuing resolution which is in effect as of today, there was a 100-percent hold harmless on a State aggregate basis. In this one there is a minimum of 90 percent set or an aggregate statewide basis. There is a reduction toward the shift which will in many cases occur under a more fair formula.

A 90-percent minimum is set for each school district within the State and also a 115-percent maximum. Districts like the average in New York which have increased in population by only 10 percent, may receive 15 percent rather than just 10 percent but at least there is an attempt to provide some movement without accepting a grossly unfair formula in full.

We must make some compromise on this bill. Perhaps no one will be fully satisfied but we must make a good faith effort to provide as fair a formula as possible under the circumstances on a temporary basis while the final authorizing provision is being developed.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. CAREY of New York. I want to point out in all fairness to New York City, that for the first time in 20 years the number of welfare children in New York City dropped by 16 percent last year.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Then that should reduce the distortion in the formula, but the point is this, that there had to be some kind of compromise worked out on this, while the legislative committee is getting some legislation ready. The Quie amendment provided 85 percent minimum for the local school district. We provide 90 percent. The Senate wanted a 110-percent maximum and we are proposing a 115-percent maximum on a State aggregate basis, we provide for a 90-percent minimum.

That means going from the 100-percent minimum in the expiring continuing resolution down to 90 percent on a State aggregate basis I would have preferred to use the additional money appropriated to hold all districts harmless while providing all districts with the increases allocated last month but the Quie amendment in the House and the Senate action both prohibit that approach. Under the circumstances I say this is the best compromise we could work out.

Mr. Speaker, it is time in this body to start thinking about the national interest. What is good for the Nation? What is fair and what is right? Members should quit securing some table somewhere and quit trying to decide on im-

portant vote solely on what is going to happen to some little area that a Member happens to represent. Anyway, with the exception of some few Members—people in the big cities—every Member in this body is going to have some districts that are going to lose and some which will gain.

Under this compromise, the extent of swing will be reduced for those who would lose the most, and take a little off of the largest increases.

I urge support of the committee proposal.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we are about ready to vote on this issue. We are going to be voting not just on educational grants, we are going to be voting on the continuing resolution which contains educational grants and many, many other things.

There will be no separate vote on the item affecting title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The continuing resolution expires tonight, and thus it is essential that it be passed today.

We have worked out the best solution we could in conference. There is no good solution, because the Committee on Education and Labor after months and months and even years has not been able to come up with a formula that it can get adopted that would remedy the situation; so we protected the local communities as best we could and the States as best we could.

So I would hope that we would not vote down the continuing resolution.

Earlier, we talked about the HEW appropriation bill which is now in conference. We will reconsider this whole matter in the conference report on the Labor-HEW bill for this year.

Let me say this to the House. When the Labor-HEW conference report comes to the House, there will be an opportunity for a separate vote on the educational grants, and the House can specifically work its will. I think these statements I have made are the reasons why men such as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) says this is the best we can do with the conference report today, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), the ranking minority member on the committee, says it is the best we can do today, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE), who offered the amendment and who spoke earlier in this discussion does not like what is going on but admits that under the circumstances we have no reasonable alternative other than to approve the conference report on the continuing resolution today.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur with what the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee said. Many Members were not here for the complete debate and did not hear the many compelling reasons set forth for passing this continuing resolution today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, others were not here when the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. FLOOD) spoke and said we have no reasonable alternative to adopting the continuing resolution conference report.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is a correct

statement by the chairman and it would be a very serious mistake to send this back to conference.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact, and I would like Members on both sides of the aisle to hear this, that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) who offered the Quie amendment is going to vote to support this continuing resolution conference report?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is a correct statement.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 727, the conference report providing continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1974. I am particularly pleased that the House amended the original appropriations bill on September 25 to protect the independent petroleum dealer from discriminatory pricing regulations promulgated by the Cost of Living Council, and that the House can now give its final consent to that provision today.

Section 3 of the resolution requires that—

None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Cost of Living Council to formulate or carry out a program which discriminates among petroleum marketers in the method of establishing prices for petroleum products.

This provision insures that, under phase IV, independent retailers cannot be confronted with less favorable markup periods for their products than retailers owned by the major companies, as was the case prior to September 28. More generally, the provision insures that any future COLC actions regarding the pass-through of product costs, markup periods, and price ceilings must be imposed similarly across the range of petroleum retailers.

This provision may seem rigid, and I suppose some of my colleagues may be concerned that it will not permit the Council to make distinctions between classes of marketers. It seems to me, however, that the provision is a real and needed safeguard for all classes of retailers, including the small independent who can hardly make his voice heard in Washington, in marked contrast to the giant majors. The Congress should take discretionary authority away from the COLC, and require neutral treatment of all marketers by the COLC—this, after all, is the only way in which the administration of wage and price controls can be at all fair and impartial.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this provision and the resolution of which it is a part. Such action is one of the most effective ways Congress can come to the assistance of the independent petroleum marketer.

Mr. BAIGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the passage of the House-Senate conference report on House Joint Resolution 727. Under the provisions of the resolution, the city of New York, as well as many other urban areas, are severely harmed and short-changed on moneys for educational assistance.

The objectionable feature of the resolution is the provision calling for a ceiling in payments to local educational

agencies set at 115 percent of the amounts made available in 1973.

This ceiling is a disaster because this year—1974—for the first time, the number of eligible children is calculated on the basis of the 1970 census figures. But the ceiling is tied to the 1973 appropriation, which is based on the 1960 census. As we all know, in the 1960's there was a great migration of poor from the country to the cities. This means there has been a great increase in the number of needy children in New York City and many other urban areas.

To grant 115 percent of last year's appropriation based on census figures of 13 years ago is to come nowhere near this year's need. It is to give moneys to areas where they are not needed, and to short-change the cities where the real need is. For all we know, it is quite likely that New York City is entitled to 165 percent of last year's allotment.

Thus this provision is unfair to the children and to the schools. They deserve their share under the new census and under the law. We cannot and should not deny it to them.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, this provision would be a disaster. I urge the House to defeat the conference report and instruct the conference committee to report out a provision that contains no ceiling on the amounts of money the local educational agencies may receive. This is only fair while we are using 1960 census figures to take care of 1974 children.

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

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. TALCOTT

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the conference report on House Joint Resolution 727 to the committee of conference.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TALCOTT moves to recommit the conference report on House Joint Resolution 727 to the committee of conference.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 225, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]		
AYES—182		
Abzug	Burgener	Coughlin
Adams	Burke, Calif.	Cronin
Addabbo	Burke, Fla.	Daniels
Anderson, Calif.	Burke, Mass.	Dominick V.
Anderson, Ill.	Burton	Danielson
Anderson, N.Y.	Carey, N.Y.	Delaney
Annunzio	Carney, Ohio	Dellums
Armstrong	Chisholm	Denholm
Badillo	Clark	Dent
Bell	Clausen,	Derwinski
Biaggi	Don H.	Diggs
Biester	Clawson, Del	Dingell
Bingham	Cohen	Donohue
Boland	Collins, Ill.	Drinan
Bolling	Conable	Dulski
Brademas	Conlan	Eckhardt
Brasco	Corman	Edwards, Calif.
Brotzman	Cotter	Evans, Colo.

Fascell	Lehman	Rousselot
Fish	Litton	Royal
Ford,	McCloskey	Ryan
William D.	McCormack	St Germain
Forsythe	McEwen	Sarasin
Fraser	McFall	Sarbanes
Gaydos	McKinney	Schroeder
Ghaimo	Macdonald	Seiberling
Gibbons	Madden	Shipley
Gilmans	Mallary	Sisk
Gonzalez	Mathias, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Grasso	Mazzoli	Stanton,
Green, Oreg.	Meeds	J. William
Green, Pa.	Metcalf	Stanton,
Griffiths	Minish	James V.
Grover	Mink	Stark
Gude	Mitchell, Md.	Steele
Hanley	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steelman
Hanrahan	Moakley	Stokes
Hansen, Wash.	Moorhead,	Stratton
Harrington	Calif.	Studds
Hastings	Moorhead, Pa.	Talcott
Hawkins	Moss	Teague, Calif.
Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Heilstokski	Murphy, N.Y.	Tiernan
Hicks	O'Hara	Towell, Nev.
Hinshaw	O'Neill	Ullman
Hogan	Owens	Van Deerlin
Hollifield	Pepper	Vanik
Holt	Pettis	Veysey
Holtzman	Peyser	Vigorito
Horton	Pike	Walde
Hosmer	Podell	Walsh
Howard	Price, Ill.	Whalen
Johnson, Calif.	Rangel	Wiggins
Johnson, Colo.	Rees	Wilson,
Jordan	Reid	Charles H., Calif.
Karth	Reuss	Wolff
Kastenmeier	Rinaldo	Wydler
Kazen	Robison, N.Y.	Yates
Kemp	Rodino	Young, Alaska
Ketchum	Roe	Young, Ga.
King	Roncalio, Wyo.	Young, Ill.
Kluczynski	Roncalio, N.Y.	Zablocki
Koch	Rosenthal	
Leggett	Rostenkowski	

NOES—225

Abdnor	Devine	Latta
Alexander	Dickinson	Long, La.
Andrews, N.C.	Dorn	Long, Md.
Andrews,	Downing	Lott
N. Dak.	Duncan	Lujan
Archer	du Pont	McClory
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	McCollister
Ashbrook	Elberg	McDade
Ashley	Erlenborn	McKay
Bafalis	Esch	McSpadden
Baker	Eshleman	Madigan
Barrett	Findley	Mahon
Bauman	Fisher	Mann
Beard	Flood	Maraziti
Bennett	Flowers	Martin, Nebr.
Bergland	Flynt	Martin, N.C.
Bevill	Ford, Gerald R.	Mathis, Ga.
Blackburn	Fountain	Matsunaga
Blatnik	Freilinghuysen	Mayne
Boggs	Frenzel	Melcher
Bowen	Froehlich	Mezvinsky
Bray	Fulton	Michel
Breaux	Ginn	Milford
Brinkley	Goldwater	Miller
Brooks	Goodling	Minshall, Ohio
Broomfield	Gross	Mizell
Brown, Mich.	Gunter	Mollohan
Brown, Ohio	Guyer	Montgomery
Broyhill, N.C.	Haley	Morgan
Broyhill, Va.	Hamilton	Mosher
Buchanan	Hammer-	Myers
Burleson, Tex.	schmidt	Natcher
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Idaho	Nelsen
Byron	Harsha	Nichols
Camp	Harvey	Nix
Carter	Hays	Obey
Casey, Tex.	Hebert	O'Brien
Cederberg	Hechler, W. Va.	Parris
Chamberlain	Heinz	Passman
Chappell	Henderson	Patman
Clancy	Hillis	Patten
Cleveland	Huber	Perkins
Cochran	Hudnut	Poage
Collier	Hungate	Powell, Ohio
Collins, Tex.	Hutchinson	Preyer
Conte	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Culver	Jarman	Pritchard
Daniel, Dan	Johnson, Pa.	Quie
Daniel, Robert	Jones, Ala.	Quillen
W., Jr.	Jones, N.C.	Railsback
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Okla.	Randall
Davis, S.C.	Jones, Tenn.	Regula
Davis, Wis.	Keating	Rhodes
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Roberts
Dellenback	Kyros	Robinson, Va.
Dennis	Landgrebe	Rogers
	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.

Welfare, is forwarded as required under Public Law 92-449.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 11, 1973.

FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H.R. 8825, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up the further conference report on the bill (H.R. 8825) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, and corporations 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 10, 1973.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a second conference report on the HUD-space-science-veterans appropriation bill for 1974. The first conference report settled all dollar amounts. That report was adopted by the House last August 1 and by the Senate on September 7. However, two amendments were sent back to a further conference.

I am glad to report that we now have a further unanimous report on these remaining two amendments and that the House position is sustained in this conference.

Members will recall that the other body proposed legislation in the form of a general provision to restrict the use of passenger motor vehicles by the department and agencies that are covered in this bill. Based on the record that has been developed to date, it would be discriminatory and unfair to the single department and eight agencies in the bill. If any legislation is needed it should be made applicable to all agencies and departments, and to include both civilian and military personnel.

In early September, at the time the Senate voted to further insist on its proposed language and requested a new conference, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee appointed an ad hoc subcommittee of seven members to initiate an analysis of motor vehicle usage in all departments and agencies. I think this is a proper way to proceed. This ad hoc subcommittee has requested the GAO to make a thorough examination to determine where and what abuses may be occurring. It may well be that existing law needs revision or clarification. It is expected to have a complete report prepared about the first of March next year.

The Senate conferees have now agreed to recede from their disagreement on the amendments Nos. 44 and 45. I do not view this as a victory, but a pause for a more

thorough examination. This is a reasonable compromise—a compromise that can be accepted by both the House and Senate without being prejudicial to the work of the ad hoc subcommittee. I welcome any equitable and reasonable proposal for clarification of the law regulating the use of these cars. But whatever action that may eventually be taken should be applied governmentwide—and not just to the one department and eight agencies in this bill.

The other matter, Mr. Speaker, that was taken up in the conference is submitted as a separate motion outside of the conference report. It relates to the construction of the proposed new laboratory for the Federal Communications Commission, which has been approved on two separate occasions by the Congress. With the rapid growth of devices having high interference characteristics such as microwave ovens, electronic garage door controls, medical devices, and ships' radars, this new laboratory is vital if the Commission is to perform the sensitive approval tests required before these and many other devices can be marketed.

Congress has previously provided \$600,000 to construct this facility in the 1973 appropriation act. The availability of these funds was extended for the current year in a supplemental when efforts to utilize an existing building fell through and delayed new construction. The lowest of five bids opened in September exceed the present limitation on funds for construction.

To delay this project further would only increase the eventual cost to the Government. The conferees have, therefore, agreed to submit an amendment to increase the limitation on FCC funds that may be used for capital improvements by \$300,000, from \$125,000 to \$425,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report and the motion of the conferees be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I concur entirely with the gentleman from Massachusetts. The minority members have concurred in the conference report. The Senate has receded in every respect, so I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration by the House of the conference report to H.R. 8825, Appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, we should take time to recognize the enormous role the Department can play in spearheading energy conservation through improved building design, construction and use.

By 1985 it is estimated that energy consumed for household and commercial purposes will account for 21 percent of this Nation's energy budget. A substantial reduction in fuel requirements could be made if solar energy is used for heating and cooling buildings and for water heating. For example, a 1 percent saving is equivalent to more than 100 million barrels of oil a year. Potentially about one half of the fuel used to heat and cool buildings could be conserved through the use of solar energy.

Recently I wrote to the General Services Administration concerning their efforts in the area of energy conservation, generally, and solar energy, specifically. In his response, Administrator Sampson states:

We believe it vital to promptly construct and operate a limited number of large solar collectors using current technology.

The recent events in the Middle East underline how tenuous our energy situation actually is. We must begin now to implement a wide-ranging, national program to increase the efficiency with which we consume energy.

For the interest of my colleagues, I submit the full text of Mr. Sampson's letter to me:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1973.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: Your recent speech to the House of Representatives relative to the energy problems facing our country was read with great interest. Further, we are pleased to respond to your letter of September 18, 1973, concerning the General Services Administration's activities related to solar energy and energy conservation.

GSA's interest in energy conservation began many years ago. It's good business to minimize fuel and energy costs, even if energy sources were plentiful. The recent energy problems have only served to intensify our efforts and to make those we serve, by providing office space and transportation, more receptive to energy conservation undertakings.

You are already aware of the two GSA Demonstration Projects (Federal Office Building, Saginaw, Michigan, and Federal Office Building, Manchester, New Hampshire) which are planned for early construction. The investigations being made concurrent with these designs will lead to new guidance for more energy efficient buildings. Factors being considered include such things as fenestration, orientation, mass and insulation of the exterior walls, as well as the selection of more efficient heating, airconditioning and lighting systems.

Your speech and letter indicated a special interest in solar energy systems. Both of the GSA Demonstration Projects are being designed to incorporate large solar collector and energy use systems. Funds have been requested for the construction, instrumentation, and evaluation of these collectors from the new energy research and development effort announced by President Nixon on June 29, 1973, for FY '74 and FY '75 thru FY '79.

We believe it vital to promptly construct and operate a limited number of large solar collectors using current technology. The information gained should prove invaluable in the further development of this vital, renewable, nonpolluting energy resource.

The enclosures will provide you with additional information on some of GSA's activities in the energy conservation and solar energy areas. Please advise if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR F. SAMPSON,
Administrator.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: On page 33, line 5, strike "405" and insert "406".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "405. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, not to exceed \$425,000 of the amount herein made available for the Federal Communications Commission may be used for land and structures. "Sec. 406."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and motion was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLAND. 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.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10614, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 589

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10614) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. 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. After the passage of H.R. 10614, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill 2408, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 10614 as passed by the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 517]

Alexander	Fuqua	Riegle
Ashley	Gray	Roncallo, N.Y.
Aspin	Hanna	Rosenthal
Barrett	Hebert	Sandman
Breckinridge	Lent	Satterfield
Brown, Calif.	Mailliard	Sisk
Buchanan	Mathis, Ga.	Steele
Carey, N.Y.	Mayne	Sullivan
Chisholm	Michel, Ill.	Tierman
Clark	Mills, Ark.	Udall
Clay	Mosher	Widnall
Conyers	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Crane	Nedzi	Wilson,
Dickinson	Patman	Charles H.,
Evins, Tenn.	Pickle	Calif.
Fascell	Railsback	Wydler
Fountain	Rarick	Yatron
Frey	Reid	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1974

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 589 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 10614, a bill to authorize construction of certain military installations.

House Resolution 589 provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections. House Resolution 589 also provides that after the passage of H.R. 10614, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2408, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2408 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 10614 as passed by the House.

H.R. 10614 provides military construction authorization in support of the active military forces and Reserve components for the fiscal year 1974. The bill also includes authorization for military family housing. The total authorization provided for in the bill is \$2,715,924,000.

The Committee on Armed Services reduced the authorization request \$341,286,000, approximately 11.4 percent of the total request.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 589 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 10614.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 10614, military construction authorization, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate. It also provides that the bill be read by titles instead of by sections, and makes it in order to insert the House-passed language in the Senate bill (S. 2408).

H.R. 10614 authorizes for appropriation \$2,651,227,000 for military construction, which is a reduction of \$341,286,000 from the amount requested by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule in order that the House may begin debate on H.R. 10614.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10614) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10614, with Mr. STEEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY) will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, today, we are presenting H.R. 10614, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1974.

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments, and is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1974.

The new authorization request for fiscal year 1974 totals \$2,970,790,000. In fiscal year 1973, the Department of Defense

requested \$2,686,800,000 after reducing the initial construction request for Safeguard facilities which was made possible by the SALT agreements. Actual enactment in fiscal year 1973 totaled \$2,549,525,000. The increase requested in fiscal year 1974 over the revised amount requested in fiscal year 1973 is due primarily to additional emphasis on people-related projects such as bachelor and family housing construction, and medical facility replacement and modernization; facilities for the Navy's Trident weapon system, as well as continued emphasis on the Reserve Forces and the pollution abatement program.

The construction proposals contained in the fiscal year 1974 request are located at approximately 300 named installations and there are some 700 separate construction projects.

In view of the emphasis on people-related projects in the fiscal year 1974 request, your Armed Services Committee faced an especially difficult task in effecting substantial reductions. However, every member of your Armed Services Committee was determined that the final committee recommendation should be made on a realistic basis, and recommend only those projects that the committee was fully convinced were essential to our military needs.

After extensive hearings by the subcommittee in 25 sessions, and review of each project requested by the Department of Defense, the committee was successful in searching out those proposals that in our view could be deferred without impairing the operational effectiveness of the armed services. In addition, the committee is convinced that these reductions will in no way jeopardize our national security.

The committee agreed to a new total in the amount of \$2,715,934,000 in new authorizations and deficiency authorizations. That amount is for specific projects authorized for construction and is a reduction of \$276,589,000. However, the committee reduced the amount authorized for appropriation by an additional \$64,697,000, leaving the total amount authorized for appropriation in the fiscal year 1974 at \$2,651,227,000. This is a reduction in the total requested authorization in the amount of \$341,286,000 or a reduction of 11.4 percent.

I would like to discuss each project in H.R. 10614 with you, but I am afraid I would unnecessarily try the patience of this committee. However, there are many significant items contained in this bill which I do feel that you would be interested in.

In the family housing section of the bill, 11,688 units of new housing were requested, at an average unit cost of \$27,500, an increase of \$3,500 from last year's average. The committee voted to increase from \$24,000 to \$28,500 the average unit cost for housing within the United States except Alaska and Hawaii; but limit the number of units to be constructed to 9,000.

Further, the committee voted to authorize 400 units of family housing at the naval complex, Jacksonville, Fla., and 325 units at the naval complex, San Diego, Calif., which units had been pre-

viously authorized at installations and facilities now slated for closure or substantial reduction. The Defense Department also requested an increase in the maximum square foot limitations on floor area in military family housing which ranged from 0 to 11 percent.

The committee was not convinced that the proposed new standard would provide any significant improvement to the housing over the existing standard. The small space increase would not provide additional rooms, but would provide minor increases in the size of existing rooms. Accordingly, the committee denied the requested increase in the maximum limitations on floor area.

The committee agreed to increase the cost limitations for permanent barracks and bachelor officer quarters. The committee action would make the new cost limitations \$28.50 per square foot for permanent barracks and \$30.50 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters. The previous cost limitations were \$27 and \$29, respectively. A new provision was added by the committee to prohibit the construction of permanent barracks authorized in titles I, II, III, and IV, which would provide for the planned occupancy of fewer than four persons per room for enlisted grades E-4 and below and fewer than two persons per room for enlisted grades E-5, E-6, and E-7. Current designs of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy presented to the committee would provide private bath facilities for each three-man room module, while the Department of the Air Force proposal would provide a private bath for each two-man room module. The subcommittee felt that the efforts on the part of the services to provide such accommodations were excessive and were neither necessary nor fiscally prudent.

That, in a nutshell, is our recommendation to the committee. We believe our recommendation to you is a good one, and one all of you can support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. As the gentleman knows, the amended section 608 of the bill on page 46 has language in it that would allow military departments to exchange land with the General Services Administration under the GSA's authority, without going to Congress. I wanted to ask the gentleman several questions in connection with that for the record.

I wondered why the amendment has been added this year.

Mr. PIKE. It was the opinion of the subcommittee, and of the full committee, that by doing so we could cut out a great deal of red tape. The GSA is loaded with real estate which it has gotten from the military but they cannot give any of it back to the military in an exchange proposition for other pieces of property without coming back to the Congress. We did not think that made much sense.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The GSA has been under considerable criticism, as the

gentleman knows; it is far from a faultless agency. This new provision of course puts land exchanges under GSA authority. I wonder if that is very prudent and will be in the best interest of the military department?

Mr. PIKE. Any proposed acquisition by the military over \$50,000 under this amendment would be reported by the military department concerned to the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate 30 days in advance, under title 10 of the United States Code. This is under existing law.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. So anything over \$50,000 would be under the purview of the Congress?

Mr. PIKE. Yes.

I think it will eliminate red tape and allow them to exchange one chunk of military-owned property for another chunk of military-owned property through GSA much more rapidly than under present provisions.

Let me be complete in my answer. It is not necessary for just property held by the GSA but the property which they acquire by the military.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. So the gentleman believes there are ample safeguards to protect the public interest?

Mr. PIKE. Yes, I do.

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

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman and all the members of the subcommittee for the careful manner in which they have gone over this budget request. Military construction is not the most glamorous issue. It is a very diffuse situation and I do think the House owes the gentleman and his whole committee a debt of gratitude for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. PIKE. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to pay my own respect to all the members of the subcommittee who did sit through those hearings, which were just about as interesting as reading an encyclopedia or a dictionary of a foreign language one does not understand. We had 25 separate sessions in going through this bill. It did take a great deal of time. The members were most cooperative. Our staff, under Mr. Shumate, was tremendously effective in helping us.

I do think we have cut this bill substantially, and sometimes on unanimous votes and sometimes on close votes, but we came up with a bill which was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee. I hope it will pass the House in the same way.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I also commend the chairman for the very careful work of the committee. As a matter of fact I think the other body passed this bill through in a very short time. We took a great deal of time in trying to be as fair as we could. I think we have now a very fine bill.

I would like to comment in support of the Army's efforts toward pollution abatement.

The past few years have seen a tremendous effort on the part of the Army to comply with Executive Order 11507 of February 4, 1970, and with local, State and Federal pollution abatement regulations. In fiscal years 1972 and 1973 a total of over \$131 million in construction was programmed by the Army and approved by Congress in support of this program. In this fiscal year 1974 bill the committee reviewed Army pollution abatement projects, both for air and water, proposed for 27 installations located in 22 States.

This year's program totals over \$14 million, down somewhat from the earlier programs which responded to the major requirements known at the time. The fiscal year 1974 program continues the drive toward a cleaner environment and satisfies newly identified requirements derived from increasingly more stringent standards. It also accomplishes projects which were deferred from inclusion in earlier programs for technological reasons.

The future will bring further increased standards and greater technological demands in this fight to cleanse our environment. The Army, and the other services, are making a significant contribution toward winning this battle.

Gentlemen, I solicit your support for this worthy program which is clearly in the national interest. Thank you.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) who I understand wants to get out of town as quickly as possible to attend a special dinner tonight.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentleman from New York recognizing me at this time. It so happens our distinguished senior Senator has a 50th anniversary celebration in New Hampshire tonight and I have to go up there tonight along with my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND).

I want to make one or two comments about the factual situation that we face here.

At page 22 in the committee's report now before the House, it is indicated that a modification in the crane rail system request for the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has been denied on the basis that it may be deferred to a future year "without serious impact on the shipyard's operations." Apparently, the committee erroneously concluded that the funds requested for this crane rail system, \$2,817,000, constituted an add-on to the original bill. For this reason, the committee denied the funding together with several other projects believed by the committee to be in this category.

The concept of "add-on" relates to items not requested in authorizing legislation being reported by the committee. This item was officially requested by the Navy Department in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, on July 17, 1973. In this letter, the Navy indicated that it would make adjustments within the budget so that no additional

appropriations were requested. Specifically, it offered to delete and defer a part of the funds for a hospital replacement in Orlando, Fla., to the extent of \$1,331,000, and reductions of Trident support complex and flight test facilities in phase 1, totaling \$6,903,000.

In short, what the Navy Department has done in this instance is to request that the money for this crane rail system be authorized to it, with a full offset at its request from other moneys heretofore allocated by it to other purposes.

The crane rail system at Portsmouth is badly needed and fully justified. It meets the requirements of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Armed Services for it is not an add-on and apparently an honest mistake has occurred with regard to this item. In short, it is a substitute.

I quote from the letter of the Navy Department to Chairman HÉBERT on July 17:

The Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget have approved several important revisions to the Navy's Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Program. These agencies have granted clearance for the Navy to present the changes to the Armed Services Committees for modification of the Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Authorization Bill.

The proposed changes will not increase the amount contained in the President's budget for Military Construction.

Attached to this request was an explanatory sheet, as I have said, indicating where certain items requested in May were to be dropped or reduced to accommodate the increase requested for Portsmouth.

The reason the Navy delayed its request for this substitution was because, of necessity, it had to respond to the base-realignment announcement made by the Secretary of Defense in late April. The bill before the committee was submitted on May 3 and the Navy Department did not have time to assess its particular situation in terms of what materiel and equipment would be made available to installations not affected by the closure order from those scheduled to be closed.

In late 1972, the final modernization report for the Portsmouth Navy Yard pointed to a deficiency that needed urgent attention. This was the fact that the yard badly needed additional new heavy equipment cranes for the performance of work on the waterfront in the repair and overhaul of nuclear submarines. However, the cranes would have to be specially ordered because the rails over which these 56-ton cranes would move—next to the drydock work area—were of the 15-gage width, while most portal cranes of this capacity made today need a 20-gage width. This equipment is very expensive and the lead-time in ordering it is almost a year and a half.

In June, the Navy determined that two large portal cranes could be made available as a result of the closure of the Boston Navy Yard and that the net result would be a saving in the long run; in addition to modernizing a needed weight-lifting service, which is presently only 60

percent of that required in the performance of work at the Portsmouth Yard.

The requested crane rail system would provide an additional rail for an obsolete gage track system serving two of the three drydocks and two of the main berths at the Portsmouth Navy Yard. The additional rail will enable the facility to utilize present 15-gage, 20-ton cranes as well as the additional 20-gage 56-ton cranes scheduled from Boston.

Mr. Chairman, deferral of this needed project will seriously impact on the shipyard operations, because the existing cranes cannot provide required lifting services without costly delays in overhaul and repair of modern nuclear subs. These delays are estimated to cost \$400,000 each year and increase overhaul time for each submarine by at least 5 days. Deferral will also complicate removal of the two 56-ton cranes required by Portsmouth from their present Boston location. Provision of the added rail system will obviate the necessity of purchasing two new cranes later on.

I am convinced that the Government will realize a saving by providing the funds now and that to delay will cost the taxpayers substantial additional sums that can be avoided by acceding to this Navy request.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I respectfully urge my colleagues, after considering these facts and alternatives, to recede in conference to the Senate bill (S. 2408), which contains authorization of these funds for this purpose. The Navy is going to keep the Portsmouth Navy Shipyard. I am advised that its mission is established and consists of the repair, overhaul, and conversion of nuclear submarines. They must eventually modernize the 15-gage track system there and have properly requested this authority as a substitute in order to accommodate the cranes to be transferred to Portsmouth from the closing of the Boston Navy Yard. Unless this work is done and done now, the Portsmouth track system will be unable to accommodate these cranes and they will have to sit unused for an additional year. This is wasteful and unnecessary.

I accordingly respectfully request from my colleagues that they will cover this point in conference since the funds are authorized in the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee, whether this matter will be attended to in conference.

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

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, if I am one of the conferees, I can assure the gentleman that I will do my best to see that it will be taken care of in conference.

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

Mr. Chairman, so that the record will be complete in this matter, at this point I include a copy of the Navy request for substitution submitted to Chairman HÉBERT on July 17, together with a specific justification for the project:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1973.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget have approved several important revisions to the Navy's Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Program. These agencies have granted clearance for the Navy to present the changes to the Armed Services Committees for modification of the Fiscal Year 1974 Military Construction Authorization Bill.

The proposed changes will not increase the amount contained in the President's budget for Military Construction, Navy.

A listing of the requested changes to the Navy program, the justification for each change, and the legislative language to effect the necessary modifications to the Authorization Bill submitted to the Congress on 3 May 1973 are enclosed.

Favorable consideration of these changes is requested during deliberations on the FY 1974 Military Construction Authorization Bill.

A similar letter has been submitted to the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JACK L. BOWERS,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy,
Installations and Logistics.

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO NAVY'S FISCAL YEAR 1974
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM

NEW AUTHORIZATION—TITLE II

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation project	From	To	Change
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES			
First Naval District: Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H., additional crane rail system	0	2,817	2,817
Sixth Naval District: Naval Hospital, Orlando, Fla., hospital replacement	22,312	20,981	(1,331)
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla., systems development and test facility	2,100	2,300	200
Naval Aerospace Regional Medical Center, Pensacola, Fla., medical/dental support facilities	0	1,084	1,084
Eleventh Naval District: Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif., applied instruction building	1,123	1,542	419
Twelfth Naval District: Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, Calif., operational trainer building addition	0	430	430
Various locations—inside United States, Trident facilities: Trident support complex and flight test facilities, phase I	125,223	118,320	(6,903)
Net—Title II new authorization changes	150,758	147,474	(3,284)

AMENDMENT TO PRIOR AUTHORIZATION

	Auth.	Current working cost estimate	Change
Fiscal year 1971 authorization law: Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va.— Sewage treatment system	530	779	249
Fiscal year 1972 authorization law: Naval air station, Meridian, Miss., installation total	3,266	3,859	593
Fiscal year 1973 authorization law: Naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla., bomb loading plant modernization	5,946	8,388	2,442
Total amendment changes	9,742	13,026	3,284

An amendment is needed primarily because of the escalation of the bachelor enlisted quarters (BEQ) project. Since there is a more urgent requirement for the BEQ, than the enlisted mens (EM) club it was decided to proceed with the BEQ construction and defer the EM club construction until enactment of the fiscal year 1974 Authorization and Appropriation Laws.

JUSTIFICATION

The Additional Crane Rail System project was included in the Navy's FY 1974 Military Construction Program at \$2,817,000. The Senate Armed Services Committee authorized the project in S. 2408 on 13 September 1973. The House Armed Services Committee denied the project on the grounds that it could be deferred to a future year without serious impact on the Shipyard operations. The justification for the project is as follows:

a. The project provides an additional rail for an obsolete gage portal crane track system serving two of the three dry docks and two of the main berths at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. The additional rail will enable the Portsmouth Shipyard to utilize two large portal cranes to be made available as the result of the closure of the Boston Naval Shipyard the latter part of Fiscal Year 1974. Existing cranes can also continue to operate on the old track. Deferral of the project will seriously impact on the Portsmouth Shipyard operations because the three existing cranes cannot provide required crane services without costly delays in overhaul and repair of modern submarines. These delays are estimated to cost \$400,000 each year and increase overhaul time for a submarine at least five days. Deferral will also complicate removal of the two 56-ton capacity cranes required by Portsmouth from their present Boston location.

b. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workload has recently changed from predominantly new construction of modern submarines to overhaul and repair. An engineering study by a commercial firm recommended augmentation of waterfront crane services to provide the additional crane lifts necessary for the overhaul work. Available portal crane service is only 60 percent of that required. The Shipyard Modernization Program completed in 1972 for Portsmouth planned acquisition of two additional cranes designed for the obsolete gage of the present system but of limited lifting capacity because of the gage restriction. Provision of an additional crane rail and utilization of the two cranes available from the Boston Naval Shipyard, due to the realignment of the shore establishment, will provide a more modern system with greater capability and obviate the necessity to purchase new cranes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10614, the fiscal year 1974 military construction authorization bill. This is a sound bill. I urge its immediate enactment.

At this point, I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) for his vigorous and patriotic leadership in drafting and presenting this bill. The members of the subcommittee also worked diligently and effectively to produce it. They, too, deserve much credit.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the major authorization bills that the Armed Services Committee presents to the House each year. Earlier, we presented the weapons procurement authorization bill.

I would like to express my full support of H.R. 10614 because it recognizes twin goals. It provides construction which our committee believes to be necessary, and at the same time it recognizes the President's call for economy and a reduction of defense expenditures whenever possible. I will not take the time of the House to go into extensive detail, because I do not think it is nec-

essary to repeat what most of you have read in our report.

The reductions made by the Armed Services Committee were not based on a judgment that the items were not desirable or important but because the committee felt they could be safely deferred without jeopardizing the security of the Nation or reducing the effectiveness of our military services.

Last year, the net reduction we were able to make was approximately 3 percent. This year, as pointed out by the chairman, we were able to reduce the Department's request by 11.4 percent. I know that there are Members who feel that there are justifiable programs in their districts which deserve to be authorized.

I can only say that, looking at one project alone, I would probably agree with them. However, we are obliged to evaluate each project on its merits relative to other proposed projects. This bill is limited to what we deem essential. We look upon a stable economy as a second line of defense.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other things I could say about this legislation, but I will not take the time of the House to do so now. The committee report fully spells out the programs approved, and we are prepared to answer any questions that the Members may have.

I hope the Members of the House will support this bill unanimously.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10614, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1974. The proposed 100-bed hospital at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point will fill a need that has been recognized for several years. The present facility is inadequate to serve the medical needs of the Academy's large, growing cadet corps.

The new West Point hospital is expected to serve the community at West Point for at least 20 years. If history is any guide, it will probably serve for more than 50 years before being replaced.

There are several major considerations favoring the construction of a new hospital at West Point: The Army's long-range projections for the size of the Academy community; the Surgeon General's estimate of hospital utilization and the Defense Department's allowances for hospital use by retired personnel.

Several alternative plans, including a facility of reduced size and a renovation of the existing facility, have been considered, but it has been reasonably concluded that neither of those alternatives will result in sufficient savings justifying the sacrifice of functional necessities provided by a new hospital. None of the alternatives can provide the modern, efficient health care made possible by a new hospital in a location removed from the congested activities of the central cadet area.

To serve one of the finest military institutions in the world, it makes sense to have a first-rate hospital.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the staff and all the Members for their careful and hard work on this bill, particularly at this time when we are trying to save, if we can, financial burdens on our country. It has been a very determined effort on their part, which has been successful, to keep this bill down to a bare-bones type of presentation.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very real pleasure to address my colleagues on the subject of the military construction bill. The committee on Armed services, under the most learned and able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has produced a sound, well-balanced program for each of our military services. I welcome this opportunity to speak in support of enactment of this military construction authorization bill. I will address my remarks to title II of the bill, the Navy's program, which totals \$539.9 million.

The purpose of the naval shore establishment is to provide the required logistic support for our modern naval forces. With today's technological developments resulting in an evolution of new and more efficient naval forces and weapons systems, modern and in many instances complicated and unique shore facilities are required to give the proper support. The Armed Services Committee has the continuing objective of ensuring that naval and Marine Corps units receive the necessary authorization to provide those essential facilities required for the maintenance of a high state of combat readiness. Construction, as authorized in this bill, will provide positive advances in accomplishing this objective.

In order to assure that the shore stations are fully capable of providing needed support, the Navy maintains surveillance of the facilities available and required. As deficiencies are identified, new weapons systems become operative, and as advancements are attained through research, the Navy's military construction managers conduct critical reviews of the competing facilities requirements. By this means, the Navy determines which of the urgent requirements are most urgent. This procedure results in a finely balanced program such as is contained in title II of the bill.

This year the Navy stressed the projects associated with: strategic forces—which is primarily Trident—and all-volunteer force, major weapon systems, pollution abatement, new technology, and training facilities.

STRATEGIC FORCES

The committee approved \$118.3 million to initiate construction of a Trident refit complex and facilities for flight testing the Trident missile. The facilities approved this year are vital for meeting the initial operational capability date of late calendar year 1978 for this weapons system which will be the country's seabased deterrent in future years. The Trident facilities support project represents 21 percent of this year's authorized program.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

Almost 30 percent of the Navy's program this year was assigned to projects

that will assist the Navy in achieving an all-volunteer force. These projects are in the categories of bachelor housing, community support facilities—which are clubs, exchanges, commissary stores and recreational facilities—medical facilities and facilities which enable a ship in port to shut down its boiler plant and electrical generation equipment. The latter facilities are identified as cold iron facilities.

For projects associated with an all-volunteer force, approximately 80 percent was requested for bachelor housing and medical facilities. The bachelor housing facilities approved will provide approximately 10,900 bachelor enlisted and 200 bachelor officer spaces. The medical program approved this year of approximately \$42 million significantly increases the \$28 million average of the last 5 years. This year's program is the start of an active program by the Department of Defense to improve the delivery of health care to service personnel. Cold iron facilities, which represent about 14 percent of the all-volunteer force projects, were requested by the Navy to reduce watch standing requirements when a ship is in port. This will enable the Navy to maximize the amount of time ships' personnel may spend with their families. Other benefits from the cold iron program is in shipboard equipment maintenance and fleet readiness. Community support facilities are only 6 percent of the all-volunteer projects and only 2 percent of the total authorized program. The Navy has requested very few morale, welfare and recreation facilities in the past, but some of these facilities should be authorized each year to provide stimulating leisure activities for Navy personnel.

MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEMS

For major weapons systems, the committee approved only \$8 million for projects associated with the F-14 supersonic jet carrier based fighter aircraft, the A-7E attack aircraft, the Mark 48 torpedo, and the airborne mine countermeasures weapons system. Although this seems small, it should not be forgotten that \$118 million was addressed and approved for Trident under strategic forces weapon systems.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

This year the committee approved \$78.6 million for air and water pollution abatement facilities at naval and Marine Corps installations, with a breakdown between air and water of \$27.5 and \$51.1 million, respectively. With \$204 million authorized for the Navy since fiscal year 1968, the Navy advised that they have been able to achieve substantial compliance with directives concerning the environment. The Navy indicates that pollution abatement efforts must continue strong in succeeding years with attention focused on:

First, facilities that have been deferred pending development of the necessary technology, or deferred pending availability of regional systems to connect to; second, additional facilities for shoreside disposal of sanitary wastes from ships; third, application of forthcoming noise standards to naval facilities; and fourth, facilities needed to meet increasingly stringent local, State, and Federal pollution

abatement standards. These new standards are being developed, in large measure, as a response to recent congressional actions such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, and the Noise Control Act of 1972. Each of these acts contained a specific requirement that Federal agencies comply with Federal, State, interstate, and local standards.

NEW TECHNOLOGY

For new technology the committee approved \$22 million for research, development, test, and evaluation facilities associated with the antiship cruise missile, communications, manned underwater systems, and coastal region warfare. This excludes \$4 million of R.D.T. & E. facilities associated with the Trident missile, since all Trident facilities were previously addressed under strategic forces

TRAINING FACILITIES

The Navy states that trained personnel are the Navy's greatest asset. This being the case, the Navy is taking several positive actions to strengthen, modernize, and vitalize its training programs. One action was the establishment in August 1971, of the Chief of Naval Training with the responsibility of overseeing and managing all training, whether academic or applied, shipboard, aircraft or submarine. Training with a common core curriculum will be consolidated to the degree feasible at one installation.

The committee approved \$50 million for training facilities with 89 percent for applied instruction and the balance for academic training facilities.

SUMMARY

The Navy program provides facilities for those areas of greatest need. The projects are required this year to satisfy new and current missions, and to provide facilities to modernize the shore establishment. I recommend that this bill be enacted as reported.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the committee has worked long and hard, and this bill contains many good things, particularly including the increase in authorization for housing. I appreciate the committee's help for my district. However, I believe I should call attention to the fact that a number of budget-approved items which were sent to the committee after the regular budget submission or were proposed as substitutes by the Department of Defense for items deleted by the Department from the original bill, were not reported favorably by the committee.

Since I am fully knowledgeable on at least one of these projects, I call to the attention of the committee my disappointment in the deletion of medical/dental support facilities requested for the Naval Aerospace and Regional Medical Center in Pensacola for \$1,084,000. This project, although small in size and low in cost, is necessary for proper medical attention for naval personnel, particularly at the Naval Communications Training Center. A new naval hospital is under construction at the Naval Air

Station. It was planned to locate all clinical and support facilities for the Pensacola area in this hospital. At the time the new hospital was programmed, the projected student load at the Naval Communications Training Center was 1,700. Now it is 4,100 and this is considered its permanent level. Such a large increase requires that medical/dental treatment be provided as quickly as possible to the student population at the training center rather than at the general hospital which is several miles away.

Concurrent with the increase in the student load, a new requirement to establish a family practice residency program at Pensacola was generated. This program will train Navy doctors who will provide vital health care services of the "family doctor" type to naval personnel and their dependents. The Navy has experienced shortages in this type of medical personnel, as has the rest of our society. They have wisely decided to institute programs at several of their medical centers in order to train Navy doctors in family practice. The family practice residency program at Pensacola was temporarily established in a bachelor enlisted quarters building at the existing hospital site. In order for this family practice residency program to perform in an effective manner, following completion of the new hospital, it must be operated in the area of the new naval hospital and receive common ancillary services support; that is, laboratory, radiology, and pharmacy.

With these new requirements, the construction program to support the concept of health care delivery requires a medical/dental treatment directly in the student area at the Training Center. This will permit conversion of the active duty sick-call area of the new hospital to a family practice clinic. Additionally, this project will permit the construction of a regional medical warehouse convenient to the new naval hospital. If this project is deferred, the delivery of health care in the Pensacola area, particularly as it affects active duty students at Corry Field, will diminish and family practice training will be adversely affected.

I am well aware of the problems which confront this committee in its attempts to be selective and to provide authorization only for projects which are seriously needed. This is one of those projects. Which is seriously needed. I feel that the committee made a mistake in leaving it out, and I sincerely urge that the committee, in conference, accept this item which already has been approved by the Senate and is in the Senate bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the recommendations for the increased statutory limitations on average unit costs in the defense family housing program.

To meet the requirements of an all-volunteer force, a force which we of the Congress support wholeheartedly, the services must attract and retain quality personnel. Adequate housing for the

serviceman and his family is recognized as an essential element in obtaining that goal. Time and our changing living standards have eroded the adequacy of military housing, even that which we have built in recent years and have yet to build under the fiscal year 1973 authorization.

I solicit your support to provide a program which will, in fact, allow the development of adequate housing for the uniformed services.

In fiscal years 1972 and 1973 the statutory limitation for new construction was \$24,000. The services experienced great difficulty in obtaining housing at that figure in fiscal year 1972 and could not, in fact, obtain all the housing authorized for that year. Houses that were built were kept within the statutory limit only by the sacrifice of many items considered standard in modern construction. The fiscal year 1974 program is in more difficulty yet as costs have increased rapidly while the statutory limitation remained the same. Construction costs have continued to rise, more than 20 percent since the fiscal year 1972 legislation was passed. The statutory limit must be increased accordingly to provide for an adequate housing program.

Of equal importance is the necessity of improving existing military quarters to the standards demanded by today's life style. Many of these quarters were built in the early 1950's and have not been improved since. Rising construction costs, again, have impacted on this program to the point that necessary improvements cannot be accomplished under the limitations imposed in previous years which was \$10,000. The \$15,000 recommended is both reasonable and necessary.

Our goal to develop and maintain an all-volunteer force will be greatly enhanced by this proposal and I encourage your support in this important matter.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BEARD).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on behalf of the troop housing projects for the Army in the bill before you.

The Army is continuing their very determined efforts to provide modern, adequate housing for their bachelor military personnel. They are proceeding in a well planned, orderly manner. In locating the many projects included in this year's program the Army has assured us that emphasis has again been placed on those troop stations which have the largest deficits in permanent, adequate bachelor housing.

The fiscal year 1974 military construction bill will provide nearly 70,000 spaces for enlisted personnel and over 800 spaces for bachelor officer personnel at permanent installations in the United States. This program is essentially the second major increment of this multi-year program.

The proper housing of our soldiers is a most critical aspect of our support for the Armed Forces. The Army should be

commanded for their massive efforts in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I solicit approval of the housing projects in this bill before us.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. O'BRIEN).

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the construction of the Army medical facilities included in the bill before you.

There have been major advances throughout the medical field—in equipment, in medicines, in facilities, and in health care delivery techniques—having significant impacts on health services. Unfortunately, the military services have, for a variety of reasons, lagged somewhat behind in taking advantage of many aspects of these advances. We can ill afford to let such a condition exist for our soldiers and their families.

Particularly deficient are the facilities. For several years many of our military hospitals and clinics have functioned in old World War II temporary type wooden structures. These buildings have long ago outlived their functional adequacy and economical life. Operating from such inadequate facilities places an even greater burden on often undermanned staffs. Many of our more recent hospitals located in permanent structures are inadequate on a space basis. They have an insufficient number of treatment rooms and outpatient clinics, often the pharmacy area is much too small, or the inpatient wards offer little flexibility leading to inefficient utilization.

This year's bill includes a modest start on an accelerated medical facilities improvement program directed by the Secretary of Defense in late 1972. There are four medical projects totaling over \$32 million in the bill recommended by your committee. Not reflected in this bill is an extensive planning and design effort now ongoing which will surface in medical projects proposed in later programs.

I am convinced the Army's efforts to improve health care for our soldiers and their families deserves our strongest support. What could be more in the national interest than the well being of our Armed Forces. I solicit your approval of the Army's medical facility projects.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to comment that the Empire State has never been better represented than it is on this subcommittee, with the lion's share of the credit for a well-done job going to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that in this authorization there is an item of \$11,996,000 for berthing piers and pier facilities at the San Diego Naval Station in California.

The need for these facilities arises because of the recent shore establishment reorganization and the consequent fleet relocations which have ensued from that reorganization. The entire armada of ships that was, for many years, homeported in the Port of Long Beach, Calif.,

adjacent to the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, has been moved elsewhere, mostly to San Diego. Some 43 Long Beach ships were involved in this massive shift in home ports. Three of the affected ships are large, very expensive nuclear surface ships: The *Bainbridge*, the *Truxton*, and the *Long Beach*. These nuclear powered ships cost about \$1 billion to build and would cost almost \$2 billion, possibly even more, to replace.

Now, while home-ported and stationed at the Port of Long Beach, these three important ships are tied up to piers that are easily accessible to the ocean. All a commander has to do is to back down about 100 yards, make a slight left turn, and he heads his ship directly out to sea and to safety from these locations.

In contrast, after these ships are moved to the Port of San Diego, they will be tied up at piers back far inland from the entry buoy in San Diego. Back to where two of these ships will probably be tied up is a distance of 8 miles inland, 8 miles through a narrow, 600-foot channel, in waters that themselves are quite shallow in relation to the kind and depths of waters that one would like to travel in when considering the safety of his ships. If that bridge were ever brought down, those ships would remain immobilized for a great length of time.

The two other nuclear cruisers would go as far as 6 miles back inland in San Diego Bay, also via this same narrow tortuous, shallow, heavily trafficked channel.

There are not only such things as attacks that could bring that bridge down, or otherwise block that channel and actively or constructively destroy those priceless ships, but there are such things as earthquakes, sabotage, civilian disturbances, tidal waves, maritime action, and probably a host of other hazards to which vessels of the sea are always subjected when they leave the sea and come to the vicinity of the shore.

Those hazards can be diminished by many orders of magnitude if these three ships are left at Long Beach rather than moved and landlocked deep in San Diego Bay. They should be left where they are relatively safe, not deliberately sent where they are relatively endangered.

I call to the attention of this body the fact that these unique and extraordinary naval cruisers are the kinds of ships that precisely during World War II became the focus of the entire war.

You remember the dramatic story of the *Graf Spee*, when that pocket battleship escaped from the land-bound harbor of Hamburg, Germany, and swept out across the seas of the world. The entire military focus of the allies necessarily had to be on that single ship until she was tracked down and destroyed.

Here are three ships of an identical character, but even greater power potential so long as they can get to sea. These ships should not be placed in harm's way by being berthed far inside a narrow, dangerous channel. They should be left where they are, where they have a clear chance to quickly flee hazardous circumstances, where they have a chance to flee to the open sea where they can be relatively

safer than they are at the land. Then they will be able to perform the functions for which the tremendous investment in them was made to safeguard the safety of the United States.

The expenditures that are to be authorized here for the berthing and the pier utilities at San Diego can be used for other ships than these three specific nuclear ships about which I speak. It would be impossible to devise an amendment that would cover the situation only of these special ships to keep them where they are now. I nevertheless want to point out to this body that I believe a very unwise error is being made by the redeployment of these ships. Perhaps that can be forestalled in some other way, particularly by some wisdom on the part of high naval authorities.

The alleged savings in money to be made by jamming San Diego Harbor full of most of the Pacific Fleet is minuscule compared to the Pearl Harbor-like danger this penurious move poses.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and want to join in commanding the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) for his leadership in this bill.

I have been a member of this subcommittee for some time, but I do not think I have ever seen the committee work as diligently and over as long hours and as carefully, particularly in going over a military construction bill, as it did under the leadership of the gentleman from New York.

Every item was gone over with great care. The deletions that were made in the proposals submitted from the Defense Department were based on sound judgments. It was not just a meat axe approach, taking a percentage cut or something of that kind. These cuts are all based on hard statistics. I think the committee is indebted to the gentleman from New York for his leadership in that regard.

This is a bill that certainly we can live with in the House and in the committee.

We frequently hear reference to travel by Members of Congress as being a waste of time. I might point out that one of the substantial savings in this legislation comes at least in part as a result of the fact that some members of the committee had an opportunity to visit military installations abroad during the spring and noticed that some of the accommodations that were being described to us as outmoded and inconsistent with current standards set by the Defense Department were in many cases more luxurious than those presently available to students in colleges.

This in some cases even includes Ivy League colleges.

So one of the substantial achievements in this legislation is to reduce some of these inflated requirements of the Defense Department for additional space for housing of personnel to bring them more into line with reality, and to save

the taxpayers some money. And that, too, was a measure instituted and followed through by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

So, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have been included in this subcommittee. And I think Members will be happy to know that junkets can save the taxpayers money.

Now to consider the bill in more detail:

Mr. Chairman, although I consider all portions of the bill to be of equal importance, I will address my remarks to the Navy program. In particular, I will address my remarks to that portion of the Navy's program that provides facilities for new technology—research, development, test, and evaluation—R.D.T. & E.—facilities; medical facilities; and pollution abatement.

The Navy requested new authorization of \$626.8 million and the committee authorized \$539.9 million. With this reduction, the committee had to use considerable judgment in differentiating between the fat and the muscle of the Navy program. Of the \$626.8 million requested, the Navy requested approximately \$23 million, or 4 percent of its program, for facilities to support the Navy's research, development, test, and evaluation program. A strong R.D.T. & E. program is vital to the readiness and combat effectiveness of tomorrow's Navy which will have fewer weapons and men. This year's program will provide facilities to support R.D.T. & E. associated with anti-ship cruise missile, communications manned underwater systems, and coastal region warfare. An additional \$4 million of R.D.T. & E. facilities are included for supporting timely deployment of the Trident missile.

One of the important R.D.T. & E. facilities approved this year is the project for an integrated electromagnetic test and analysis laboratory at the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. Although this is a classified project an unclassified description can be provided to show the importance of providing the facilities needed by the Navy in conducting this research, development, test and evaluation. The proposed facility will enable the Navy to move ahead in the vital area of electronic warfare alternatives for countering the threat to our surface fleet posed by the anti-ship cruise missile. The Soviets have advanced their hardware development for many types of anti-ship weapon systems such that after being air, surface, or subsurface launched and attaining low level, supersonic cruising speed they can home on surface ship targets. The Navy expects the anti-ship missile threat to grow as the Soviets develop increased capabilities for multiple missile launches against entire task forces and as they install improved guidance and homing systems into the ships and submarines of their fleets.

The integrated electromagnetic test and analysis laboratory project will provide a facility to support research and development in an area offering great potential as a countermeasure—one that provides significant peace and wartime capabilities and which will complement the "hard kill" approach of our defensive

systems embodied in the interim close-in weapons systems (CIWS) or the longer range AEGIS system. This facility fosters electronic warfare research and development and will permit the Navy to make the necessary tests and trade-off studies to develop countermeasures which are both highly reliable and cost effective. Simply stated, the technology the Navy is pursuing will allow highly sophisticated electromagnetic "jamming" and "deception" techniques to be employed by individual ships or entire task forces to divert incoming missiles from their intended course, causing the missiles to miss and impact at a safe distance from the target. These techniques will also materially support and increase the effectiveness of the "hard kill" defensive systems.

The development of effective countermeasures for the anti-ship cruise missile is one of the Navy's top priorities. I fully support the committee's action in approving facilities at the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, which will enable the Navy to move ahead with this research and development.

In the communications area, an electronics development and test laboratory was approved in the amount of \$4,518,000 at the Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, Calif.

This project will provide facilities needed for effective development and try-before-buy performance testing of electronic guidance control, communications, and surveillance systems for the new guided missile frigate, destroyer, and amphibious assault ships.

In the area of manned underwater systems, the environmental health effects laboratory—second phase—approved at the Naval Research Institute, Bethesda, Md., will provide facilities to experiment with animals at a 3,300-foot depth so that operational human diving depths may be lowered from 1,500 to 2,000 feet and beyond.

At the Navy Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla., an experimental diving facility was approved that will utilize the results of the basic research completed at the environmental health effects laboratory, in testing and evaluating diving schedules, excursion diving, crew training, and underwater salvage operations.

In the coastal region warfare field, a system development and test facility was approved for coastal testing and amphibious operation research at the Navy Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Fla.

MEDICAL PROGRAM

The medical program approved this year significantly increases the amount authorized in prior fiscal years. This year \$42 million was authorized as compared with an average for the past 5 years of \$28 million.

There is recognition within the Defense Department of a serious need to upgrade medical facilities so that the delivery of health care will be improved. The quality of medical care has not diminished, just the delivery. The majority of the inefficiencies in the Navy's present health care system stem from

the inadequate facilities in which the physicians and dentists are required to practice their profession. Medical facilities that are unsatisfactory from a professional standpoint does very little toward motivating a physician or dentist to make a career of the Navy. In recognition of these problems, the Navy, under the direction of the Department of Defense, will embark next year on a \$600 million medical modernization program with a 5-year goal for completing the modernization. Major medical improvement projects approved this year were: a 150-bed nursing unit at the Naval hospital, New Orleans; alterations and modernization of Naval hospitals at Quantico, Va.; Great Lakes, Ill.; Oakland, Calif.; Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and Guam; and 11 dispensary and/or dental clinic projects.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

This year the committee approved \$78.6 million for pollution abatement for the Navy which will enable the Navy to continue the aggressive program initiated in 1968 to abate air and water pollution at Naval and Marine Corps installations. The Congress has given strong support to Navy requests and authorized through fiscal year 1973, \$204 million for pollution abatement facilities. The breakdown between air and water pollution abatement facilities is \$53 and \$151 million respectively.

For air pollution abatement facilities, \$27.5 million was approved for air emissions facilities, pipe insulation working facilities, facilities to control particulate and chemical fume emissions produced in the industrial operation of coating metal surfaces, and facilities to improve boiler plant emission through fuel conversions.

For water pollution abatement, \$51.1 million was approved to provide for the construction of pier sewers for collection of sanitary waste from ships in port, facilities for handling fuels and collection, treatment, and disposal of oils and oily waste products from ships and shore installations, municipal sewer connections, improvements to sanitary sewer systems and treatment of industrial waste. Approximately 50 percent of the amount authorized is for the construction of pier sewers for disposal ashore of ship wastes. The construction of pier sewers is scheduled to coincide with the ship alterations.

SUMMARY

I wish to emphasize that in my opinion the Armed Services Committee has developed a soundly conceived, yet austere bill. I recommend that you approve it in its entirety.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY).

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise also in support of this legislation. I believe it to be good legislation. I wish also to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, and my colleague with whom I served on this subcommittee, and wish to point out that

particular emphasis was placed upon the quality of life of the military man; a lot of attention was given to the place where the man lives, where the man eats, and where the man sleeps. I think that we put priority of the homes of the military service personnel and their barracks, and I believe that we have a fine modernization program under way.

We have new barracks which are being planned for present and future needs which are consistent with the goals of an all-volunteer Army concept, and I think this is good and consistent with the thrust which the Secretary of the Army and the Department of Defense are making.

Also, a matter which has been of some personal interest to me is on the use of lands adjacent to airfields, not only in the Air Force, but at Army installations. And in this regard, Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to invite your specific attention to a program designed to provide compatible uses of lands adjacent to military airfields which are consistent with essential flying activities. When our military airfields were established years ago, they were located in rural areas in order to protect population centers from the noise of aircraft operations and to minimize the loss of life and property damage in the event of an aircraft accident. Over the years this degree of separation has diminished as our country has experienced great urban expansion and as military installations have provided economic attractions to area development.

As a result, residences, schools, and commercial and public buildings have been constructed immediately adjacent to some of our airfields. The inhabitants soon experienced considerable annoyance from the noise associated with flying operations. This significantly increased as we moved into the jet age. All too frequently members of these communities have sought relief through limitations on or outright termination of military flight operations. Obviously, such actions seriously degrade mission capability and in turn jeopardize the substantial investment that the Federal Government, the taxpayer, has made in these installations.

To prevent this situation from becoming more critical, the Air Force instituted the compatible use zone concept in the military construction program. This concept involves the development of a comprehensive land use plan for the area around an airfield which is significantly affected by aircraft operations. Primary inputs into this plan are the noise impact and accident hazard associated with flying operations. A full range of land uses are permitted within the compatible use zone, with density and use restrictions governed by tolerance to the noise and accident hazards.

For example, this means that residen-

tial construction would be acceptable outside the high noise and accident potential areas.

Ideally, comprehensive community planning and zoning is the most economical and appropriate method of achieving this necessary compatibility. This approach has been used quite successfully at several installations and will continue to be the primary method of implementation. After zoning has been pursued to the fullest extent, the Air Force will attempt to secure interests in critical areas within the zone by an exchange for excess or surplus land of equal value. As a last resort, outright purchase of sufficient interest in the most critical areas may be made to assure compatible usage.

Based on this concept, and in furtherance of the effort instituted in the fiscal year 1973 military construction program, incremental implementation is continued in this bill. An authorization involving 78,000 acres at a potential value of \$25.9 million was requested. In view of the progress toward zoning at several installations and in anticipation of successful exchanges where necessary. The bill limits the authorization to \$18 million. Moreover, only \$2 million is being requested in appropriation.

I am pleased to support an authorization that so reasonably approaches a serious problem and I suggest and solicit the support of this body so that the program may move ahead.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (**Mr. CAREY**).

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to both commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York (**Mr. PIKE**) the chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing forth a bill that realistically addresses itself to those items that are truly necessary to carry on our defense mission, and to ask a specific question. There is an item in the bill on page 7, which would upgrade and improve facilities for the military ocean terminal at Bayonne, N.J. Let me state that we of the New York port area—and the "we" being we from the State of New Jersey and the State of New York—regard our port as one unit. We are engaged in comprehensive planning to provide those who use the port, with the best possible modern facilities, and that includes modern defense transportation facilities.

I would hope, as I read the bill, that local authorities: The city of New York, the State of New York, the State of New Jersey, and the city of Bayonne plus the port authority, would continue to have access to the committee and be able to work with the committee to see that the facilities of the port are utilized to the maximum feasible degree. These authorities also wish particularly to give the Military Sea Lift Command the kind of space it needs for efficient movement. As I read in the bill, Mr. Chairman, I note that the \$1.8 million is to convert and upgrade the Bayonne facilities to put them in such shape that they can handle an expanded mission. I would hope this

does not mean the committee has reached final determination that all defense activities at the Brooklyn Terminal will cease.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New York, in response to his inquiry, that, first of all, we are well aware of the gentleman's interest in and the gentleman's dedicated efforts on behalf of the Brooklyn Port and the Army terminals, and the Navy facilities there. The item in this bill, first of all, is essentially a cost overrun item, and it is not a transfer of the facilities from Brooklyn to Bayonne.

They found they could not build the administrative facilities there at the price of \$3,245,000 which was authorized, so we have had to raise it from \$3,245,000 to \$3,603,000, and that is all it is. It is an increased authorization for a previously authorized project.

In response to the gentleman's larger question, I would simply say that while I cannot speak for the committee as a whole, I want to assure the gentleman that I personally will exert every effort that I can to see that Brooklyn gets its fair consideration as a naval port and as an Army terminal.

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

I would advise the chairman I appreciate his offer of cooperation. I shall now state for the record that the city of New York and its ports and terminals commissioner in their economic development organization are working very assiduously to place alternatives before the Defense Department for port facilities upgrading plus a variety of options that will improve shipments in that area. I hope the committee will take a look at these when they are ready and suggest to the Department of Defense that New York should receive adequate consideration.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (**Mr. GROSS**).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the distinguished yachtsman and chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, a question that is not covered by the power that he has to answer other questions.

I am curious to know, does the first column on page 3 of the report represent the budget figure? In other words, how does the final authorization of the subcommittee compare with the budget?

Mr. PIKE. The gentleman is correct. The first column does represent the budget figure, the request of the Department of Defense for authorization.

Mr. GROSS. And that is the same as the budget?

Mr. PIKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. And we have very substantially cut it, I would say to the gentleman.

I am glad that I was able to respond to his question without any advance notice or preparation. I am surprised.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman

from California such time as he may consume.

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman and I should like to ask him a question relative to section 609 of the bill, the provision dealing with the National Capital Planning Commission.

I would ask the gentleman if he was aware of any litigation pending over the Bolling-Anacostia complex at the time this section was considered?

Mr. PIKE. I will not say I was aware of any specific litigation that was pending, but I am not surprised.

Mr. STARK. I mention that because I happen to be a plaintiff in a lawsuit against the Secretary of Defense concerning construction at Bolling-Anacostia.

There would be some question raised as to whether the intention of the committee was to interfere with that litigation.

Mr. PIKE. I would answer the gentleman with a categorical no, because I was not aware of the existence of the litigation.

Mr. STARK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the Delegate from Guam such time as he may require.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10614, a bill to authorize the construction of needed military facilities at American bases throughout the world.

Included within this measure are approximately \$9.5 million in requested projects at the Navy's sizable facilities in Guam. Additionally, both the Navy Department and the U.S. Air Force are asking permission to construct a total of 1,100 new housing units in the territory.

Section 515 of the bill would increase the present housing rental allowance limit from \$250 to \$290 per month for each family. In view of the rapidly increasing housing costs across the Nation, and particularly in the offshore American areas, passage of this provision will certainly be welcomed by the men and women in uniform.

It is readily apparent from the large amount which the Navy expends annually for construction on Guam that the island is vitally important to this country's defense plans. And we on Guam are proud of our part in helping the military to do its job. Many of our people are employed at the local military bases, and it is estimated that almost 4,000 Guamanians are serving in the Armed Forces.

Despite these facts, however, I regret to state that the U.S. Navy is relentlessly pursuing a course which will certainly destroy the amiable and close relations between the civilian and military communities on Guam unless promptly checked.

The problem concerns land. Shortly after U.S. forces recaptured the island in 1944, a great deal of our limited land area was taken by the military for their activities in the war effort. By 1950, the total of federally owned land amounted to almost 50,000 acres—one-third of the entire island—all of which

they insisted was needed for national security.

During the next 25 years America became involved in two major land wars in Asia, both of which resulted in a dramatic rise in the level of military activity in the territory. And, despite the construction of many new facilities, over 11,000 acres of land which the military said was required for "national security" continues to lie unused—abandoned for all practical purposes and off limits to the very people who could make the land productive once again.

To a people living on an island only 30 miles long and 8 miles wide, every acre counts. Guam cannot afford the luxury of having 11,000, 5,000, or even 1,000 acres of our best land idle.

The problem of land shortage has grown more acute in recent years as Guam has begun to develop on a large scale. Our population is soaring, and our tourist industry has grown from a mere 10,000 tourists just 5 years ago to over 130,000 this year. We need space for development: housing, recreational facilities, schools and other public buildings. Our children need parks, and our sick and elderly urgently require new hospitals and nursing facilities. In short, we need to use our limited resources to enable us to develop an economy separate from the vicissitudes of military spending, which is precarious at best.

Needless to say, efforts by the Government of Guam to gain access to the unutilized portions of the federally owned properties have, for the most part, met with failure. Military authorities continue to insist that they need the vast land holdings for national defense purposes—this despite the fact that they have not made use of them for 25 years and through three major conflicts. Moreover, there is a compelling need for the Congress to be apprised of future military plans in the Pacific area if we are to avoid another Vietnam.

Last year, at my request, the President's Property Review Board directed the Department of Defense to conduct a long-range study of its land requirements in the territory. Known as Project Gateway, the study was completed by the Navy about September 1972, and promptly classified on the grounds that it contained additional material relevant to strategic matters.

On March 26, 1973, I wrote to then Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson, asking that certain portions of Project Gateway be declassified. Naturally, I wanted only those portions relating to Guam and not material pertaining to strategic plans.

On May 3, 1973, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Edward J. Sheridan wrote to me to say, and I quote:

We have initiated action to provide you and the Governor of Guam, who also requested a copy of Project Gateway, an unclassified version of the study. We hope to be able to provide you with this document within the next few weeks.

Seven months later, Mr. Chairman, the Governor of Guam and I have yet to lay eyes on this elusive study, despite repeated requests.

Mr. Chairman, in 1944 the vast majority of our citizens on Guam did not

question the massive landgrab by the military. We appreciated our liberation dearly, although many quietly resented the highhanded manner which some military officials used to obtain over one-third of the island.

Almost 30 years later, however, the patience of the citizens of Guam is running out. I do not believe that it is asking too much of our fellow citizens in the military to be honest and above board with us on the issue.

The people of Guam are not anti-military. Their loyalty to America is unquestioned. We want to preserve Guam's role in America's strategic plans. However, I do not believe that asking the military to also consider the growing needs of a civilian population is prejudicial to the defense interest of our country. A viable civilian community is essential to the military activity and its personnel. Cooperation and understanding between the civilian and military sectors are essential to the orderly development and progress of the territory. An equitable settlement can be worked out to the best interests of all parties concerned if only a few diehard individuals would recognize the just claims of the people of Guam. I pray that this will happen soon, before a complicated issue mushrooms into a bitter and insoluble dispute.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1974. As reported out of the Armed Services Committee, it represents an 11-percent reduction for the original administration request. While I welcome this reduction by the committee, I cannot support a \$2.7 billion addition to our already inflated military budget and will therefore vote against the bill.

Our armed services should both reflect and serve the democratic ideals and security interests of our Nation—and only those interests. Such recently discovered abuses of Federal funds as the Defense Department's subsidization of military officers' servants should be reason enough for more intense scrutiny and greater reduction of the present authorization bill for military construction. It seems very clear to me that the military budget can stand a substantial amount of reduction without impairing our national security, and that this is no time to be spending more money on military facilities that we do not need.

The point should also be made that while the Department of Defense proposes to spend \$2.7 billion on new construction, Massachusetts and other States suffer because of military installation closings in Boston and elsewhere. The rationale behind such economy measures is not disputed, but the Department's lack of economic assistance to workers, firms, and communities affected by base closings is deeply disturbing. It seems to me that those areas are more appropriate for increased appropriations than are major new construction projects. In short, the priorities, to use a wornout phrase, reflected by the military budget are out of line with our needs, and should be changed.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, dictates of economy and social welfare call not

only for a larger reduction of military expenditures than is present in the bill, but for a more reasoned and responsible attitude by the Defense Department toward those Americans put out of work by the closing of military facilities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in effecting a partial realinement of our spending priorities by voting against this bill.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to learn that the committee failed to include the sum of \$4,760,000 for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center to provide necessary housing for enlisted men at the Navy's training service schools.

According to a bachelor housing survey recently completed by the Navy, there is a shortfall of about 3,000 bunks at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center. On the 24th of July, the Chief of Naval Operations directed that the Electronic Supply Office building be made available for use as a training building. Based on this, the Naval Training Center planned to relocate two schools now housed in temporary quarters: the Operational Specialists School and Basic Electricity and Electronics School. The Naval Training Center has already planned a future project for permanent quarters for these two training schools, but the ESO building—to be vacated by reasons of the transfer of the ESO from Great Lakes to Mechanicsburg, Pa.—will take the place of the construction project avoiding \$6 million in military construction costs. The total estimated cost of the proposed project is \$8 million. Rehabilitation of the ESO building would be in the vicinity of \$2 million.

The ESO building is located approximately 2 miles from the service school area. Effective use of the building requires adjacent living quarters. The Navy's new multimedia, self-paced learning techniques dictate that students have access to the classrooms and laboratories at any time. To provide the optimum in learning environment for the two schools, the Navy proposes to build lesser quarters for about 2,500 personnel. The quarters will be sited adjacent to the ESO building.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project, should have been included in the military construction program for fiscal 1974, to provide 876 of the 2,500 housing accommodations. Use of the ESO building for these two training schools, when it becomes available in December of 1974, will depend on availability of bachelor housing.

Establishment of the two schools make imperative the resiting of the BEQ quarters project to an area adjacent to the ESO building. This would provide quarters concurrent with the availability of the ESO building. Availability of 876 man BEQ quarters in fiscal 1974 would allow the basic electricity and electronics school to occupy the ESO in March of 1975.

There is a genuine need at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center which the Department of the Navy has overlooked, and which the House and Senate Armed Services Committees have failed to meet. It is urgent that funds in the amount of \$4,760,000 be added to the

military construction program for fiscal 1974 for construction of bachelor enlisted quarters required by the establishment of the two service schools in the ESO building. Failure to do so will require the Navy to bus students from the main part of the naval center at a substantial cost in money, man-hours, and morale. To include the necessary funds at this time in the budget will evidence an awareness on the part of the Congress of the needs of our naval installations and Navy personnel, and result in a savings to the taxpayer. It is my hope that a supplemental appropriation—or other action by the Congress will enable these enlisted quarters to be constructed—promptly.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the continuing efforts of the Armed Services Committee to provide authorizations for the modernization of our defense health facilities; this year marks the beginning of a triservice 5-year program to accelerate this modernization effort, and represents a major step forward in eliminating those inadequate and inefficient facilities in which many of our health professionals are now required to practice. Modern health facilities increase the efficiency of physicians and dentists by reducing the physical impediments which delay patient care, thereby enabling more patients to be seen. Modern health facilities are also an important factor in attracting and retaining both health professionals and the military personnel using these services.

The Air Force is participating in this triservice effort by devoting an exceptional share of this year's total construction program to health facility modernization projects. Seven of the projects will permit total replacement of inadequate and obsolete medical facilities. One project will provide a composite medical facility capable of delivering hospital-level care to 40 percent of the American servicemen and their families stationed in the United Kingdom, who must now travel several hours by road to get to the nearest military hospital. Other projects will provide for expansion of health facilities which are functionally inadequate and too small for the efficient delivery of health care, although the existing facilities were built in the early 1960's, changes in the practice of the health professions have shifted the emphasis from inpatient care to outpatient care, and a greater demand for health services due to the rising expectations of a more sophisticated health care consumer have created over-crowding and operational nightmares.

We have an obligation to provide the highest caliber of health care consistent with the state-of-the-art of health care. Adequate health facilities are a vital component of health care.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, the military construction authorization bill, H.R. 10614, presently before the House contains a provision particularly important to those who are assigned to the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Harford County, Md. The bill authorizes the construction of an additional 166 family

housing units at Aberdeen, which will help ease a serious housing shortage there. A total of \$4,731,000 is authorized for this project. While the housing needs at Aberdeen are actually somewhat higher, and several hundred units more than are provided in this bill could easily be put to immediate use, I know that the construction authorized by this bill will be much appreciated by the servicemen and their families stationed there. Such construction is essential in our overall efforts to mobilize and sustain an effective all-volunteer army.

I appreciate the committee's support of this very necessary housing project and I support the bill.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, generally I commend the Committee on Armed Services, and especially the subcommittee members who have devoted so much time and attention to this important military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1974.

The committee has presented an excellent report.

However, one item which was recommended by the administration in the budget proposal was \$7,776,000 for enlisted men's barracks at the Hunter Liggett Military Reservation.

Hunter Liggett is the site for our most important research, development and testing activities for the Army. Weapons and tactics are successfully tested there. The base is large and isolated and encompasses a wide variety of terrain. The climate is excellent—no testing or training days are lost to weather.

The base has easy access to rail, interstate highway, and air transportation.

The base adjoins the large Camp Roberts which is now utilized by the Reserves and National Guard.

The location terrain, climate and natural advantages are second to none in the United States for training and testing.

Enlisted men now stationed at Hunter Liggett are required to exist in bivouac conditions—some in tents with wooden sheathing for floors, no sanitary facilities, no running water.

Living conditions are the worst in the United States.

The inferior, unsanitary, inadequate housing is aggravated by the lack of other community support and recreation facilities. The nearest community is many miles away which makes commuting a great hardship expense and distraction to the mission.

This is one of the most urgent items in the budget and is considered one of the highest priorities of the Army. I regret that the committee deleted this important and urgently needed item by inadvertence.

In spite of this deletion, I intend to vote for the otherwise good bill.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the disappointments for me in today's bill is that no funds are authorized for facilities improvements at the Naval Underwater Systems Center at Newport, R.I. This center has a validated \$20 million facilities improvement requirement. On September 17, I urged Chairman PIKE's Subcommittee No. 5 to accelerate construction for the Newport command

by adding to this bill a first increment authorization.

The transfer of the entire destroyer-cruiser Atlantic Fleet from Newport involving approximately 39 ships and thousands of military personnel has struck a blow to the economy that may well require a decade for recovery.

Accelerating construction for the NUSC at Newport at this time would be clear evidence of the Navy's desire and that of the Congress for a long-range and meaningful presence at Newport. Aside from the psychological boost this would have, the construction activity generated would, of course, be most helpful as we attempt to cope with the problems of increasing unemployment.

We in Rhode Island are proud of the capabilities and accomplishments of the Naval Underwater Systems Center at Newport. The antisubmarine warfare research, which is carried on at the center, emphasizes fire-control hardware relating to offensive and defensive weaponry, torpedoes, missiles, and launchers oriented toward surface platforms. Advanced engineering research in connection with Trident components is certainly a most significant advanced function now underway at Newport.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the staff at the center for something which goes beyond their day-to-day activities in behalf of our country's defense. I am speaking of their interest in applying their highly developed technical knowledge and skills to dealing with our critical urban development problems. It is too seldom recognized how deeply concerned and involved the men and women in uniform and out of uniform, who work for defense programs, are with our domestic problems. The contributions they make to every aspect of our society are too seldom acknowledged.

Recently, staff members from NUSC took part in the third annual Urban Technology Conference in Boston. The conference is important in bringing technology to bear on solving urban problems. I know that we in the Congress who wrestle with the problems of transportation, environmental protection, and urban management, value and appreciate the important role which these skilled technologists can play in solving the troubling and increasingly acute problems we face in our cities. Thus, I want to take note here of the outstanding work being done in this regard by staff members at the Newport NUSC. The following article from the center's newspaper, NUSCOPE, refers to those efforts and I would like to include it here for the benefit of my colleagues:

CENTER TO PARTICIPATE IN URBAN TECHNOLOGY CONFERENCE AT BOSTON

NUSC professional staff members will discuss science and technology concepts that may help provide valuable ideas for environmental protection and community service programs development at the third Urban Technology Conference and Technical Display to be held Sept. 25-28 at John B. Hynes Veterans Auditorium, Boston.

The conference seeks to generate improvement in the communication and understanding between those who generate technology

and those in the urban sector who require and use it.

As a member of the Department of Defense consortium, NUSC will be participating for the first time in the Technical Exhibit. The Office of Special Programs has designed and developed a special display which will illustrate NUSC's contribution to the urban sector through the Technology Transfer Program.

Five independent topics comprise the theme of the conference:

- Balanced transportation for the city.
- Effective designs for municipal vehicles.
- Energy: Crisis of the 70's.
- Protecting the environment.
- Urban management.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

An interdisciplinary panel, chaired by H. Guyford Stever, Director of the National Science Foundation, will discuss urban development with emphasis on the Federal role. Many working groups and technical sessions are scheduled wherein the various interactions between technologists and urban sector "users" will be discussed.

The Urban Technology Display is the activity which perhaps best characterizes the overall purpose of the conference. Gathered in the exhibit hall will be many examples of urban-oriented products and systems as well as graphic illustrations of urban technology programs of the past, present and future.

The exhibit schedule follows: Tuesday, Sept. 25, 5 to 7 p.m., official opening and reception; Wednesday, Sept. 26, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Thursday, Sept. 27, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Joseph D. Antinucci of Bristol head of NUSC's Special Programs Office, in explaining Technology Transfer and the conference, said, "A great deal of time and energy has been spent to present a representative display to the public.

MANY FIRMS

"Many outside firms and government officials will be in attendance. We would like to invite and encourage as many Center employees to attend the exhibit in Boston and witness first hand how technology transfer is being used to resolve many urban problems."

The conference in Boston is being sponsored by the American Institute of Aeronautics, and Astronautics Public Technology Inc., an office of the National Science Foundation.

The NUSC exhibit will display the Center's application of technologies available at its oceanographics and acoustics facilities, and how these techniques may be applied to urban needs.

Included in the exhibit will be NUSC's expertise in the fields of simulation, systems analysis and engineering, and the Center's background in electromagnetics and multispectral photography, the latter an improved technique of film filter processing utilized by NUSC in aerial monitoring of the environment.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1974. The bill contains a number of extremely wasteful and unnecessary items that cannot be disguised by the rhetoric of "preserving our national defense."

I think it is absolutely unjustifiable that the administration tell the American taxpayer to make do with less Federal money for housing, health care, and education, while at the same time passing along bloated Department of Defense requests such as these.

Today the citizens of New York lost a minimum of \$60 million in education funds as a result of changes in the funding formula for title I of the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act. It is inconceivable to me that on the same day we should swallow unquestioningly the \$2.7 billion authorization contained in H.R. 10614.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out a few of the figures in this bill that deserve the close scrutiny of every Member of Congress.

There are no less than five items in this bill, totaling over \$7.4 million, for military construction in Iceland. These items are included in spite of clear indications by the Government of Iceland that it will seek to have the U.S. military installations withdrawn in the near future. The committee in its report acknowledges the likelihood of this eventuality, but explains the authorization is necessary "to allow the executive branch reasonable leeway to negotiate with the Government of Iceland." Such a flimsy justification for authorizing over \$7 million must not be allowed to stand when this money can be better spent on domestic reforms for improved social services in this country.

Another wasteful item in the bill is the authorization of over \$118 million for various facilities for Trident weapons systems. Included in this figure is an estimated \$83 million for a Trident base in Bangor, Wash. The selection of this site has come under severe criticism recently by Herbert Scoville Jr., the former Assistant Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Deputy Director of the CIA. Mr. Scoville has pointed out that Pacific bases are especially vulnerable and their use may constitute a grave strategic mistake.

I would also add that the Trident program is a major source of controversy in the Nation today, and it seems imprudent to commence spending on a base for this program which eventually may cost \$583 million.

I believe we must maintain a strong military capacity in this country. But much of the money in this bill is devoted to facilities that bear no relation to our military strength. In view of the rampant inflation the desperate need in other areas for Federal tax dollars, this authorization should have been pared to the bone. Unfortunately, this was not done: the bill remains wasteful and bloated, therefore I cannot support it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 10614, and to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) for his leadership and the excellent manner in which he has acted as floor manager for the bill.

My one regret is that the bill omits a provision permitting a land exchange with the State of Hawaii which the Army had requested. The Senate has approved the provision in its bill, but the House Armed Services Committee declined to include it in the reported bill.

I had originally intended to offer an amendment to restore the omitted provision, which would authorize the Army to convey 57 acres of undeeded land at Fort Ruger, Hawaii, in exchange for housing site and utility development costs at Aliamanu Crater, also in Hawaii. The exchange would enable the Army and Navy to erect about 2,500 units of

family housing at Aliamanu, primarily for lower ranking enlisted men.

The need for the housing planned for Aliamanu is critical. Right now, counting units under construction or authorized, the Army lacks almost 4,500 units of family housing in Hawaii. The situation is forcing military families to seek housing in the civilian market, where there is a shortage of about 50,000 units. Because of this housing shortage military families must pay excessively high rentals, and their very presence in the civilian market drives those rents still higher.

If my reading of the committee report is correct, the committee declined to approve the land exchange for two reasons: First, the apparent incomplete planning on the exchange by the Army; and second, a fear that the weather might be too hot for family housing at Aliamanu.

The reservations about the temperature at Aliamanu are, I believe, readily dispensable. The Army recently completed a 4-month study of temperature and winds at Aliamanu and compared those readings with ones taken at nearby Honolulu Airport. The final report of this study was not available to the committee until after it had completed its hearings on the subject. The study shows that Aliamanu is indeed warmer, but by only eight-tenths of 1 degree at the east end of Aliamanu, and by only six-tenths of a degree at the west end. Objections to Aliamanu because of its heat is further negated by the fact that the units will be constructed with central air conditioning.

The other committee reservation, that the exchange has not been completely planned, is understandable. A previous proposed exchange for the Fort Ruger land was rejected by the Secretary of the Army, when the housing site to be received in exchange turned out to be unsuitable for housing because of its excessive slope.

But the site at Aliamanu is a good one, Mr. Chairman. Even before grading, no area of the actual housing site has a slope of as much as 20 percent. This is choice land, which would sell for more than \$60 million if developed privately. It is near to Federal installations which employ the personnel who need the housing. Preliminary engineering studies of the site have been completed and ready for some time.

Rather than take the time of the House by offering an amendment to restore the exchange authority, however, I have conferred with the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) the chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill, as well as with the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT). I have been assured that an accommodation will be sought in conference with the Senate committee on this matter. It was suggested that the Senate version could be agreed to if the Armed Services Committee is vested with the right of final approval of the land exchange. Any lingering doubt about the fairness of the exchange could then be completely eliminated prior to the exchange itself. Because of this assurance from the gentleman from New York, I will not offer the amendment which I had earlier intended

to offer. I will instead look forward to a compromise provision to be worked out in conference.

I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Louisiana, and the other members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the approval by the House of H.R. 10614.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, today the House is about to vote on H.R. 10614, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. Included within the legislation, section 609(c) provided that further approval of the National Capital Planning Commission was not necessary and that the Secretary of Defense could proceed with any planning development and construction of the Bolling-Anacostia complex. Section 609(b) extends the Rivers rider until January 1, 1980.

Yesterday, during the debate on the District of Columbia self-determination bill, many of my colleagues expressed concern over the protections of the Federal interest through the National Capital Planning Commission. Today, some of the same persons will vote to approve an act which repeals the Planning Commission's authority over the Bolling complex. The Congress will thus initiate an action which could have grave consequences for future protection of the Federal interest in the District of Columbia. All of my colleagues must realize, the Federal interest is not that of one group or agency, alone, but rather, a composite set of varying needs and demands by many Federal agencies. The role of the National Capital Planning Commission is to reconcile all the needs and demands for space of all the Federal agencies in the National Capital region. The precedent initiated today opens the door to future imposition of demands, on the District by any powerful Federal agency, and implies that should there be conflicts between various agencies, reconciliation would be accomplished by sheer force, rather than by virtue of allocation of actual need. The time could come when this Congress would be unable to find land for expansion simply because another agency used more force in restricting the use of land in the Federal city.

In addition, there is pertinent data I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, concerning the Bolling-Anacostia complex, data which clarifies my objections to section 609 of H.R. 10614.

The construction of the complex adds additional costs to be paid by the District of Columbia government without providing benefits in return, a process which is an unfair burden to place on a city 50 percent of whose land is untaxable. The 1973 military (DOD) plans for the Anacostia/Bolling site propose an employment complex, along with a major housing component for the site, and includes:

First, a projected working population of 22,000 persons, the majority of which will not reside on the site;

Second, a 15-year staging process for construction of housing for 1,000 residents on the site—multifamily garden apartments and single-family houses;

Third, a 300-foot easement along the Anacostia River for recreational purposes;

Fourth, a housing density of 10-12 dwelling units per acre with a total of 4,500 barracks, dormitories, and housing units; and

Fifth, provision of Metro access to the site by means of an added spur line.

The plans also recommend that:

First, construction and operation of proposed schools for the families of military personnel to be paid for by the District. The present enrollment in that area is 21,000 pupils, while the capacity is only for 11,000.

Second, sewage treatment and solid waste removal to also be paid for and conducted by the District.

Section 609 essentially voids a prior decision of the National Capital Planning Commission, made on May 20, 1973, to develop only the southern portion of the site, pending determination of the potential use of the northern portion by the District of Columbia.

The plans violate at least four of the Department of Defense policies for the National Capital region. The DOD policies for the region state that:

First, all agencies that do not have a valid requirement for remaining in the region should be relocated. Does the commuting of 15,000 to 20,000 personnel imply that these facilities should remain? Does the construction of housing for 10,000 persons indicate the same?

Second, the NCPC master plan should be supported.

Third, Federal employment should be consistent with community facilities. There is virtually no commercial development in that section of Anacostia, and there are overcrowded facilities, which would have to be rebuilt to serve the project site.

Fourth, promote efficiency in the use of transportation systems. The site plans would require up to 20,000 persons to commute from northern Virginia and Maryland. Existing routes, such as the Southeast Freeway would have to be expanded to meet the traffic needs. Plans originally called for the construction of a Metro spur line, to provide a stop on the site.

The DOD's own survey of community attitudes toward the development of the site indicates that the overwhelming community attitude is for suspending the present uses.

Finally, the construction of this Bolling complex goes directly against the Department of Defense policies to reduce personnel and installations across the country in cities that are dependent on the installations for their employment base. The city of Washington, D. C., has no need for another major installation while some 274 military installations are being reduced in personnel, or totally closed.

Mr. Chairman, although I will vote for this bill because it is inclusive of all U.S. military construction both here and abroad. I urge that somewhere along the legislative route sections 609(a) and (b) should be eliminated.

I would like to insert in the RECORD, the comments of the Metropolitan Washington Housing Association, concerning

the Bolling-Anacostia complex and its impact on the natural and urban environment surrounding the site. The criticisms of the association have not been satisfied by further plans for the site. I would also like to insert the following two tables regarding educational facilities in the Bolling School District and proposed land use and benefits to the District.

The material follows:

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON

PLANNING & HOUSING ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., April 30, 1973.

Mr. CHARLES CONRAD,

National Capital Planning Commission,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLES: This is in response to your request for comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the modifications to the Comprehensive Plan to conform to the proposed Bolling-Anacostia Base Development Concept. The staff of the Metropolitan Washington Planning and Housing Association (MWPNA) has reviewed the statement and our comments will consider the following areas:

- (1) justification of proposed action;
- (2) inadequate discussion of adverse environmental impacts; and
- (3) further considerations that should be addressed in the final impact statement.

JUSTIFICATION OF ACTION

While the National Capital Planning Commission has stated the modification of the Comprehensive Plan is related to the development of the Bolling-Anacostia tract, it does not adequately explore how such actions will affect the unresolved issues over the future use of the entire site. The Commission has taken the naive position that because it has no authority to implement the proposed Development concept in the Bolling-Anacostia area, its plan modification will not affect the resolution of the issues over the ultimate use of the tract. However, the plan change will represent the official plans for the city and hence will bias any official decision made about the tract. The draft statement failed to explore the implications of NCPC actions if the Commission is bound to approve construction activity by the Department of Defense based upon approved plan changes.

ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The draft statement has provided additional discussion and information on the impact of the proposed action, but in the case of the river front park and noise impacts, it neglected to address significant points. The statement acknowledges that the main objectives of the park along this area should be for public recreation use. In addition, in a proposal called *The Urban River*, released in December 1972, NCPC stated, 1) there should be continuous public access to the entire water-front, and 2) new pedestrian and bicycle paths should cross barrier thoroughfares to connect inland communities with the rivers. Such connections, as stated in the staff proposal, would be particularly important as a means of providing river access and recreational opportunities for neighborhoods in Capital East and Anacostia.

The draft statement makes the assumption that public access will be guaranteed along the water-front. That assumption, however, may not be justified. First, the base commander is given the discretion to determine whether the base will be open or closed to the general public and if open at what times and under what conditions. There are precedents, as in the case of Fort McNair, where the base commander closed the facility to the general public after it had previously been an open base. Such an action is also possible under the present plans. If the base were closed or in any way limited public use

of the river front park it would be inconsistent with the objectives of NCPC. It is inconceivable that a modification to the plan could be made without a written guarantee that would allow the public free access to the park. If NCPC allowed a plan change without such a guarantee, it would be in a position of contradicting itself by allowing a change that could produce what NCPC would consider a situation adversely affecting the general public.

Concerning the impact of noise, the draft statement uses noise measurements for aircraft take offs and landings at Washington National Airport taken in 1966. More recent data showing the noise levels of National Airport operations in 1970 indicate a Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) level between 30-35 on a significant portion of the Bolling-Anacostia site. Within those noise contours the Department of Housing and Urban Development states that the noise exposure is significantly severe so that unusual and costly building constructions are necessary to ensure some tranquillity indoors, hence building in such an area is normally unacceptable. Within the 30-35 NEF contours the plan modification would allow the construction of numerous housing units, an elementary school for 1200 pupils and a community center for base personnel.

In addition, the noise generated by the Executive Flight Detachment helicopter

facility located on a 25 acre site approximately 2,100 feet from the elementary school site was not considered. While it is recognized NCPC recommends the site for the heliport to be temporary, its transfer may not coincide with other development activity and hence its adverse impacts should be considered.

While the traffic generated by the proposed developed was considered in the statement, there was no discussion of their polluting effects caused by a new concentration of automobile use at peak rush hour periods.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION IN THE FINAL STATEMENT

The final environmental impact statement should address the issue of public access to the riverfront park at all times and not assume the base commander will take such a step automatically. Second, the final statement should call for a redesign of the land use patterns because of the effects noise pollution will have on the proposed development. This should be done before the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan are made. Otherwise, NCPC will be knowingly approving a plan that allows housing and a school in an area with potentially dangerous noise hazards.

Third, the final statement should discuss in detail the controversial nature of the project and the desire of the city residents

to use the land for purposes more appropriate for scarce urban land.

Sincerely,

RALPH D. FERTIG,
Executive Director.

Educational facilities, Bolling School District

In SAC IV, the Bolling School District, there are presently 2 senior high schools, 4 junior high schools, and 19 elementary schools. Only two of the elementary schools are not overcrowded at this time, as evidenced by the following table:

Elementary school	Overcrowded, percent
McCogney	83
Patterson	67
Leckie	0
Simon	60
Congress Heights	219
Turner	109
Green	54
Drapee	76
Hendley	112
Birney	45
Moten	83
Nichols	0
Savoy	43
Orr	88
Ketchum	118
Randle	200
Garfield	90
Stanton	54
Beers	6

PROPOSED LAND USE AND BENEFITS TO THE DISTRICT: BOLLING-ANACOSTIA COMPLEX

	Industry	Education	Recreation	Office	Retail	Community facilities	Housing	Cantonment
Proposed land use allocation (acres):								
DOD	74	37	119	114	45	381	142	
Percent	8	5	12	12	5	42	16	
	New jobs generated	Retail facilities	Recreational space	Community facilities	Educational facilities	Private housing		
Benefits to SAC IV—Anacostia: Proposed DOD plan	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10614, military construction authorization fiscal year 1974. While I am pleased with the Armed Services Committee's 11-percent reduction in the administration request and feel that we should continue to upgrade the military family housing program to increase the success of the All-Volunteer Army, I cannot support this bill.

Most of the provisions of this legislation should receive much more critical examination before they are authorized. In view of increasing inflation, can we afford to fund new, very specific military facilities that bear no direct relationship to national defense and strength? In view of major cutbacks in programs such as housing, health care, education, and manpower, how can we justify military expansion? In view of the end of the Vietnam war, why are we funding an increased defense budget? In view of the closing of many military bases and the resultant economic depression of surrounding communities, why are we authorizing new military facilities without having first taken care of the depressed areas?

The answers to these questions have not been forthcoming in the debate and discussion of this bill. In fact, I think that we have failed to even address such questions. If Congress is serious about realining priorities, bringing the economy

under control and exercising its constitutional oversight function, then we cannot allow such failures. I cannot support the authorization of new military construction which is largely unjustified and which has not been critically examined in the light of larger national concerns.

Mr. KING. I have no further request for time.

Mr. PIKE. I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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

TITLE I

Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND

(First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, \$897,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, \$2,749,000.
Camp Drum, New York, \$1,099,000.
Fort Eustis, Virginia, \$4,782,000.
Camp A. P. Hill, Virginia, \$535,000.
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pennsylvania, \$1,657,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, \$7,305,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, \$18,326,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$5,924,000.

Camp Picket, Virginia, \$476,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia, \$21,904,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, \$32,400,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, \$51,881,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$2,950,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia, \$20,230,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, \$2,902,000.

Fort McClellan, Alabama, \$19,505,000.

Fort McPherson, Georgia, \$1,804,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama, \$3,987,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, \$264,000.

(Fifth Army)

Port Bliss, Texas, \$6,087,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, \$3,893,000.

For Hood, Texas, \$7,921,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, \$11,738,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, \$29,276,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas, \$30,943,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma, \$9,447,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, \$44,482,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado, \$5,651,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington, \$8,327,000.

Fort Ord, California, \$9,812,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California, \$5,751,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, \$7,472,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas, \$1,088,000.

Port Monmouth, New Jersey, \$8,401,000.

Tobynna Army Depot, Pennsylvania, \$411,000.

Natick Laboratories, Massachusetts, \$466,000.
 Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, \$255,000.
 Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, \$294,000.
 Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, \$4,971,000.
 Sacramento Army Depot, California, \$412,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, \$3,715,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, \$4,695,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, \$6,539,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, \$1,394,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, \$30,145,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Oakland Army Terminal, California, \$343,000.

Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina, \$1,628,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska, \$3,060,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska, \$2,140,000.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska, \$2,715,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, \$9,592,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$7,295,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$6,799,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Canal Zone, Various Locations, \$8,095,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Korea, Various Locations, \$1,568,000.

Puerto Rico

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, \$517,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, \$1,434,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Various Locations, \$2,097,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Germany, Various Locations, \$12,517,000.

Various Locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, \$80,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$3,000,000.

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national se-

curity, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment; in the total amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1974, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 104. (a) Public Law 92-545 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia," strike out "\$13,161,000" and insert in place thereof "\$15,868,000".

With respect to "Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey," strike out "\$3,245,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,603,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES—UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND," in section 101 as follows: "with respect to "Various Locations," strike out "\$1,412,000" and insert in place thereof "\$1,649,000".

(c) Public Law 92-545 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$441,704,000"; \$117,074,000;" and "\$558,778,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$444,767,000"; "\$117,311,000;" and "\$562,078,000", respectively.

Sec. 105. (a) Public Law 92-145, as amended, is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Germany, Various Locations," strike out "\$1,946,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,553,000".

(b) Public Law 92-145, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 702 "\$41,374,000" and "\$404,500,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$41,981,000" and "\$405,107,000", respectively.

Sec. 106. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Benning, Georgia," strike out "\$2,855,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,383,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$181,306,000" and "\$266,503,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$181,834,000" and "\$267,031,000", respectively.

Sec. 107. (a) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended under the heading "UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA" in section 101 as follows:

With respect to "Fort Richardson, Alaska," strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert in place thereof "\$2,100,000".

(b) Public Law 90-110, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 802 "\$288,055,000" and "\$391,448,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$288,355,000" and "\$391,748,000", respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no

amendments to title I, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

Sec. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, \$135,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, \$6,158,000.

Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, New Jersey, \$1,806,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$180,000.

NAVAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington District of Columbia, \$4,655,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, \$4,334,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, \$1,546,000.

Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, \$6,372,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, \$1,528,000.

Naval Hospital, Quantico, Virginia, \$484,000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, \$5,959,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, \$3,211,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, \$2,525,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, \$18,183,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, \$567,000.

Nuclear Weapons Training Group, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia, \$2,470,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, \$3,386,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, \$11,183,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, \$1,327,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, \$3,636,000.

Naval Air Station, Ellyson Field, Florida, \$75,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, \$14,366,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, \$6,109,000.

Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, \$3,663,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, \$2,699,000.

Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, \$10,690,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, \$3,568,000.

Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi, \$9,444,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, \$4,532,000.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, \$252,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, \$1,498,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, \$4,478,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Hospital, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$3,386,000.

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, Louisiana, \$13,880,000.

Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Texas, \$2,875,000.

Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, \$3,040,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Complex, Great Lakes, Illinois, \$15,148,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, \$2,946,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, \$6,808,000.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, \$878,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, \$1,873,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, \$2,415,000.

Fleet Combat Direction Systems Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, \$1,118,000.

Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, San Diego, California, \$3,518,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, \$11,996,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, \$2,944,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, \$2,471,000.

Navy Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California, \$3,920,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California, \$807,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, \$3,827,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, \$1,333,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, \$2,650,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California, \$5,839,000.

Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California, \$250,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, \$1,874,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Complex, Adak, Alaska, \$2,695,000. Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, \$2,300,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii, \$4,306,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii, \$457,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$845,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$2,013,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, \$1,863,000.

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa, Hawaii, \$2,324,000.

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Quantico, Virginia, \$831,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, \$1,541,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, \$8,902,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, \$1,821,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, \$3,245,000.

Fleet Marine Force Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia, \$686,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia, \$5,204,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, \$126,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, \$2,580,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, \$7,834,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, \$3,802,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, \$10,920,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, \$747,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, \$3,825,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, \$2,992,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, \$5,988,000.

TRIDENT FACILITIES

Various Locations, TRIDENT Facilities, United States, \$118,320,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$27,466,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$51,112,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Complex, Puerto Rico, \$1,707,000.

Naval Facility, Grand Turk, The West Indies, \$1,145,000.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, \$3,010,000.

Naval Complex, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, \$8,376,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, \$6,092,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete, Greece, \$4,153,000.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy, \$3,086,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell, Scotland, \$778,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain, \$85,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, \$1,192,000.

Naval Complex, Guam, Mariana Islands, \$9,508,000.

Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, \$278,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$3,995,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$10,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1974, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 203. (a) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to Navy Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, strike out "\$7,411,000" and insert in place thereof "\$9,397,000".

(b) Public Law 90-408, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 802, "\$239,682,000" and "\$246,547,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$241,668,000" and "\$248,533,000", respectively.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows: With respect to Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia, strike out "\$530,000" and insert in place thereof "\$779,000".

(b) Public Law 91-511, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "\$246,955,000" and "\$274,093,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$247,204,000" and "\$274,342,000", respectively.

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 92-145 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 201 as follows:

With respect to Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, strike out "\$19,316,000" and insert in place thereof "\$22,716,000".

With respect to Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, strike out "\$3,266,000" and insert in place thereof "\$3,859,000".

(b) Public Law 92-145 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$266,068,000" and "\$321,843,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$270,061,000" and "\$325,836,000", respectively.

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 92-545 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 201 as follows:

With respect to Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma, strike out "\$6,336,000" and insert in place thereof "\$8,778,000".

With respect to Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, strike out "\$4,372,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,144,000".

(b) Public Law 92-14 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 702 "\$474,450,000" and "\$515,667,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$477,664,000" and "\$518,881,000", respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no amendment to title II, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following acquisition and construction:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$7,843,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida, \$1,020,000.

AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Grandview, Missouri, \$3,963,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, \$11,343,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$2,306,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$92,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Warner Robins, Georgia, \$4,125,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, \$11,166,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, \$12,887,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California, \$889,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, \$7,039,000.

Satellite Control Facilities, \$192,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi, \$8,786,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$6,509,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas, \$4,635,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado, \$20,350,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California, \$810,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, \$1,463,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas, \$4,211,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas, \$2,753,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, \$371,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas, \$3,154,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona, \$347,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, \$1,557,000.

Various Locations, \$1,698,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, \$16,639,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia, \$1,500,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma, \$1,078,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware, \$2,558,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, \$1,698,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, \$1,283,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, \$3,092,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, \$7,331,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, \$1,200,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, \$232,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas, \$730,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, \$514,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, \$5,834,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Kinross, Michigan, \$2,430,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, \$600,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas, \$1,042,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, \$617,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, \$526,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York, \$286,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California, \$220,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, \$3,892,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, \$616,000.

Various Locations, \$1,988,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas, \$2,273,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico, \$162,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana, \$183,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico, \$1,524,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, \$503,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas, \$1,165,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Glendale, Arizona, \$1,220,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida, \$2,657,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho, \$258,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, \$306,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, \$483,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas, \$6,115,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Air Pollution Abatement, \$3,689,000.

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$5,381,000.

AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONES

Various Locations, \$18,000,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Naval Station Keflavik, Iceland, \$1,355,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Various Locations, \$7,950,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany, \$5,181,000.

United Kingdom, \$9,313,000.

Various Locations, \$800,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SOUTHERN COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone, \$927,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations, \$221,000.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Various Locations, Water Pollution Abatement, \$750,000.

WORLDWIDE COMMUNICATIONS

Various Locations, \$330,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$1,000,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (1) unforeseen security considerations, (2) new weapons developments, (3) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (4) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real es-

tate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1974, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 304. (a) Public Law 92-145 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 301 as follows: Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command" with respect to Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana, strike out "\$522,000" and insert in place thereof "\$735,000".

(b) Public Law 92-145, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 702 "\$226,484,000" and "\$247,347,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$226,897,000" and "\$247,560,000", respectively.

Sec. 305. (a) Public Law 92-945 is amended under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES," in section 301 as follows: Under the subheading "UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE" with respect to Germany, strike out "\$11,422,000" and insert in place thereof "\$18,755,000".

(b) Public Law 92-545 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 702 "\$32,565,000" and "\$284,150,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$39,898,000" and "\$291,483,000", respectively.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendment to title III, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for defense agencies for the following acquisition and construction:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$374,000.

Atomic Energy Commission Nevada Test Site, Las Vegas, Nevada, \$200,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, \$1,188,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, \$2,048,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, \$360,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, \$250,000.

Defense Depot, Tracy, California, \$747,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, \$250,000.

Defense Logistics Services Center, Battle Creek, Michigan, \$160,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$560,000.

Regional Office, Defense Contract Administration Services, Chicago, Illinois, \$404,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, \$8,156,000.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendment to title IV, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and mobile home facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units—

(1) The Department of the Army, six thousand one hundred thirty-five units, \$178,208,000.

Fort Carson, Colorado, two hundred units.
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, twenty-five units.

United States Army Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, one thousand units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, nine hundred one units.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, one thousand units.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, five hundred units.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, one hundred sixty-six units.

Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, one hundred thirty-six units.

Toboyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania, eighty-six units.

Fort Hood, Texas, nine hundred units.

Red River Army Depot, Texas, twenty-one units.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, seven hundred units.

Fort Eustis, Virginia, three hundred units.

Fort Monroe, Virginia, two hundred units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, four thousand four hundred sixty-six units, \$137,666,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, eight hundred units.

Naval Facility, Centerville Beach, California, sixty units.

Naval Complex, San Diego, California, three hundred twenty-five units.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Jacksonville, Florida, four hundred units.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, six hundred units.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, one hundred units.

Naval Support Facility, Thurmont, Maryland, six units.

Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, one hundred units.

Naval Home, Gulfport, Mississippi, five units.

Naval Complex, South Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, three hundred fifty units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, two hundred seventy units.

Naval Complex, Guam, Marianas Islands, eight hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred fifty units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, one thousand eight hundred units, \$55,501,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, one hundred units.

Avon Park Weapons Range, Florida, fifty units.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, two hundred fifty units.

United States Air Force Installations, Oahu, Hawaii, four hundred units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, three hundred units.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, two hundred units.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, two hundred units.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, Marianas Islands, three hundred units.

(b) Mobile home facilities—

(1) The Department of the Army, eight hundred twenty-five spaces, \$3,300,000.

(2) The Department of the Navy, one hundred spaces, \$400,000.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, four hundred fifteen spaces, \$2,000,000.

SEC. 502. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures.

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) shall not exceed \$28,500 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the area specified in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$45,000 including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than that specified in subsection (a) the average cost of all such units shall not to exceed \$38,000 and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$45,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall include the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army, \$28,160,000.

(2) for the Department of the Navy, \$10,600,000.

(3) for the Department of the Air Force, \$23,750,000.

SEC. 504. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 502 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, or otherwise acquire, in foreign countries, twelve family housing units. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land and interests in land. The authorization contained in this section shall not be subject to the cost limitations set forth in section 502 of this Act: *Provided*, That the cost shall not exceed a total of \$520,000 for all

units nor \$60,000 for any one unit, including the cost of the family unit and proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 506. (a) Subsection 610(a) of Public Law 90-110 (81 Stat. 279, 305), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 610. (a) None of the funds authorized by this or any other Act may be expended for the improvement of any single family housing unit, or for the improvement of two or more housing units when such units are to be converted into or used as a single family housing unit, the costs of which exceed \$15,000 per unit including costs of repairs undertaken in connection therewith, and including any costs in connection with (1) the furnishing of electricity, gas, water, and sewage disposal; (2) roads and walks; and (3) grading and drainage, unless such improvement in connection with such unit or units is specifically authorized by law. As used in this section the term "improvement" includes alteration, expansion, extension, or rehabilitation of any housing unit or units, including that maintenance and repair which is to be accomplished concurrently with an improvement project. The provisions of this section shall not apply to projects authorized for restoration or replacement of housing units damaged or destroyed."

(b) The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish repairs and improvements to existing public quarters in amounts in excess of the \$15,000 limitation prescribed in subsection (a) of this section as follows:

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, one unit, \$35,800.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California, one unit, \$17,000.

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, five units, \$165,000.

Naval Complex, New Orleans, Louisiana, four units, \$119,600.

Ramstein Air Force, Federal Republic of Germany, one unit, \$26,500.

SEC. 507. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (68 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1974 and 1975, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, without rental charge, at or near any military installation in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam if the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, finds that there is a lack of adequate housing at or near such military installation and that (1) there has been a recent substantial increase in military strength and such increase is temporary, or (2) the permanent military strength is to be substantially reduced in the near future, or (3) the number of military personnel assigned is so small as to make the construction of family housing uneconomical, or (4) family housing is required for personnel attending service school academic courses on permanent change of station orders, or (5) family housing has been authorized but is not yet completed or a family housing authorization request is in a pending military construction authorization bill. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual unit basis and not more than ten thousand such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation may not exceed: for the United States (other than Hawaii), Puerto Rico, and Guam an average of \$210 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$290 per month for any one unit; and for Hawaii, an average of \$255 per month for each military department, or the amount of \$300 per month for any one unit".

SEC. 508. Section 507 of Public Law 88-174 (77 Stat. 307, 326), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 507. For the purpose of providing mil-

itary family housing in foreign countries, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements guaranteeing the builders or other sponsors of such housing a rental return equivalent to a specified portion of the annual rental income which the builders or other sponsors would receive from the tenants if the housing were fully occupied: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed under such agreements entered into during the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 shall not exceed such amount as may be applicable to five thousand units: *Provided further*, That no such agreement shall guarantee the payment of more than 97 per centum of the anticipated rentals, nor shall any guarantee extend for a period of more than ten years, nor shall the average guaranteed rental on any project exceed \$275 per unit per month, including the cost of maintenance and operation."

SEC. 509. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to settle claims regarding repairs and improvements to public quarters at F. E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, in the amount of \$41,221.92.

SEC. 510. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(1) for construction and acquisition of not more than nine thousand seven hundred and twenty-five family housing units, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, relocation of family housing, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of mobile home facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$330,901,000, and,

(2) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principle and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m) an amount not to exceed \$826,793,000.

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendment to title V, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and V shall not exceed—

- (1) for title I: A total of \$572,963,000.
- (2) for title II: A total of \$539,933,000.
- (3) for title III: A total of \$246,656,000.
- (4) for title V: Military family housing, \$1,157,694,000.

SEC. 603. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), any of the amounts specified in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum when inside the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska), and by 10 per centum when outside the United States or in Hawaii and Alaska, if he determines that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such estimate was submitted to the Congress. However, the total cost of all construction and acquisition in each such title may not exceed the total of the amounts authorized for projects in that title.

(b) When the amount named for any construction or acquisition in title I, II, III, or IV of this Act involves only one project at any military installation and the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines that the amount authorized must be increased by more than the applicable percentage prescribed in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may proceed with such construction or acquisition if the amount of the increase does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the amount named for such project by the Congress.

(c) Subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a), no individual project authorized under title I, II, III, or IV of this Act for any specifically listed military installation may be placed under contract if—

(1) the estimated cost of such project is \$250,000 or more, and

(2) the current working estimate of the Department of Defense, based upon bids received, for the construction of such project exceeds by more than 25 per centum the amount authorized for such project by the Congress, until after the expiration of thirty days from the date on which a written report of the facts relating to the increased cost of such project, including a statement of the reasons for such increase, has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall submit an annual report to the Congress identifying each individual project which has been placed under contract in the preceding twelve-month period and with respect to which the then current working estimate of the Department of Defense based upon bids received for such project exceeded the amount authorized by the Congress for that project by more than 25 per centum. The Secretary shall also include in such report each individual project with respect to which the scope was reduced in order to permit contract award within the available authorization for such project. Such report shall include all pertinent cost information for each individual project, including the amount in dollars and percentage by which the current working estimate based on the contract price for the project exceeded the amount authorized for such project by the Congress.

SEC. 604. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, or such other department or Government agency as the Secretaries of the

military departments recommend and the Secretary of Defense approves to assure the most efficient, expeditious and cost-effective accomplishment of the construction herein authorized. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a breakdown of the dollar value of construction contracts completed by each of the several construction agencies selected, together with the design, construction supervision, and overhead fees charged by each of the several agents in the execution of the assigned construction. Further, such contracts (except architect and engineering contracts which, unless specifically authorized by the Congress, shall continue to be awarded in accordance with presently established procedures, customs, and practice) shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 605. As of October 1, 1974, all authorizations for military public works, including family housing, to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations for facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135), and all such authorizations contained in Acts approved before October 26, 1972, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts, land acquisition, or payments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in whole or in part before October 1, 1974, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(b) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), all authorizations for construction of family housing, including mobile home facilities, all authorizations to accomplish alterations, additions, expansion, or extensions to existing family housing, and all authorizations for related facilities projects under said Act are hereby continued and shall remain in effect until October 1, 1974; and

(4) notwithstanding the repeal provisions of section 705(a) of the Act of October 25, 1972, Public Law 92-545 (86 Stat. 1135, 1153), authorizations for the following items which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1975:

(a) Enlisted women's barracks construction in the amount of \$437,000 for Fort Rucker, Alabama, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" of the Act of October 27, 1971 (85 Stat. 394, 395), as amended.

(b) Airfield expansion in the amount of \$882,000 for the United States Army Security Agency, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" of the Act of October 27, 1971 (85 Stat. 394, 395), as amended.

(c) Environmental Health Effects Laboratory in the amount of \$4,500,000 for the Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" of the Act of October 27, 1971 (85 Stat. 394, 397).

SEC. 606. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction projects inside the United States in excess of a unit cost to be determined in proportion to the appropriate area construction cost index, based on the following unit cost limitations where the area construction index is 1.0.

(1) \$28.50 per square foot for permanent barracks;

(2) \$30.50 per square foot for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act. *Provided further*, none of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act shall be deemed to authorize the construction of permanent barracks providing for the planned occupancy of fewer than four persons per room for enlisted grades E4 and below nor fewer than two persons per room for enlisted grades E5, E6, and E7.

SEC. 607. Section 709 of Public Law 92-145 (85 Stat. 394, 414), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the lands constituting Camp Pendleton, California, may be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of by the Department of Defense unless hereafter authorized by law: *Provided, however*, That with respect to said lands the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, may grant leases, licenses, or easements pursuant to chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, and section 961 of title 43, United States Code.

SEC. 608. Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2674(f) is amended by striking out the phrase "every six months" in the second line and inserting "annually" in place thereof.

(2) Section 2676 is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following: "Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to the acceptance by a military department of real property acquired under the authority of the Administrator of General Services to acquire property by the exchange of Government property pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)."

(3) Section 2672 is amended to redesignate the existing section as subsection "(a)" and by adding a subsection "(b)" as follows:

"Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that deferral of acquisition under this subsection for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of national defense, and after notifying the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Secretary of a military department may acquire, without regard to the limitations in subsection (a) above and under such terms as he deems appropriate, any interest in land required to maintain the operational integrity of a military installation. This authority includes authority to make surveys and acquire such interests in land (including temporary use) by gift, purchase, or otherwise."

(4) The catchline of section 2672 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "and for other purposes".

SEC. 609. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the National Capital Plan-

ning Commission and other interested agencies, but without being subject to the approval of the Commission or any other agency, is directed, within available authorizations and appropriations, to proceed with the further planning, development, and construction of the Bolling-Anacostia Complex. The Secretary shall use as a guide to such further planning and development the Bolling-Anacostia Base Development Concept included with the final environmental impact statement filed with the Council on Environmental Quality on July 26, 1973, under the provisions of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(b) Section 607(b) of Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended by deleting the words "January 1, 1975" wherever they appear, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1980."

SEC. 610. (a) The Secretary of the Army, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the San Antonio Country Club, subject to terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, may deem to be in the public interest, all rights, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this section, in and to certain two parcels of land containing, in the aggregate, 2.39 acres, more or less, situated in the county of Bexar, State of Texas, being part of the Fort Sam Houston Military Reservation, and more particularly described as follows:

PARCEL NO. 1

From boundary marker numbered B-88 for Fort Sam Houston, said point being a northeast corner for Fort Sam Houston and a southeast corner for San Antonio Country Club property, along the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, north 16 degrees 50 minutes, east, 48.3 feet to boundary marker numbered B-87.

Thence north 15 degrees 11 minutes east, 546.15 feet to a point in the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, said point being located north 78 degrees 10 minutes west, 298 feet from boundary marker numbered B-81;

Thence north 04 degrees 36 minutes east, 623.49 feet to a point in the common line between said San Antonio Country Club properties for the point of beginning, said point of beginning being located north 68 degrees 59 minutes west, 695 feet from boundary marker numbered B-79;

Thence along the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties as follows: north 68 degrees 59 minutes west, 300 feet to boundary marker numbered B-78;

Thence north 00 degrees 32 minutes west, 1197.6 feet to boundary marker numbered B-77 for the corner common to said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, situated in the south right-of-way line for Burr Road;

Thence departing from said common line, along the south right-of-way line for said Burr Road, north 89 degrees 58 minutes east, 50 feet to a point;

Thence south 00 degrees 32 minutes east, 1028.08 feet to a point;

Thence south 21 degrees 26 minutes east, 114.79 feet to a point;

Thence south 48 degrees 05 minutes east, 254.90 feet to the point of beginning, containing 1.73 acres, more or less.

PARCEL NO. 2

From boundary marker numbered B-88 for Fort Sam Houston, said point being a northwest corner for Fort Sam Houston and a southeast corner for San Antonio Country Club property, along the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, north 16 degrees 50 minutes east, 48.3 feet to boundary marker B-87 for the point of beginning;

Thence along the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United

States of America properties as follows: north, 102.2 feet to boundary marker numbered B-86;

Thence north 07 degrees 15 minutes east, 117.4 feet to boundary marker numbered B-85;

Thence north 12 degrees 30 minutes east, 88.1 feet to boundary marker numbered B-84;

Thence north 07 degrees 10 minutes west, 168.4 feet to boundary marker numbered B-83;

Thence north 51 degrees 05 minutes east, 104.4 feet to boundary marker numbered B-82;

Thence south 78 degrees 10 minutes east, 50 feet to a point;

Thence departing from said common line, south 15 degrees 11 minutes west, 546.15 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.66 acre, more or less.

(b) In consideration for the conveyance by the United States of America of the property described in paragraph (a), the San Antonio Country Club shall convey to the United States, for incorporation with the Fort Sam Houston Military Reservation, a parcel of land containing 6.47 acres, more or less, being described as follows:

From boundary marker numbered B-88 for Fort Sam Houston, said point being a northwest corner for Fort Sam Houston and a southeast corner for San Antonio Country Club property, along the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, north 16 degrees 50 minutes east, 48.3 feet to boundary marker numbered B-87;

Thence north 15 degrees 11 minutes east, 546.15 feet to the point of beginning, situated in the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, said point of beginning being located south 78 degrees 10 minutes east, 50 feet from boundary marker numbered B-82;

Thence north 04 degrees 36 minutes east, 623.49 feet to a point in the common line between said San Antonio Country Club and United States of America properties, said point being located south 68 degrees 59 minutes east, 300 feet from boundary marker numbered B-78;

Thence along said common line as follows; south 68 degrees 59 minutes east, 695 feet to boundary marker numbered B-79 for a re-entrant corner for said United States of America property and a northeast corner for said San Antonio Country Club property;

Thence south 44 degrees 07 minutes west, 333.7 feet to boundary marker numbered B-80;

Thence south 42 degrees 04 minutes west, 261 feet to boundary marker numbered B-81 for a re-entrant corner for said United States of America property and a southeast corner for said San Antonio Country Club property;

Thence north 78 degrees 10 minutes west, 298 feet to the point of beginning containing 6.47 acres, more or less.

(c) The legal descriptions in paragraphs (a) and (b) may be modified as agreed upon by the Secretary, or his designee, and the San Antonio Country Club, consistent with any necessary changes which may be disclosed as a result of accurate survey.

(d) The conveyance of property authorized in paragraph (a) of this section shall be subject to the following provisions, conditions, and reservations, which shall be incorporated in the deed of conveyance to be executed by the Secretary of the Army:

(1) Reservation to the United States of rights-of-way for any existing utility lines or access roads.

(2) Provision that the grantee, in accepting the deed, shall agree (1) to relocate fences between its property and the boundary lines of Fort Sam Houston, at no expense to the United States, and (2) to hold the United States harmless from any damage that may result from drainage from the property

conveyed to the United States under paragraph (b).

(e) All expenses for surveys and the preparation and execution of legal documents necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section shall be borne by the San Antonio Country Club.

Sec. 611. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974".

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendment to title VI, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) For the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$29,900,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$35,900,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$21,458,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$16,000,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$9,000,000.

Sec. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774 and 9774 of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on lands includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 703. With respect to the preceding authorization contained in section 701 for the Army Reserve, no portion of such authorization or any other prior Army Reserve authorization granted by the Congress may be utilized to construct replacement facilities for Army Reserve units at Fort DeRussy, Hawaii, at any location other than Fort DeRussy.

Sec. 704. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1974".

Mr. PIKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VII be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendment to title VII, and there being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and

the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STEED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10614) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 589, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PIKE. 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 359, nays 28, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]		
YEAS—359		
Abdnor	Cotter	Guyer
Adams	Coughlin	Haley
Addabbo	Cronin	Hamilton
Alexander	Culver	Hammer-
Anderson, Calif.	Daniel, Dan	schmidt
	Daniel, Robert	Hanley
Anderson, Ill.	W., Jr.	Hanrahan
Andrews, N.C.	Daniels	Hansen, Idaho
N. Dak.	Dominick V.	Hansen, Wash.
Annunzio	Danielson	Harsha
Archer	Davis, S.C.	Harvey
Arends	de la Garza	Hastings
Armstrong	Delaney	Heinz
Ashley	Dellenback	Henderson
Bafalis	Denholm	Hicks
Baker	Dennis	Hillis
Barrett	Dent	Hinshaw
Bauman	Derwinski	Hogan
Beard	Devine	Holifield
Bell	Dickinson	Holt
Bennett	Diggs	Horton
Bergland	Dingell	Hosmer
Bevill	Donohue	Howard
Biaggi	Dorn	Huber
Biester	Downing	Hudnut
Bingham	Dulski	Hungate
Blackburn	Duncan	Hunt
Boggs	du Pont	Hutchinson
Boland	Eckhardt	Ichord
Bolling	Edwards, Ala.	Jarman
Bowen	Ellberg	Johnson, Calif.
Brademas	Erleborn	Johnson, Colo.
Brasco	Esch	Johnson, Pa.
Bray	Eshleman	Jones, Ala.
Breaux	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Brinkley	Fascell	Jones, Okla.
Brooks	Findley	Jones, Tenn.
Brotzman	Fish	Jordan
Brown, Mich.	Fisher	Karth
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Kazen
Broyhill, N.C.	Flowers	Keating
Broyhill, Va.	Flynt	Kemp
Buchanan	Foley	Ketchum
Burgener	Ford, Gerald R.	King
Burke, Calif.	Ford,	Kluczynski
Burke, Fla.	William D.	Koch
Burleson, Tex.	Forsythe	Kyros
Burlison, Mo.	Fountain	Landgrebe
Butler	Fraser	Landrum
Byron	Frenzel	Latta
Carey, N.Y.	Froehlich	Leggett
Carney, Ohio	Fulton	Lehman
Carter	Gaydos	Littton
Casey, Tex.	Gialmo	Long, La.
Cederberg	Gibbons	Long, Md.
Chappell	Gilman	Lott
Clancy	Ginn	Lujan
Clark	Gonzalez	McClory
Clausen, Don H.	Goodling	McCloskey
Clawson, Del.	Grasso	McCollister
Cochran	Gray	McCormack
Cohen	Green, Oreg.	McDade
Collier	Green, Pa.	McEwen
Collins, Ill.	Gross	McFall
Collins, Tex.	Grover	McKay
Conlan	Gubser	McSpadden
Conte	Gude	Macdonald
Corman	Gunter	Madden
		Madigan

Mahon	Randall	Steiger, Wis.
Mallary	Rees	Stratton
Mann	Regula	Stubfield
Martin, Nebr.	Reid	Stuckey
Mathias, Calif.	Rhodes	Symington
Matsunaga	Rinaldo	Symms
Mayne	Roberts	Talcott
Mazzoli	Robinson, Va.	Taylor, Mo.
Meeds	Robison, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.
Melcher	Rodino	Teague, Calif.
Mezvinsky	Roe	Teague, Tex.
Michel	Rogers	Thomson, Wis.
Milford	Roncallo, Wyo.	Thone
Miller	Roncallo, N.Y.	Thornton
Minish	Rooney, N.Y.	Towell, Nev.
Mink	Rooney, Pa.	Treen
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rose	Ullman
Mizell	Rostenkowski	Van Deerlin
Montgomery	Roush	Vander Jagt
Moorhead,	Rousselot	Vanik
Calif.	Roy	Voysey
Moorhead, Pa.	Runnels	Vigorito
Mosher	Ruppe	Waggoner
Moss	Ruth	Walsh
Murphy, Ill.	Ryan	Wampler
Murphy, N.Y.	Sarasin	Ware
Myers	Sarbanes	Whalen
Natcher	Saylor	White
Nelsen	Scherle	Whitehurst
Nix	Schneebeli	Whitten
Obey	Sebelius	Widnall
O'Brien	Seiberling	Wiggins
O'Hara	Shipley	Williams
O'Neill	Shoup	Wilson, Bob
Owens	Shriver	Wilson, Charles H.
Parris	Shuster	Calif.
Passman	Sikes	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Patten	Sisk	Winn
Pepper	Skubitz	Wolff
Perkins	Slack	Wright
Pettis	Smith, Iowa	Wyatt
Peyser	Smith, N.Y.	Wydler
Pike	Snyder	Yates
Poage	Spence	Young, Alaska
Powell, Ohio	Stanton	Young, Fla.
Preyer	J. William	Young, Ga.
Price, Ill.	Stanton	Young, Ill.
Price, Tex.	James V.	Young, S.C.
Pritchard	Steed	Zion
Quile	Steele	Zwach
Quillen	Steelman	
Railsback	Steiger, Ariz.	

NAYS—28

Abzug	Heckler, Mass.	Royal
Badillo	Helstoski	St Germain
Burke, Mass.	Holtzman	Stark
Burton	Kastenmeier	Stokes
Dellums	Metcalfe	Studds
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Moskley	Tierman
Harrington	Rangel	Waldie
Hawkins	Reuss	
Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal	

NOT VOTING—47

Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Mollohan
Aspin	Frey	Morgan
Blatnik	Fuqua	Nedzi
Breckinridge	Gettys	Patman
Broomfield	Goldwater	Pickle
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Rarick
Camp	Hebert	Riegle
Chamberlain	Kuykendall	Sandman
Chisholm	Lent	Satterfield
Clay	McKinney	Stephens
Cleveland	Mailiard	Sullivan
Conable	Maraziti	Udall
Conyers	Martin, N.C.	Wyman
Crane	Mathis, Ga.	Yatron
Davis, Ga.	Mills, Ark.	Zablocki
Evins, Tenn.	Minshall, Ohio	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hebert for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Satterfield for, with Mr. Clay against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Breckinridge with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Martin of North Carolina.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Cleveland.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Chamberlain.
 Mr. Riegle with Mr. Malliard.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Maraziti.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
 Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Wyman.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McKinney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provision of House Resolution 589, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2408) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PIKE moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 2408 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 10614 as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10614) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 6691) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-576)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6691) "making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes," having

met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 38, 50, and 51.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 52, 53, 54, and 55, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT Salaries and Expenses

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-484), \$2,000,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter stricken by said amendment, and delete the matter proposed by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 47, 48, and 49.

BOB CASEY,
 FRANK E. EVANS,
 ROBERT N. GIAMO,
 EDITH GREEN,
 JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
 EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
 LOUIS STOKES,
 GEORGE MAHON,
 LOUIS C. WYMAN,
 E. A. CEDERBERG,
 JOHN J. RHODES,
 EARL B. RUTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
 JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
 BIRCH BAYH,
 THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
 RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
 MILTON R. YOUNG,
 CLIFFORD P. CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6691) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Senate

Amendments Nos. 1 through 33: Reported in technical disagreement. Inasmuch as these amendments relate solely to the Senate and in accord with the long practice, under which each body determines its own house-keeping requirements and the other concurs therein without intervention, the managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in the Senate amendments Nos. 1 through 33.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment relating to clerk-hire allowances of Senators and rates of compensation increased in accordance with the

order of the President pro tempore of the Senate of October 4, 1973. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which appropriates the usual gratuity of \$42,500 to the widow of a deceased Member.

JOINT ITEMS

Joint Committee on Printing

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$300,620 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$295,620 as proposed by the House.

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, 1973

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$10,000 for expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Joint Committee on Congressional Operations

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$530,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$619,019 as proposed by the Senate. The managers question the propriety of a study of Senate committee jurisdiction by a joint committee. Should the Senate direct the Joint Committee to undertake such a study a supplemental request can be submitted.

Capitol Police

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate changing the titles of certain police positions detailed to the Capitol Police Board from the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia.

Official mail costs

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$30,500-000 for expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$26,106,000 as proposed by the House.

Capitol Guide Service

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Appropriate \$320,225 for salaries and expenses and increase the limitation on employment from 24 to 28 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$301,185 as proposed by the House. The managers are agreed that the designation of the additional employees as temporary or permanent shall be at the discretion of the Sergeants at Arms of the respective bodies.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$2,000-000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$3,980,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes restriction on the amount of employee compensation proposed by the Senate.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Capitol buildings and grounds

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$4,535-000 for Capitol Buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,519,600 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 45, 50 and 51: The first paragraph of amendment number 45 was inserted in the bill by the House and provided an appropriation of \$58,000,000 for extension of the Capitol. The paragraph was deleted by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to delete the language and the appropriation.

Amendment number 45 also provided as proposed by the Senate, language and an appropriation of \$18,000,000 for restoration of the West Central Front of the Capitol. The conferees agreed to delete the language and the appropriation on restoration as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment number 50 was proposed by the Senate and would provide an appropriation of \$15,000,000 and authority for the construction of an additional House Office

Building. The language and appropriation proposed by the Senate was deleted by the conferees.

Amendment number 51 was proposed by the Senate and provided an appropriation of \$300,000 and authority to conduct a master plan for future development of the Capitol grounds and related areas. The proposal of the Senate in this respect was deleted by the conferees.

In deleting these amendments for extension, restoration, an additional House Office Building and comprehensive planning, the conferees realize that full consideration could not be given these amendments at this time in that the House held no hearings on the proposal for an underground building next to the House wing of the Capitol. Lacking this the House conferees were in no position to consider the proposal. Both Houses receded to leave the question open.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$1,337,000 for the Capitol grounds as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,087,000 as proposed by the House and provides \$250,000 for modifications to and replacement of existing traffic signals and installation of additional traffic signals in the Capital grounds and adjacent street intersections, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which appropriates \$6,460,200 for the Senate Office Buildings.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which authorizes the continued availability of the unobligated balance of \$174,000 on June 30, 1973 under the heading "Extension of Additional Senate Office Building Site" until expended.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which appropriates \$97,000 for the Senate garage.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$39,458,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$39,213,000 as proposed by the House.

Congressional Research Service

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$10,927,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,690,000 as proposed by the House.

Books for the blind and physically handicapped

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$9,805,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,672,500 as proposed by the House.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Office of Superintendent of Documents

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$36,471,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,421,000 as proposed by the House.

Conference total—With comparisons

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1974 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1973 amount, the 1974 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills for 1974 follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973— \$610,692,015
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1974— 677,150,959
House bill, fiscal year 1974— 550,044,940
Senate bill, fiscal year 1974— 640,558,952

Conference agreement-----	\$605,189,933
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973-----	—5,502,082
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority (as amended), fiscal year 1974-----	—71,961,026
House bill, fiscal year 1974----- ¹ +55,144,993	
Senate bill, fiscal year 1974-----—35,369,019	

¹ Includes \$97,744,553 for Senate items not considered by the House, conforming to long practice, funds exclusively for operations and activities of the Senate—including three items jurisdictionally under the Architect of the Capitol—are left for decision and insertion by that body.

BOB CASEY,
FRANK E. EVANS,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
LOUIS STOKES,
GEORGE MAHON,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
JOHN J. RHODES,
EARL B. RUTH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
BIRCH BAYH,
THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FURTHER 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 have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), the program for the rest of today, if any, and the schedule for tomorrow.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding me this time.

The program for today is completed. Tomorrow we will bring up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 542, the war powers resolution.

Then, we will take up the conference report on H.R. 969, the school lunch program, and then H.R. 10203, the Water Resources Development Act under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

The Members can anticipate a full day's work tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I inquire further of the distinguished majority leader if it is the expectation that we will take them up in the order the gentleman has indicated?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

MILLS-VANIK AMENDMENT TO TRADE BILL

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, I circulated a petition and obtained the signatures of more than 50 members of the Democratic Caucus requesting that a specific amendment attached to the petition be made in order to H.R. 10710.

The amendment dealt with the extension of credit to nonmarket countries under trade agreements which might be entered into by the President. Congressman CHARLES VANIK circulated a petition with a similar amendment. I am happy to announce that an accommodation has been reached with the understanding that the Rules Committee will be requested to make the Mills-Vanik amendment in order. Therefore, I am today withdrawing the petition and directing a letter of withdrawal to the necessary parties.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10710 is not the ideal vehicle for the House to fully consider the matter of extension of credit to the Soviet Union, but this is a subject to which the House should address itself. It is my opinion that the House of Representatives on a clear-cut issue as to whether or not credit should be extended to the Soviet Union, the House would vote no at this time. We are presented with a paradoxical situation. On the one hand we maintain a large military machine primarily because of the threat presented by the Soviet Union. On the other hand, we are asked to extend the Soviet Union credit on both consumer and capital goods which aids the Soviet Union in continuing to divert a large share of its gross national product to the production of military weapons.

In fact, the Soviet Union is presently spending twice as much as the United States for defense as a percentage of its gross national product. Therefore, I serve notice that when the Export-Import Bank legislation and other credit legislation comes before the House next year it is my intention to see that the House is given the opportunity to fully work its will on the question of credit to the Soviet Union. The time is long past that the Congress should take advice without question from the Executive in this matter. The egregious and, in my opinion, scandalous errors of the administration in the Russian wheat sale at the expense to the American taxpayer of more than \$300 million and untold millions of dollars in increased food costs to the American consumer has shown that the Executive is not so competent that it should be given an absolute free hand to deal with the Soviet Union.

MEDICARE HOSPITAL DEDUCTIBLE GOES UP TO \$84

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger announced today that the medicare inpatient hospital deductible will go up to \$84 from \$72 for spells of illness beginning in 1974—an

increase of one-sixth, or 16.6 percent. When medicare began in 1966, the hospital deductible was \$40.

I realize that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has no choice in the matter, since the law requires him to set the dollar amount of the deductible on the basis of the average daily cost of hospital care under the hospital insurance program.

However, the Cost of Living Council does have a choice, and I think it has made the wrong one. Last year, the Council and the Price Commission limited the increase in the deductible to 6 percent. This year, the Council has said go ahead: that the increase "is not inconsistent with the Council's policies and regulations now governing price adjustments in the health industry."

Maybe not, but I submit that the increase is wholly inconsistent with what medicare patients can afford to pay. Confronted with a 9 percent increase in the cost of living so far this year, they now face a 16.6 percent increase in the hospital deductible next year. That just does not make sense.

Here is the text of Secretary Weinberger's announcement in today's Federal Register:

SOCIAL SECURITY—INPATIENT HOSPITAL DEDUCTIBLE FOR 1974

Section 1813(b)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395(b)(2)), as amended, requires that the dollar amount for the inpatient hospital deductible, be set on the basis of the average daily cost of hospital care under the hospital insurance program. For purposes of section 1813(a) of the Act, as amended, therefore, the amount shall be \$84 in the case of any spell of illness beginning during 1974.

The Social Security Act provides that, for calendar years after 1968, the inpatient hospital deductible shall be equal to \$40 multiplied by the ratio of (1) the current average per diem rate for inpatient hospital services for the calendar year preceding the year in which the promulgation is made (in this case, 1972) to (2) the current average per diem rate for such services for 1966. The law provides that, if the amount so determined is not an even multiple of \$4, it shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$4. Further, it is provided that the current average per diem rates referred to shall be determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from the best available information as to the amounts paid under the program for inpatient hospital services furnished during the year by hospitals who are qualified to participate in the program, and for whom there is an agreement to do so, for individuals who are entitled to benefits as a result of insured status under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance program or the Railroad Retirement program.

The data available to make the necessary computations of the current average per diem rates for calendar years 1966 and 1972 are derived from individual inpatient hospital bills that are recorded on a 100-percent basis in the records of the program. These records show, for each bill, the total inpatient days of care, the interim reimbursement amount, and the total interim cost (the sum of interim reimbursement, deductible, and coinsurance).

Each individual bill is assigned both an initial month and a terminal month, as determined from the first day covered by the bill and the last day so covered. Insofar as the initial month and the terminal month fall in the same calendar year, no problems of classification occur.

Two tabulations of interim reimburse-

ments are prepared, one summarizing the bills with each assigned to the year in which the period it covers begins, and the other summarizing the same bills with each assigned to the year in which the period it covers ends. The true value with respect to the interim costs for a given year on an accrual basis should fall between the amount of total costs shown for bills beginning in that year and the amount shown for bills ending in that year.

The average interim per diem rate for inpatient hospital services for calendar year 1966, on the basis described, is \$37.92, while the corresponding figure for calendar year 1972 is \$79.07. It may be noted that these averages are based on about 30 million days of hospitalization in 1966 and 64 million days of hospitalization in 1972. The ratio of the 1972 rate to the 1966 rate is 2.085.

In order to reflect accurately the change in the average per diem hospital cost under the program, the average interim cost (as shown in the tabulations) must be adjusted for (1) the effect of final cost settlements made with each provider of services after the end of its fiscal year to adjust the reimbursement to the provider from the amount paid during that year on an interim basis to the actual cost of providing covered services to beneficiaries, and for (2) changes in the benefit structure since the base year, 1966. To the extent that the ratio of final cost to interim cost is different in the current year than it was in 1966, the increase in average interim per diem costs will not coincide with the increase in actual cost that has occurred. The inclusion of the lifetime reserve days in the current tabulation of the average interim per diem cost when such days were not included in the corresponding tabulation for the base year, 1966, will underestimate the estimate of the increase in cost that has occurred, because the average cost per day of very long confinements in a hospital is less than the average for all confinements. In order to estimate the increase in average per diem cost that has occurred, a comparison must be based on similar benefits in the two periods (1972 and 1966); thus the effect of lifetime reserve days, must be eliminated from the current year tabulation. Actuarial analysis of the data available indicates that these adjustments do not change the ratio shown above by enough to result in a different deductible for 1974. The values shown in this report do not reflect these adjustments for final cost settlements or lifetime reserve days.

When the ratio of 2.085 is multiplied by \$40, it produces an amount of \$83.40, which must be rounded to \$84. Accordingly, the inpatient hospital deductible for spells of illness beginning during the calendar year 1974 is \$84.

The Cost of Living Council has analyzed the increase and has determined that the proposed increase is not inconsistent with the Council's policies and regulations now governing price adjustments in the health industry. This authorization reflects certain interpretative changes in the Cost of Living Council's regulatory policy which have occurred since the October 1972 Price Commission ruling which restricted the increase for calendar year 1973.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 13.800, Health Insurance for the Aged—Hospital Insurance)

Dated October 5, 1973.

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 73-21779 Filed 10-10-73; 8:45 am]

minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when people are in difficulties—even when the difficulties are of their own making—an expression of compassion is well taken, but this human reaction should not obscure the seriousness of the scandals before the Nation.

Without question, the events which culminated in the resignation and sentencing of Vice President Spiro Agnew are a tragedy for the man and his family.

But the events and the facts alleged by the government in this case are also a tragedy for the American people and for our system of government. The second highest office in the land has been demeaned and confidence in government has been badly shaken. It is the American people who are the victims of these crimes and I have always felt the victims of criminal activity were due the compassion rather than the perpetrators of the illegal acts.

It is highly regrettable that our system did not make these discoveries earlier so that the Nation could be spared the wrenching sight of a Vice President forced out of office. It is regrettable that the President of the United States was not more careful in selecting his running mate and it is regrettable that the press and the law enforcement agencies did not discover these flaws in this highly publicized official at an earlier date. The dogged pursuit of the health records of last year's first Democratic nominee for Vice President and the resulting harsh judgments visited on the party's Presidential nominee are in distinct contrast.

It will do the Nation little good to have the present events swept quietly under a cover of "no contest." Although the criminal side of the case has apparently ended, it is still within the responsibility of the Congress to examine the facts and to let the American people know exactly what has happened to an official in whom they placed their trust.

By the same logic, it is time to stop the cat and mouse game over the remaining records, books, and electronic tapes involved in the Watergate and related cases. The Agnew case points to a need to clear the air quickly and totally and to restore full confidence in our political and governmental processes. The American people want a fresh start and this is possible only with all the facts out in the open.

A cloud still hangs over the President and the administration which must now use its judgment in selecting a new Vice Presidential nominee. I would hope that the presentation of this name to the Congress will be accompanied with a simultaneous release of all documents, tapes, and other materials involved in the remaining scandals.

In this manner we can have a new Vice President and hopefully a new start. Without this full disclosure, the new Vice President, whoever he may be, will enter an unknown situation with the Nation still confused and divided about unexplained and unprecedented political scandals. While the Justice Department has its own special responsibilities, the Congress has a broader responsibility and

AGNEW CASE SHOULD BE FIRST STEP IN CLEARING THE AIR

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

it should take the lead in providing the fullest disclosure in all of these cases.

CANADIANS GEAR UP FOR FOREIGN INVESTMENT RESTRICTIONS

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, since introducing H.R. 8951, the Foreign Investors' Limitation Act, much of my work has centered around researching the foreign investment policies of other countries. Earlier this year, I briefly reported on the investment policies of Japan. At this point, I should like to briefly discuss the current Canadian trend toward foreign investment control. The recent tender offer by the Canada Development Corp. to Texasgulf, an American corporation operating in Texas, Wyoming, North Carolina, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Utah, and abroad adequately illustrates the Canadian posture—for complete discussion, please see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 2, 1973, at page 27756—since then, I have come across a number of very informative and interesting articles some of which I would like to share with the Members of the body.

The economic consequences of foreign takeovers can be briefly sketched. A foreign takeover increases the stock of capital if the recipients of the foreign funds reinvest them elsewhere in the country, and can add to the productivity of an enterprise if it is inefficient or its methods outdated. But a takeover adds nothing where a company is efficient, or where the takeover is financed from local sources. This is especially the case if the corporation's assets are undervalued because of inefficient management, conservative accounting, the state of the share market, or the current exchange rate. A takeover in these circumstances means only a further loss of control to foreigners and a commitment to make long-term remittances outside the country. Ross Cranston, in the Harvard International Law Journal, continues on the Canadian situation:

On May 2, 1971, the Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Gray, made a statement to the House of Commons, indicating that the government planned to take steps to review the foreign acquisition of Canadian firms. At the same time, he tabled a draft bill, the Foreign Takeovers Review Bill, 1972. The general effect of the bill is to set up a review process for foreign corporations seeking to buy out or take over existing Canadian businesses above a specified size, in order to ensure that the purchase will result in significant benefit to Canada. As the Minister put it to the House of Commons:

In general terms the purpose will be to examine proposals for takeovers of Canadian businesses, to approve those that, on balance, will be of significant benefit to Canada, to negotiate with the proposed acquirer in those cases where he can reasonably be expected to make a greater contribution to Canadian development, and to refuse to allow those takeovers that would not bring significant benefit to Canada.

The Act will apply to a takeover of a Canadian business by other than a Canadian citizen ordinarily resident in Canada, an immigrant who has lived there six years or less, or by firms which they control. In other words, a takeover by a foreign investor of an

already foreign controlled firm will be subject to review. Even though the enterprise will still be foreign controlled if a takeover eventuates, the government will at least have had the opportunity of preventing new restriction on the operation of the firm involved, and of negotiating terms more commensurate with Canadian interests.

The scope of the bill is limited in a number of ways. It does not apply to specified enterprises which are wholly, or almost wholly, government owned. Presumably it is felt that the government will not sell these enterprises and, in the unlikely event that it did, would at least operate on the basis of principles similar to those it was applying to review private takeovers. Firms with gross assets less than \$250,000 and annual gross revenues less than \$3 million are not included. Standing alone, this section would allow an enterprise to be broken up before a proposed takeover, so that its separate parts would fall within the monetary limits. But the bill prevents this by requiring the aggregation of the gross assets and gross revenue of any enterprises associated by means of the interrelationship of management, ownership or financial affairs, unless the government is satisfied that the separate existence of the associated enterprises is not for the purpose of avoiding the provisions. Even then, the monetary limits are somewhat arbitrary, although administrative convenience in the early stages of the legislation might demand that the government not concern itself with the takeover of a very small Canadian enterprise.

As indicated, the review process will apply when a foreign investor proposes to acquire control in a Canadian enterprise. For the purposes of the bill, control is confined to the acquisition of shares in a business or of all or substantially all of its assets. Yet it is well recognized that there are avenues for obtaining control of a corporation other than the two mentioned. With regard to the acquisition of shares, three presumptions exist. First, control is conclusively presumed if a foreign investor holds more than 50 per cent of the voting shares of a corporation. Second, where a foreign investor holds more than five per cent of the voting shares of a corporation, the shares of which are publicly traded, or more than 20 per cent of the shares in any other corporation, there is a rebuttable presumption of control, the burden being on the foreign investor to demonstrate that control has not been acquired. Methods of rebuttal would include the filing of shareholders' lists, the submission of the records of annual meetings, or the presentation of affidavit evidence of the location of control in the company. Third, if a foreign investor holds less than five per cent of the voting shares of a public corporation, or less than 20 percent of the shares in the case of other corporations, control is conclusively presumed not to have occurred for that reason alone.

The third presumption is deficient, because control of a corporation can sometimes be secured by holding a smaller percentage of the shares than the five and 20 per cent figures mentioned. Even if it is accepted that a foreign investor should not have to go through the review process every time he purchases a small number of shares in a Canadian corporation, there seems no justification for the conclusiveness of the presumption. One solution would be to presume control had not occurred for purchases under the limits unless the Minister, in his absolute discretion, decided otherwise. The foreign investor would then be on notice to acquire a shareholding in a Canadian corporation for the purpose of enabling him to control it. Transactions involving dealers in securities, the provision of venture capital, and bona fide loan agreements are now exempted from the provisions of the bill, as a result of government sponsored amend-

ments in committee. It was thought that these transactions did not typically involve the acquisition of control in Canadian enterprises.

The review process is comparatively simple. A non-eligible person proposing to take over a Canadian business enterprise must give notice of that fact and provide certain information required by the regulations to the registrar in charge of foreign takeovers. At the same time, he may also wish to take the initiative in giving written binding undertakings to the government about his intentions. The undertakings would be related to the benefits which would accrue to Canada through the takeover in the way of new research and development in Canada, the expansion of operations, or regarding exports. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce then assesses whether the takeover would significantly benefit Canada. In making this assessment, five factors are to be taken into account: the effect of the acquisition of the level and nature of economic activity in Canada, including employment; the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise and in any industry or industries in Canada of which it forms a part; the effect of the acquisition on productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada; the effect of the acquisition on competition within any industry or industries in Canada; and the compatibility of the acquisition with national industrial and economic policies, taking into account the industrial and economic policies of any province likely to be significantly affected by the acquisition.

If the Minister concludes that the takeover will result in significant benefit to Canada, he shall recommend to the government that it be allowed to occur. If the government reaches the same conclusion, the takeover will be allowed, and an order in council to that effect will be published. The government must decide within 90 days of the initial notification, for at the end of that period the foreign investor obtains an automatic right to proceed.

Should the Minister conclude on the basis of the information and undertakings given that he is unable to make a favorable recommendation, he is obliged to notify the foreign investor, who then has a right to make further representations or to provide additional undertakings. It is at this point that bargaining between the investor and the government might begin, with negotiations taking the form most suitable to the particular case. The Minister will then decide whether the takeover is of significant benefit to Canada.

A number of criticisms have been made of the review process. The first is that the government has wide discretionary power. This criticism, however, fails to recognize that this is almost inevitable if the process is to work with any degree of flexibility. Then, in assessing whether the takeover will bring significant benefit to Canada, neither the Minister nor the government need take into account the social, political, or cultural implications of the proposed takeover. While these factors are somewhat intangible, they are of great concern to many Canadians, and there seems to be no valid reason for excluding their consideration. Third, no opportunity is given to outside parties to make representations to the government on the proposed takeover. Finally, there are difficulties with the enforcement procedure, should the undertakings given at the time the foreign investor is allowed to proceed not be complied with. Clearly some leeway must be given, for non-compliance may result from factors completely unforeseeable. If necessary, a superior court, on application of the Minister, can order the investor to carry out an undertaking. But this has two weak-

nesses: the Minister alone can take the initiative and, furthermore, no guidance is given to the court as to how it should exercise its discretion.

An additional indication that the Canadians are serious in their pursuit toward more national control of their resources is a recent series of news articles appearing in both the *Washington Post* and the *Canadian Financial Post* concerning the restriction of foreign landholding—from companies to individuals—in the province of Ontario.

[From the *Washington Post*, Sept. 23, 1973]

ONTARIO MAY RESTRICT FOREIGN LANDHOLDERS

(By Eric Malling)

TORONTO, September 27.—Some Ontario legislators want to bar all foreigners—including U.S. companies—from buying land in the province.

The measure would be aimed mainly at American vacationers and the foreign real estate companies that own much of the valuable land in the province's big cities.

The proposal, which was leaked to the *Toronto Star* yesterday, comes from a special committee of the provincial legislature that is studying all aspects of economic and cultural nationalism in Canada's most populous province.

It will be presented to the legislature in a few weeks, and although the Conservative Party government that has governed Ontario for 30 years is not bound to accept the recommendation, it cannot dismiss it lightly because seven of the 11 legislators on the committee are Conservatives.

OUTSIDE SPECULATORS

The committee has no estimate of how much Ontario land is already owned by foreigners. However, it said that Americans own 90 per cent of the prime homesites in some areas, and foreign investors are buying large tracts of wilderness land for long-term speculative profits.

It said the book value of land foreign companies hold and conduct their business on exceeds \$10 billion—and if it were valued at market prices the total would be much higher. Foreign companies own about 60 per cent of Canada's manufacturing industry, which is concentrated in Ontario.

The committee said restrictions on land ownership are "a matter of urgency and priority."

"As a general tenet, the committee considers it desirable that land, the basic natural resource of the province, be owned within Canada rather than abroad," the report said, warning that "availability of land and other real property at reasonable cost is the key element in the future quality of life in the province."

LEASE, NOT BUY

Under the committee proposals, companies would not be able to buy land unless they are at least 75 per cent Canadian-owned. Foreign-dominated companies would be allowed to lease land if this is essential to their business.

Vacationers would be completely blocked—prevented from either buying or leasing. They could, however, rent lots from Canadian owners.

Americans who already own cottages in Canada would not have to give them up, but they could not pass them on to their children; a foreigner inheriting Ontario land would be given three years to sell it to a Canadian.

Although measures to protect the economy from too much foreign influence are generally seen as a federal responsibility, land management is under provincial jurisdiction in Canada.

[From the *Canadian Financial Post*, Oct. 6, 1973]

ONTARIO UPROAR: "FOREIGNERS CAN'T BE LANDED GENTRY"

(By Richard Starks)

"It's ludicrous, just incomprehensible."
"It boggles the mind."
"It's economic suicide."

Such were the anguished cries of outrage that were swarming around the business community in Ontario last week.

The cause: newspaper leaks of a report from the Economic & Cultural Nationalism Committee to the Ontario government, urging severe restrictions on the amount of land foreigners—both corporations and individuals—may own in the province.

Admittedly, the business community refused (rightly, as it turned out) to accept the validity of the newspaper stories. And it was generally convinced that, as one real-estate spokesman said, "no responsible government could ever adopt (the leaked) proposals." So the outrage didn't really come from the heart.

Nevertheless, there is enough strength in the committee report that, should the Ontario government move toward making the proposals law, some of those confident chuckles of disbelief now emanating from corporate boardrooms could easily rise to hysterical giggles.

The full extent of the committee's report will not be known until its report is published early next week. However, FP has confirmed the accuracy of some of the recommendations that were leaked to the press.

The most far-reaching is the proposal that no foreign corporation or individual should be allowed to purchase land in Ontario. They would only be able to lease.

(The committee defines a foreign corporation as one that is less than 75% Canadian-owned.)

The proposal, if made law, would severely limit many of the expansion plans of foreign companies, which undoubtedly would think twice before building a new plant on leased land where they had no control over costs.

(The foreign company could, perhaps, take a 99-year lease, but that would give it effective ownership. If the Ontario government was really serious about limiting foreign ownership, it could easily prohibit such long-term leases by law.)

Fifty-three of Canada's largest 100 companies are foreign-owned under the committee's definition. And nearly all of them have substantial operations in Ontario. The only way they could expand—if a land purchase were involved—would be to become 75% Canadian owned, a highly improbable event if for no other reason than that Canadians couldn't afford to take them over.

CANADIAN FIRMS

Even such "Canadian" companies as Canadian Pacific Ltd. (40% foreign-owned) and Hudson's Bay Co. (50% foreign-owned) would feel the restriction.

Joint ventures such as Simpsons-Sears Ltd. would also be affected.

Major developers such as Trizec Corp. (60%–65% foreign-owned) could no longer expand freely in the province. The company owns such major Ontario shopping centers as Yorkdale Plaza and has a 65% holding in Scarborough Town Centre.

In fact, says one Toronto real-estate broker, construction in the major urban areas would "grind to a halt" if foreign land purchases were prohibited.

Suppose a Canadian company decides to build an office block, he says. To satisfy the mortgagee, the company must lease about 50% of the building before it starts construction, and to attract tenants into a building that does not yet exist, it must offer low rents.

When the building is finished, the developer will likely sell it, to liquidate the capital he needs to build elsewhere. But since the rents are low, the return on the building will be low—usually too low, the broker says, to attract a Canadian buyer.

FIZZLE OUT?

Non-Canadians, however, are prepared to accept the small return, and will come up with enough money to keep the construction cycle turning over. Without their money (and thus their ownership), the construction boom would rapidly fizzle out.

(It's been argued that restricting foreign ownership would be justified if foreigners were buying up land and holding it off the market to force up prices. But the victims of such a practice would suffer just as much if the speculators were Canadian.)

The ban of foreign land-purchases would also curb apartment and house construction in the province, lowering supply and raising prices.

Richard Costain Ltd. (49% foreign owned), for example, buys land, builds on it, and then sells it back to Canadians. Although the land ultimately ends up in domestic hands, the company (and others like it) would have trouble operating under the ban.

It's not surprising, therefore, that the business community is a little concerned over the committee's recommendations.

What is surprising, however, is the number of business leaders FP contacted who were in favor of some sort of control on land ownership by foreign corporations—but not such stringent controls as the committee suggests.

When it came to individual land ownership, the feeling was almost unanimous that controls are needed.

The committee's proposals here are aimed primarily against foreign (that is, U.S.) ownership of prime vacation land in the province. In some areas of Ontario, the committee found that up to 90% of the recreational land is in the hands of foreigners, most of whom make use of their property for only a few weeks out of the year.

If buying pressure from the U.S. was relieved, land prices would undoubtedly decline allowing more Ontarians to own a piece of their province.

The proposals, of course, are far from being passed into law. And Ontario Premier William Davis has indicated in the past that he would be against sweeping restrictions on land ownership.

However, it should not be forgotten that, in spite of its business-community support, Ontario's Conservative government has led the rest of the country in some foreign-ownership areas—such as its bill requiring Canadians resident in Canada to form the majority on the board of directors of companies incorporated in the province.

And it just might transpire that some stiff anti-foreigner, pro-nationalist legislation is exactly what the government needs to restore its flagging popularity.

In closing, I would hope that any discussion on this matter would be toward a fruitful end. Only an integrated set of policies can successfully and intelligently handle foreign investment. It is my intent to sponsor legislation that will develop rational policies along the lines suggested, being careful to insure both economic growth and national independence.

NOMINATION OF THE NEW VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Maine (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the circumstances which have brought about the resignation of the Vice President. Of necessity, however, we must turn our attention to the matter of whom the President shall nominate to fill the office.

With the great uncertainties that have faced this country in the last several months, I consider it vital that a successor be chosen and approved as quickly as possible. I commend the President for the prompt action he has taken to consult with the leadership of both parties in Congress. In my opinion, such consultation is essential for securing the appointment of an individual who will help restore public confidence in our national leaders and promote the commitment and cooperation of all parts of our Government toward the realization of common goals.

In considering the appointment of a new Vice President, it is my fervent hope that the House and Senate will eschew partisan considerations and urge the nomination of the strongest, most qualified person possible. This country has experienced the tragic loss of incumbent Presidents too often for us to be content with appointing only a "caretaker" to the Vice Presidency. I submit that it is our absolute duty to approve a Vice President who, in an emergency, will be capable of assuming the reins of leadership and securing the aid and support of the Congress and the people.

During the next few weeks we will have the opportunity and responsibility to review the nomination of a new Vice President. Let us thoroughly, but quickly and responsibly discharge this great duty so that the country and the Congress can leave this unfortunate period behind us and proceed with the task of resolving the great national and international issues of the day.

DÉTENTE IMPERILED—NOT BY JACKSON AMENDMENT BUT BY SOVIET INTERVENTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much over the past 3 years on the viability of a meaningful détente between the United States and the Soviet Union. Détente—the relaxation of strained relations or tensions between nations—was intended to be an immediately available mechanism for the President's much-heralded era of negotiations. It was the cornerstone of many of the President's most significant foreign policy initiatives. It was to form the basis upon which the United States and the Soviet Union would enter into a series of conferences—the European Security Conference, the Mutual Reductions of Forces and Armaments and Associated Measures in Europe Conference, and the second round of strategic arms limitation talks—as well as serving as a device for

heightened social, cultural, and scientific exchanges between the nations.

Détente, in the original French, meant "a mechanism which unlocks." It is just that—a mechanism, a procedure, a tactic, a device. Thus, there appeared to be little wrong with a sincere pursuit of détente, provided that such sincerity was manifested by actions, not just words, from both major parties; provided that the American people and their leaders appreciated fully that a relaxation in tensions must be undertaken with our foreign policymakers having their feet squarely upon the ground and in no mood of euphoria; and provided that emphasis upon the mechanism—détente—did not obscure the substantive foreign policy objectives sought by the United States and other free world nations.

The one unanswered question through all of the discussion about détente, and the preliminary and plenary sessions of the conferences arising therefrom, was the willingness of the Soviet Union to match its words with deeds—matching the spirit of détente with its letter.

During the past 6 days, the Soviet Union has been given the opportunity to show to the world its desire to curb tensions among nations, to cooperate in refusing to fuel the hostilities in the Middle East, to cooperate specifically with the United States in arriving at a cease-fire in the Middle East, and to retreat from its manifest policy of anti-Semitism. The Soviet Union has taken none of these approaches.

What the Soviet Union has done became clearer with today's morning newspapers and broadcasts. It has commenced a "major airlift" of supplies, machinery, and other articles of war to both Egypt and Syria, the principal belligerents against Israel in the present conflict. The leads in this morning's papers are clear: "Soviets Airlifting Aid to Arabs," "Soviets Start 'Major Airlift' to Egypt, Syria."

We do not yet know from public sources if the Soviet Union has begun the movement of ground troops within Eastern Europe or the Soviet Socialist Republics in the southwestern Soviet Union. We do know, however, that the Soviet Navy has moved its ships in the Mediterranean to the vicinity of the conflict and has steamed out additional warships through the Straits of Bosphorus into the Mediterranean.

The Soviet Union's actions should come, in my opinion, as little surprise. They are fully consistent with their never-renounced intentions to obtain, secure, and hold the oilfields of the Middle East, providing them with oil supplies in quantities fully adequate for their own uses, with sufficient leverage to be able to curtail oil shipments to the Western Powers simultaneously.

Additionally, the seizure of the east bank of the Suez Canal would not only provide the Egyptians with a breakthrough in the Sinai Peninsula, but would also permit a reopening of the canal, an important and major need of the Soviet fleet, within the past few years operating freely within the Mediterranean Sea, to gain easy and rapid access to the Persian Gulf and the Indian

Ocean. It is in furtherance of Soviet national interests to obtain these major, strategic advantages at this point in history, while negotiations—from positions of strength—with the United States and the nations of western Europe continue. It is also an additional expression of Soviet opposition to the State of Israel.

Perhaps, the most distressing single aspect of the Soviet action is the way in which it invites, in the understandable and natural course of affairs between nations, a counter and balancing measure from the United States. To preserve a semblance of balanced military capabilities within the Middle East, the United States must resupply Israel. The ultimate tragedy is the needless loss of life—Arab and Jew, soldier and civilian, which will come from these hostilities.

Two days ago, I took the floor of the House to warn that the United States should immediately proceed to the full inventory, exploration, and capturing of all available oil supplies within the United States and its Continental Shelf. In making those remarks, I stated:

I believe we can have both adequate energy and adequate environmental protection at the same time, but we must move forward in these two areas now. To do otherwise is to invite continued abuse at the hands of the belligerent Arab nations.

I stand in this Well today to stress the immediate necessity of our Nation's foreign policymakers fully appreciating the seriousness of the Soviet airlift, its impact upon détente, and the escalation which is inevitable. To underscore these indices of judgment which must now be brought to bear, I include in the RECORD excerpts from today's Washington Post lead article:

SOVIETS AIRLIFTING AID TO ARABS, UNITED STATES REPORTS

(By Marilyn Berger and Michael Getler)

High-ranking U.S. officials and Israeli military sources said yesterday that the Soviet Union had begun a "major airlift" of supplies to both Egypt and Syria.

The disclosure appeared to open the way for the immediate supply of U.S. equipment to Israel to replace that country's heavy losses sustained during the five days of fighting in the Middle East.

While State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey said he could not confirm for the record reports of the Soviet shipments to the Mideast, he said that any "massive airlift . . . would tend to put a new face on the situation." The implication of his remarks was that it would affect the U.S. posture in the Middle East and, beyond that, U.S.-Soviet detente.

McCloskey recalled that Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger had said in a carefully prepared speech Monday evening that "détente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East."

It appeared that the United States had already begun responding to the Soviet action. Neither U.S. nor Israeli officials would comment in any way on the military supply situation, but there were indications that equipment was already on its way to Israel.

A Boeing 707 with Israeli markings was seen at Norfolk being loaded with Sidewinder and Sparrow air-to-air missiles, the type used by Israeli Phantom jets. The plane took off immediately after loading. U.S. government sources say it is likely that there will be other arms airlifts to Israel including artillery, shells, bombs and tactical missiles.

At the beginning, the United States had

taken a hands-off attitude, clearly in the expectation that the Israelis would be able to respond to the Arab attack with ease and dispatch. The prolonged battle has created an entirely new situation.

A major reason for wishing to stay outside the battle, beyond the desire to keep the conflict a local one isolated from the major powers, is the continuing threat of a cutoff of Arab oil to the West as an Arab weapon.

Egypt yesterday urged King Faisal of Saudi Arabia to halt oil production at his American-run wells if the United States moved to replace Israel's losses in military equipment. Such a warning reportedly was already sent by Faisal to Washington. President Nixon noted in speaking to scientists yesterday that the United States must become self-sufficient in energy supplies so as not to be dependent on "uncertain sources."

As the Mideast crisis deepened, President Nixon and Kissinger met for 90 minutes with congressional leaders of both parties to brief them. Ten senators and nine congressmen attended the session in the Cabinet Room and gave their support to the administration's efforts to bring an end to the hostilities.

Before going to the White House meeting, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana told reporters at a breakfast meeting that the United States should avoid any involvement in the war. "I want no more Vietnams," he said.

Speaking before the disclosure of Soviet arms supplies, he also said that the United States should "be guided by what the other side does" so far as equipping the belligerents. "What the other side does, we should do," he said.

Mansfield's assessment, prior to the White House meeting, was that the Soviet Union had been "relatively restrained." He did not address the question after the briefing by the President and Kissinger and said that the question of U.S. arms supplies to Israel had not been discussed "specifically."

At the beginning of the battle, when it appeared that it would be a swift although bloody skirmish, State Department officials suggested that the Soviet Union had shown an interest in preventing a wider war. Reports that the Soviet Union was urging other Arab states to provide the belligerents with "the greatest possible support," and later signs of Soviet arms shipments were causing a re-evaluation.

[Soviet Ambassador to Lebanon Sarvar Azimov met with Lebanese President Suleiman Franjeh Tuesday and Beirut newspapers reported yesterday that the Russian handed Franjeh a message from Soviet Communist Party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev containing pledges of support, including military help, for the Arab states.

[Soviet envoys in all Arab capitals reportedly transmitted copies of the letter, originally addressed to Algerian President Houari Boumediene.]

Other Soviet moves also were causing concern here. Yesterday Moscow sent reinforcements for its Mediterranean fleet through the Dardanelles, the 19,000-ton cruiser Sverdlov used for offshore bombardment and two guided-missile destroyers. This was the first reinforcement of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet since the conflict began and came as major elements of the U.S. Sixth Fleet, including the attack aircraft carrier Independence and the helicopter carrier Guadalcanal, plus guided missile frigates and destroyers, were reported "within a few hours steaming time" of the Mideast combat zone.

The U.S. aircraft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt also left Barcelona, Spain, apparently sailing eastward in the Mediterranean, U.S. defense officials said yesterday.

The Soviet airlifts to Syria and Egypt, which were believed to be coming via Hungary, contained materiel in crates. Informed sources said they assumed that shipments to Syria contained ground-to-air missiles, probably the mobile SA-6 that has been highly ef-

fective in bringing down Israeli planes over the Golan Heights, and possibly aircraft. These sources speculated that the Egyptians were receiving antitank and antiaircraft missiles, ammunition and possibly planes.

In Moscow, a Soviet foreign ministry spokesman declined to comment on the reports from Washington of a step-up in arms supplies to the Arabs.

There were indications meanwhile that the United States was already wrestling with the problem of re-supplying F-4 Phantom jets following the loss of what is believed to be more than 60 of the Israeli fleet of 300-plus jet fighters and attack planes. Israeli officials are known to have met at the Pentagon with members of the Defense Department's International Security Assistance office, the section that handles equipment destined for overseas delivery.

Such superpower supply to the belligerents and the almost total disagreement exhibited in the Security Council by the United States and the Soviet Union appear in conflict with the various declarations that came out of the Moscow and Washington summits where both countries pledged to "create conditions which promote the reduction of tensions." McCloskey, at the regular State Department briefing yesterday, declined, however, to make charges or accusations against any country. "That may come," he said, "but I'm not prepared to do it now."

The Post, in that same edition, editorialized, as follows:

A HEAVY CHALLENGE TO DÉTENTE

For the United States, the most sobering revelation to come out of the fourth Arab-Israeli war is that détente—the President's "structure for peace," or at least that part of it which rests upon a Soviet-American détente—may not be nearly as sturdy as its American builders proclaimed it to be. When the war broke out last weekend, the immediate tendency was to take comfort in the fact that neither Moscow nor Washington was involved militarily, and that no unduly harsh Soviet-American political crisis threatened. But as Murrey Marder writes elsewhere on this page today, this is no longer the case.

This is the emerging record:

The Russians unquestionably knew Egypt and Syria were about to attack yet they did not inform the United States as they are obligated to do under the Basic Principles of Relations which were signed in Moscow in 1972 and reaffirmed in Washington last June.

The third "Principle" affirms the special Soviet-American responsibility "to do everything in their power so that conflicts or situations will not arise which would serve to increase international tension." Faced with a choice between honoring this fundamental commitment and letting its clients start a war, Moscow chose war. It violated its solemn obligation to the United States and it did so in a context where the result was immediate, violent and tragic.

Since the war opened, moreover, Moscow has begun a military supply airlift to Syria, if not also to Egypt, and publicly urged other Arab states to give the combatants the "greatest possible support." These actions run directly counter to the specific promise of General Secretary Brezhnev to work for international order, and, indeed, counter to the general promise of détente.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said last Monday: "We will react if relaxation of tensions is used as a cover to exacerbate conflicts in international trouble spots." He went on to say that "the Soviet Union cannot disregard (these principles) in any area of the world without imperiling its entire relationship with the United States . . . Detente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East." These statements suggest the administration fully understands the heavy challenge to a relaxa-

tion of tension which has been posed by the Kremlin's Mideast policy. For it cannot be easy for a President who is otherwise weakened by a multiplicity of domestic troubles, and has made détente the centerpiece of his presidency, to admit the possibility that that policy may be deeply flawed.

It is cruel to imagine that the hopeful prospect of Soviet-American relations could dissolve as the result of Soviet policy in this crisis. But the stakes cannot be ignored. . .

These positions were underscored by columnist Joseph Kraft:

UNITED STATES-SOVIET DÉTENTE AND THE MIDEAST

(By Joseph Kraft)

The new outburst of fighting in the Middle East shows the limits of détente between the Big Two. The Russians are willing to cooperate with this country only on an opportunistic basis.

As soon as chances for gain present themselves, Moscow turns a deafish ear to Washington. So this country is justified in holding the Russians to stiff conditions as a price for détente.

What this behavior shows is that the elements already involved in détente are not enough to restrain the Soviet Union. No doubt General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev would like to develop his country economically with help from the United States in farm produce and technical know-how. Probably he would also like to pare military budgets by arms control agreements putting a lid on the most expensive weapons. But these prospects are not sweet enough or important enough to deter the Soviet leadership from rash actions certain to jeopardize Big Two cooperation and peace in the world.

In these circumstances, the United States needs to hold the Soviet Union more strictly to account. One way to do that lies in the amendment offered by Sen. Henry Jackson to the administration's proposal for granting Russia nondiscriminatory trading terms for most favored nation treaty. The Jackson Amendment provides that "most favored nation" treatment and economic credits can be granted only if the Soviet Union makes progress in freeing up internal emigration.

For some time it was difficult to organize a position on the Jackson Amendment. The President argued that adding conditions to the deal he had cut with the Russians would put his word in doubt, threaten détente and cause a reversion to the cold war.

But part of that argument is bogus. The Congress has always insisted on playing a major role in trade agreements. Back in 1911 the Congress passed a resolution condemning Russia for harsh treatment of the Jews. The next year, in pursuit of that resolution, President William Howard Taft actually abrogated an ongoing trade treaty with Czarist Russia.

In 1962, President Kennedy wanted to broaden trade rules so that "most favored nation" status could be extended to several East European countries besides Yugoslavia and Poland. The Congress, instead, passed a bill which eliminated Yugoslavia and Poland from "most favored nation" status.

So the President had no right in the first place to make with Russia a binding deal involving trade. Now, on top of the tradition comes the evidence of the irresponsible way the Russians interpret détente.

Accordingly, there can be little doubt about the appropriate American reaction. The Russians are not offering this country the kind of restraint that justifies important economic concessions. Washington ought to raise the price of the détente. The way to do that is to acknowledge our deepest humani-

tarian standards. It is to go at least part way with Sen. Jackson in insisting that Russia progressively humanize its regime.

Mr. Speaker, if the Soviet Union does indeed want détente—and need détente because of the economic advantages which will accompany a relaxation in tensions—then there is little to lose for the United States to now insist, as an antecedent to any continuation of conferences or agreements pending, that the Soviet Union immediately cease and desist from providing any additional military hardware, technology, or advice to the belligerent Arab nations. This should be a precondition to the relaxation of trade—to even the consideration of preferential treatment by the United States through most-favored nations status or credit extensions, or of reductions in force and arms limitations, or any other major agreement.

U.S. action should be characterized by a determination to use what is now its leverage—the withholding of that which the Soviets want—to effectuate a peace in the Middle East. It is a mechanism which could work, for without Soviet assistance Egypt and Syria cannot long afford this war.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to convene a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.

A similar resolution was recently introduced, Mr. Speaker, by the distinguished minority leader, Mr. GERALD FORD of Michigan, and I welcome this bipartisan support for the concept of such a conference.

I should also note, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee only yesterday reported a companion measure sponsored by my able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL).

Libraries are so familiar to us that we may tend to take their many valuable programs and services for granted. When we seek information or enlightenment or recreation or refreshment of the spirit, we turn to the library to find what we seek. Few of us have any notion of the staffs, equipment, facilities, and procedures that are required to provide us with library services, any more than we are aware of the inner workings of most of the other complex institutions of modern life on which we rely.

MANY TYPES OF LIBRARIES

Mr. Speaker, the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, has overseen the development of the Library Services and Construction Act, which has strengthened our public libraries, and the Committee on Education and Labor has fostered the services of school and college and university libraries through provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act,

the Higher Education Act and other measures. Members of Congress are also aware of the role of the Library of Congress as a keynote of the structure of library services throughout the Nation and as one of the preeminent national libraries of the world.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have such a great variety of libraries because libraries serve a very great range of needs. The public library typically contains several specialized departments to serve its various constituencies—adults, children, businessmen, craftsmen, and technicians—and to provide its various materials—pictures and books, as well as recordings and periodicals.

School and college libraries must meet the needs of both students and teachers while the libraries of the institutions of higher education must also provide the many raw materials of scholarship and research.

There are, in addition, the libraries of hospitals and medical schools, the law libraries to which so many of my colleagues have turned in their time, the libraries of the professional and scientific societies, and the libraries of the larger business firms and trade and industry organizations.

HIGH COST OF LIBRARIES

The point of this enumeration is to emphasize a peculiarity of libraries that has helped to put them in their present predicament. It is this: not everyone uses a library, nor does everyone use the same library throughout a lifetime of learning and work, yet the library must be there—ably staffed and well-stocked—for those who need it, when they need it. And the library cannot await a request before obtaining an item. The law library, for example, must be ready to serve its patrons even when they are not preparing for the bar examination or searching for precedents while drafting a brief.

In economic terms, the library is thus a high-overhead institution. Moreover, it is a public service the costs of which are met through public funds. It is inconceivable that libraries be operated on a fee-for-service basis; for that would be totally inconsistent with the ideals of education as well as sound public policy. Learning is not hoarded for sale in the marketplace, but offered freely to all, especially new generations, by those who possess it—the scholars and teachers who themselves freely received it from those who taught them. Our system of self-government requires an enlightened electorate with free access to information and opinion, and the library is as essential to the processes of self-government as the newspaper, the broadcast, the public speech or the legislative debate.

SOUND LIBRARY ECONOMICS

Aware of their commensurate responsibilities to the public, libraries are economical, even parsimonious, in their operations. They cooperate to keep their costs at a minimum. They borrow and lend their materials among themselves so that almost any user of virtually any library may obtain the book or journal or map or print or tape that he requests. Doubtless we have all made use of this remarkable attribute of libraries at one time or another. The Library of Congress has arranged with hundreds of

publishers to print standardized cataloging numbers in their publications so that libraries can put them on their shelves and list them in their catalogs more rapidly and at less expense. Libraries have utilized the developments of advancing technology, too, in order to provide services more economically. They use microphotography to save space, telecommunications to save time, and now computers to save money as well as space and time.

AMERICAN LIBRARY CRISIS

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, our libraries are today in crisis. The characteristic commitment of the American people to education remains as firm as ever. Although about 76 percent of our 18-year-olds were graduated from high school in 1971, almost 86 percent will be graduated in 1981. Although 59 percent went on to college in 1971, by 1981 the proportion is expected to be over 67 percent. We have a far more highly educated electorate and labor force than any other large nation, and librarians confirm that the thirst for knowledge is rarely quenched, and that the more formal education a person has, the more informal education he seeks at the library and elsewhere.

So the greater numbers who are using libraries are one factor in the present crisis. Another element is the rising output of the materials that libraries must make available to their users. Every year, more books are published, more scientific journals are issued, more magazines, newspapers, films, and recordings are produced—and in more and more languages. And so there is vastly more material to peruse, and consult, and compare, in addition to the many more people who want to know, and need to know, what has been learned or envisioned and brought to the libraries.

These two factors of rising numbers of users and rising output of materials combine to increase the costs of libraries.

The third factor in the library crisis is primarily political, not economic. It is the question of how the increasing, largely uncontrollable, costs of library services are to be met, that is, by what units or levels of government.

STATE AND PRIVATE ROLE

Like most other public services in this country, libraries were originally almost entirely a responsibility of local government and philanthropy. Libraries were endowed at first by societies of their patrons and later by public-spirited donors, among whom Andrew Carnegie was unquestionably foremost, but by no means alone. Larger units of government then joined in support of libraries, the States through aid to the public schools and through the development of the public universities as well as of the State libraries themselves.

FEDERAL SUPPORT

Aside from the development and maintenance of the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library and the National Library of Medicine, the Federal Government did not support public libraries, school libraries or the libraries of higher education and other institutions until relatively recent times.

The Rural Library Services Act, Mr. Speaker, was enacted in 1956 after a

decade of consideration and debate in Congress. In time this statute was broadened to become the present Library Services and Construction Act, which addresses the needs of public libraries. In time, too, through the National Defense Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Medical Library Assistance Act and other legislation, Congress affirmed a measure of national responsibility for school and college libraries as well as others.

DEBATE OVER FEDERAL ROLE

Mr. Speaker, as in other areas of our national life, such as education, provision of these vital public services for libraries is still preeminently a local and State responsibility. And that is as it should be.

Yet there has been a steadily increasing recognition of the concept that all our citizens, no matter where they happen to live and work, are entitled to public library and other services of a certain level and quality. To stimulate and assure an equitable provision of these services, Congress has been sharing their costs with the States and with local governments.

This trend has been questioned in recent years. Presidential aides, no longer at the White House, have asserted, in substance, that "libraries are traditionally and wholly a local responsibility—why should the Federal Government assist them?" The budgets submitted by the President in the last few years have proposed drastically smaller, and even no, appropriations for major library programs. We have been told that other activities have a higher priority, or alternatively, that revenue sharing is the answer to the problems of libraries and other local services. I would note in passing that libraries received only \$12.5 million, or six-tenths of 1 percent, of the first \$2 billion received by local governments under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act.

A PUBLIC DEBATE

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we in Congress should shrink from the challenge that is being presented to the wisdom of Congress in enacting and continuing the legislation that supports the development of libraries. But I believe that people outside Congress should also confront this question more directly. That is the reason I am today introducing a joint resolution calling for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services. The resolution calls for a meeting of a representative group of the citizens who use and pay for libraries, and those who direct and operate them, as well as appropriate public officials. The delegates to this White House Conference should confront the crisis that currently threatens our libraries, shall consider the ways in which the crisis can be surmounted, and should present to public officials their proposals for the continued growth and development of the libraries of the American people.

GROUNDWORK ALREADY LAID

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate that a great deal has already been done to assure the success of a White House Conference on Libraries. Under provisions of

the Library Services and Construction Act, a statewide planning process has been assessing the needs for library services of the people of each State, in their various communities. Each State ranking those needs in terms of relative priority so that they can be met in an equitable and prudent manner.

During this continuing process of planning, each State is considering the needs of all types of libraries including the Nation's State, public, school, and academic libraries, special libraries serving persons in government, commerce and industry, the arts, the armed services, hospitals, prisons, and other institutions.

Many States, Mr. Speaker, are also addressing the provision of library services across political boundaries. In many metropolitan areas, the inner city libraries are heavily patronized by suburban residents who do not pay the municipal taxes that support these libraries. In certain parts of the country, library users cross State lines. These are simply facts of modern life. We cannot escape their implications by asserting that traditional divisions of governmental responsibility must remain unchanged.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

In addition to the State-by-State appraisal of library services that we have required under the LSCA, Congress has also created the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to review and evaluate the problems and potentialities of libraries from a national perspective. That Commission has been at work, through studies, meetings and hearings, since its appointment by the President in 1971. The joint resolution I propose would have the Commission direct the planning and conduct of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976 so that there would be no need to establish a costly ad hoc body to do this job. The resolution would also authorize the holding of State-wide conferences in association with the meeting in Washington if these are deemed to be useful, as I believe they would be.

NEED FOR A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

As the National Commission is assuring the careful and coordinated development of library and information services, a White House Conference could assure the broad public understanding and support of its findings and recommendations for the further progress of our libraries. We know that a White House Conference can effectively clarify the national purpose and strengthen the national resolve to press forward.

We have seen the White House Conference on Aging help to formulate public policy initiatives which became the law of the land in the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments, which I had the privilege of sponsoring in the House.

One of the provisions of that legislation, Mr. Speaker, dovetails nicely with the library programs we are discussing today. I refer, of course, to the fact that the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments authorizes older readers' service by means of which li-

braries may provide house visits to elderly Americans, as well as librarians especially trained in the needs of older people.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the White House Conference on Library and Information Services will be as productive as the White House Conference on Aging.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that convening a White House Conference in 1976, as the resolution provides, would be appropriate as well as timely. Authorizing the conference now would afford opportunity to prepare for it without haste or waste. The bicentennial year will be a period of reviewing our accomplishments in many aspects of our national life and a time for setting new goals and determining how best to reach them. We shall be asking ourselves what contributions we Americans have made to better lives for our own people and for others, and we shall be considering the extent to which we have succeeded in realizing the ideals and ambitions of our forefathers.

The public library is a great and distinctively American contribution, as is our provision of educational opportunity on a scale as yet not matched by any other large nation. Like many other Members, I have been critical of some of the proposals for marking the Nation's bicentennial observance and have asked that our celebration of this momentous anniversary be thoughtful and worthy of our own high goals, and our great heritage, and not shallow and self-serving.

A White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976, Mr. Speaker, would be fully consonant with the serious appraisal of the essence of our past and future that I believe should characterize our bicentennial activities. Franklin and Jefferson would approve, Lincoln and the Roosevelts would agree.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the proposed resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976

Whereas access to information and ideas is indispensable to the development of human potential, the advancement of civilization, and the continuance of enlightened self-government; and

Whereas the preservation and dissemination of information and ideas is the primary purpose and function of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas the growth and augmentation of the Nation's libraries and information centers are essential if all Americans are to have reasonable access to adequate services of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas new achievements in technology offer a potential for enabling libraries and information centers to serve the public more fully, expeditiously, and economically; and

Whereas maximum realization of the potential inherent in the use of advanced technology by libraries and information centers requires cooperation through planning for, and coordination of, the services of libraries and information centers; and

Whereas the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is developing plans for meeting national needs for library and information services and for

coordinating activities to meet those needs; and

Whereas productive recommendations for expanding access to libraries and information services will require public understanding and support as well as that of public and private libraries and information centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) *the President of the United States is authorized to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976.*

(b) (1) *The purpose of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Conference") shall be to develop recommendations for the further improvement of the Nation's libraries and information centers, in accordance with the policies set forth in the preamble to this joint resolution.*

(2) *The conference shall be composed of, and bring together—*

(A) *representatives of local, statewide, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations which provide library and information services to the public;*

(B) *representatives of educational institutions, agencies, organizations, and associations (including professional and scholarly associations for the advancement of education and research);*

(C) *persons with special knowledge of, and special competence with, technology as it may be used for the improvement of library and information services; and*

(D) *representatives of Federal, state, and local governments, professional and lay people, and other members of the general public.*

(c) (1) *The conference shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").*

(2) *In administering this joint resolution, the Commission shall—*

(A) *when appropriate, request the cooperation and assistance of other Federal departments and agencies in order to carry out its responsibilities;*

(B) *make technical and financial assistance (by grant, contract, or otherwise) available to the States to enable them to organize and conduct conferences and other meetings in order to prepare for the Conference; and*

(C) *prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the Conference and associated State conferences, and prepare and distribute such reports of the Conference and associated State conferences as may be appropriate.*

(3) (A) *Each Federal department and agency is authorized and directed to cooperate with, and provide assistance to, the Commission upon its request under clause (A) of paragraph (2); and, for that purpose, each Federal department and agency is authorized to provide personnel to the Commission in accordance with section 3341 of title 5, United States Code. For the purposes of such section 3341 and this paragraph, the Commission shall be deemed to be a part of any executive or military department of which a request is made under clause (A) of paragraph (2).*

(B) *The Librarian of Congress is authorized to detail personnel to the Commission, upon request, to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.*

(4) *In carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, the Commission is authorized to engage such personnel as may be necessary, without regard for the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive civil service, and without regard for chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating*

to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(5) *The Commission is authorized to publish and distribute for the Conference the reports authorized under this joint resolution without regard for section 501 of title 44, United States Code.*

(6) *Members of the Conference may, while away from their homes or regular places of business and attending the Conference, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be allowed under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without pay. Such expenses may be paid by way of advances, reimbursement, or in installments as the Commission may determine.*

(d) *A final report of the Conference, containing such findings and recommendations as may be made by the Conference, shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and twenty days following the close of the Conference, which final report shall be made public and, within ninety days after its receipt by the President, transmitted to the Congress together with a statement of the President containing the President's recommendations with respect to such report.*

(e) (1) *There is hereby established a twenty-eight member advisory committee to the Conference composed of (A) at least three members of the Commission designated by the Chairman thereof; (B) two persons designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; (C) two persons designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and (D) not more than twenty-one persons appointed by the President. Such advisory committee shall assist and advise the Commission in planning and conducting the Conference. The Chairman of the Commission shall serve as Chairman of the Conference.*

(2) *The Chairman of the Commission is authorized, in his discretion, to establish, prescribe functions for, and appoint members to, such advisory and technical committees as may be necessary to assist and advise the Conference in carrying out its functions.*

(3) *Members of any committee established under this subsection who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while attending to the business of the Conference, be entitled to receive compensation therefor at a rate fixed by the President but not exceeding \$100 per diem, including traveltime. Such members may, while away from their homes or regular places of business, be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as may be authorized under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.*

(f) *The Commission shall have authority to accept, on behalf of the Conference, in the name of the United States, grants, gifts, or bequests of money for immediate disbursement by the Commission in furtherance of the Conference. Such grants, gifts, or bequests offered the Commission, shall be paid by the donor or his representative to the Treasurer of the United States, whose receipts shall be their acquittance. The Treasurer of the United States shall enter such grants, gifts, and bequests in a special account to the credit of the Commission for the purposes of this joint resolution.*

(g) *For the purpose of this joint resolution, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.*

(h) *There are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution. Such sums shall remain available for obligation until expended.*

CHICAGO'S 1973 COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

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, for the third time in our Nation's history, Monday, October 8, was celebrated as a national legal holiday honoring the discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus. The parade this year had greater participation than ever before and culminated a weekend of festivities with a gigantic parade on State Street. The theme was "America—A Nation of Immigrants" in honor of those who have immigrated to the United States.

Columbus is remembered as a man who fought against tremendous odds because he wanted to find truth and make it triumph. He is regarded as a great pioneer personifying the spirit of discovery, and embodying the will to overcome insurmountable obstacles. Columbus' fleet may have found its port, but the journey which he began has not yet been completed.

For it was through Columbus' voyage that a pattern was established for a nation of many nationalities, traits, and beliefs, and it was through this voyage that men looked upon this land as a place where all people, regardless of how humble or exalted their origin, could achieve their full potential. And, as we become ever more conscious of the importance of our historic roots in both understanding the founding concepts on which our country stands, and the needs and demands of the present as well as future generations, the importance of Columbus as the father of all immigrants takes on added significance.

The all day Columbus Day celebration began with a Concelebrated Mass at Our Lady of Pompeii Church at 9 a.m. Presiding at the Mass was Most Rev. Michael R. Dempsey, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago. The concelebrants included Very Rev. Edward M. Pellicore, Rev. Leonard H. Mattei, Rev. Gino Dal Piaz, C.S., Very Rev. Peter Sordi, C.S., Rev. August Feccia, C.S., and Rev. Paul J. Asciolla, C.S., coeditor of *Fra Noi*. The homily was given by Rev. Msgr. Geno C. Baroni, president of the Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington, D.C.

Special wreath-laying ceremonies took place at 11 a.m. at the Columbus Statue in Vernon Park, and at 3 p.m., following the parade, the Order of Sons of Italy in America laid a wreath at the Columbus Statue in Grant Park.

The main event of our celebration, Chicago's gigantic Columbus Day parade, began on State Street at 1 p.m. Sixty floats, depicting the theme of the parade, and 73 marching units participated. Women and children wearing authentic native costumes of Italy rode on the floats and Anthony Morizzo portrayed Christopher Columbus. In addition, various school bands, corps of marchers, and a number of drum and bugle corps took part in the parade.

Those leading the parade were Honorable Richard J. Daley, Chicago's Mayor; Honorable Dan Walker, Governor of Illinois; Michael Balzano, Na-

tional Director of ACTION; the guest of honor, Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and former top administrative aide to President Lyndon B. Johnson; Mrs. Marilyn Orsucci Weber, Illinois teacher of the year; Piero Nichele, representing the Italian Ambassador; Rudolph Leone, general chairman of the parade committee; John C. Porcelli, grand marshal of the parade; Charles C. Porcelli, president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans; Anthony Paterno, president emeritus of the joint civic committee; Aloysius A. Mazewski, national president of the Polish National Alliance; and Mitchell Kobelinski, director of the Export-Import Bank. Following them in the line of march were hundreds of political dignitaries, civic leaders, members of the judiciary, businessmen from the community, and labor leaders.

Featured in the parade were 17 surviving flyers of the first mass trans-Atlantic flight from Rome to Chicago in 1933 as part of the Century of Progress Exhibition. Paolo Balbo, son of the leader of that historic 25-plane flight 40 years ago, was with the group.

Sponsor of the Columbus Day parade and other related activities honoring Christopher Columbus was the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, comprised of more than 40 Italo-American civic organizations in the Chicago-land area. Many local groups cooperated with the Joint Civic Committee in this communitywide tribute to Columbus, and Rudolph Leone served as general chairman of the 1973 parade. Both Anthony Sorrentino, consultant, and Dr. Frank Pellegrini, executive director, of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, helped to coordinate the various activities.

One of the highlights of Chicago's Columbus Day celebration is selection of the queen of the parade. This year, Carol Ann Di Giacomo was chosen to reign as queen of the Columbus Day parade. The prizes awarded to the queen included a free trip to Italy, courtesy of Alitalia Airlines.

Members of the queen's court were Debbie Saracco, Janice A. Moreschi, Caryn Mangialardi, and Mary Elizabeth Boccio.

Judges for the final Columbus Day Queen Contest were Fred Mazzel, chairman, Hon. Philip Romiti, judge of Cook County Circuit Court; Hon. Pasquale A. Sorrentino, judge of Cook County Circuit Court; Hon. Frank M. Siracusa, associate judge of Cook County; Hon. Lawrence DiPrima, Illinois State Representative; John Curielli, president, Youth Division JCCIA; Mrs. Theresa Petrone, and Miss Mary Jane Hayes, writer, producer, and hostess of "It's Worth Knowing" TV program.

The selection of the queen was also accompanied by a "Festa del Moda"—a fashion show in which some 150 participants celebrated Columbus Day in traditional handmade costumes representing the culture native to various areas of the Italian peninsula. Dr. Mary Ellen Batinich, chairman, and her committee can be proud of their contribution to the success and beauty of the Columbus Day

extravaganza. Lawrence Spallitta and the float personnel committee members can also be proud of their outstanding contribution to the parade.

The colorful and distinctive costumes, worn by the people who made them by hand, were an enormous contribution to the parade's ethnic flavor and were most appropriate for the occasion.

The Columbus Day parade in Chicago is one of the highlights of the year. Over one-half million people viewed the parade in person and more than 1 million viewed it on television. WGN-TV televised the parade again this year as it has in the past and the sponsors were Anthony Paterno, of the Pacific Wine Co., Dominick Di Matteo, of Dominick's Finer Foods, and Frank Armanetti, of Armanetti Liquor Stores. The parade was narrated by Vince Lloyd, of WGN and Dominick DiFrisco, of Alitalia Airlines.

The massive Columbus Day celebration closed with a reception at the Chateau Royale. Mrs. Serafina Ferrara and Mrs. Jean Abbott were the official hostesses at the reception which was held in honor of all of the officers, subcommittee chairmen, and members who participated in making the 1973 Columbus Day parade the greatest parade ever held in our city. Leaders of the Italo-American organizations from Illinois were present at the reception as well as officials from our State and city governments.

I was honored to participate in this year's Columbus Day parade as honorary parade chairman on this third celebration of Columbus Day as a national legal holiday. The members of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans are to be commended for their dedicated hard work and the imaginative creativity that goes into the planning of a grand event such as the Chicago Columbus Day parade. Our community and our city are proud of these citizens and of the work they have so successfully completed.

Mr. Speaker, the officers, and members of the 1973 Chicago Columbus Day Parade Committee are as follows:

Rudolph Leone, general chairman 1973, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, honorary parade chairman, John C. Porcelli, grand marshal, honorary chairmen, Honorable Richard J. Daley, Dr. Giuseppe Avitabile, Consul General of Italy, executive director, Dr. Frank Pellegrini.

Officers: Charles C. Porcelli, president, Anthony J. Fornelli, 1st vice president, Dr. James F. Greco, 2nd vice president, James E. Cilli, 3rd vice president, John C. Porcelli, 4th vice president, Joseph Tolitano, 5th vice president, Joseph DeLetto, treasurer, Ettore Divito, secretary, Achille J. Chiappetta, Sgt-at-Arms.

Consultant, Anthony Sorrentino, president emeritus, Anthony Paterno, past presidents, Peter R. Scalise, Dr. Mario O. Rubinelli, Victor J. Failla, Anthony Bottalla.

Executive assistants to general chairman, Jack G. High, Armine Van Roon.

Special assistants to general chairman, Emil M. Caliendo, Frank N. Catrambone, Sr., Joseph DeLetto, Marco DeStefano, Anthony J. Fornelli, Marshal Anthony J. Pilas, Judge Philip Romiti, Joseph J. Scilabro, Lawrence Spallitta, Joseph Tolitano, Jerome Zuria.

Past parade chairmen, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, Frank Armanetti, Fred Bartoli, Anthony Bottalla, Martin R. Buccieri, James Cilli, Dominick Di Matteo, Victor J. Failla, Nello V. Ferrara, Anthony Paterno, John G.

Porcelli, Dr. Mario O. Rubinelli, Anthony Terlato.

Public Officials: Hon. John D'Arco, Co-Chairman, Hon. Frank Belmonte, Co-Chairman, Hon. Elmer Conti, Co-Chairman, Hon. Louis Garippo, Co-Chairman, Hon. Anthony Laurino, Co-Chairman, Hon. Vito Marzullo, Co-Chairman, Hon. Paul Ross, Co-Chairman.

Chaplain: Reverend Armando Pierini, C.S. Television & Radio Sponsors: Anthony Paterno, Chairman, Frank Armanetti, Dominick DiMatteo.

Finance & Souvenir Book: Joseph DeLetto, Chairman, Frank N. Catrambone, Sr., Co-Chairman, Sam Cerniglia, Co-Chairman, Mrs. Serafina Ferrara, Co-Chairman, Mathew J. Alagna, Mo. Cav. Domenick M. Alberti, Anthony Apa, Mrs. William Boschelli, Sam Cannino, Frank Cacciatore, Jr., Charles Carosella, John D'Arco, Jr., Louis Farina, Joseph Fusco, Peter Lavorata, Ralph Massey, Marino Mazzel, Joseph Nicoletti, Louis H. Rago, Michael R. Rosin, George Salerno, Benny Zucchini.

Program & Arrangements: Hon. Victor A. Arrigo, Chairman, Dominick De Frisco, Co-Chairman, Dr. Joseph H. DiLeonardo, Co-Chairman, Alex Batinich, William Fantozzi, Rosario Lombardo, Dr. Joseph J. Sirchio.

Women's Division, Ann Yelmini, Chairman.

American Unico Club of Chicago, Arcolian Dental Arts Society, Chicago Chapter American Committee on Italian Migration, Circolo Di Lingua e Cultura Italiana, Club Calascibetta Lodge No. 75, IANU*, Columbian Club, DuPage Italian American Civic Committee, Father Louis Pilgrimage to the Mother Cabrini Shrines Society* Filippo Mazzel—Post No. 1 (Illinois), Filippo Mazzel Women's Aux. Post No. 1.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Peter Tatocles, Amedeo Yelmini.

Queen Contest: Fred Mazzel, Chairman, Mrs. Josephine Bianco, Co-Chairman, Anita Louise Bianco, Special Assistant, Domenick DiFrisco, Advisor, Sam Bruno, Photographer, Joseph Alagna, John Curielli, Stephen Fiorentino, Bob Gelosimo, Charles Cannon Giannone, Nick La Ponte, Joseph Lucania, Linda Lucatorto, Marie Palelio, Robert Napoli, Peggy Pilas, Vincent Severino, William Capraro, Jerome Zuria.

Religious Program & Organizations: Joseph DeSerto, Chairman, Louis Moretti, Co-Chairman, Carl Ferina, Michael R. Fortino, Michael J. Mento, John Spatuzza.

Bands, Marchers & Transportation: Dr. James F. Greco, Chairman, Jordan Canzone, Co-Chairman, Mo. Cav. Dominick M. Alberti, Frank Bottigliero, Hon. Lawrence DiPrima, John Epifanio, Michael R. Galasso, Dr. Joseph J. Sirchio.

Labor: James E. Cilli, Co-Chairman, Victor J. Failla, Co-Chairman, Thomas Siracusa, Edward Coco, James L. Cilli, Jr., Angelo Fosco, John Parise, Joseph Spingola.

Parade Marshals: Marco DeStefano, Chairman, Louis H. Rago, Co-Chairman, Sam Cannino, Louis Del Medico, Ettore Divito, Michael Epifanio, Neil Francis, Henry Jenero, Guido H. Melone, Marshal Anthony Pilas, Vito Siciliano, Ronald Marra, Frank J. Tomaso.

Business & Professional: Carl DeMoon, Chairman, Anthony Terlato, Co-Chairman, Vincent Lucania, Co-Chairman, Anthony Pellicano, Co-Chairman, Joseph Bottalla, Dr. N. R. Bruno, Jack Cerone, Achille J. Chippetta, Dominic Chirchirillo, Carl Cipolla, Charles P. DeVito, Dominick P. Dolci, Joseph Fontana, Peter Ingraffia, Albert Litterio, Vincent F. Lucchese, Vincent Lupo, Nicholas Marino, Arthur Monaco, Dr. Frank Motto, Anthony Partipilo, John Paterno, Paul Paterno, Alex Puccillo, Hon. Lawrence X. Pusateri, Gerald L. Sbarbo, Peter R. Scalise, Louis Seno, Horatio Tocco.

Communications: John C. Severino, Anthony Sulla.

Authentic Italian Costumes: Dr. Mary Ellen (Mancina) Batinich, Chairman, Mrs. Tena Amico, Co-Chairman, Mrs. Maria DeSerto, Co-Chairman, Mrs. Elena Frigoletti,

Co-Chairman, Mrs. Josephine Lavorata, Co-Chairman, Mrs. Norma Battisti, Mrs. Stella Boschelli, Mrs. Gene Bruno, Mrs. Mary Ann Cervi, Mrs. Judith Guzaldo, Miss Barbara Inendino, Mrs. Ann Menconi, Mrs. Ann Parisi, Mrs. Marie Pedi, Mrs. Annette Salvatore, Mrs. Mary Spallitta, Mrs. Dorothy Tardl, Mrs. Ange Tufano, Mrs. Ann Yelmini.

Floats: Tom Ardino, Chairman, Sam J. Coco, Co-Chairman, Edward S. Fussek, Joseph Pope, Joseph Rovetto, Frank Vechiola.

Float Personnel: Lawrence Spallitta, Chairman, Nick Bianco, Russell Bonadonna, Carl DeFranco, Stephen Florentino, Michael Galgano, Barbara Inendino, Joseph Pantaleo, Mrs. Mary Spallitta.

Cuisine & Culture: Ann Sorrentino, Chairman.

WEST SUBURBAN CHAPTER, WOMEN'S DIV.

Marion Fritscher, Chairman.

YOUTH DIVISION

John Curielli, Chairman.

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Furlan Family of Chicago, Good Fellowship Club, The Gregorians, Italian American Executives of Transportation, Italian American Federal Club, Italian American Labor Council of Greater Chicago, Italian American Police Assn., Italian Chamber of Commerce in Chicago, Italian Cultural Forum, Italian Optometric Society, Italian Women's Club, The Italics*, Italo American National Union Fraternal Life Insurance Society, Justinian Society of Lawyers, Lake View Betterment Club, Lodge Aetna No. 1—I.A.N.U., Maria Adelaide Club, Mazzini Verdi Club, Norwood Park Chapter of Unico, Anthony R. Pilas, S.A.C., Our Lady of Grace Senior League, The Louis and Joseph L. Rago, Memorial Lodge No. 88—I.A.N.U., Saint Callistus Alumni Assoc., Saint Francis DePaola Society, Scalabrinis League, Society of Italian American Musicians of Greater Chicago, Unico Chicago West Suburban Chapter, Vicari Social Club, V. E. Ferrara Lodge No. 19—I.A.N.U., Vizzinese Society, Voluturno Lodge No. 25—I.A.N.U.

THE VICE-PRESIDENCY AND THE ORDER OF SUCCESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been shamefully abused by their elected leaders.

That is the central, overriding fact in the drama surrounding Vice President Agnew's abrupt resignation yesterday and his plea of "no contest" to a criminal charge of income tax evasion.

The President praises the departing Mr. Agnew for his courage and "strong patriotism" and the Attorney General urges "compassion" in explanation of the deal by which the Vice President got off with a fine and a suspended sentence for a crime that would have sent many less influential men or women to prison.

Personally, I do not care whether Mr. Agnew goes to jail or not, though considering that for more than 5 years he sanctimoniously lectured the Nation on "law and order" and the perils of permissiveness it would only be fitting that he should be required to pay the penalty that he so freely recommended for others.

I do care, however, that the issues not be steamed over by the sentiment with which Americans traditionally regard so-called underdogs. I think it is time that we had some compassion for our-

selves and the agonizing ordeal to which our country has been subjected and will continue to be subjected because of the criminal acts of the Nixon-Agnew administration.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to state the facts, to call a crook a crook, if that is what he is and no matter what office he has held, and to uphold the good names and reputation of the great majority of elected political leaders who are honest and faithful to their oaths of office.

One of the most deplorable results of this mess would be for the public to accept Mr. Agnew's cynical explanation that he was simply following "the system" when he accepted kickbacks and payoffs from contractors and business firms in Maryland while he was Governor and even, we now find to our horror, while he held the second highest office in the land. Mr. Agnew made a choice he did not have to make. He chose the path of corruption and deceit.

And in the antithesis of patriotic behavior, Mr. Agnew for the past few months has been thrashing about in all directions, falsely proclaiming his innocence, deceiving the public, trying to manipulate the Congress into acting as a shield for him, threatening a constitutional crisis, and initiating a witch hunt against members of the press that could conceivably have resulted in sending to jail reporters whose only "crime" was in reporting the truth. This entire hypocritical performance by Mr. Agnew was directed at saving his own neck and when he had succeeded in doing that, he stepped down.

President Nixon dutifully says that in resigning Mr. Agnew acted out of "concern for the national interest." Whatever Mr. Agnew's motives were, there can be no doubt that the national interest must be paramount—at long last—in what happens next. Since August, Mr. Agnew's plight has had the effect of diverting national attention from the main issue before the American people, and that is the manifold corruption and lawbreaking of the Nixon administration and its subsidiary, the Committee To Reelect the President. The polls show public confidence in President Nixon is at an alltime low.

The charges against Mr. Agnew seem insignificant in comparison with all those misdeeds of which there is substantial evidence directly involving the President. They range from political crimes such as secretly and illegally bombing Cambodia, doing favors for business corporations in exchange for campaign contributions, approving law-breaking espionage and burglary ventures, and covering up the Watergate crime to personal transactions involving mysterious cash contributions from billionaire Howard Hughes to the President's closest friend, Bebe Rebozo, and possible misrepresentation in the President's tax returns.

The Nixon administration has been described by historian Henry Steele Commager and others as the most corrupt in the history of our Nation. It exists in a cloud of suspicion of lawbreaking and violations of the Constitution, a cloud that will persist for months to come.

I have said before that the charges

against the President are grave enough to warrant an inquiry by the Judiciary Committee to report whether he has committed impeachment offenses. If concern for the national interest was foremost, the President would be well advised to follow Mr. Agnew's example and resign, allowing the proper process of succession to follow and giving the American people what they deserve—a government that is above suspicion.

Since neither of these events is likely to occur in the next few days, I believe the House should make explicit by resolution that it is unacceptable for a President who is himself liable to impeachment proceedings to name the man or woman who will be the new Vice President, and his possible successor if he should be impeached.

Richard Nixon still has a great deal of explaining to do to the American people in connection with his choice of Spiro Agnew to be his running mate in 1968 and 1972. As far back as 1968 when Mr. Nixon first selected this obscure politician with no discernible qualifications to be Vice President, the New York Times was already carrying articles implicating Mr. Agnew in conflict of interest charges in Maryland. No effort was visible on the President's part to investigate these charges.

One of the recurring rumors in this more recent scandal is that President Nixon was informed in August 1972, before the elections, that Mr. Agnew was facing criminal charges for taking kickbacks from contractors. That is another question to which we deserve an honest answer, but like, so many others it goes unanswered.

In view of Mr. Nixon's proven bad judgment in foisting Spiro Agnew upon the country and in view of his own extremely vulnerable position, I can see no necessity for allowing him to nominate a Vice President. I agree with Henry Steele Commager who said in a television interview this morning that there is no pressing need for a Vice President at all. Aside from presiding over the Senate, and this is scarcely an indispensable function, the Vice President has no duties at all except to stand around waiting to replace the President if he should no longer be able to serve.

Under the process of succession provided for in the 25th amendment we have an elected member of the Government who can succeed to the Presidency, if that should be necessary. Previously, the next in line for the Presidency after the Vice President was the Secretary of State, an appointed official. The 25th amendment changed that to insure that the successor would be an elected official. The Speaker of the House is as well qualified as anyone Mr. Nixon can produce to be in line for the Presidency, and I believe we should leave it at that without involving the Congress in a political struggle over an unnecessary nomination. Let us remember that President Truman governed without a Vice President for almost four years and President Johnson went without one for over a year, and we survived.

The 25th amendment states:

Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall

*Life membership.

nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

However, it does not set forth any timetable under which this has to happen and again I see no necessity for any haste in this matter. If the President feels compelled to nominate a Vice President, then I believe the Congress should insist that he simply formalize the existing succession by nominating the Speaker of the House.

We are in an unprecedented situation and I believe it calls for unprecedented actions by the Congress, if necessary, to protect the interests of the American people.

We are paying the price for Watergate and the misdeeds of the Nixon administration, and it is a price that we should not have to pay nor do we deserve to be in such a terrible dilemma at this time of international crisis.

World peace is threatened and the survival of a tiny and valiant democracy, Israel, is in peril as a result of the surprise attack by Arab nations. We are properly concerned with containing and ending this war and bringing about a speedy cease-fire that will return to the post-1967 status quo. We are concerned with helping Israel to withstand this assault and to bring about conditions that will lead to direct negotiations between Israel and the belligerent Arab nations. We are also concerned with the threatened deterioration of the détente with the Soviet Union as reports mount that the Russians are airlifting military supplies to Egypt and Syria.

There is cause for great alarm about the threat to Israel and world peace, and it is natural that we should hear calls for forgetting the past and lining up behind the President and his policy of seeking a cease-fire.

We need a President at all times, and we certainly need one now more than ever. But I question whether we need Richard Nixon. Certainly, the President has the support of both political parties and a majority of the American people in his efforts to obtain a cease-fire and to guarantee the survival of Israel. This is a policy that we will insist on, no matter who is President. It is unfair, however, to tell us that we have no choice now but to exonerate the President who has committed possibly impeachable offenses. We are in this dilemma solely because of violations of morality and legality committed by the Nixon administration. We must have confidence in the honesty of our Government leaders, and we dare not forego that standard of behavior.

With the Watergate hearings continuing and the legal arguments over the release of the tapes wending their way up to the Supreme Court, we face a prolonged period of national doubt and conflict. The solution is not to participate in another coverup, but to insist on new and honest leadership that will conduct the domestic and international affairs of our Nation in the interests of our people and of world peace.

DO NOT RIDE ALONE—JOIN A CAR POOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 3, I introduced H.R. 10734, the National Carpool Assistance Act, which would authorize GSA to implement a computerized carpool program on a national scale by offering the services of its computers and personnel to millions of commuters who volunteer to be computer matched. Because the GSA has extensive facilities in all major cities, it has the capacity to bring this Federal program to the local level by involving the commuters in a voluntary and cooperative effort with Government in helping to relieve our energy and pollution problems.

In last Sunday's Parade section of the Washington Post there was an article pointing out the dramatic results of isolated incidents of carpooling. I ask permission to have the full text of this article printed in the RECORD.

DO NOT RIDE ALONE—JOIN A CAR POOL

(By Theodore Irwin)

In Omaha, Neb., employees of an insurance company who come to work in car pools are honored with free breakfasts and tickets to sports events. A mortgage banking firm in Washington, D.C., hands out books of trading stamps to share-a-ride office workers. The number of cars at the parking area of the Burroughs Corp. in Pasadena, Calif., has dropped from 654 to 427, since a computerized share-a-ride system was instituted. In St. Charles, Mo., bumper stickers distributed by a civic group spread the message: "Help Clear the Road, Join a Car Pool."

Throughout the nation, moves to change our one-man, one-car habit have been accelerating, and for good reason. The rush hour traffic crush has reached the saturation level in many cities. Car exhausts, magnified by road congestion, heighten air pollution. Parking lots are crammed. And we face possible shortages of gasoline.

"If only half the drivers now going to work by themselves would join car pools," says Virginia H. Knauer, director of the U.S. Office of Consumer Affairs, "we would have no gasoline or oil shortage."

The idea of car pooling is hardly new. During World War II many Americans enlisted in pools as part of the civilian war effort, to save rubber and gas. But with the war's end, the practice faded. Today, eight out of 10 in the nation's work force travel to work in cars—and 56 percent of them drive solo.

SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS

Is car pooling worthwhile? A Highway Users Federation study this year found that an average one-way 10-mile commuting trip costs a lone driver \$2.64. In a four-passenger car pool, the cost to each rider is only 66 cents.

The savings in parking alone can be substantial in downtown Washington, D.C., for example, parking rates have vaulted to as much as \$2.75 a day.

It is also possible to economize on insurance. Generally a person who regularly drives to work pays a 15 to 40 percent higher premium than if his car is used solely for pleasure. Thus, if only one car in a pool is used, premiums can be reduced on those cars left at home.

Other merits are pointed out by a leading authority on car pools, urban transportation planner Lew W. Pratsch of the Federal Highway Administration.

"Car poolers tell us," says Pratsch, "that when they are not at the wheel tensions vanish, and they come to work relaxed. They can read, chat, or just sit back and doze. In a one-car household the car is released for the rest of the family. I hear of other families that have actually given up a second

car. Moreover, car pooling evidently promotes more careful driving and more punctual arrivals at work—the influence of peer approval or disapproval."

'A MOBILE SEMINAR'

A car collective can also be a stimulating experience. Attorney Victor Perini of Potomac, Md., travels to Washington with an engineer, another attorney, and a business manager specializing in investments. "We're like a mobile seminar," says Perini. "With our varied expertise we iron out a lot of problems. And since we're homeowners, we also exchange expertise on such matters as planning a garden or fixing a sink."

A car collective can also be a social microcosm, providing some of the amenities associated with a civic association, a church social, or Saturday night poker game. Some stage occasional parties. Unexpected windfalls have occurred. In one Philadelphia group, an engineer saved \$2,000 on his income tax after a casual chat with an accountant in the pool. Frank Bryars, an education specialist and inveterate ridesharer, tells of the Washington car pool that salvaged a marriage.

"Every morning," Bryars recalls, "one of our members would complain of the hard time he was having with his wife. The rest of us served literally as marriage counselors—like an encounter group. After a month or so our friend decided against a divorce and has now patched things up with his wife."

SOME DRAWBACKS, TOO

The drawbacks to cooperative driving? Some people fear being stuck with an inflexible schedule, an erratic driver, smokers, or incompatible car mates. In Baltimore, a woman executive resigned from a car pool out of boredom with the incessant jawing of sports fanatics. One disenchanted young bachelor found himself with a band of older men who constantly talked about retirement rather than his favorite subject: women. To some the idea of waiting at a pick-up point or gathering passengers at their scattered homes seems onerous and time-wasting. And there are those who welcome solitary travel to work as a time to think, a rare moment of privacy.

Nevertheless, the trend toward car pooling is growing as private industry and government agencies spur the concept in several ways. They use computers to match people. Some companies reserve preferential parking places for registered cars carrying three or more passengers. In Pasadena, Calif., Operation Oxygen, an environmental group dedicated to clearing the air in Los Angeles by reducing traffic congestion, tells employers how to set up a car pool data-processing system. Major West Coast companies have begun active programs, and seven Los Angeles banks maintain joint computerized car pools.

Honeywell, Inc., has turned to computer printouts of car pool arrangements for its eight plants in eastern Massachusetts. The GEICO insurance company in Chevy Chase, Md. now has 1071 of its employees "pooling it." Typically, Janice McLean rotates driving with two other girls. "Car pooling is really great," she testifies. "I have to battle traffic only one week out of three. And since a parking place is waiting, we can leave home later and still be on time."

'VAN POOLING'

As an extension of car pooling, the 3M Company in St. Paul, Minn., bought six 12-passenger vans and assigned them to workers to form "van pools." Riders pay a monthly fee, based on mileage. Van pool driver-coordinators receive free rides and can use the van during off-duty hours. Thus far at least five riders have sold their second cars. The plan has been so successful that 3M may add 25 more vans.

Government, too, has been getting into the act. Washington is witnessing more car pooling than any other city in the nation, primarily because federal agencies are ac-

tively encouraging it. NASA, the Bureau of Standards and, naturally enough, the Federal Highway Administration all rely on computer matching. Connecticut has developed a computer matching service which is offered to any employer in the state. The Minnesota Highway Department has set up a state employees' ride-sharing operation.

Incentives pay off. Toll rates on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge were adjusted during commuting hours to 50 cents a two-way crossing for an individual driver and \$1 a month permit for cars carrying at least three people, with special lanes provided to speed them through. Results: almost twice as many car pools now cross the bridges during rush periods. (There was a secondary result as well: several crafty commuters put like-life dummies in their passenger seats in an ill-fated attempt to take advantage of the reduced rate.)

THE POSSIBILITIES

These are encouraging steps. Yet studies in major metropolitan sectors show that the average auto heading downtown during rush hours still rarely contains more than 1.5 persons. If the occupancy rate were increased to only two persons, one out of five cars would disappear from rush hour traffic.

What can you do about it?

1. Suggest to your employer's personnel department that a car pool system be initiated. Your company can find out how to set one up by writing to the Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C. 20590, for its "Car Pool and Bus Pool Matching Guide." Further guidance may be obtained from the Highway Users Federation, 1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

TRY THE BULLETIN BOARD

2. On your own initiative, at your office or plant, put up "Share-a-Ride?" index cards—with your name, address and phone number—on bulletin boards. Or ask the editor of the company house organ to start a classified column for ride-sharing.

3. Sound out neighbors and friends. Use community supermarket and library bulletin boards. Indicate your address, destination, time of departure and return.

4. Gather pertinent data on those who respond. Will they share driving or take part only as passengers? Are the pick-up locations and destinations not too far out of your way?

5. Arrange a get-acquainted meeting of the group. Elect a chairman. Work out a mutually acceptable time schedule. Whose car will be used on what day or week? For comfort, the size of cars driven should be specified. Decide on meeting arrangements—whether the driver should collect all passengers at a central point or at each home. Figure out costs, including gas, tolls and parking; when to pay, daily or weekly. Note that cost-sharing is unnecessary when driving is rotated equally. With one person doing all the driving, an expense allowance may be made for wear and tear on the car used.

ARE DIRTY JOKES OK?

6. Agree on rules. Limit the waiting time and eliminate the habitually tardy. If a passenger must skip a ride one day, he must notify the driver ahead of time. Specify interim stops or none at all. There should be a tacit understanding about smoking, turning on the radio and air conditioner, and eating in the car. Is shoptalk or off-color stories (in mixed company) to be permitted?

7. Whether you are a driver or a rider, check with your insurance agent to make certain you are sufficiently covered in case of accident. Most states permit a "guest" clause excluding the driver from liability (except for gross negligence) as long as he or she doesn't derive a profit from passengers.

8. Before firming up a car pool, try it for a week during which you can iron out any possible kinks in the schedule and rules.

THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL VACANCY

(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, as the country recovers from its initial shock over Vice President Agnew's sudden resignation, the need for an outstanding and nondivisive replacement is widely recognized.

The President and the Congress are confronted with a grave responsibility to select a person who will not only bring distinction to the office of the Vice Presidency, but who will be fully capable of performing the duties of the Presidency if that should be required.

The role of the Congress in this case is not the same as the role of the Senate with regard to Presidential appointments. The 25th amendment says that the President shall "nominate," subject to confirmation by a majority of both Houses; the word "appoint" is not used. Moreover, since the task here is to fill a vacancy in an elective office, the President and the Congress are, in a sense, acting as representatives of the people in selecting a new Vice President.

Neither the Democratic Party and its congressional leaders nor the Republican Party and its leader in the White House should seek to take political advantage of the situation. Obviously this means that the Democratic majorities in the Senate and the House should not insist that the nominee be a Democrat. It also means, in my judgment, that the President should not nominate a person who might be a candidate for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency on the Republican ticket in 1976.

I know that this view is shared, not only by many of my Democratic colleagues, but also by many Republicans who do not want to see the choice of the Republican Convention of 1976 predetermined in any way by the selection of a new Vice President now.

It is reassuring that President Nixon has been consulting national leaders, both in and out of Congress, on this matter. I hope this means that the President will make his choice on a nonpartisan basis and will select a distinguished and capable American who will clearly indicate that he or she will under no circumstances be a candidate for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency in 1976. In this way an unfortunate confrontation with the Congress can be avoided, and a Vice President can be selected who will have wide support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(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, I was unavoidably absent from the floor for rollcalls 365, 366, 416, and 432. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "aye" in each instance.

BUSINESS WEEK POINTS OUT FEDERAL RESERVE'S FLAWS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at long last, there is broad recognition that the Federal Reserve System is populated by human beings subject to the full range of human frailties.

Business Week, a conservative business publication, points out a number of the Federal Reserve's current problems and shortcomings in an article entitled, "Is the Fed Brewing Another Recession?" Business Week, October 6, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve, through the mismanagement of the money supply, has been a major factor in the current inflation and these policies have led to the highest interest rates in the history of the United States. The mistakes of the Federal Reserve have led to three credit crunches in 7 short years and as the Business Week article indicates, these policies are almost certain to bring us a serious recession in the coming months.

These errors in judgment are repeated because the Federal Reserve performs its duties in isolation without regard for national policies or the economic needs of the Nation. While the Congress has never granted independence to this agency, the Federal Reserve operates in total secrecy thumbing its nose at the elected representatives and the people. The result is a sad mish-mash of monetary policymaking which has left our economy in near shambles.

Mr. Speaker, the question is "How long will the Congress tolerate the mistakes of the Federal Reserve System without exercising its constitutional responsibilities in the area of monetary policy?"

I place a copy of the article in the RECORD:

IS THE FED BREWING ANOTHER RECESSION?

The Federal Reserve is embroiled in the most intense controversy in its 59-year history, charged by critics first with bringing on today's inflation by creating too much money and now with threatening to bring on a recession in 1974 by creating too little.

The Fed did push short-term interest rates to record levels during the summer, but it also allowed the nation's money supply (demand deposits and currency in the hands of the public) to grow at an inflationary 7% rate in the year ended June 30. Then the money supply shrank by 1.4% in August and barely grew in September—the sort of restraint that can lead to recession. Two weeks ago, the Fed seemed to be swinging back to ease, and stock prices climbed and interest rates plunged. Yet the Fed insists that its policy has not changed—that it is trying, as it has all year long, to be restrictive without touching off either a credit crunch or a recession.

The Fed's policy moves are so critical because what it did with monetary policy last week, and what it does with policy next week and next month, will have a profound effect on how the U.S. economy behaves next year, and even beyond. The way the Fed handles its unique ability to regulate the flow of money into the financial system always has a profound effect on the U.S. economy. If it gauges the flow just right, the economy will flourish. If it is too lavish, the economy will overheat. If it is too stingy, the economy will wither.

Monetary policy should share the spotlight with two other tools of economic management—fiscal policy and wage-price controls. But the Nixon Administration has eschewed higher taxes this year, and no one knows how well the Phase IV controls program will work. So the burden of managing the economy falls most heavily on monetary policy—and that means on the Fed. True, the Fed has carried that burden more often than not over the past two decades, but it is heavier now than ever before.

So the Fed finds itself squarely at center stage—caught up in a debate not only over how well it is doing its job but over whether it is capable of doing its job. It pits those who argue that the central bank is doing the best it can in a time of awesome, worldwide, demand-pull inflation against those who insist that everything wrong with the U.S. economy today can be traced to a succession of monetary policy decisions tragically botched over the past eight years.

There are few neutrals in the debate, and it is only slightly melodramatic to say that the very future of the Fed as it exists today—fundamentally independent of domination by Congress or the White House—hinges on which side wins. Nor will it be hard to spot the winner. If 1974 brings a slower rate of inflation with no recession, then the Fed will have won. If 1974 brings recession, the Fed will have lost.

On one level, of course, it is just another chapter in the argument between monetarists and Keynesians that has been going on for years. The Fed tries to stabilize the business cycle through constant fiddling with the supply of money in the economy, the cost of that money, and conditions in the money markets. The monetarists, led by Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, see the Fed's efforts at countercyclical monetary policy as destabilizing. They simply want the Fed to concentrate on keeping the money supply growing at a steady rate.

The gap between the two camps has narrowed a little because the Fed has been paying more attention to the money supply since Arthur F. Burns became its chairman in 1970. But the two camps are still poles apart on such gut questions as these:

Are the economy and the demand for money inherently stable, as the monetarists believe, or inherently volatile, as the Fed believes?

Do short-run fluctuations in the money supply affect the economy? The Fed says "no," and the monetarists say "probably."

Can the Fed control the money supply with absolute precision? The monetarists say "yes," and the Fed says "definitely not."

Under other circumstances, the debate would be carried out in academic journals—quietly and in private. Today, it is being fought out in the open—in the press and even on the floors of Congress. President Nixon and Chairman Burns are close, long-time friends, but unquestionably the debate has been carried to the White House because Treasury Secretary George Shultz, a colleague of Friedman when Shultz was at the University of Chicago, is very much a monetarist.

What has happened, of course, is that something has gone dreadfully wrong with the U.S. economy: The rate of inflation is shockingly high, the cost of short-term money has gone to almost undreamed-of levels, the stock market has been in deep trouble. The search is on for someone to blame, and the Fed stands as the most visible, most logical villain.

NO PUBLIC ADMIRATION

Thus, a recent poll of 415 business economists could produce only 1.4% who rated monetary policy excellent over the past year, compared with 39% who rated it only fair and 41% who rated it poor. And a Federal Reserve economist concedes: "I don't blame

the public for being upset. The economy is not in good shape. We were fooled in 1968, we were fooled in 1971, and there is fear that we will be fooled again in 1973."

Meanwhile, Representative Wright Patman (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Banking & Currency Committee, seems to be gathering support in Congress for whittling the Federal Reserve Board down to size. He would subject the Fed to audit by the General Accounting Office, reduce the board membership from seven governors to five while cutting their terms from 14 years to 5, and abolish the policy-setting Open Market Committee, which meets monthly and is made up of the seven governors and the presidents of the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks. There is even growing support for the monetarist-backed proposition that the President set guidelines for money supply growth, with the Fed obliged to operate within those guidelines.

That, sniffs Burns, would turn monetary policy over to "a few boys in the White House cellar, whose sole consideration is what they consider to be good politics." Adds Burns: "The whole genius of monetary policy is its flexibility, and that is precisely what the monetarists want to destroy."

The monetarists, in turn, Huff that money supply growth has been too erratic over the last decade, too inflationary in 1972 and early 1973, and that the Fed must gently nudge the growth rate to a lower level or risk still more trouble in 1974. What the monetarists—and a goodly slice of the financial markets—fear is that the Fed is now braking too sharply, and thus threatening a recession in 1974. Should that happen, the Fed would be in calamitous trouble on Capitol Hill.

In other words, the Fed is precisely where it has been so often in the 22 years since it quit simply supporting the government bond market and, under then-Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., adopted an activist stance. It is right in the middle. But never before has so much ridden on what the Fed does, both in terms of the future of the economy and in terms of the future of the Fed.

AGAINST A STACKED DECK

Fed policymakers are convinced that they have done well enough so far this year—pricing short-term money sufficiently high that a number of borrowers find it unattractive but without producing a money crunch like those in 1966 or 1969-70. They are convinced that they will come out all right in the end, with the rate of inflation down and with no recession in 1974. But they have been optimistic before and been wrong. It may even be that the Fed is playing against a stacked deck, for there are two glaring weaknesses in monetary policy as it has been applied:

Of all the weapons in the government's arsenal, monetary policy has been asked to carry a disproportionately heavy economic stabilization burden over the past 20 years.

The theory of monetary policy is little understood and the policy itself is viciously unselective in its application.

Burns and Martin both argue that the Fed has carried the heaviest economic stabilization burden because no one else has been willing to carry it, and that is undoubtedly true. Fiscal policy is a frail reed, because Congress is loath to raise taxes and Administrations are loath to ask them to do so. Government spending is influenced by many factors beyond what it will do to the economy. Controls have been tried, discarded, and tried again, and all that has been proven is that controls work well only when they are not needed.

But the Fed is always there—Independent from Congress and the White House, the governors appointed rather than elected (and appointed for 14-year terms). A member of the tax-writing House Ways & Means Committee will face reelection six times during the term of a Fed governor, and that alone

is reason enough to leave economic stabilization to the Fed. So the Fed has leaned this way and that, raising and lowering its discount rate, fiddling with the level of reserves that banks must hold against deposits, buying and selling securities in the open market to alter the level of reserves in the banking system—all in the name of keeping the economy stable.

The Fed could have refused to take on this burden. It played a wholly passive role in the 1940s. But it turned activist in 1951, finally breaking free from its obligation to support government bond prices, so it could wrestle with the inflation that accompanied the start of the Korean War. It has remained activist ever since—even during periods when passivism might have made more sense.

It was brutally severe in combating "Inflation" in the late 1950s, even though the rate of inflation seldom went over 3%. It kept money tight well into the 1957 recession and actually tightened it in 1959 though the rate of unemployment was over 6%.

It turned aggressively easy in mid-1968, literally flooding the economy with money under the impression that ease was needed to offset what it mistakenly assumed would be the depressing effects of the 10% income surtax.

It gamely helped the Treasury finance a gigantic federal budget deficit last year, feeding money into the economy at a prodigious rate so the Treasury could sell its debt without wrecking the financial markets. But all that money simply added fuel to an inflation that was already out of control. One alternative would have been to proclaim the deficit intolerably large and let Congress and the Administration worry about what they were doing to the markets. But Burns asks: "What are we going to do? Let a Treasury issue go sour? Government credit is the foundation of all credit. Let that collapse, and where are we? To ignore Treasury needs would be a measure of complete irresponsibility."

A CHAIN OF MISTAKES

So the Fed has carried this heavy stabilization burden partly because there was no one else to carry it, but also because Martin, and Burns after him, chose to carry it. The question then becomes: How well has the Fed done with its stabilization burden? The answer, unfortunately, is that it has not done well at all. Testifying before Patman's House Banking Committee, monetarist economist A. James Meigs, a vice-president at Argus Research Corp., said last month: "Every major reduction in the rate of [money supply] growth, except the one in 1971, was followed by a recession or a mini-recession." On the other hand, Meigs blamed today's rate of inflation on excessive money creation by the Fed.

The Fed and its allies obviously do not agree. "The experience of the past 10 years," says one Fed official, "shows, I think, that Fed policy has been in the right direction, by and large, even if the degree wasn't always right." But that is like saying: We were on the right road, and the accident would not have happened if we had been going 50 mph instead of 100 mph. Time after time, the Fed has been caught doing 100 mph—or 5 mph—when it should have been doing 50 mph.

In retrospect, it should have tightened credit early in 1965 to deal with the buildup of wartime inflation. It did nothing until early 1966 and then had to make money so tight so quickly that it brought on a credit crunch. Unhappy over that, the Fed poured money into the economy in early 1967 and, while that certainly kept the mini-recession from becoming anything worse, it also helped bring on the furious inflation of the late 1960s and 1970s.

In trying to bring that inflation under control, the Fed in turn gave the country the credit crunch of 1969-70. It plainly was

too accommodating last year and early this year, and it may be too restrictive now.

This record would be more tolerable if monetary policy hit every sector of the economy with equal force. But it does not. In reducing the available supply of money, or increasing the cost of money, or some combination of both, the Fed tries to damp economic activity by squeezing people out of the financial markets. It is the nature of these markets that the process hits hardest those with the weakest claims on the money that is available. The housing market is invariably hit first, followed by state and local government (which are often limited in what they can pay to borrow), small business, and the stock market. The Fed's ultimate target may be consumer or capital spending, but consumer loans reward banks handsomely, and big corporate borrowers usually have long, close ties to their banks. Both groups are the last to feel the rigors of tight money, and policy has to be made very tight before either group feels the pinch at all.

To Robert E. Weintraub, a monetarist economics professor from UCLA who now works for Patman's committee, the Fed is merely "irrational," making one goof after another and then seeking others to blame for its errors. A Federal Reserve economist concedes: "The Fed has a tendency to follow a target to the bitter end, and it will hang on long after everybody is shouting 'Let go.'"

WHAT ELSE WORKS BETTER?

Fed policymakers acknowledge the imperfections of countercyclical policy, but they stick to it nonetheless, on the grounds that the economy needs to be nudged this way and that to keep it in balance. Meanwhile, the Fed keeps seeking explanations for why policy does not work better than it does. "Because we don't have perfect wisdom doesn't mean we should abandon countercyclical policy," says Daniel H. Brill, a senior vice-president at Commercial Credit Co. who headed economic research at the Fed under Martin.

One obvious explanation is that in the past decade the Fed has had to deal with a world gone slightly mad: the Vietnam war and all that it did to the economy and society of the U.S., the collapse of the international monetary system, the current worldwide inflation. It has had to grapple with the collapse of the Penn Central, with gigantic budget deficits, and with an Administration that keeps changing its mind about economic policy: first hands-off, followed by the wage-price freeze of Aug. 15, 1971, followed by Phase II, Phase III, and now Phase IV.

It is one of the peculiarities of Administration policy that Burns wears two hats. He is Fed chairman and also chairman of the Committee on Interest & Dividends, which monitors increases in both corporate dividends and the cost of money. As Fed chairman, Burns may have wanted higher interest rates earlier this year. As CID chairman, though, he was obliged to fight increases in the banking system's prime lending rate. Monetarists insist that the rapid rate of money supply growth in 1972 and 1973 was due to these efforts to keep rates down. Burns insists he kept his two jobs "quite separate," and it is possible that if there had been no effort by the CID to control rates, Congress might have frozen them.

This array of problems has been compounded by the nearly impossible job that governments have given to overall economic stabilization policies since World War II. Governments the world over have promised their citizens what is plainly impossible: simultaneous high employment and low inflation. And, having made that promise, most governments have relied on monetary policy to make it come true. Burns has frequently asked for help from fiscal policy—arguing for a controls program long before President Nixon slapped the freeze on in 1971. More

recently, he has asked for higher taxes to help control the economy. But the White House has been content to let the Fed do it.

Also, the Fed faces a technical problem, because not all banks belong to the Federal Reserve System and thus are not subject to the same reserve requirements as member banks. In the 1950s, member banks accounted for 87% of all bank deposits. Now the figure is 78%, and slipping. To make monetary policy more potent, the Fed wants Congress to let it set reserve requirements for all banks. States, fearful the Fed will wind up also regulating all banks oppose the idea.

Finally, it is a brutal fact of life that monetary policy, even today, is not clearly understood. The Fed has hundreds of economists, powerful computers, sophisticated models—and it still does not know precisely how its policy moves percolate through to the real world, or how long it takes for a shift in policy to be felt in the economy.

James Pierce is the Fed's top man on econometrics and model-building. He says bluntly: "We really don't know for sure how the economy works. The world is much more complicated than the world of theory—the theories of the monetarists and the Keynesians."

Pierce adds: "The most recent models, for example, show horrendously long lags in any effort to bring a rapid inflation under control through traditional monetary policy—lags far longer than anything we thought possible, lags on the order of four years or more. There are fundamental changes going on in the economy that we don't yet understand. The people who were born in the baby boom of World War II are causing shifts in demand for things such as washing machines, TV sets, automobiles, and housing. We don't know enough yet about their habits to adjust the consumption function in our models. Also, we are pushing interest rates far above what they have been in the past, given similar real economic conditions. Yet our models probably are not good at predicting swings in interest rates. At times our models make me very uneasy."

So the Open Market Committee meets monthly, tries to forecast the economy as best it can, and then decides on the course that monetary policy should take during the ensuing four weeks. Fed watchers can get an inkling of what the OMC has decided by watching what the Fed does with its open market dealings, and where it pushes the key federal funds rate (the rate that banks pay for short-term borrowings from one another). Sometimes the Fed will give a clear indication of policy by raising or lowering the discount rate, or adjusting the level of required reserves. Not until 90 days after each OMC meeting, though, are the minutes of the meetings released to the public.

THE MONETARIST APPROACH

To Friedman and the other monetarists, all this is little short of madness—this constant fiddling with policy in a world that the Fed itself concedes it does not fully understand. If the Fed motto is "When in doubt, do something," the Friedmanians say the Fed ought to do nothing at all. Rather than lean this way and that against the prevailing winds, they say, the Fed should simply pick an appropriate money-supply target and stick to it.

Typically, the monetarists would have the money supply grow by about 4% a year. Actually, most would permit the Fed a range to work within—2% to 6% in most cases, though Vice-President Jerry Jordan of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (the only monetarist bank in the whole Fed system) prefers a 3%-to-5% range. Basically, though, the rate of money supply growth would approximately match the most desirable rate of real economic growth. Once the rate of money supply growth stabilized, the argu-

ment goes, then interest rates would also stabilize, because the monetarists believe that fluctuations in rates are caused by fluctuations in money supply growth.

Indeed, it is a basic tenet of the monetarist creed that high interest rates are not a sign of tight money but rather an indication that the money supply has been growing too rapidly. The point is that rapid money supply growth breeds inflation which, in turn, breeds higher rates. In his testimony to the House Banking Committee, Meigs of Argus Research argued, "The only effective way to attain lower and more stable interest rates is through maintaining lower and more stable rates of growth of the money stock than those of recent years. Under our current institutional arrangements, only the Federal Reserve can do that."

The monetarist assumption is based on the argument that the Fed, by regulating the flow of reserves on which the banking system builds deposits, can control money supply growth with near-perfect precision. Thus, 11 monetarist economists, including Meigs and Professors Allan Meltzer of Carnegie-Mellon University and Karl Brunner of the University of Rochester, met in a "shadow" OMC meeting in New York two weeks ago. Their ultimate decision was that, to avoid both inflation and recession, the Fed should keep the money supply growing at precisely 5.5% over the next six months. Brunner himself believes that the Fed "can control money supply quite closely over a year, pretty well over six months." It can even control it quite closely over a three-month period, he says, "though with some loose ends."

AN ARRAY OF VARIABLES

The beauty of the monetarist approach lies in its stark, pure simplicity. No longer must the Fed worry about where the economy is heading, or about such exogenous variables as what the disappearance of the anchovy from off the coast of South America can do to U.S. food prices (raising them, since anchovies are a source of low-cost feed for cattle).

And the Fed has listened to the monetarists. Under Martin, the central bank paid little attention to the money supply. Guy Noyes, a senior vice-president at Morgan Guaranty and, like Brill of Commercial Credit, a Fed research director when Martin was chairman, says, "There is no question Martin was both right and candid when he said, as he did on numerous occasions, 'I don't understand money. I don't pretend to.' What he meant was money in the Friedman sense."

But Burns, who taught Friedman in college, understands money, and the Fed has chairman. Where it once worried about interest rates to the exclusion of most other variables, it now gives considerable weight to the money supply in formulating policy. Says a Fed official: "In making a trade-off been paying more attention to the 'monetary aggregates'" (the money supply being the best-known aggregate) since he became as to whether to sacrifice interest-rate stability of aggregates-growth stability, or to sacrifice a little of both, the Fed these days gives a higher priority to smoothing out fluctuations in money supply growth."

What the Fed really aims for us is not direct control of the money supply per se but rather control of something called "reserves available to support private nonbank deposits" (RPDs). This is the money supply minus the impact of Treasury additions to and withdrawals from the banking system. It was adopted as a measurement because fluctuations in Treasury balances at the banks can cause the money supply figures to move wildly over the short term—all the more so now that federal revenue-sharing makes the Treasury balances more volatile than ever.

The monetarists quibble over the use of RPDs as a target but, more important, they see the Fed still trying to juggle a host of variables when it ought to be concentrating on only one. That is what Patman believes, and he could hardly argue with Meigs, who testified: "I believe monetary policy would be enormously improved if the President were to set money-supply growth guidelines in his Economic Reports to Congress and require the Federal Reserve to operate within those guidelines."

And that, for the moment at least, is more than the Fed means to do.

For one thing, it probably is unrealistic to lock seven able-bodied, intelligent men in a building for 14 years and expect them to do nothing more than pass on bank merger applications. Even more basic, though, is that accepting the monetarist view requires accepting certain fundamental beliefs about the economy that are not easy to accept: that the economy itself is inherently stable, that as long as interest rates are kept relatively stable the demand for money will remain stable, that short-run changes in the money supply do matter, and that the Fed does have considerable short-run control over the money supply.

THE DEMAND FOR MONEY

Economists have been brawling over those issues for years, and they are no closer to agreement today than when the debate began. Nor is it possible to feed all available data into a computer and conclude, once and for all, which side is right. Fed economist Pierce says that some work has been done on how the steady-aggregate-growth theory would work. The trouble, he says, is "that this country has not been without a central bank since 1914, and it is impossible to wash out the effects of the policies it has followed over the years."

Jordan of the St. Louis Fed can argue: "The economy is inherently stable, and we find no evidence that there is instability in the demand for money." And senior economist Michael Hamburger of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York has studied the experience of 1971 and concluded that, given a stable monetary policy, the demand for money will be stable.

But Professor James Tobin of Yale says, "I just don't see how the Fed can ignore that there are likely to be short-run changes in the demand for money." Nor does the Fed ignore it. In testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress last summer, Chairman Burns spoke of the "volatility in the public's demand for money . . ." Given this volatility, he said, "it has seemed undesirable to control the supply of money rigidly."

Nor does Burns believe that the economy itself is inherently stable. "What the monetarists say, in effect," Burns observes, "is 'Let's forget entirely about the business cycle. When a period of unemployment occurs, let the economy go and hope it will correct itself.' It never has done so in the past. There isn't a shred of evidence the monetarists have ever produced that their *laissez-faire* policies would ever work. History is all against them."

Burns, and others at the Fed, believe that they can do a tolerably good job of controlling money supply growth over a six-month period and that this is all that really matters. The economic effect of an overrun in the money supply, Burns told the JEC, "appears to be quite minor if it is followed by an offsetting undershoot over the next six months." A study done by E. Gerald Corrigan, secretary of the New York Fed, appears to bear Burns' view out.

THE FED'S LAST CHANCE

Monetarists admit they have no absolute proof that short-run swings are important. But they have a gut feeling that they are important. Brunner points out that the pe-

riod of intense restraint in 1966 lasted barely six months but still led to the slowdown of 1967. In St. Louis, Jordan argues that if the Fed misses its money target for as long as three months, it can expect trouble on two counts:

Its error will start to have an impact on prices, output, and employment.

What has already been done will have a bearing on what is done next, meaning that a three-month overrun may be followed by an extra-sharp reduction in the growth rate over the next three months.

Even Noyes of Morgan Guaranty, who certainly is not monetarist, can argue that "whether it hurts to have six months one way and six months another, it certainly doesn't help."

But no one—not even the monetarists—knows for certain how long it takes a change in the growth rate of money supply to work through to the real world. And that, coupled with the lack of clear-cut proof about the stability or lack of stability in the demand for money, makes it highly unlikely that the Fed will willingly cast countercyclical monetary policy aside. Instead, the Fed will keep juggling the full array of variables—money supply, interest rates, and market conditions. Meanwhile, it will keep looking into how monetary policy affects the economy. (Current research indicates that policy works on the economy through its effect on stock prices.)

But the Fed may lose its freedom of action if the economy slips into recession in 1974. Continued inflation can be blamed on a number of factors, but a recession would be almost entirely the Feds doing. Should that happen, the Fed is going to have to fight hard to keep its independence. True, Patman has not had much luck in getting Congress to go along with his plans for reining in the Fed, but one more policy goof could just about hand the ballgame to the monetarists.

FIFTY YEARS OF THE U.S.S.R. ECONOMY

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the Soviet Union this year is supposed to be one of celebration of the founding of the U.S.S.R. 50 years ago. At that time the many non-Russian nations now in this empire-state were supposed to have joined voluntarily with the R.S.F.S.R. in forming this federal union. We know, of course, the facts of imperialist Russian conquest contradict this. But what is noteworthy is how little or virtually no celebrating is done in the U.S.S.R. over this event of union, as against, for example, the 50th celebration of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia proper 6 years ago. What is more, Western organs and scholarship played up the latter, but they are virtually quiet over the relative neglect of Moscow toward the former.

In a significant issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, devoted to 50 years of the U.S.S.R. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University has written a penetrating article on "50 Years of the U.S.S.R. Economy," which by its perspectives goes a long way in explaining why Moscow is playing down this spurious union. The full article appeared in the spring issue of this internationally renowned journal of East European and Asian Affairs, and its excerpted essential contents here should be most illuminat-

ing to those evaluating United States-U.S.S.R. relations:

FIFTY YEARS OF THE U.S.S.R. ECONOMY

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Reading the addresses of Podgorny, Brezhnev and other Kremlinites on the occasion of the USSR's 50 anniversary, a novice would get the distinct impression that a paradise of nations exists in the Soviet Union and that this was primarily made possible by the economic achievements of what is euphemistically called socialism. Podgorny, the USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, which is a figurehead position, let it emphatically be known that "After the October revolution, the formation of the first united multinational workers state in the world can rightly be termed one of the greatest landmarks in the history of our country. Having wiped out the exploitation of man by man and ended national inequality and oppression, the proletarian revolution paved the way to the cohesion of liberated people and the unification of Soviet republics, a mighty state union."¹ This one sentence alone surpasses anything Goebbels was capable of if one understands that there is not one country but many in the USSR, that the exploitation of all peoples, Russian and non-Russian alike, justifies even the application of Marx's tenets of workers' exploitation and surplus value creamed off, in this case, by the state as represented by the totalitarian regime in Moscow, and that rather than cohesion and unification, sheer military and secret service coercion and force preserve the superficial union of these republics.

The Brezhnev speech is illuminating for its lingering preconceptions and rhetorical manipulations. For example, the real Russian leader of the USSR makes the point that "Literally within a week after the birth of the Soviet state its famous declaration of the rights of the peoples of Russia put on record these principles of the national policy of the Soviet power: The equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia; the right of nations to free self-determination, including secession and the establishment of an independent state; the abolition of all manner of national and national-religious privileges and restrictions; the free development of the national minorities; the need for a voluntary and honest alliance of the peoples of Russia and their complete mutual trust."² This declaration under Lenin has been so often negated by events of Russian imperialist conquest, purges, man-made famines, and cultural and political repressions of all sorts down to the present date that one marvels at the propaganda tenacity of the Kremlin and its persistent beliefs that each generation produces its massive crop of dupes and the naive.

Later in the address the Russian leader begins to wax economic and provides "statistics" for the comrades to consider in order to appreciate his point. He continues, "Since the establishment of the Soviet Union its industrial output has gone up 320-fold." Clearly displaying pretentious "objectivity," Brezhnev then asserts, "Some may say, of course, that any comparison with 1922 is not indicative, because it had been a year of postwar ruin and famine. Indeed, that is so. In that case, let us compare 1972 with the prewar year of 1940, the year by which our country had already surpassed the pre-revolutionary level. In that period alone, the Soviet Union's industrial output increased 14-fold."³ His audience is also told that in this period, real incomes of the population "increased by more than 300 per cent," retail sales increased "by over 600 per cent," the number of doctors "by 370 per cent," and citizens with "a higher, and a complete or incomplete secondary education, by 550 per cent."

Footnotes at end of article.

Almost complete quotes were given here so that the reader might sense with feeling the full context of the propaganda line taken by the Kremlin leaders on this occasion of the 50th anniversary of the USSR. Anyone in the least familiar with "Soviet statistics" would measurably discount the so-called proofs offered by Brezhnev for the type of economic development sustained by the USSR over the past thirty or fifty years. Doubtlessly, progress has been made in many areas of economic activity, but what state or country that has been influenced by the material culture of Western civilization hasn't on a per capita basis experienced similar and, in most cases, better progress? The far more important question is what kind of progress and at what cost? Significantly, little was said by Brezhnev and others about agriculture, housing, the diversity and quality of consumer goods, and the fact that total consumption in the USSR is only about 35 percent that of the U.S. Being a forced and contrived multinational state the USSR hardly qualifies to be called, as many analysts mistakenly do, the second national economic power in the world. But if such comparisons are to be made with this necessary caveat, it won't be long that tiny Japan will properly occupy this position.

Internal analysis of data, both statistical and empirical, issued by Moscow are, of course, indispensable. They are constantly being undertaken by governmental and private agencies. The annual exercise of evaluating growth rates in the vital sectors of the USSR economy is also necessary, as is the quinquennial one of interpreting the economic plan for the period ahead. Yet, for an overall, organic understanding of this particular economy these necessary approaches and fragmentary analysis are by themselves insufficient. On these bases of analysis, it is true, as one incisive analyst puts it, "As you know only too well, experts rarely agree on anything, but, interestingly, wide agreement among U.S. experts exists today—in fact, a virtual unanimity—on the nature, the limitations and the prospects of the Soviet economy."⁴

THE DETERMINATIVE STRUCTURE OF 50 YEARS

Despite transient changes in the evolution of the USSR, involving personalities, the disjunctions of unplanned events, spectaculairs such as a flamboyant Khrushchev and the Sputnik, and concessions in the Leninist tradition of more steps forward than backward, a permanent politico-economic structure has existed and is scrupulously preserved to virtually predetermine sectoral investments and outputs on a scale of essential, politically-oriented priorities and also, above all, to safeguard the very existence of the contrived union itself and the power and influence its center in Moscow wields far beyond the borders of the USSR. Absorbed in what are regarded as typical economic activities of investing, consuming, pricing, taxing and so forth, most analysts are either indifferent to these ultimate institutional detriments of the political economy of the USSR or are even unaware of their fundamental influence on the directions and flows of the economic process *in toto*. For both societal understanding and policy determinations the totalistic approach suggested here is mandatory. Regrettably, little has been done in this area, and as a consequence, in the field of global activism, the Russian totalitarians have been able time and time again to pan off the type of politico-economic propaganda indicated by the foregoing quotes.

Before adumbrating this determinative structure of fifty years it would do well for us to gain a few insights into what I have described in other places as a holistic relationism, that is, viewing the economic not

just in output-input, price-cost calculus terms but also and simultaneously in those of the historic-political pattern of the USSR which contains the basic sources of motivation, conditioning forces, and determining influences that in varying degree and limited by objective restraints affect economic activity, directions and performance. Thus, for example, if we cling to the erroneous concept of the USSR being a nation such as ours, economic as well as other data assume a different meaning than if the accurate concept of a multinational empire-state held sway. Further, if there is any prime example of political economy in this world, the USSR is unquestionably it. This holistic, relationist type of analysis allows more than any other for realistic assessments of such fundamental questions as the existence of economic imperio-colonialism in the USSR, the possibilities for a free market economy there, technical-scientific pressures for enhanced economic rationality, requisites for an improved standard of living, and prospects of an evolution for more peaceable relations with other states in the world.⁵ . . .

The Ukrainian Quarterly

Within the span of an article on the USSR economy in its 50th year, it is, of course, possible only to outline the salient features of its determinative structure. First, reduced to its ultimate determining elements, the politico-economic framework in the USSR is punctuated by a multinational, imperial structure and totalitarian rule. Sufficient reflection on this observation would show that the suffusive influences of course and direction in the economy emanate, in the last analysis, from these two irreducible institutional sources. Given the sway of critical import, all else is directly or remotely reducible to the sway and impact of the two sources. As concerns the multinational, imperial structure, little wonder that with their own distorted version of voluntary federation the Kremlinites hammer away repeatedly on this source, which historically predates the Russian Bolshevik seizure in 1917. Over 20 years ago Secretary of State Dean Acheson summarized eloquently the nature and growth of this structure and, on record, is yet to be matched anywhere.⁶ . . .

50 Years of the USSR Economy

With these points in mind, not much imaginative thought is required to see the portents of the recurring Russification moves sponsored by the Moscow center, moves that are almost always portrayed in cultural and political terms. Yet all too often economic reasons and forms are advanced to justify what is in essence a concerted attempt to erode individual republic national consciousness. Stalin practiced this, as did also Khrushchev. And it is significant that at the December, 1972 sessions celebrating the 50th of the USSR, Brezhnev and others saw fit to inject the prospect of altered national boundaries in order to facilitate regional economic development.⁷ The idea is an old one, but recently it has been proposed by a planning economist, Prof. Victor V. Kistanov.

To go on to the second institutional basic, equally belied facades of elections, a constitution, legal facilities and procedures, and latitudes for public dissidence, there is the functional reality of totalitarian rule. Exercised generally through the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and subordinate parties in the non-Russian republics, but particularly through the Politburo members of the CPSU. This rule cements the forced union of the various nations in the USSR, secures its own survival through police state methods, and provides the controlling sinews to what has aptly been called a "command economy." Aside from the constitutional pretenses, if multinationality is the essential institutional structure of the USSR, politico-economic totalitarianism, centered in Russian Moscow, is the fundamental institu-

tional instrument of control, coercion and direction. In the light of the cumulative tradition of modern socialist thought and theory, including Marxism, the concept of totalitarianism rather than socialism conforms accurately with the politico-economic realities of the USSR. To give adequate weight to the Party apparatus, it is necessary to stress that its composition consistently and predominantly has been Russian in nationality. The use of the janissary technique, placing in the upper levels of the apparatus in government many representative non-Russians—as of late, especially Ukrainians—is an old one practiced by the Czars themselves.

Briefly, difficult as it may be for those bred in the environment of democratic institutions to comprehend this, as a totalitarian party the CPSU subordinates all of life to itself, including the state but excluding in great measure the inner consciences of men. In one of the finest expositions of the role of the CPSU, it is shown that with the mass character of the Party and all of its ritualism, in the last analysis no individual person counts for much.⁸ From the politico-economic viewpoint, it is this Partyocracy, the spirit of which totally permeates the work of *Khrushchev Remembers*, that provides the cementation, solidity and stability to the totalitarianized politico-economic system in the USSR. The Party is the focal point of the system, which on a descending scale embraces government, industry, agriculture and all other spheres of "Soviet Society." In essence, it is the real and finally determining system through which individual aspirations and ambitions can be best advanced and fulfilled. Most important for our purposes here is that the Party, working through the Politburo and the Council of Ministers, is the decisive source in the determination of All-Union politico-economic priorities, the main allocator of scarce investable resources among the ends and objectives that it, in the last analysis, sets.

In logical compression the ultimate realities outlined so far present us with a state basically marked by economic totalitarianism and imperio-colonialism, the former derived from general political totalitarianism, the latter from the forced, multinational composition of the USSR.¹⁰

Needless to say, primary resources for this global political play on the part of the Moscow totalitarians are exacted from the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR. A notable feature of the economic-geographical factor is the peculiar pattern of resource distribution which is inextricably related to the first institutional basis of multinationality. In most categories of material resource, half and even more are found in the non-Russian republics. A glance at the familiar agricultural triangle, extending from the Baltic to the Caucasus and across the steppes into Central Asia, shows that most of the area is non-Russian. Petroleum flowing out of the first and second Baku, iron ore in eastern Ukraine, manganese in Georgia and Ukraine, copper supply in Idel-Ural and Kazakhstan, lead and zinc in the broader Turkestan area, silver in the north Caucasus and so forth—these and many other minerals are found in decisive supply in the non-Russian lands.

INHERENT USSR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

In every real sense the foremost economic problems in the USSR are inherent in the system as shaped by the two basic institutional elements above. No matter how well modeled, logically or mathematically, no economy exists in an institutional void, and the coercive institutions in the USSR weigh heavily on the shape, contours and performance of the economy. Fundamentally, it is because of these institutions that a monumental dilemma faces the CPSU state leadership in its search for socially more efficient

Footnotes at end of article.

means to advance both its internal and external ends. Significantly, in the multinational triangle of Eastern Europe—the USSR, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia—a striking similarity exists on the score of resolving economic problems by more liberal methods and the accompanying institutional pressures of nationalism.

Five dominant features characterize the USSR economy. The first of these is economic totalitarianism, plainly derived from the institutional basic of the CPSU and political totalitarianism. The "Soviet-type economy" is not consumer-oriented, with fundamental economic decisions flowing from the top downward. The second feature is the economy's distinctive and sharply defined priorities, with arms, space and heavy goods production usually leading the field. Striving in no unmistakable terms for global power dominance, the USSR, with half the economy of the U.S., sustains with equal total expenditure a sophisticated quantitative military output and a surpassing research and development.¹¹ As to heavy goods production, Kosygin let it be known at the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971 that it "has been and remains the foundation of the country's economic might and of the further growth of living standards." Unquestionably, if the foundation were geared to truly serve the objective of rising standards, if people rather than global prowess were of primary concern, if free consumers choice prevailed rather than totalitarian planned direction—in short, if the basic institutional environment were different—the average standard of living would be substantially higher and USSR consumer output would no longer be the object of ridicule among visiting East Europeans themselves.

The third dominant feature of the USSR economy is that, in overall political terms, it is not only a "command economy" but also inherently a "cold war economy." Though today we are prone to minimize the functional importance of the CPSU, the international Communist parties network, and the diplomatic and other instruments of political warfare employed by Moscow and its associates, considerable invested resources are nonetheless applied in this dimension of its global power endeavor, ranging from high-powered propaganda and political warfare schools and operations to military and economic "aid." In overt propaganda alone well over \$5 billion are spent annually.

Based on the above features, the fourth one is clearly an unbalanced, underdeveloped economy in the conventional equilibrium sense of proportional economic development. In the period of 1928-60 fixed capital in industry increased 36.9 times, while social capital covering housing, schools, hospitals and the like increased only 4.5 times. The developments of the past decade have not substantially altered this ratio of increase, and the USSR's expanding commitments in Eastern Europe, Cuba, Vietnam, the Mideast and elsewhere will only intensify the pressures on its short capital supply. In short, the economy is not a consumption expenditure one, nor an automotive one, nor a service one by any measure of imagination and observation. It is plainly punctuated by disproportionate progress and sector underdevelopment. However, although the economy is strikingly deficient in social efficiency, it has developed on equally striking technocratic bent that places a premium on technologic efficiency, which is readily observable in space performance, in its drive for military superiority, and in certain areas of capital goods production.¹²

Finally, reflecting further the inherent economic problems predicated ultimately on the two institutional basics, is the fifth dominant feature of the USSR economy, namely its instrumentality of trade. What amounts to a trade sieve, particularly in view of Moscow's penchant for self-sufficiency, is an instrumental device for the acquisition of the

best of Western technology, long-term Western credits to facilitate this, and a convenient means to shore up the non-leading links and consumer goods deficiencies. Under the monopoly of the state, in turn dominated by the CPSU, the trade sieve has already been an instrumental part of the strategy to serve the Plan, its top priorities as well as deficiencies, depending on the international climate and the opportunities of advantage in technological development. Clearly, nothing in the fundamental institutional structure of the USSR has changed to warrant the present conjecture that Russian interest in stepped-up trade with the U.S. and others is any indication of a substantial change in Russian behavior. Furthermore, in the long record on this Stalin and Khrushchev were not unmindful of the crucial American economic contribution to USSR's development and growth. It is sufficient to point out here that Moscow has never been primarily interested in our array of consumer goods. It has been consistently interested in our advanced technology, blueprints, and skilled knowhow. To provide the Russian totalitarians with these via trade means plainly to reinforce their coercive rule. Many years ago the writer advocated a politrade policy, that is economic exchange founded on political concessions, which is not restricted to the issue of Soviet Jewry alone, and currently feels strongly that this is the policy to be pursued with an eye to the multinational construct in the USSR.¹³

After 50 years of existence it should be evident that the economy of the USSR is far from being a human and humane economy. If anything, it remains as the colossal instrument of Soviet Russian imperial-colonialism to secure permanently totalitarian and imperialist power within and also to secure expanding and absolute dominance without. The paramount objective in its calculated exploitation is the economic generation of power, one that is thoroughly politicized for the continued domination of the captive nations both within and without the USSR, and the ultimate goal of world dominance. For these ends the USSR economy does not have to compare favorably with the U.S. or any other Free World economy in terms of consumption expenditure and general standard of living. All it has to do within the safeguards of the two institutional basics is to concentrate, as it has for 50 years, on this generation of power, primarily translated into military prowess, world-wide political warfare, and propaganda bluff. Herein rests the grave threat to the U.S. and the Free World, which are fairly easy terrain for political warfare play as the U.S. involvement in Vietnam has well demonstrated. Characteristic of traditional Russian imperialist policy, whether white or red, the basic elements of success are patience, power accumulation, and deceptive diplomacy. The current Red Czars have displayed all three surpassingly, along with an inordinate ability to retreat when problems within mount, but the post-Vietnam period will itself—once again on long historical record—confirm this to our grave disadvantage.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Podgorny Speech Text, Dec. 21, 1972, *Daily Report*, Soviet Union, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, Washington, D.C., p. AA1.

² *Ibid.*, p. AA7.

³ *Ibid.*, p. AA9.

⁴ Hans Heymann, Jr., "The Soviet Economy," *The National War College Forum*, Fall, 1972, p. 51.

⁵ E.g., *Foreign Policy*, *Message from the President of the United States*, House Document No. 92-53, 1971, pp. 122-123.

⁶ Testimony, *Mutual Security Act*, Hearings, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 1951.

⁷ Theodore Shabad, "Shift In Boundaries of Soviet Republics Is Proposed in Moscow."

The New York Times, New York, January 3, 1973.

⁸ Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov, *The Communist Party Apparatus*, Illinois, 1966.

¹⁰ For detailed descriptions of this nexus, see Y. Boyko and others. *Russian Bolshevism*, Munich, 1960.

¹¹ See *The Shifting Balance of Military Power*, supplemental statement, Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, 1970.

¹² See George R. Feivel, *The Soviet Quest for Economic Efficiency*, New York, 1967.

¹³ Author quoted in Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, "Needed: A Realistic East-West Trade Policy," *Reader's Digest*, June 1969.

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. RINALDO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 20 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. HOLTZMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADEMAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN, for 60 minutes, on October 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

Mr. PATMAN 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 \$627.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RINALDO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH in five instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in five instances.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. KEMP.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. HOLTZMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. BADILLO in five instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in four instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington.

MR. DENT.
MR. DE LUGO.
MR. MACDONALD.
MR. STUDDS.
MR. OBEY in four instances.
MRS. GRIFFITHS in two instances.
MR. BRASCO in six instances.
MR. DORN in two instances.
MR. ROONEY of New York in two instances.

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. 425. An act to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the regulation of surface mining operations, and the acquisition and reclamation of abandoned mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2413. An act to authorize the disposal of aluminum from the national stockpile and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2463. An act to change the name of the Beaver Dam in the State of Arkansas to the James W. Trimble Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2493. An act to authorize the disposal of silicon carbide from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2498. An act to authorize the disposal of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2556. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 8 months the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

MR. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7645. An act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8619. An act making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

THE SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1317. An act to authorize appropriations for the United States Information Agency.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 12, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, execu-

tive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1440. A letter from the President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Corporation for fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 240A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended [22 U.S.C. 2200a(a)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1441. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on receipts and expenditures of the Department of the Interior in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, covering fiscal year 1973, pursuant to section 15 of the act (43 U.S.C. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1442. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the life of the June 5, 1972, grand jury of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, report of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

MR. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10717. A bill to repeal the act terminating Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin as a federally recognized, sovereign Indian tribe; and to restore to the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin those Federal services furnished to American Indians because of their status as American Indians and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

MR. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10586. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of health maintenance organizations in providing health care (Rept. No. 93-573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

MR. CASEY: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 6691; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-576). Ordered to be printed.

MR. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 593. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9681. A bill to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-574). Referred to the House Calendar.

MR. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 594. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. Res. 582. A resolution deplored the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East (Rept. No. 93-575). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 10857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a tax on every new automobile with respect to its fuel consumption rate, to provide for public disclosure of the fuel consumption rate of every new automobile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 10858. A bill to regulate commerce by assuring adequate supplies of energy resource products will be available at the lowest possible cost to the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 10859. 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. GREEN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. NIX, and Mr. BARRETT):

H.R. 10860. A bill to provide for the addition of Colonial Germantown in the city of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10861. A bill to extend daylight saving time to the entire calendar year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 10862. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 16 of the United States Code (respecting national forests) to provide a share of timber receipts to States for schools and roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself and Mr. CULVER):

H.R. 10863. A bill to amend the act to incorporate Little League Baseball to provide that the league shall be open to girls as well as to boys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 10864. A bill to extend the Head Start program for 1 year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10865. A bill to provide financial assistance to enable State and local governments to assume responsibilities for community services, and for other purposes to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10866. A bill to encourage States to establish motor vehicle disposal programs and to provide for federally guaranteed loans and tax incentives for the acquisition of automobile scrap processing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax incentives to improve the economics of recycling waste paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 10868. A bill to prohibit different types of foreign assistance to any country which interns or imprisons its citizens for political purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. ASPIN, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ASHLEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. REES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 10869. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the inclusion of certain information on discharge certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 10870. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 10871. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to make mandatory the systematic allocation of petroleum products in accordance with the procedures established under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 10872. A bill to provide a minimum level for retirement salaries of certain Federal judges in territories and possessions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 10873. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assist school districts to carry out locally approved school security plans to reduce crime against children, employees, and facilities of their schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 10874. A bill to provide assistance to the owners of forest land for the reforestation of areas infested by pests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10875. 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. ROE:

H.R. 10876. A bill to require that impact-resistant eyeglasses be issued under the medical program for members of the uniformed services on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10877. A bill to authorize the President to call and conduct a White House Conference on Energy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10878. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder to widows and widowers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10879. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the circumstances under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may pay for care and treatment rendered to veterans by private hospitals in emergencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10880. A bill to provide for assistance in international drug control through the use of trade policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and

Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 10881. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to extend the tariff filing period for proposed tariff changes and to provide that the Board cannot suspend a proposed tariff for interstate or overseas air transportation less than 15 days before the time when the tariff would otherwise go into effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (for himself, Mr.

RHODES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. TREEN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. THONE, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. RARICK, Mr. MILLER, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, and Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama):

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of United States relative to force and effect of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 766. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services in 1976; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution to designate the second week of February of each year as "National Vocational Education, and National Vocational Industrial Clubs of America (VICA) Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.J. Res. 768. Joint resolution to designate February 10 to 16, 1974, as "National Vocational Education, and National Vocational Industrial Clubs of America (VICA) Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself and Mr.

MITCHELL of Maryland):

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution offering honorary citizenship of the United States to Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Andrey Sakharov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 348. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that in concert with efforts toward a cease-fire and upon the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East, the President and the Secretary of State shall focus the diplomatic efforts of the United States toward effecting direct negotiations among all parties to the conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McSPADDEN:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for a review by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Polecat Creek, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE—Thursday, October 11, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Guard and Guide and Judge, look in mercy upon this Nation in its time of anguish and uncertainty. Draw us close to Thee and to one another in humility and in prayer that we may bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law and the gospel. Spare us from arrogating to ourselves the judgments which belong to God alone, but equip us in mind and soul to bear the responsibilities we cannot assign to others, but must carry in the strength Thou dost impart. As we agonize with the wounds and the surprises of history, so prepare us for the healing interventions which Thou dost give to the people who love Thee and serve Thee.

May the redemptive messages of Mount Sinai and Mount Calvary penetrate the soul of America that the law of grace and love may prevail. O Lord, in Thee do we put our trust now and evermore.

We pray in the name of the Great Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 10, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SECRET AND CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, OCTOBER 15, 1973, TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, pursuant to Senate Resolution 13 of the 93d Congress, that the special committee to study questions relating to secret and confidential Government documents have until midnight, October 15, 1973, to file its report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard Jenkins, Jr., of Colorado, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

ACTION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Marjorie W. Lynch, of Washington, to be an Associate Director of ACTION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wythe D.