United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 8, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him.—James 1: 5.

Our Father God, unfailing source of light and love, may the light of Thy love and the life of Thy spirit move within our hearts as we wait upon Thee at the altar of prayer. Amid the persistence of pressing problems we would feel the tender touch of Thy healing hand, receive the wisdom to make worthy decisions and become one with Thee in the endeavor to make the world a better place in which men can learn to live together.

Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts that pride and prejudice may have no dominion over us and that through good will and good deeds we may become builders of bridges across which mankind can walk in the glorious adventure of ushering in a day when righteousness will reign, peace will prevail, and the welfare of all will become the desire of every heart.

In the spirit of Jesus Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 1, 1973, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution providing for a moment of prayer and thanksgiving and a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving.

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 joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution relating to the date for the submission of the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House from Thursday, February 8, 1973, to Monday, February 19, 1973.

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

S. 583. An act to promote the separation of constitutional powers by securing to the Congress additional time in which to consider the Rules of Evidence for U.S. Courts and Magistrates, the Amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which the Supreme Court on November 20, 1972, ordered the Chief Justice to transmit to the Congress.

DESIGNATING FEBRUARY AS "AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH"

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 211) designating February of each year as "American History Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 211

Whereas the study of history not only enlivens appreciation of past but also illuminates the present and gives perspective to our hopes;

Whereas a knowledge of the growth and development of our free institutions and their human values strengthens our ability to utilize these institutions and apply these values to present needs and new problems;

Whereas Americans honor their debt to the creativity, wisdom, work, faith, and sacrifice of those who first secured our freedoms, and recognize their obligation to build upon this heritage so as to meet the challenge of the future;

Whereas February 1967 has been designated by the President as "American History Month"; and

Whereas it is appropriate to encourage a deeper awareness of the great events which shaped America, and a renewed dedication to the ideals and principles we hold in trust: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February of each year is hereby designated as "American History Month", and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such month in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On pages 1 and 2, strike out the entire preamble.

On page 2, line 3, strike out the phrase "each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1973."

On page 2, line 5, strike out the word "annually."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Designating February of 1973 as 'American History Month'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—A MOVE BACKWARD

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States sent to Congress a Federal budget that he called a charter for progress.

After examining that budget, I must say that the only motion I can discern is movement backward. This kind of movement is certainly not synonymous with progress.

I understand that some administration officials have characterized this budget as "austere." I would call it lackluster. It is without either the imagination or the initiative to challenge and call forth the vast energies and talents and aspirations of a resourceful people. It stimulates neither the mind nor the

heart; it sets no examples, outlines no great national objectives.

Now, from the standpoint of the individual, what would Mr. Nixon's budget do to the American people? Well, take a look at medicare. The administration wants to shift the burden of hospital costs to the consumer and save the government $690 million. Well, the consumer is a 70-year-old widow who is ill with cancer. The consumers are an elderly couple trying to live out their lives in frugal dignity who suddenly discover that a major operation will take more than all the savings they have left.

Medicare was enacted to protect these kinds of persons from those kinds of worries. This so-called budget savings is nothing less than a piece of callous showmanship by President Nixon. He knows very well that the Congress is not going to let him do that to the Nation's elderly citizens.

How about agriculture? The President says he can save $700 million by reducing price supports to farmers. Now what does that mean for the 70 percent or more of our population who live in urban areas? Very little in terms of savings on food, because the major cost of food is in the processing and fancifying and advertising and distributing.

What that cut in price supports does mean is that many thousands more of our efficiently run family farms will go out of business this year and the next and the next. The fact is that our food-growing capabilities are being concentrated into the hands of fewer and larger producers—the agribusinessmen so favored by Agriculture Secretary Butz. Today fewer than 1 million farms can provide the food supply for this entire Nation of 210 million persons.

The cut in price supports will reduce the number of suppliers at an even faster rate. It would move us even more rapidly toward a monopoly on our food production resources. As the number of food suppliers declines, you may be sure that the price of food will go up—even more steeply than it is now.

Mr. Nixon, in his radio message to the Nation last week chose to talk about taxes and to make much of his announcement that he will not ask for a tax increase—provided the Congress does exactly what he says and passes his fiscal 1974 budget proposals untouched. I think it is important to point out what he did not say about taxes. He made no mention of this critical problem of tax reform and he said nothing about relief from property taxes.

In fact, Mr. Nixon's budget proposals imply a tax structure exactly as it is—which means that the little guy, the individual, will continue to pay the biggest share of the bill. Taxes on individuals today produce 42 percent of our national tax revenues. The huge corporations of this Nation, which do billions and billions of dollars worth of business annually, pay only 14 percent of the Nation's tax bill.

This is the system that Mr. Nixon would perpetuate by his simplistic solution of—as he said—keeping a lid on spending. Actually, intelligent and prudent budget outlays, combined with firm leadership and direction by the administration, could be used to simulate the steady, healthy economic growth that this Nation needs. We must strive toward an economic climate which will create more jobs so that we can get more people off our swollen unemployment rolls and give them back their self-respect and help them once again to become useful, productive members of our society. These reemployed wage earners, in turn, will help us share the tax burden of this Nation.

The trouble has been that full employment has never had the wholehearted support of this administration. Way back at the beginning, the President's spokesmen made it clear that joblessness was to be used as a tool to keep down inflation.

And yet the President this year projects a reduced budget deficit for fiscal year 1974 and a slight surplus for 1975 based on a full-employment economy. If Mr. Nixon is going to put his budget on a full-employment basis, he had better do something about unemployment.

The unemployment rate was only 3.4 percent when Mr. Nixon first took office. Under his anti-inflation policies, that figure rapidly climbed to 6 percent and it has hovered between 5 and 6 percent ever since. Last year unemployment averaged 5.6 percent and the President's own economists can see nothing better than a 4.5 percent rate by the end of this year—with good luck.

So how does Mr. Nixon's budget propose to deal with unemployment?

By cutting out $1 billion in emergency job funds voted by the Congress to meet this emergency;

By reducing funds for manpower and training programs for those who are now of employable age; and

As a long range project, by eliminating the elementary and secondary education assistance authorized in 1965 to help the Nation's schools give the Nation's children the skills they will need to compete in the job markets of the future.

Besides the immediate human consequences of Mr. Nixon's unemployment policies, this course of action also contains far-reaching implications for another important part of Mr. Nixon's budget proposals. I am speaking of revenue sharing. Mr. Nixon has made much of his plan to turn over Federal money with little or no Federal guidelines on how this money is to be spent, to States and localities, to let them spend as they deem best.

It does not take much vision to see that if unemployment continues, the economy is going to produce less in tax revenues than the President has projected. And that is going to mean less revenue for sharing with the States and localities.

What this means is that the hard decisions concerning such vital areas as education, manpower, training, urban renewal, health, and others are going to be forced upon State and local governments. Many of these programs were begun by local governments at the urging of the Federal Government and with the promise of Federal support. Now that the Federal Government proposed to abandon these programs, State, and local officials are left to decide whether to reduce these programs in scope or to discontinue them altogether or—perhaps most difficult of all—to decide to maintain them. And the last choice, of course, would mean a raise in local taxes to help pay for these programs that the communities need and want.

So Mr. Nixon's lid on spending is not much of a lid at all: he is not really guaranteeing us security from a tax hike. He is just assuring that the responsibility for such a hike must be borne by Governors, and mayors and county executives—not by his administration.

It is important to remember the nature of these programs that the President would eliminate. They include the war on poverty, which is one war that is worth fighting.

The President's spokesmen give short shrift to the Office of Economic Opportunity; they say the agency and the programs it represents have not worked. These Republicans give up very easily.

Of course, we recognize that the program encountered problems. It also offered some of the brightest promises for the Nation's future.

I could give you several other examples of how the operations of this proposed budget would have similarly deleterious effects on the American people—in such fields as land and water conservation, housing, and environmental. And all this in the name of fiscal responsibilty. Last week, Mr. Nixon chose to use the forum of a national radio network to deliver to the Congress a little lecture on its responsibilities in connection with this budget. I want to say that this Congress does not need to be told its responsibilities—it is fully aware of them.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee—Congressman MAHON, of Texas—has informed me that the Congress has actually trimmed administration requests for budget authority by $9.2 billion during Mr. Nixon's first 4 years. In terms of actual outlays, the Congress has added only a net $4.6 billion to Presidential requests through all those years.

That is a far cry from the fiscal irresponsibility that Mr. Nixon so decries. A far more important contribution to inflation and to an unstable economy has been the President's own budget deficits which have averaged $26.8 billion, including the projected $12.7 billion deficit for fiscal 1974.

No, Mr. President, the Congress does not need to be reminded of its responsibilities. Perhaps the administration might want to reconsider its own responsibility to lead—to point us toward a brighter tomorrow.

This budget certainly does not provide a charter for progress for America.

INVASION OF THE FARMERS' PRIVACY

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri (Mr. LITTON), has performed an invaluable service in bringing to the attention of the Congress and the public Executive Order No. 11697, which directs the Internal Revenue Service to open the tax returns of American farmers to the Department of Agriculture for inspection.

Even though this order states that data obtained from the returns is to be used only for "statistical purposes," I believe that the President's action can only be construed as a complete and unquestioned invasion on the right of privacy of this large segment of the American society.

Under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Act, the President does have the authority to open returns to authorized persons. However, I do not believe the law intends to allow wholesale invasion of the private personal income tax of a group of individuals to an entire department of bureaucrats without a more specific motive than "statistical purposes." This is equivalent to a John Doe search warrant.

As has been noted by my colleague, a comprehensive farm survey was completed only 2 years ago which should have supplied any data available on the IRS returns. Thus, it would appear on the surface that this order demonstrates a blatant insensitivity of the rights of farmers.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Government Information I am calling on the chairman to begin an immediate investigation of this apparent invasion of the right of privacy.

How does the executive rationalize this encroachment when it refuses to share with Members of Congress much needed information which is far less sensitive than the personal affairs of our Nation's farmers?

AIR FORCE SECURITY

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the President recently issued an order requiring armed local law enforcement officers to be stationed at airline boarding gates before all commercial flights, in an effort to make air travel more secure from hijacking. As a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Transportation and Aviation, I consider it crucial that the issue of whether armed local police are to be used is resolved as soon as possible, for the benefit of both the airlines and the traveling public.

On February 5, a temporary restraining order was handed down by a Federal district judge that would block for 10 days the implementation of the President's order. Should this temporary order become permanent, it could conceivably have the effect of seriously handicapping any attempt to secure this Nation's airports from hijackers. The legislation I am introducing today would resolve the conflicts between the President, the regulatory agencies, and the airline industry on the matter of stationing armed local police at commercial facilities. My proposal would ease the financing of that security force, keeping at a minimum the cost to the Government and the taxpayers.

Last year President Nixon vetoed legislation to provide for an airport security force and for training funds for it because it would be too expensive. The estimated cost for that proposal was $35 million in the first year of operation. Under my proposal, a total of $28.5 million of that cost would be saved.

What I propose is, simply, to utilize members of the Armed Forces—specially trained—at boarding gates, and have them empowered to search and detain or arrest anyone trying to board aircraft who may reasonably be believed to be carrying a concealed weapon or explosive device. The advantages of using military personnel rather than local police forces are readily apparent.

As we move toward disengagement and peace, it would be an ideal training for a specialist corps within the services. We have a standing army or over one million men and women. Even if this number is reduced as our military manpower is cut back, there would still be more soldiers available for such airport duty than civilian police. This would mean greater security to the traveling public and the airlines, because of the larger security force possible.

Rather than setting up an entirely new bureaucratic structure to train, deploy and administer civilian police, the training facilities of the military could be utilized. The armed servces have a uniformly administered, nationwide operation readily adaptable to such a program. To duplicate those facilities for a special security force is to ask the taxpayers and the flying public to pay twice for a service that for practical purposes is already in existence. The military services already have a rich heritage of know-how in policing difficult situations and in dealing with the public.

Since airports in major cities are for all intents international facilities, it would make more sense to use Federal troops rather than State or local police forces. These men and women guarding our airports would be just as much representatives of our country as any other airport personnel.

Finally, there is an overriding Federal interest in protecting interstate and international air transportation. It was for this reason that the Federal Aviation Administration was created by the Congress. And it is for this reason that any policing of airports for the purpose of antihijacking security should be done by Federal troops at Federal expense. It is unfair to ask local governments and the traveling public to take on this added expense when the cost of air travel is already so high.

PROPER TREATMENT OF SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, we have made great progress in granting proper treatment to our senior citizens. Services, funds, and attention to the problem have steadily expanded. The process, unfortunately, is still far from complete. Too many of the elderly still lack adequate funds to lead the full lives they deserve. We must continue to plug any loopholes we find in the system and provide wide and diverse opportunities for assuring comfortable retirement.

Today I am introducing three bills designed to attack the retirement problems of Federal employees. They widen the benefits of the present system and allow greater freedom for the employees to expand their own coverage. Social security has come to cover such a large percentage of the population that those people working under other systems are too often neglected.

One bill will bring immediate relief to those already retired. It provides that the first $5,000 of income received as a civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency will be excluded from gross income for tax purposes. This exemption will end our policy of giving with one hand while we take away with the other. It is one more step toward a satisfactory pension system.

The other two bills look to the future; creating new alternatives for Federal employees interested in financing more extensive retirement programs. The first provides tax relief to any civil service employee making payments toward a personal retirement annuity. These contributions would be allowed as income tax deductions. This will not interfere with the present pension system but will create an incentive and an opportunity for additional coverage.

In line with this policy of greater freedom and wider options, my third bill will allow Federal employees to elect coverage under the social security system. This is also a question of equity. Presently, Government employees in all 50 States are allowed to come under the social security system in addition to their local pension plans. Similarly, military personnel are provided with this advantage. The time has come to end this discrimination against Federal employees.

Providing this optional coverage will alleviate the problem of many Federal employees who have achieved partial coverage and need to complete a number of additional quarters to be eligible for minimum coverage under social security. For all employees social security can provide protection against the weaknesses in the present pension system; notably in the provision of medical care.

Why am I so concerned with optional coverage? We know that all too often even the better pension systems leave the retired worker in difficult financial situations. Optional coverage, aided by the Government, is only a partial solution to this problem but one that cannot be neglected.

Senior citizens should not have to live at the whim of Congress, hoping from year to year for new largesse. Only by

setting up adequate and on-going pension systems can this be avoided.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO REDUCE DISABILITY COMPENSATION SCHEDULES FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Veterans' Administration proposed sweeping changes in Veterans' Administration disability compensation schedules which if allowed to stand will have a tremendous impact on hundrdes of thousands of America's disabled war veterans, with a particularly bad impact on returning Vietnam veterans. It has been indicated that these changes will save $160 million. We are already beginning to receive calls from Members' offices and the public. In view of this, I think it desirable to explain my personal views and the plans of the Committee on Veterans Affairs with regard to these proposed changes. I do not believe that the American public or the Congress will tolerate this kind of treatment of its war disabled. Service-connected veterans have always enjoyed the highest priority among veterans programs, and I believe that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will act to insure a continuation of this high priority.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues my full comments on this working proposal. The Veterans' Administration delivered to us yesterday a proposed revision in the schedule for rating disabilities for service-connected disabled veterans. Under the law, the Veterans' Administration has authority to promulgate such a schedule and the schedule presently in force covers the 2 million service-connected veterans now receiving disability compensation.

I am shocked at the proposals which the Veterans' Administration is making. The changes which they plan in the disability rating schedule will substantially downgrade many serious combat disabilities and injuries, and will result in large reductions in disability compensation to hundreds of thousands of seriously disabled war veterans.

We understand that the President's budget contemplates a saving of $160 million a year as a result of downgrading disabled veterans compensation.

These changes will have an especially serious impact on younger Vietnam veterans suffering combat disabilities. About 10 years ago we froze the rates for any veteran who had held his disability rating for 20 years. This means that most World War II veterans and many veterans of the Korean conflict are protected and will not be affected by these reductions. On the other hand, a young veteran returning from Vietnam with a combat disability would not be protected for an identical disability and would, under this proposed schedule, receive substantially less.

Here are some examples of the changes the Veterans' Administration proposes:

Disability	Current rating (percent)	Proposed VA reduction (percent)	Loss in compensation (per month)
Amputation at forearm	80	40	$139
Amputation 5 fingers	70	40	106
Leg amputation at hip	90	40	169
Amputation midthigh	60	30	102
Amputation of foot	40	30	29

It should be emphasized that the examples above do not reflect all the veteran would lose. Veterans rated 50 percent or above now receive dependency allowances. A veteran married with two children receives an extra dependency allowance. This allowance for a married veteran with two children varies from $67 to $34, depending on the degree of disability above 50 percent. In those cases where the disability rating for an injury is being lowered below the 50 percent level, and that seems to be the case in many of the proposed changes, the veteran will not only suffer a loss in his service-connected compensation rating, but he will lose his dependency allowance.

The impact on the 100 percent service-connected disabled veteran can be even greater. A reduction in his disability of as much as 10 perent would remove him from the 100 percent category and in addition to lowering his monthly compensation, he would lose PX and commissary privileges, special medical benefits, and his children would no longer be eligible to obtain an education under the war orphans' scholarship program. This scholarship is worth about $6,000 for each child.

We have been furnished no information justifying these proposed changes. It is incredible that at a time when we are trying to bring a war to a conclusion and bring our POW's home that the VA would propose to reduce disability compensation for war veterans. Personally, I know of no way I could justify to a veteran or POW of Vietnam that his leg or arm is worth less than the rates we have been paying and will continue to pay to older veterans who enjoy a protected rate.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee is proceeding to assemble information about these proposed changes and if we conclude that these reductions are unfair and unwise, as they certainly appear to be, it will be necessary that we resort to some sort of legislative device such as freezing the rating schedule, as we did once before.

We are well aware that there is great concern about the level of spending in the Federal Government, but at a time when it is indicated that a billion or more dollars may be furnished to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, I seriously doubt that the Congress or the American public would tolerate this kind of treatment to its war disabled in an effort to save $160 million a year.

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the strength and power of America lies in the hands of the common man. It is from his ranks that its greatest leaders emerge. It is the workingman who holds the latent power in America—a power that is most effectively translated by those leaders who are drawn from the masses.

Such a leader was President Lyndon Baines Johnson. Lyndon Johnson was not only a great man, he was an honest man, with an intense love of all human beings; the poor, the sick, the handicapped, the underprivileged, and those against whom discrimination was directed.

He once recalled:

> I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American and a public servant, and a member of my party in that order, always and only.
>
> Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, and until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins . . . emancipation will be a proclamation . . . which falls short of assuring freedom to the free.

When he saw suffering, President Johnson looked to the government for the cure and in most cases he provided, if not a cure, an improvement and a bridge to hope for those previously without hope.

Lyndon Johnson will be remembered for many things during his long political career. For those of us who knew him personally, his physical presence was overwhelming, his dynamic energy brought forth the Great Society, the national war on poverty, and the greatest efforts toward equal rights and equal opportunities in history.

These Halls have seen few men as powerful and effective as Lyndon Johnson. He was first and foremost, a parliamentary expert. No arm of government was a stranger to him. He held every high elective office at the Federal level; Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President. Where weaker men may have hesitated President Johnson acted, letting praise and criticism come his way. He knew that, above all things, the President must endure the loneliness of having the very last word.

Lyndon Baines Johnson will be remembered by historians as a man who declared total war on poverty, deprivation, disease, and ignorance with every fiber of his being, while suffering criticism because he stuck to the course he believed right. As President Johnson himself once remarked:

> Our democracy cannot remain static, a prisoner to the past . . . Government itself has the continuing obligation—second to no other—to keep the machinery of public participation functioning smoothly and to improve it where necessary so that democracy remains a vital and vibrant institution.

Lyndon Johnson will be sorely missed by his friends and colleagues, but long remembered by every American for whom his goal was to make democracy a reality.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL TRUST FUND AND REVENUE ACT

(Mr. SMITH of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend

his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, last October 18, the House of Representatives voted to override the President's veto of the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, and the Senate of the United States, likewise, voted to override this veto. Accordingly, more than two-thirds of the Congress of the United States has made what we consider to be a major national commitment to clean up our waters and to achieve clean waters within the foreseeable future. This bill provided for the expenditure of some $18 billion over the next 3 years for sewage disposal plant construction grants and another $6 billion for research and development and for training programs and for other matters collateral and necessary to cleaning up of our waters.

The President, in his veto message, said that a vote to override his veto would be a vote for higher taxes, and a vote to sustain his veto would be a vote for no increased taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the action of the Congress of the United States, in overriding the President's veto, did constitute a strong national commitment, reflected by the Congress, to clean up our waters so that man can survive.

The President had proposed a budget for sewage disposal plant construction and related activities, of about $6 billion over the next 3 years—a program barely one-third or one-fourth of what the Congress thought necessary.

The Congress and the people of this Nation, I believe, do not view the President's proposal as sufficient to do the job. I feel the people of this country have decided that it is time to roll up our sleeves and do the job that has to be done. I further believe that the people know a price tag must be attached to any job of this magnitude, and that they are willing to pay that price, knowing it is an investment for themselves, an investment in the future, particularly if they can know exactly where their money will go.

Since the Congress has authorized a water pollution control program three to four times larger than the President's proposals, but has not provided any money to do the job, I believe it is time that we in the Congress accept the responsibility of getting the job done which we have said needs to be done. Therefore, today, recognizing the impasse which exists, I introduce a bill which establishes a water pollution control trust fund and proposes to finance the trust fund and thereby the Water Pollution Control Act program which we adopted last October, by levying a 3-percent surcharge on all income taxes. This surcharge is not a tax which will place the burden on the individual, nor does it single out industry to bear the burden of returning clean waters to this Nation. Rather, this bill is designed to tax both individual and corporate income taxes, so that all segments of the community will share in the responsibility, and both segments of the community will reap the benefits that they have striven for.

The revenues so provided, which will go directly into the water pollution control trust fund, will be spent solely for purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act, and the American public will know exactly where this extra tax money is going.

The President will not be in the position of raising taxes, because this is purely a responsible action of the Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this Water Pollution Control Trust Fund and Revenue Act so we can get on with the job we all know must be done.

POSTAL WORKERS APOLOGIZE TO ARIZONA RESIDENTS

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, an advertisement which appeared in the Arizona Republic, which serves the Phoenix area, was recently sent to me. This advertisement appeared on Sunday, December 17, 1972, and was paid for by the postal workers who serve the Phoenix area.

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, the ad apologizes to Arizona residents for the poor mail service and explains why the mail service is late.

I want to particularly call attention to item No. 1, which explains that a package from Modena, Utah, to Panaca, Nev., a distance of some 20 miles, travels 2,300 miles on a five-State truck ride before it is delivered.

I, for one, would like to hear the Postmaster General's explanation of this one, and I also did not see this interesting statistic in any of his recent reports.

I want to insert the complete text of the advertisement at this time:

[Advertisement from the Arizona Republic, Dec. 17, 1972]

THE REASON WHY YOUR MAIL SERVICE ISN'T BETTER

We, the Postal Workers employed by the United States Postal Service throughout the entire Valley of the Sun are dedicated to serving the public efficiently and courteously. We have a proud tradition of service to all segments of the public and want to continue it. Recently in a national news magazine the employees have been subjected to unjustified criticism by top Postal Service Management who are trying to blame us for their mistakes in managing the mail service. Postal Service Management is not concerned with service. They care only about effectuating a series of policies which they claim will cut costs, but which we believe will seriously erode the service we now provide and which will add substantially to the cost of operating the Postal Service. This added cost will be paid by the public through increased fees, decreased services and increased taxes.

Item: Rather than delivering packages directly from one city to another, management now routes them through a wide/area delivery system. Thus, a package mailed from Marquette, Michigan, to Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, a distance of 167 miles east, will go by truck south to Iron Mountain, Milwaukee and Chicago, then east to Detroit and then north to Mackinaw City before arriving at its destination, 961 tired miles later. Similarly, a package mailed from Modena, Utah to Panaca, Nevada, a distance of 20 miles, will wind its way through a tortuous 2300 mile, 5 state truck-ride before being delivered. A letter mailed in Casa Grande to an address in Casa Grande will go to Phoenix and back prior to delivery. These are not accidents. These unbelievable delivery schemes are actually planned by Management. All of these schemes, along with the service cutback of collection from neighborhood mail boxes, delay delivery of your mail by 2 to 5 days. The same driver that is now hauling mail in a cross-country circle could be used to collect local mail from neighborhood boxes so that it could be delivered directly to you as in the past.

Item: While proclaiming a freeze on hiring full time trained career employees, the Postal Service is hiring thousands of untrained temporary employees. Thus, while 33,000 vacant career jobs remain unfilled, employees are hired for 90 day periods. This results in a significant deterioration of service and a large planned turnover of personnel on a regular basis. For example, in Springfield, Illinois, 9 people were recently hired for 90 day periods to fill career vacancies. One quit on the first day because the "work was too hard"; one failed the drivers test and was terminated; one was fired for possession of dangerous narcotics while on the job; one was fired for hiding ⅔ of his day's mail volume; one was fired for taking a 3 hour rest in mid-day; one was fired for mail theft; and 3 were fired for repeatedly failing to report for work when scheduled. This extreme situation is just one example of what happens when career professionals are replaced by untrained undisciplined temporary help. By hiring temporary employees, management saves money on fringe benefits such as health and life insurance and vacation pay, but management must then spend significantly greater amounts on recruiting 4 employees each year to fill one vacant career job and on repetitive training of these temporary employees. Additional money is lost due to the employee's inability to properly learn the job before his term is over. The "saving" realized by freezing out career employees is lost many times over by the resultant personnel practices engaged in by management.

Item: Carriers have traditionally sorted all mail on their route at the start of their day prior to delivery. In a truly mystifying move, the Postal Service recently ordered them to treat some mail as "preferential mail" and sort only that mail prior to delivery. After completion of the day's delivery, they are to sort the rest. This scheme is designed, so we are told, to save carriers up to one hour per day and they were therefore told to come to work one hour later. However, all it does is cause the "non-preferential mail" (which includes magazines and small packages) to be left over until later. The work still has to be done but it is done after the deliveries have been made and therefore much mail is delayed still one day more. Thus, despite no saving in labor or cost, Management has delayed delivery of some of your mail by one more day.

Item: In order to overcome further effects of the hiring freeze, management has assigned more force overtime. The 12 hour day is becoming more common and the 10 hour day 6 day week, is becoming standard. With overtime rates figured in, the cost to keep 2 employees on a 10 hour shift, 6 days per week, greatly exceeds the cost of utilizing 3 employees on an 8 hour shift, 5 days per week. Yet, both formulas give Management the same total number of man-hours per week (120)), yet the overtime formula costs more and with its heavy emphasis on overtime, results in higher fatigue rates and lower production than the former system of a 40 hour week. It also results in a virtual absence of leisure time for employees to spend with their families. Management knows this, yet to make it look as if they are saving money they persist in their policy of less employees plus more overtime. Fewer employees means more unemployment, more

welfare, more crime and more taxes. More overtime means less production per man-hour, less efficiency, less morale, less pride in work and less stability in the work force. In short, less employees plus more overtime equals more taxes and less service.

These are just some of the truths about the Postal Service Management. We, the employees, want to continue providing you, the public, with efficient, courteous service. We believe that an immediate, sweeping change in policy is necessary to resume providing such service. However, if the above Management policies continue, we predict further deterioration of service and further increases in charges and taxes to pay for these mistakes.

(Paid for by voluntary contributions by Postal Employees for an efficient postal service—Bernard C. Claahsen, Paul S. Delgado, Jerry Wilson.)

We wish you a Happy Holiday Season and Joyous New Year and, if Management allows us to, we will deliver your gifts and cards on time.

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT AS A BASIC RIGHT

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

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great blessings of living in a free country is the right to move about without undue restraint. If a person in our country does not like a particular area he is free to move elsewhere. And if he should desire to leave the country altogether he may do so without any great difficulty. Unfortunately it is difficult for some people to emigrate from certain other countries in the world.

We are all aware of the problems people of Jewish origin are having in trying to move from the Soviet Union to Israel. And while I am completely sympathetic to their cause I do not believe we should overlook, or ignore, the plight of others. People of many different origins and of many different faiths have encountered considerable and unnecessary difficulties in trying to leave Communist-dominated countries.

Who can forget the thousands who have died trying to escape to West Berlin? Who can forget the many who have drowned, or been shot, while trying to flee the island of Cuba? Who can forget the thunder of the tanks as they clattered into Czechoslovakia to crush a glimmering hope for freedom? Have we forgotten these? I hope not.

This bizarre persecution of those who wish to emigrate should be stopped. I am, therefore, proposing a resolution that urges the President to take action in this matter.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mention a joint resolution I have introduced today with respect to the offering of voluntary prayer in tax-supported public buildings. Does this proposal sound familiar? I am sure that it does. The school-prayer issue has been before the Congress each session since 1962 when the U.S. Supreme Court began to proscribe the historic tradition of students recognizing our Creator in the Nation's public classrooms. Indeed, the initial public outcry against the Engel decision and subsequent school-prayer decisions has never really subsided even though a decade has elapsed.

The reason for this phenomenon is not difficult to understand. The American people want the right of voluntary prayer in public schools restored where it has been discontinued. Moreover, they will persist in their efforts until they again have it. This fact has been illustrated by every public opinion poll ever conducted on this issue. The legislatures, or the people by referendum in a number of States have indicated their overwhelming support of this proposal. It has been endorsed by clergymen from many faiths and denominations. It has been a plank in the platform of the Republican Party in 1964 and 1972. Of even greater import is the multitude of ad hoc citizen groups that have worked and will continue to expand their efforts mobilizing public action in this regard. I am sure my colleagues, that all of you will be hearing from them, and citizens in your district, in this regard.

The 92d Congress in 1971, had an excellent chance to resolve the issue when the prayer amendment came up for a vote via a discharge petition. The floor tally was 240 yeas to 162 nays on final passage, a substantial majority in favor but short of the two-thirds majority required for a constitutional amendment.

Already a significant number of my colleagues in the House and the other body have sponsored prayer amendments to the Constitution. I would hope that the continuing support for the restoration of this right the intense legislative activity on behalf of this proposal and the argument of opponents to the constitutional amendment procedure that prayer in schools has never been outlawed might get the message to the courts. If reluctant lower court judges and school administrators take a page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and permit some tolerance of this 171-year-old privilege, a constitutional amendment might not be necessary. This would be most helpful and might even put the issue to rest.

If, however, it appears that the legal stalemates will continue, the public will again demand a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in public schools and facilities. It is in the interest of expressing this continuing concern that I introduce this resolution today.

BONUS BENEFITS TO PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to grant certain bonus benefits to our men who are being returned to us after being kept in captivity as prisoners of war in Vietnam.

These men have suffered unimaginable hardships over periods of months and years. At least one returning POW has been behind bars in North Vietnam for more than 8 years.

They deserve much from us, and this bill will make it possible for us to repay some of our debt to them.

Living in the Fifth Congressional District in Florida, the district which I am privileged to represent, is one of the three prisoners of war who was returned this past September from Hanoi. His name is Mark Gartley, a Navy pilot, and a leader in the truest sense of the word.

While he was still a prisoner he had many discussions with his fellow POW's about the problems they would one day face, and the kind of assistance they would need to solve those problems.

As a result of those discussions, and of what he has experienced both as a POW and as a repatriated serviceman, Mr. Gartley has outlined the legislation he feels would help meet these basic needs.

The legislation I am introducing today embodies the five provisions that Mr. Gartley, in behalf of his fellow POW's, has requested.

In a very real sense, then, this legislation is actually legislation which these brave and honorable men have, in effect, themselves drafted.

The bill would provide for assistance in five areas:

First, it would provide that POW's receive 2 days' credit toward retirement from military service for every day served as a prisoner of war. This will enable them to retire earlier than usual and begin a second career or try to make up the years of family life and enjoyment they were denied while in prison. Those who were in prison the longest, of course, will gain the most time toward retirement.

Second, it would stipulate that Vietnam POW's would receive per diem at a rate equal to what their counterparts in Saigon received when military quarters and food were not available. They will receive $5 per day from the foreign claims settlement commission, but this should be supplemented by military per diem pay equal to what other men of the same rank on duty were receiving when quarters and food were unavailable for various reasons.

Third, it would call for a waiver of import duties on household goods purchased overseas for a year after repatriation. This is a benefit for which most POW's legally qualify but will be unable to obtain due to the existing plan for their repatriation.

Fourth, it would enable POW's to leave their deposit in the uniformed services savings deposit program for a period of 6 months after repatriation. Ordinarily, 3 months grace period in the savings program is provided, but Mr. Gartley has found that this is not sufficient time for a man to be expected to make wise investment decisions. He feels that the POW's time will be too occupied with adjusting to freedom, family, and the U.S.

life style to have to be burdened so soon with that kind of decision.

Fifth, it would provide that POW's who choose not to remain in military service will be entitled to psychological and physical health care on a long range continuing basis. This is especially important because history has indicated that physical and psychological problems arising from military captivity may go undetected and unsuspected for many years after release. It is our responsibility to see that medical treatment is available to them for any such condition as long as it is needed.

It seems to me that this is the very least we ought to do for these men whose service to their country has led them into months and years of suffering and deprivation.

The bill is especially appropriate at this time, since it now appears that the first American prisoners will be airlifted from Hanoi this coming weekend.

I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to them and to the sacrifices they have made for us, than the introduction and swift passage of this bill.

We may find that this bill does not provide everything that proves to be needed, but it is a responsible first step toward meeting our obligation to this band of brave and lonely men, and I urge the support of my colleagues in making it the law of the land.

REPUDIATION OF INDIAN TERMINATION POLICY

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing with 15 cosponsors, legislation to officially repudiate the Indian policy.

As everyone knows, over the years the U.S. Government signed treaties with Indian nations across the continent. Like treaties with other nations around the world, the United States owes native Americans a legal and moral obligation to fulfill the provisions of those treaties with Indian tribes.

However, in 1953 the 83d Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 108 declared a congressional policy disavowing its trustee obligations to the first Americans. The idea embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 108 became known as "the termination policy." In concrete terms the policy meant that an Indian tribe would be cut adrift from Federal services and protection if it were deemed that a tribe were economically able to stand on its own feet. With hindsight we can see that no tribe has enjoyed such a state of economic self-sufficiency.

The resolution merely expressed the sense of the 83d Congress; it officially bound only that Congress and none thereafter. Although it is no longer effective congressional policy, Indians have seen no repudiation of termination and thus assume it to remain operative.

The two prosperous tribes which were terminated found the severance of their relationship with the Federal Government to be devastating. The Menominees of Wisconsin and the Klamaths in Oregon were thriving Indian communities until termination. Since then many of their tribal lands have been sold off to pay taxes. Once productive businesses have gone downhill.

With such a history as this, it is no wonder that termination is viewed with fear and anxiety within the Indian community. This fear and anxiety have manifested themselves in a very tangible way. Indians say, "if we're going to lose the gains we make, why should we work hard in the first place." Thus merely the threat of termination has contributed in a large way to the poverty of our native Americans.

President Nixon in his July 8, 1970, message to Congress on the American Indian said:

> Because termination is morally and legally unacceptable, because it produces bad practical results, and because the mere threat of termination tends to discourage greater self-sufficiency among Indian groups, I am asking the Congress to pass a new Concurrent Resolution which would expressly renounce, repudiate and repeal the termination policy as expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83rd Congress.

Considering the damage which termination has done in the past and the damage which the threat of termination is doing presently, it is incumbent upon the Congress to repudiate the policy expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83d Congress. Such a repudiation will free native Americans to improve their standards of living and develop a self-sufficiency.

H.R. 2840—WAR POWERS 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, recently I joined with my friend and distinguished colleague from the State of Oregon, Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, in introducing H.R. 2840, a war powers bill designed to insure that this country will never again become engaged in a protracted and devisive armed conflict similar to the Vietnam war.

Unlike many of my colleagues who are supporting some type of war powers legislation, Mr. Speaker, I consistently supported the President in the Vietnam struggle until it was resolved. I could not see the justification of tying the hands of the Commander in Chief in the midst of a conflict in which American troops were fighting and dying. I do, however, want to make sure that we are never again faced with a protracted undeclared war.

This bill will, in fact, limit the President's authority to commit American combat troops in an emergency situation to a reasonable period of time without congressional authority. On the other hand, it will also force Congress to take a stand one way or another. This second point is more important in my opinion than the first. We owe to this country and especially to the young men who are called upon to do the fighting that the Congress exercise its constitutional war powers prerogative to adopt a formal declaration of war or to prevent the continuation of any Executive or undeclared war.

Mr. Speaker, as you know Executive wars, such as Korea and more recently Vietnam, create situations in which the laws of treason are not applicable and the will of the country is divided. If we are ever again to ask our sons and brothers to shed their blood on foreign soil we must make sure that we have the resolve and the dedication of this Nation behind such efforts.

How can we as a responsible and democratic Nation commit young men to suffer and die in the swamps and rice paddies of Southeast Asia or for that matter the highlands or the mountains of any place on the globe while fellow Americans are sending blood to aid the enemy, stopping troop trains, or walking the streets of the enemy capital damning our country's policies? How can we ever again envision our own sons suffering in POW camps or bleeding in forsaken jungles while Members of this body rise to call our involvement immoral or irresponsible?

The terms of H.R. 2840 do not impinge upon the Executive resources and responsibilities to meet the demands of any emergency, nor does this bill grant the Executive any further authority than it already possesses. It does, however, assure this country that the legislature, the possessor of the warmaking powers, must affirmatively ratify the President's actions or refuse the means to continue to wage war. Congress is mandated by the act to exercise its responsibilities. It is easy to sit on your hands and criticize, but it is not as easy to face up to your responsibilities. The burden falls squarely where it was clearly intended by the framers of the Constitution. With this bill as law this government must decide, within time limits specified, that we shall either wage war or make peace.

I urge all my colleagues to join with us in approving this vital piece of legislation.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that such a recess shall not extend beyond 2 p.m. this afternoon.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this matter, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, has been discussed with this side of the aisle. In view of the circumstances with which we are confronted at the moment, we recognize the need for this request.

I know of no objection on this side of the aisle.

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

There was no objection.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972, UNDER THE UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION POLICIES ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting today the second annual report of each executive department and agency on their activities during fiscal year 1972 under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

The reports describe the efforts within the Federal Government to provide for the uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farm operations by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish fair and uniform policies for real property acquisition under these programs.

The reports give positive evidence that the objectives of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act are being achieved. While the limited experience under the Act has not permitted a comprehensive survey of its effect on the general public, the principal reporting agencies agree that most of the people displaced by federally related activities were pleased with both their new relocation sites and their benefits. The agencies attributed this favorable reaction to the increase in relocation benefits provided under the Act. Relocation payments during FY 1972 totaled more than $109 million for both Federal and federally assisted programs and were paid to over 50,000 claimants.

Early in 1972 I was concerned that legislation implementing the Act had not yet been passed by the States, and that the Act was not being carried out as effectively as it should be. A number of actions were taken to improve this situation:

—On February 2, 1972, the Vice President wrote to each Governor and to the majority and minority leadership in each State's legislature to encourage the enactment of comprehensive implementing legislation.

—The Office of Management and Budget, in cooperation with the Council of State Governments and the National Governors' Conference, solicited the assistance of Federal agencies and State officials. Partly as a result, most States had apparent statutory authority to comply with the Act's provisions by July 1, 1972.

—The Office of Management and Budget also issued a new and more comprehensive set of guidelines for agencies' regulations on May 1, 1972.

—In addition, the Relocation Assistance Implementation Committee, formed pursuant to my memorandum of January 4, 1971, has undertaken a number of projects to increase uniformity and effectiveness in carrying out the law. For example, a pilot test is being conducted to develop standard application forms so that all displacees, regardless of the program that displaces them, may be able to follow uniform instructions when seeking benefits under the Act.

—As a further step toward uniform and equitable treatment of individuals affected by Federal and federally assisted acquisition programs, the Office of Management and Budget has encouraged all concerned Federal agencies to conduct early audit programs to check progress. I understand that the General Accounting Office has also been engaged in a review of the implementation of the law. I appreciate this effort and I am confident that Federal agencies will continue to cooperate in making improvements in these programs.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1973.*

RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 8, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am hereby submitting my resignation as a Member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, effective immediately. Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated.

With every good wish and kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(b), Public Law 89–491, as amended, the Chair appoints as a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. STUDDS, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS COMMENCING FEBRUARY 8, 1973

The SPEAKER laid before the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105), providing for an adjournment of the House from Thursday, February 8, 1973, to Monday, February 19, 1973, together with the Senate amendment thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1973." and insert: "1973, and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 8, 1973, it stand adjourned until 11 o'clock antemeridian, Thursday, February 15, 1973."

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the Congress commencing February 8, 1973."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to his announcement of the program for the week of February 19, 1973.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the House on the resolution just passed, we shall be through here this evening, and the program for the House of Representatives for the week of February 19, 1973, is as follows:

On Monday, February 19, there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address. That will be the only business on Monday.

On Tuesday, February 20, there would normally be the Private Calendar, but there are no bills.

On suspensions, there is one bill, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission amendment. That is H.R. 3694. That is for Tuesday.

On Wednesday and for the balance of the week, there is H.R. 3577, the interest equalization tax extension, with an open rule, 2 hours of debate.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON FEBRUARY 21, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 21, 1973.

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

There was no objection.

BRIGHT STREETS PROGRAM

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to encourage the use of modern street lighting as an important way to curb the problem of nighttime crime on the streets of this Nation's cities.

Today, in all too many American cities, the setting of the sun has become the signal for the onset of a reign of

terror. Law-abiding citizens flee the streets while criminal elements take over.

The bill which I am introducing would earmark $50 million annually in Federal funds for the installation of high pressure sodium lighting in an effort to cut crime. This legislation draws upon a bill introduced in the House by Mr. KOCH, but expands on that proposal.

Under my bill, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration would be authorized to make direct grants to cities to cover up to 80 percent of the cost of lighting their streets with the most advanced development in outdoor illumination, high pressure sodium lighting. Those grants would be made to units of general local government in urban areas with populations in excess of 100,000 persons.

In addition, the LEAA would make grants to reimburse those cities which have already installed high pressure sodium lighting. Under this provision, those municipalities which have been farsighted enought to make the capital expenditures necessary to return their streets to the people would not be penalized for their initiative. LEAA grants would also be available to reimburse private organizations and individual citizens who have advanced their funds to improve the quality of street lighting in their neighborhoods.

New York City has embarked upon a $35 million program to install high pressure sodium lights along 1,600 miles of streets. As of this month, it had already expended over $1 million on this project in Manhattan, the Bronx, Queens, and Brooklyn. Completion of the entire program is scheduled for mid-1974. Prior to this, a program entitled "Operation Main Street" had solicited contributions from civic and business organizations to install bright sodium lighting in New York City; $90,000 was contributed citywide and, in the Bronx, merchant associations responded with donations in excess of $9,000. My bill would permit both the city of New York and these private contributors to be reimbursed for up to 80 percent of the expenditures which they made prior to the date of the enactment of this legislation.

The value of modern sodium lighting in the war against nighttime crime in the streets has been demonstrated around the country. In Washington, D.C., sodium lighting cut the rate of crime in high crime areas by 31 percent. In Gary, Ind., criminal assaults dropped by 70 percent and robberies by 60 percent after this lighting was installed. Crime in a chronic problem area of Chattanooga, Tenn., plunged by 70 percent following the initiation of a sodium street light program.

The major cities of this country are in a state of spiraling decline. Shopping areas are deserted after nightfall, theater and restaurant attendance has dwindled, law-abiding residents lock themselves inside their homes, and a sordid collection of muggers, thieves, and rapists prowl the streets. One step in attempting to reverse this decline is the improvement of street lighting. Police patrolling will be facilitated and the citizens who do an honest day's work for an honest day's dollar will be able to venture onto city streets in greater safety.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The bill adds a new part, designated part F, to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968:

PART F

Section 461 states that the purpose of the bill is to encourage improved street lighting in urban areas.

Section 462 directs the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to make grants to local urban governments whose populations exceed 100,000 for the installation of high pressure sodium lighting. Section 463 authorizes the LEAA to reimburse local urban governments, civic organizations, and private persons for expenditures made to install high pressure sodium lighting on public streets prior to the passage of the bill. Section 464 establishes that the LEAA grants may be made in amounts up to 80% of the cost of installation of the sodium street lighting. Section 465 authorizes annual appropriations of $50,000,000 for fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976 for the purposes of funding this program.

DIVORCING MARITAL STATUS AND VOTER REGISTRATION

(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 one of the first public officials to propose wider use of "Ms." to permit women to keep their marital status private if they so desire, I have been interested to see this idea catch on.

For the most part the use of prefixes to refer to women is and ought to be a matter of choice and not of law. With regard to voter registration, however, there is need for legislative action. Several States require women to designate themselves "Miss" or "Mrs.," while no designation of marital status is required of men.

With that in mind, I introduced in 1971, and am today reintroducing, legislation designed to take the sexual bias out of voter registration. This legislation will enable women, on an equal footing with men, to register to vote without disclosing their personal marital status unless such disclosure in order to register is also required of men.

It is unjust, it seems to me, to deny privacy to women while permitting it for men. My bill would not disallow women from registering as "Miss" or "Mrs." if they so desire. It would, however, give women who wish to use the "Ms." form the legal right to the privacy that affords in every State where men are permitted to keep their marital status private by using "Mr." or no prefix at all before their names.

An article reporting recent developments in the use of "Ms.," and the text of my bill, follow:

AN "OPTIONAL TITLE" TO GPO: "MS." TAKES ANOTHER STEP FORWARD

(By Joanne Omang)

It will be officially correct later this month to use the term "Ms." in all government publications, even—should some bureaucrats so desire and the women not object—to refer to Ms. Nixon and Ms. America.

The revised edition of the Government Printing Office's style book will for the first time, include "Ms." in its list of acceptable prefixes, identifying it as "an optional feminine title without marital designation." It was a long time reaching this level of respectability.

"Grammarians are still wrestling with it," said Robert Kling, special assistant to the GPO public printer. "It's not a true abbreviation, it has no spelled-out form, no accepted pronunciation, no plural and no foreign-language counterpart. In fact, there's been quite a ring-ding about it."

Generally pronounced "Miz," the term has been used for at least three decades by direct-mail advertisers and people sending bills to avoid mislabeling women either "Mrs." or "Miss." "It's been more of a convenience for us than anything anybody's requested," said Joseph Nichols, BankAmericard credit manager in Washington. "We've used it for ages," agreed Bob Christian, D.C. public relations director for Eastern Airlines.

That is just the point, say the women's liberationists who began working in mid-1970 to popularize the term. "A man is just 'Mr.' and it's nobody's business whether he's married or not," said Joanne Edgar, an editor of Ms. magazine. "Why should women be forced to proclaim their marital status? It's a downright invasion of privacy."

Her view is not universally shared. The Rockville (Conn.) Journal-Inquirer began using "Ms." last February in place of all "Miss" and "Mrs." designations, but dropped the practice three months later when a poll showed that 82 per cent of those responding disliked the term.

Henry Pearlman of the Washington branch of Dependable Mailing Lists, Inc., said those who compile his 9,000 lists of names tend to use a woman's given name without any prefix rather than using Ms. if her marital status is unknown. "It's not popularly accepted," he said. "Why be offensive if you don't have to be?"

Nonetheless, the term's use is expanding, if slowly. "At least nobody says anymore, 'What's that?'" said Ms. editor Ms. Edgar. "When we first started the magazine we had to do an awful lot of explaining as to what it was, but not anymore."

Businesses don't keep records on how many women scratch out all the available choices on application forms and write in "Ms." and neither does the government.

Zeller & Letica, Inc., a New York mailing list compilation firm the vice president of which is a woman, reports noticing increased use of "Ms." within the past six months.

The marketing director of a large East Coast mailing list broker, who declined to be identified, said things had reached the point where his firm was considering putting together a separate list of women who had requested "Ms." be used on their personalized checks, bills, credit cards, airplane tickets or on anything else.

That list would be full of militants, he indicated, because most of the foregoing checks, bills, etc., are normally issued to neither "Miss," "Mrs.," "Mr." or "Ms." but to titleless John or Jane Doe for convenience's sake. Officials queried all reported a scattering of "Ms." labels on those documents.

The same situation prevails in the stationery and card field where the women who prefer "Ms." are apparently not making many personalized purchases.

"Not once. No one. Never. Nobody," reported Lawrence Straus, manager of Falls Church Stationers at 1049 W. Broad St., Falls Church. "But if they asked, sure."

Emily Sheridan, owner of Sheridan Engravers in Bethesda, got to thinking about it as she talked. "I do 'Mrs.' cards for older people and 'Miss' for the high school graduates," she said. "It gets complicated when you're widowed, like I am, or divorced, when

you have to say 'Mrs.' with your own name and then the husband's and so on.

"In fact, you can put 'Ms.' in front of my name and I think I'll use it from now on."

Like Ms. Sheridan, Rep. Bella S. Abzug (D-N.Y.) has decided to use the feminist designation and after many demands managed to get the Congressional Record to list her as Ms. Abzug. Legislation she has introduced would prohibit any government agency from using a prefix that indicates marital status, and it is cosponsored this year by six other members of Congress, all men.

Rep. Jonathan Bingham, also a New York Democrat, plans to reintroduce a bill this year providing that no one be required to indicate marital status when registering to vote. In California, a bill allowing women to register as "Ms." passed the state senate last year, and in Princeton the Gallup organization is preparing a poll on what American women think of the term.

And perhaps the final sign that "Miss" and "Mrs." face serious challenges comes from France, where Justice Minister Rene Pleven, in the Journal Official, ruled last September that a woman could be called "Madame" even if she were a "mademoiselle" on grounds neither term has any legal significance.

H.R. 3925

To make requirements with respect to the disclosure of marital status the same for men and women in matters relating to voting qualifications in Federal elections

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and by inserting at the end of such paragraph the following new subparagraph:

"(D) in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law or laws to vote in any Federal election, require individuals of one sex to disclose their marital status if the same disclosure is not required of individuals of the opposite sex."

CITIZENS ANTICRIME PATROL ASSISTANCE ACT

(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 have reintroduced for consideration in the 93d Congress the Citizens Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act, which I originated and first introduced in the 92d Congress on December 13, 1971.

The Citizens Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act, Mr. Speaker, would amend the Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make available funds specifically to encourage and assist responsible citizens groups who wish to perform or are performing anticrime patrol services in their respective communities. The bill would authorize $50 million for fiscal year 1974, $75 million for fiscal year 1975, and $100 million for fiscal year 1976 for that purpose.

Since I first introduced this legislation in 1971, I have heard from many citizens anticrime groups from around the country who have reported on their activities and indicated their enthusiastic support for this kind of legislation. They have indicated that, while their costs generally are small, they support their programs from their own pockets, and many citizens who would like to participate find it difficult to do so because of the personal costs involved. They report that small amounts of Federal assistance, of the type proposed by my bill, would do a great deal to stimulate involvement by citizens in organized anticrime programs.

Mr. Speaker, the President has been talking a lot lately about turning initiative and decisionmaking back to the people, and there is considerable merit to that position. The growth of citizens anticrime groups around the country is a good example of increased public initiative and involvement. But, as a practical matter, such public initiatives cannot continue without at least minimal assistance from government. The Citizens Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act would provide help directly from the Federal Government by way of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to citizens anticrime groups, bypassing the massive State and local bureaucracy that has been set up to administer the safe streets funds and that is partly responsible for the fact that few if any citizens groups receive financial help under the safe streets program as it now operates.

The bill sets broad limits on the programs to be funded. It requires that the citizens coordinate their activities with local law enforcement officials and authorities that they have demonstrable community support, and that they adopt a specific plan to assure respect for the civil rights of the community. Federal grants under the program could be "used to pay the costs of stipends to, and necessary training and equipment of, residents' organization members" performing anticrime services, but no funds may be used "for the purchase, lease, rental, maintenance, or use of any firearm, chemical agent, or other weapon, or the purchase, lease, rental, or maintenance of any motor vehicle."

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this bill and the entire matter of citizen anticrime patrols, their effectiveness, organization, and proper role in crime control, would be a most appropriate one for investigation and full consideration by the House Select Committee on Crime should this Congress, in its wisdom, reestablish that committee. There are a great many questions to be answered and cases of existing citizen anticrime efforts to be examined which the standing committees simply cannot be expected to have time to delve into given the long lists of existing programs and legislation they are expected to monitor and act upon.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime, under the guidance of its very able and distinguished Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), has performed a most useful function in probing in detail such matters as the relationship between drugs and crime, the facts of the juvenile delinquency problem, and so forth. These are problems in which the public has a special interest. They are problems which cut across the jurisdictions and programs of the standing committees. They are highly complex social problems which require careful and extensive examination on a continuing basis. I believe the Select Committee on Crime has been most helpful to the Members and to the various standing committees in this respect, and that it should be applauded and reactivated by the House for the 93d Congress.

A great many Members of this House, I am sure, are aware of the need for greater citizen participation in crime-prevention and detection, and of the existence of citizen anticrime organizations and operations in their own congressional districts. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Congress give these groups more attention; that we look into what they are doing and should be doing to assist, influence, and support the Federal Government. The Citizens Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act which I have reintroduced provides a focus for such action. It proposes a workable program to encourage and assist citizen anticrime efforts. It would provide a means of Federal guidance to assure that citizens perform anticrime services to their communities in a responsible manner. I hope and urge that the Select Committee on Crime will take up this most important and constructive response to the crime situation, and that it will be enacted by the Congress in conjunction with the renewal of the safe streets program.

People in the streets, Mr. Speaker, are the best deterrent to crime in the streets. The Citizens Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act is a needed step to begin bringing people back to the streets.

PRISONER OF WAR TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1973

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remraks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide extensive tax relief for the American military and civilian prisoners of war who are returning from the Indochina conflict.

The Department of Defense lists 589 men as prisoners of war and 1,222 as missing in action. To date, North Vietnam has confirmed 562 military and 29 civilian prisoners of war. These men have endured awesome hardships, and they have truly been sacrificial victims of America's tragic involvement in the struggle in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Some have suffered from serious wounds and diseases, and all have undergone the trauma of separation from their familes and homes. Among these returning men are individuals who have spent more time in captivity as prisoners of war than any other military personnel in American history.

Many of us Members of Congress have long criticized the U.S. involvement in Indochina and have argued for speedy withdrawal. However, our dissatisfaction with national policy was never a criticism of the American personnel who were ordered to military service in Indochina. Trained to obey their commanders, these men discharged their duties and paid a terrible price.

Unfortunately, there is nothing which

this Congress can do to give back to the returning POW's the lost years of their lives. It is obvious that financial compensation can never repay these men for the uncertainty, deprivation, loneliness, and desperation to which they were subjected, but it is the responsibility of Congress to make their reentry into American society as painless as possible.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation which would provide maximum tax relief for the returning prisoners and their families in order to alleviate their financial burdens and to release them from the obligation of filing Federal income tax returns in 1973 and 1974.

My proposal consists of three provisions.

First, all income received by a prisoner of war during a year in which he was in captivity would be exempt from Federal taxation. Thus, a prisoner returning in February 1973 would not pay tax on income received during this year or during any other year part of which he was in captivity. Present law provides that military or civilian wages earned for any month of captivity shall not be taxed. My proposal goes well beyond that and exempts all income, including capital gains and investment income, earned during a year any part of which was spent in Communist captivity. Full Federal refunds would be paid to returning POWs who had previously been taxed on income earned while in captivity.

Second, in the year in which a prisoner returns from Indochina the first $20,000 of his wife's income would be exempt from Federal tax. The wives of POWs have also suffered terribly from the separations imposed by the war, and this provision would relieve them of the burden of paying income tax during the year of their husbands' return.

Third, military salaries and bonuses paid to servicemen for their period of captivity would be exempt from State and local taxation, and State and local governments would be encouraged to relieve their nonmilitary income from tax liability.

Mr. Speaker, the scars of our Indochina involvement will be printed on the conscience of this Nation for many years to come. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians have lost their lives or have been injured and maimed. Countless villages, towns, and cities have been destroyed. Over 45,000 Americans were killed in combat, and more than a quarter of a million were wounded. Thousands of our troops returned from Vietnam as heroin addicts and large amounts of dangerous narcotics have found their way from Asia onto the streets of our own cities. Many young American men followed their consciences and have accepted prison here or exile in Canada and Sweden rather than enter military service. Pressing domestic needs went begging while vast portions of our national budget were squandered on this useless and arrogant military adventure.

Now that a cease-fire agreement has been signed and all our troops are at last returning, Congress has two major legislative priorities facing it. First, we must insure that our military involvement in Indochina is terminated for good and that no decision is made by the President to recommit our forces in Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia. To achieve that end, I have already introduced legislation cosponsored by 44 Members of the House of Representatives. (H.R. 3349, see pages 2869–2870 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 31, 1973.) Second, we must exert all possible efforts to compensate those who have suffered the consequences of our involvement in Indochina. Among that group are the returning prisoners of war.

The February 7, 1973, edition of the New York Times carried a column by James Reston focusing on our national obligation to the returning prisoners of war, I am appending that column, entitled "A Debt of Honor," to my statement.

Back in 1775, Thomas Paine wrote that "the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will shrink from the service of their country." The men who will be returning over the next 2 months from incarceration in Indochina were men who served their country and sacrificed years of their lives. In the hope that we shall not forget the debt this Nation owes to them, I am offering this legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 states that the title of the act is the "Prisoner of War Relief Act of 1973."

Section 2, part (a), amends chapter 1, subchapter B, part III of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by redesignating section 124 as section 125 and by adding a new section 124.

New section 124, subsection (a) excludes from gross income all income earned by an individual during a taxable year any part of which was spent as a prisoner of war in Indochina. This subsection also excludes from gross income the first $20,000 of income of the spouse of a prisoner of war in the year of the prisoner's release.

Subsection (b) defines missing status, employee, and missing serviceman.

Subsection (c) defines spouse of a missing serviceman for the purposes of subsection (b).

Subsection (d) defines the period of the Indochina conflict as running from February 28, 1961 until the date designated by Executive order of the President as the date of termination of combatant activities in Vietnam.

Section 2, parts (b), (c), (d), conforms other parts of the Internal Revenue Code to this legislation.

Section 2, part (e) provides for refunds on Federal tax previously paid by prisoners of war on income described in the new section 124.

Section 3 amends chapter 10, title 37, of the United States Code by adding a new section 559.

New section 559. Subsection (a) provides that no compensation paid to a member of the U.S. armed services for a month during any part of which he was a prisoner of war shall be subject to State or local taxation.

Subsection (b) conforms the table of sections for chapter 10 of the U.S. Code to this legislation.

Subsection (c) provides that State statutes of limitations shall not prevent State refunds of taxes already collected on income described in subsection (a) of new section 559.

Subsection (d) urges State and local governments to relieve returning prisoners of tax liability on income other than the military compensation described in subsection (a).

The article referred to follows:

A DEBT OF HONOR

(By James Reston)

After the return of the prisoners from Vietnam, after all the counsoling ceremonies at the White House, and the family reunions and tears on television, the reality for the prisoners coming home at last will begin in private. When they come home from Vietnam, what will they find?

The rest of us will never really understand. Most of us in this big continental country never had a son or relation killed or maimed in Vietnam. America lost over 46,000 dead, but, for most of us, this was a statistic in the papers and not a tragedy in the family or down the street.

For the liberated prisoners and their families, however, it is an intensely personal crisis. On the television it looks like a reunion of lovers and families, but in reality, it is a reunion of strangers.

The prisoners come back different men, usually helpless or rebellious. They have had to surrender to endure. Many of them have literally been "killing time," which means killing their fears, blotting out the present, romanticizing the past and dreaming of a family and an America that are changed beyond their imagining.

In the history of the Republic, the Vietnam war will probably look like a capricious incident, but the United States was already involved in it casually but carefully under President Eisenhower in 1953, twenty years ago, and much more deeply involved under President Kennedy in 1963. In family terms, this is a very long time.

The Census Bureau in Washington tells us that over half the people in the United States are now under 28 years of age. This means that most of our people cannot even remember much before we were involved in Vietnam. And in the lives of the prisoners now coming home, most of whom are under 25, Vietnam dominates everything.

They not only come home different men, but come home to the same but different and older wives, different children, a different country, with different memories and different values. After the reunion and the celebration, trying to sort all this out at home and in the community is bound to be an agony.

The least that can be done for these returning prisoners is to see that they are given good jobs and relieved of the economic anxiety and taking care of the security of their wives and the education of their children. But even this is not enough.

No doubt the communities they return to will see that they are employed, but after a few years it is easy to forget. So while the President and the Congress are now celebrating the courage and endurance of the prisoners, maybe they should agree on a prisoners bill that would ensure the economic security of these families during the coming years, when they will still be struggling with the consequences of Vietnam, long after most people have forgotten.

After all, the prisoners amount to only a few hundreds, and their sacrifice is not as great as the tens of thousands who were killed in the struggle, but they are a symbol of the tragedy of the Vietnam war and the conscience of America, and if the Government is as sympathetic and grateful as it now says, maybe it should not only welcome

them home but give them a chance for a secure economic future after the celebrations are over.

If the returning American prisoners are to be dealt with practically, and not merely politically and romantically, legislation must be introduced now, with the support of the President and the leaders of the Congress, to relieve these families of their economic anxieties.

The Government cannot wipe out their memories. The war has gone on too long and many of them have been in prison for too many years to regain a normal family life or readjust to the value and styles of America that changed so much while they were in prison.

Some of the prisoners will have been strengthened by sacrifice and adversity, and will come back to families ennobled by sorrow and fidelity; but others will be overwhelmed by remorse, and even the austere and faithful families may have trouble with their wayward children.

For a returning prisoner to deal with all this, even in the best of circumstances, to make decisions when for years he had no power of decision, to get to know himself at another time of life, and his wife, and his growing and transformed children—this is a challenge beyond the reach of most men.

Right now, however, when the President and the Congress are conscious of the returning prisoners' problems, there is at least a chance to ease his economic burdens in a time of inflation and unemployment, and give him time to think and sort things out.

Speeches of gratitude from the President, which are undoubtedly sincere, and homecoming celebrations and parades on Main Street, are not really enough. These prisoners and their families need to be relieved for a time of economic worries to deal with their personal and family anxieties, and a Government that speaks of "peace with honor" owes them a debt of honor, which so far has not been paid.

THE CRISIS AT PANAMA: A THREE-PRONGED ASSAULT ON CANAL ZONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in numerous addresses in the Congress and statements before congressional committees about interoceanic canal problems over many years, I have presented in considerable detail the evolution of U.S. Isthmian Canal policies and thus am reluctant to belabor you with another recital of all of this historical background. For those seeking information on it attention is invited to the volume of my addresses on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions"—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress—and to my testimony on September 22, 1971, before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and on December 6, 1971, before the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal.

PANAMA CANAL FORMS PART OF U.S. COASTLINE

A reading of the above-mentioned sources will conclusively establish that the Canal Zone and Panama Canal are constitutionally acquired territory and property of the United States. Exclusive sovereign rights, power and authority in perpetuity, were obtained by treaty grant from Panama, the successor state to Colombia, after the Panama Revolution of 1903. In addition, title to all privately owned land and property in the Zone was obtained by the United States through purchase from individual property owners. The cost of the Canal Zone acquisition as estimated in 1964 was $144,568,571, which is more than the costs of all other U.S. territorial acquisitions combined.

Constructed by the United States, the Panama Canal has been subsequently efficiently maintained, operated and protected by the United States. The Canal Zone, as the indispensable protective frame of the canal, has been sanitated and governed by the United States, making it a model for emulation by other tropical areas.

Including defense, the Panama Canal enterprise from 1904 to June 30, 1971, represented an investment of $5,695,745,000 of our taxpayers' money.

During the fiscal year 1971 there were a total of 14,617 transits of vessels with a total cargo of 121,010,654 long tons. Some 70 percent of this traffic either originated in or terminated in other U.S. ports.

Such data, in a realistic sense, confirms what some of our leading statesmen have so often said: the Panama Canal is a part of the coastline of the United States. Its protection is just as important in the defense of the Western Hemisphere as is that of the Chesapeake or San Francisco Bays.

SUSPENDED TREATY TALKS RESUMED, NOVEMBER 29, 1971

In 1967 when the terms of three proposed new Panama Canal treaties, negotiated after the 1964 Panamanian mob assault on the Canal Zone, were published, the reactions against them in Panama, in the United States, and in the Congress, were so strong that they were never signed. Thoughtful editors in our country expressed the hope that they would be allowed to die. But this was not to be.

On October 11, 1968, the constitutional government of President Arnulfo Arias of Panama, in office only 11 days, was overthrown in a military coup d'etat led by a small radical group, among them Omar Torrijos. It is significant that in the preceding Panama election campaign, candidate Arias did not make the Panama Canal an issue but did appeal for Panamanians to develop the natural resources of the interior of their own country.

The revolutionary Government of Panama promptly abolished its National Assembly, established closer relations with Cuba, accepted U.S.S.R. agents in Government departments, inaugurated a worldwide campaign of hate against the United States, and adopted a new constitution enabling Torrijos to remain in power indefinitely as chief of government and commandant of the national guard. Such facts, together with increasing truculence on the part of Panamanian officials, can only be explained by a growing reliance on Communist advisers.

The Secretary of State of the United States, William P. Rogers, on June 26, 1970, in a talk with Foreign Minister Juan Antonio Tack of Panama in the Pan American Union Building in Washington, requested that the negotiations for new canal treaties be resumed—Dr. Jorge Illueca address, University of Panama, December 12, 1972. Despite the formal rejection on August 5, 1970, by the revolutionary government of the proposed 1967 treaties, the Presidents of Panama and the United States met on October 25 of that year in the White House and agreed to resume the negotiations, which started on November 29, 1971.

THOUGHTFUL PANAMANIANS OPPOSE U.S. SURRENDER

In much of the propaganda in these connections, I have noted the tendency not only among Panamanian demagogs but also among many writers in the United States and certain officials in our own Government to picture the debate over continued U.S. control of the Panama Canal as being one between the people of Panama and U.S. citizens in canal service who are contemptuously referred to as the "Zonians." There could be no greater distortion. U.S. citizens in the zone, who are correctly known as Zonites, are loyal U.S. officials and employees who have the heavy burden of keeping the canal operating and in protecting it in one of the most oppressive climates of the world and in an area notorious as a land of endemic revolution and political instability.

They know from personal observation and history that were the directing hand of the United States ever withdrawn the canal could not last long and would probably revert to the jungle as occurred in 1889 after the tragic French canal failure and in 1945 to our defense bases after the closing of many defense installations. No one understands the weaknesses of the Panamanians better than some of their own leaders who are strongly opposed to any surrender of U.S. sovereignty to Panama, the economy of which in 1971 received from U.S. Canal Zone sources more than $168,092,000.

In addition, from 1946 through 1972 it received a total of $496,400,000 in direct and indirect U.S. economic and military aid programs. The effect of these programs has been to give Panama one of the highest per capita incomes in all of Latin America and to make it a major beneficiary of the canal enterprise.

Thoughtful Panamanian leaders also ponder what they would do to escape assassination should the Canal Zone be surrendered to Panama. As to such surrender, to which I am strongly opposed under any conditions, it would be far better to cede it to Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus before November 3, 1903, rather than to Panama.

In reply to those who wish to increase the dignity of Panama by ceding the Canal Zone, that country is not a strong nation like Great Britain, France, Germany, or Japan, but a weak one with a population of 1,428,082 about one-third of which lives near the Canal Zone. This emphasizes Panama's dependency on U.S. agencies in the zone. No wonder many Panamanians look upon the canal as their lunch counter. The more thoughtful ones realize that Panama could never stand up against the pressures that would inevitably arise should the United States

surrender our indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority.

PANAMA CANAL—PRIME TARGET FOR CARIBBEAN CONQUEST

As the revived canal diplomatic negotiations proceeded, Panamanian radical leaders took an increasingly severe position against the United States, which was accompanied by much hate propaganda. This hostility was emphasized in 1972 in the expropriation by force of arms of the American-owned Panama Power & Light Co., the hijacking at pistol point of 17 Canal Zone buses and the involvement of high Panamanian officials in the narcotics traffic to the United States—House Report No. 92–1629. The effects of these truculent actions was aggravated by the failure of our appeasement-minded officials in the State Department to meet the challenge, which, in line with Communist technique, was really a probing of the strength of our determination to stand up for the just rights of the United States.

As I have repeatedly stated in the Congress, the Caribbean is our fourth front in which the Panama Canal is the prime target for the control of the Western Hemisphere. The importance of this area was instinctively recognized by such leaders as Admiral Mahan, William Howard Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Charles Evans Hughes and cannot be ignored, for the isthmus has become a focal point in the struggle for world power. The real issue there is not U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone versus Panamanian but undiluted U.S. control of the zone versus U.S.S.R. domination of the Panama Canal and the Caribbean region, with the Canal Zone serving as a Soviet base.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal is not a toy for diplomatic playboys but the strategic center of the Americas on which the eyes of the world are now focused. The time for diplomatic dalliance and weakness in regard to its juridical structure is over.

JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN DISPOSAL OF U.S. TERRITORY OR PROPERTY

One of the main points in the current inquiry by the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal under the able leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) has been the clarification of the authority of the House of Representatives as regards the proposal to cede U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Initially in its hearings, both the State and Justice Departments took the view that this could be done without House authorization in spite of the provision in the U.S. Constitution that vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress, which branch of our Government includes the House as well as the Senate. The subcommittee's report concluded that, before such disposal can be made, "the authority of the U.S. House of Representatives is required"—House Report No. 92–1629, page 21. Thus its inquiry has emphasized a vital constitutional safeguard against executive dismemberment of the U.S. territory which, in the negotiations for the proposed 1967 treaties, was wholly ignored by our responsible officials. Furthermore, the Constitution places a heavy responsibility on this body that cannot be evaded.

STATUS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AS REGARDS THE PANAMA CANAL

Panamanian officials have frequently stated that in the event of being unable to negotiate a treaty satisfactory to them, they would take other measures, including an appeal to the United Nations. What is the authority of that body as regards such vital U.S. territories as the Canal Zone?

Article 2, section 7 of the U.N. Charter states that nothing in it shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter."

Article 80, section I of the Charter states that as regards the trustee syststem "nothing in this Charter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments."

In addition to the 1903 canal treaty with Panama, the United States has treaties with both Colombia and Great Britain, which would inevitably be in conflict with any major change in the existing 1903 Panama Canal Treaty.

It is indeed interesting to note that 1903 was the year in which the construction of the trans-Siberian railroad was completed. This together with the opening of the Panama Canal advanced the time when the world's two largest nations would directly confront each other in the Pacific. It is also significant that after World War II, Alger Hiss, a Soviet agent in the State Department, when transmitting a 1946 report of the Governor of the Panama Canal to the United Nations, incorrectly described the Canal Zone as "occupied territory".

PANAMANIAN THREATS TO CANAL ZONE

On January 16, 1973, the U.N. Security Council, on invitation of Aquilino Boyd, the radical Panamanian representative in that body, and against the token low key opposition by the U.S. representative, decided to hold a series of meetings of the Council starting on March 15 in Panama. Nor should it be overlooked that Boyd is the same radical who in 1958 led an anti-U.S. demonstration into the Canal Zone, and will be President of the Council during the scheduled meetings.

My information is that at the same time our Ambassador to the United Nations was verbally opposing the decision, some of his subordinates were actually encouraging the Panamanian representative to extend the invitation.

It is, Mr. Speaker, reprehensible that our Ambassador did not vote against the action, for its purpose is obvious—to encourage wresting control of the Canal Zone from the United States. It is significant that the Panamanian proposal received strong support from the U.S.S.R., Red China, India, Yugoslavia, and Indonesia, nations that have been major recipients of U.S. generosity. The time has certainly come to end such duplicity in the conduct of vital foreign policy matters that affect the security of the Panama Canal.

Nor should the fact be over looked that Panamanian officials have often stated that if they cannot secure possession of the Canal Zone peacefully, they will do so by force even if it requires the lives of a generation of Panamanian youth.

Briefly stated, the United States now faces a potential three pronged and outrageous assault on the Canal Zone: First, one via treaty negotiations through the State Department; second, another by means of the United Nations; and third, a third by an invasion of the Canal Zone by the Panamanian National Guard and mobs, which could include sabotage of vital canal structures if not properly guarded.

Certainly there is no choice except to be ready for all three fronts. The first step in preparing to meet these challenges is for this House of the Congress to show its determined opposition to any surrender at Panama. As to that, Mr. Speaker, I know from an extensive correspondence that the people of our country are far ahead of their government in correctly evaluating the Isthmian situation. They will be watching to see who supports and who does not support the pending Canal Zone sovereignty resolutions.

In these connections, it should be remembered that until World War II the U.S. Navy had stationed in the Caribbean-Central American region what was called the special service squadron for diplomatic missions under the direct control of the Chief of Navy Operations. This unit, by making courtesy calls, served the people of those countries well and at times helped to avoid needless bloodshed for which I shall cite only one example: Cuba in 1933. Certainly, the present situation at Panama is an appropriate occasion for our government to reactivate the special service squadron with Balboa as its home port.

PURPOSES OF THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING IN PANAMA

As a result of steady and close observation of Caribbean problems over many years, I have been able to foresee crises well in advance. Among them were: the Panamanian flag-planting forays in 1958 into the Canal Zone, mob attack against it in 1959, the formal raising in the zone in 1960 of the Panama flag, and the Dominican crisis in 1964; and to give timely warning to proper authorities in addresses in the Congress. I am not a prophet or any other kind of seer but a student of history and, as such, have no difficulty in foreseeing what may happen when the projected U.N. Security Council meets in Panama, March 15–21. It obviously will be used in:

First, wringing greater concessions from the United States by political blackmail;

Second, inviting intervention by the U.N. in the internal affairs of the United States;

Third, inciting a "peaceful" invasion of the Canal Zone, with resulting loss of life, sabotage, and property damage in an attempted take over of the Canal Zone by force.

Mr. Speaker, it is naive to think that

such program as that contemplated by Panamanian revolutionary leaders is solely their own. It conforms with the Communist program for getting control of strategic waterways and with the ideas of some of our own theorists who seek their internationalization. In view of the power of the United States, Panamanian officials would not dare to act as they have if they did not have their collaborators, including some in our own government.

As all who have followed my public career know, I have always looked upon the United Nations as a great hope of mankind. As long as that body stays within the limits of its authority, it is safe and will be supported. But when it undertakes to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States such as the Panama Canal, it will be in serious trouble. I know from my many correspondents from various parts of the Nation and abroad, the feeling of our people as regards the great isthmian waterway. Should they be forced to choose between the United Nations and U.S. control of the Panama Canal they will reject the U.N. and retain the canal.

PLAN FOR ACTION

Mr. Speaker, the current negotiations relative to the Panama Canal have been intermittently in progress since 1964. Started on the unconstitutional basis of an Executive-agreed-upon surrender to Panama of the Canal Zone, there was really nothing to negotiate and our officials have been rendered impotent and thus unable to resist brainwashing.

There does not appear to be in the entire Department of State anyone of the capacity of Secretary Charles Evans Hughes who, when faced with a similar situation in 1923, called in the Panamanian Minister and bluntly told him that it was "an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part" of U.S. sovereign rights, power, and authority acquired under the 1903 treaty—Foreign Relations, 1923, volume III, page 684.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the U.N. Security Council to hold its March 15–21, 1973, meetings in Panama has been made and it is too much to expect from routine officials that it will be rescinded. There is no course for our Government except to prepare to meet the forthcoming challenge and I propose the following program:

First. Cognizant committees of the Congress investigate the failure on January 16, by the responsible officials of our Government to prevent the planned March 15–21 U.N. Security Council meetings in Panama.

Second. House of Representatives adopt the pending "Canal Zone Sovereignty and Jurisdiction" resolutions.

Third. U.S. Senate adopt resolutions denouncing the proposed U.N. intervention in the matters wholly within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States in the Canal Zone and calling for retention of our undiluted sovereignty over the zone and canal.

Fourth. Canal Zone civil and military authorities plan for eventualities that could endanger the lives of our citizens, injure the canal or interfere with its normal operation.

Fifth. Reactivate the special service squadron with its home port at Balboa, Canal Zone.

As partial documentation, I quote six papers as part of my remarks and invite special attention to the newsstories by Jeremiah O'Leary and the latest resolution of the American Legion:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1973]

U.N. COUNCIL TO GO TO PANAMA IN MARCH

(By Robert Alden)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The Security Council decided today to hold a series of meetings in Panama City beginning March 15 on matters concerning Latin America.

The action was taken without a formal vote and despite serious reservations expressed by the United States and Britain. Neither, however, was prepared to exercise its veto to block what was clearly the will of the 15-member body.

Sir Colin Crowe of Britain said he did not feel it was wise of the Council, in the event of a sudden world emergency, to be separated from its base, its records, its communications and other facilities unless there were other overriding reasons.

These reasons do not exist in the case of the proposed meetings in Panama City, Sir Colin said.

Strong support for the Panamanian proposal came from the Soviet Union, France, China, Guinea, Peru, India, Kenya, the Sudan, Yugoslavia and Indonesia.

The United States was particularly vehement in its expression of disapproval of the holding of the meetings in Panama City, since it will bring about what is expected to be abrasive airing in a hostile atmosphere of the dispute between Panama and the United States over the matter of the Panama Canal Zone.

Aquilino E. Boyd of Panama, who extended the invitation for the meetings in Panama, said today that a "semi-colonial" situation existed in all of Latin America and that it existed in particular in "the so-called Panama Canal zone" where "a colonial situation divides Panama into two parts preventing the political, economic and social integration" of his country.

Mr. Boyd called the zone "a hotbed of international tensions, where a dangerous situation, potentially explosive, exists."

"Panama claims effective sovereignty and exclusive jurisdiction over the area involved," he said. "A power foreign to the territory of Panama occupies the area and the Council is needed to eliminate conflict" regarding the canal.

Speaking for the United States, George H. Bush replied that it was essential for the proper functioning of the Council that a meeting not be conceived as a means for bringing pressure on bilateral issues not currently before the Council.

"Ambassador Boyd," Mr. Rush said, "has raised such an issue in mentioning the Panama Canal, the status of which is under active bilateral negotiations. With due reference to the history of the area and the issues, we, of course, do not accept the contention that the Canal Zone is an 'inner colonialist enclave.' "

Mr. Bush recalled that members of the Council had earlier expressed concern about holding meetings where public opinion could affect the work of the Council.

"In this case, it is already evident that the prospect of this meeting is stimulating a heated propaganda campaign in Panama, which will not be conducive to the kind of atmosphere needed for Security Council meetings or be helpful for the future course of bilateral negotiations," he said.

Meetings of the Security Council away from the United Nations headquarters in New York have been rare. In 1948 and again in 1951 meetings were held in Paris, concurrently with the General Assembly, which was also in session there.

Early last year, the Council met in Addis Ababa to discuss matters of concern to Africa as the result of an invitation from the Organization of African Unity.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1973]

PANAMA ASKS U.N. AID ON CANAL

UNITED NATIONS.—Panama charged today that a dangerous situation, potentially explosive, exists in the U.S.-controlled Canal Zone.

Panamanian Ambassador Aquilino Boyd, in appealing for a Security Council meeting in his capital from March 15 to 21, asked for U.N. help to achieve his government's claim of "effective sovereignty and exclusive jurisdiction over the area" through "a new treaty, genuinely just and equitable."

Boyd told the council, which convened at his request, that a "colonialist situation" exists because the 500-square-mile U.S. enclave divides the territory of Panama and "prevents the political, economic and social integration of the republic, contrary to the U.N. Charter."

George Bush, the U.S. ambassador, responded in a low key, saying that the United States "does not accept the contention that the Canal Zone is a colonialist enclave."

But Bush, who leaves the United Nations Wednesday to become chairman of the Republican National Committee, urged the council not to stage a meeting designed to "bring pressure on bilateral issues not before it." The canal dispute, he said, should be dealt with first through bilateral negotiations, which are currently under way, and then through the "existing regional system," the Organization of American States.

"It's kind of a meeting seeking an agenda," Bush said, terming the Panamanian request "capricious, thoughtless and contrived," and suggesting that the precedent might contribute to the "further weakening of the U.N. itself."

Britain and Australia, also expressed technical reservations, but the council agreed without objection to the principle of holding a meeting in Panama on a broad range of Latin American questions, and asked a committee of the whole to report back next week on the details of cost, agenda and travel arrangements.

Privately, U.S. officials expressed the fear that the March meeting in Panama City, which they accept as inevitable, would turn into a forum for the expression of various Latin American grievances against the United States.

Boyd, in his presentation, hinted at this prospect by suggesting that the March meetings deal with "problems of colonialism . . . permanent sovereignty over natural resources . . . disarmament and denuclearized zones." In Latin America, Boyd said, the wealth has been "handed over for centuries to semicolonial exploitation by more industrialized states," and now "the old imperialism seeks new forms to manage and imprison the world."

Continued U.S. jurisdiction over the canal and the zone, he suggested, is foreign control of a natural resource which is contrary to the U.N. Charter.

The canal question was first put on the council agenda in 1964 after riots led to negotiations on a replacement for the 1903 treaty that gives the United States control over the canal and the zone "in perpetuity." Since the topic is still officially on the agenda it is still open to discussion by the council.

The talks deadlocked in 1967, resumed in June, 1971, and remain stymied over the timing and nature of increased Panamanian control and sovereignty over the zone, and the U.S. military pressure inside it.

Latin American diplomats suggest that the pressure generated by a council meeting and the demonstrations that are likely to accompany it might prove embarrassing to Washington, but are not going to change the negotiating picture significantly.

The precedent for council excursions was set one year ago, when 10 days of meetings were held in Addis Ababa to discuss the many African problems on the council agenda. Now some Asian states, the Philippines in particular, are talking of a council meeting in Asia next year.

The cost of the African junket came to $105,000, despite dire predictions of a $500,000 bill. Panama has offered to pay $100,000 of the expenses of this trip.

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 20, 1973]

LATIN AMERICAN STINGS CONTINUE

Many of the nations of Latin America appear to have gained a lot of satisfaction at the recent decision of the United Nations Security Council to hold a meeting in Panama beginning on March 15.

With Aquilino Boyd of Panama presiding over the session and an agenda loaded with subjects of colonialism, sovereignty and hemispheric politics, there will be ample opportunity for those obsessed with the size and strength of the United States of America to condemn and harass us. Panama in particular will use the meeting as a lever to try to dislodge the United States from control of the Panama Canal. The affair will have a sharp focus throughout the world because it will be only the third time since its existence that the United Nations Security Council has met outside of New York.

Like Panama, Peru is bearding the United States, with little apparent fear of reprisal. She has herded another of a long procession of U.S. tunaboat fleets into the port of Talara where they will be held until we pay what has come to be a customary ransom.

Unfortunately, these are not isolated examples of the attitude of many Latin American nations toward their northern neighbor. From Chile to Mexico the harassment of the United States and the tests of our patience, benevolence and charity appear to be increasing.

One of the worst manifestations of the whole affair is that it provides basis for convictions of the so-called Third World nations that the United States is, by choice, a helpless giant, and that the other cheek always will be turned.

The United States, for example, has been making concessions to Panama almost since the day that we acquired control of the canal in 1903. We shrugged—and yielded—even when four U.S. soldiers were killed in the 1964 canal zone rioting. By the same token, we have endured in pained patience the South American extortions from U.S. tuna fishermen for many years, kept a low profile in Chile and meekly accepted considerable unwarranted criticism as well as diplomatic bad manners when President Echeverria of Mexico read off the U.S. Congress and U.S. people during his recent visit to this nation. Indeed, we still are furnishing the gunboats that will harass future tuna fishermen and are assisting every nation in the hemisphere, including Chile, through aid or trade.

Our patience is warranted to a degree, considering our size, strength and leadership role. We do not want to be the neighborhood bully. We could very well be, because the United States is by no means helpless or without economic, political and social power in any nation in Latin America.

The determination that we now have to make as a nation is at just what point we must stop proving to ourselves that we are not a bully, and start behaving with resoluteness.

It would be our feeling that the day has already arrived.

[From the Washington Evening Star and Daily News, Jan. 26, 1973]

PANAMA SESSION BY U.N. TROUBLING

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

There is concern in United States government circles about the possibility of something more than the expected verbal fireworks when the United Nations Security Council meets in Panama March 15 through March 21.

This concern is rooted in the belief that the Panamanian regime of Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos will turn the meeting into, at the least, an anti-U.S., anti-colonialist public relations circus at a time when the two nations are in theory trying to rewrite the Panama Canal Treaty.

Torrijos' Foreign Minister Juan Tack has freely admitted in interviews that Panama anticipates the bilateral problem of U.S.-Panamanian relations to come up during the sessions of the Security Council. How far Torrijos will let the oratory, the public demonstrations and other outbursts go is not known, but the chief of the Guardia Nacional can regulate the temperature of the fervor as he wishes.

TREATY ARRANGEMENT HOPES

If Panama decides to keep the denunciations and the public's patriotic ardor at low pitch, it is possible that the meeting will not generate any fatal blow to hopes for new treaty arrangements regarding the Canal Zone. But if Torrijos decides to pull out all the stops while the U.N. is in Panama, no one can be sure that things will not get out of hand.

Rep. John M. Murphy, D-N.Y., chairman of the House Panama Canal subcommittee and currently the leading critic in Congress of Panama's demands, evidently fears the worst. He plans to hold hearings in early February and call in "those officials responsible for allowing this travesty to occur." Presumably this means Murphy will try to hail State Department officials and some of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. before the House panel.

PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

"The decision of the Security Council to hold these meetings on the Isthmus of Panama," Murphy said, "raises serious legal questions concerning the authority of that body to intervene in the internal affairs of the U.S., of which the Canal Zone is a constitutionally acquired domain."

Murphy figures Panama asked for the Security Council meeting to mount a propaganda campaign and try to wring concessions from the United States in the new treaty negotiations by "focusing world attention on the extravagant demands" of Panama.

Murphy said it is inexcusable that the United States made token objection but did not vote against the Panama meeting of the Security Council.

"I cannot comprehend how the Panamanians, who are facing a financial crisis, can pay the $100,000 cost of holding the meeting in that country unless, of course, they intend to borrow the money from the United States," Murphy said. "The avowed purpose of the current military government of Panama is to seize the Canal Zone by whatever means are expedient. If they fail politically, they have announced they will march on the zone and take it by force even if it takes the lives of a generation of Panamanian youths."

The negotiations on the new treaty suffered another blow recently when Panamanian negotiator Jorge Illueca made public details of the closely held U.S. proposals and Panama's counter-proposals.

NEGOTIATIONS DISCLOSED

The U.S. negotiators face a double handicap, since any treaty they approve, as representatives of President Nixon, must be approved by both the Senate and House. Torrijos has no such problem, since his legislature is obedient.

The United States wants a new treaty that will meet many but not all of Panama's aspirations and apparently is prepared to make major concessions on almost everything but control and security of the waterway. What the U.S. does not want is another repetition of the 1964 collision between Panamanian mobs and U.S. troops.

[From the Washington Sunday Star and Daily News, Feb. 4, 1973]

PANAMA THREATENS VIOLENCE OVER TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Panama's leaders have informed a former senior American diplomat that the isthmian republic has exhausted its patience over the canal treaty negotiations and is at the point of resorting to violence, The Star-News learned today.

This dire message was given to the ex-diplomat by Foreign Minister Juan Tack last month in Panama City after a discussion that included the Panamanian dictator, Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos. The message was relayed immediately to the State Department which is already in a state of deep apprehension over the upcoming meeting of the United Nations Security Council in Panama March 15 through 21.

The fears of the State Department range from the possibility of an outbreak of nationalistic violence by Panama's citizenry, similar to that which led to fighting with the U.S. Army in 1964, to the near-certainty that the United States will be the target of severe attack on charges of colonialism by several Latin nations at the UN sessions.

CRITICISM EXPECTED

There also is apprehension in Foggy Bottom that the anti-U.S. atmosphere at the Security Council meeting will be increased by the possible presence there of Prime Minister Fidel Castro of Cuba.

Castro, some diplomats feel, will not overlook this chance to castigate the United States on a wide range of subjects from the American-held naval base at Guantanamo Bay to the occasional anti-Castro exile activity against the Havana regime.

Observers believe the United States may be assailed by: Chile, because of its problems in selling copper as a result of U.S. pressure in behalf of an American firm and the failure of any multinational loans to be approved for Santiago since Marxist President Salvador Allende took office; Ecuador and Peru, over the tuna-fishing problem off their coasts and Venezuela, because of the touchy oil quota situation. Panama is regarded as certain to use the UN Security Council as a sounding board for fierce denunciations of the long-drawnout negotiations over the Canal Zone.

DENUNCIATORY SPEECHES

Torrijos and Tack reportedly told the former diplomat that they knew the State Department was powerless in the negotiations over the canal and the U.S.-occupied zone on either side of it. They indicated that President Nixon, if he chose, could take action to make major concessions in Panama just as he did in the case of returning Okinawa to Japan.

But they said that they also knew that they had no other way of attracting Nixon's interest in Panama and the canal controversy than by resorting to violence. And they urged

the ex-diplomat to relay this word to Washington.

The general assessment in the United States is that Torrijos, who commands Panama's 5,000-man Guardia National, has the power to turn on the heat or to suppress it as he wishes. Recent speeches and broadcasts by Panamanian officials subservient to Torijos have been couched in denunciatory and implacable terms.

Some Washington sources believe the Panamanian strategy will be to try to make a strong propaganda and legal case for their aspirations for major concessions from the United States on the canal. Torrijos, they believe, would not permit violence to break out while the U.N. is in his capital but after the meeting ends no one knows.

The United States in turn, is attempting to influence other Latin diplomats to help keep the U.N. session in a low-key on the grounds that nothing will be gained by airing a long string of frustrations and disagreements in Panama.

The meeting will be the first severe test for the new U.S. ambassador to the U.N., John Scali. Scali is already busily preparing for the meeting by adding Latin specialists to his staff in event the session turns into a palpable anti-U.S. meeting. These preparations are being made in the assumption that the United States will be the whipping boy.

RESOLUTION NO. 280 OF THE 54TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Whereas, under the 1903 Treaty with Panama, the United States obtained the grant in perpetuity of the use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone territory with all sovereign rights, power, and authority to the entire exclusion of the exercise by Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority as well as the ownership of all privately held land and property in the Zone by purchase from individual owners; and

Whereas, the United States has an overriding national security interest in maintaining undiluted control over the Canal Zone and Canal and its treaties with Great Britain and Colombia for the efficient operation of the Canal; and

Whereas, the United States Government is currently engaged in negotiations with the Government of Panama to grant greater rights to Panama both in the Canal Zone and with respect to the Canal itself without authorization of the Congress, which will diminish, if not absolutely abrogate, the present U.S. treaty-based sovereignty and ownership of the Zone; and

Whereas, these negotiations are being utilized by the U.S. Government in an effort to persuade Panama to agree to the construction of a "sea-level" canal eventually to replace the present canal, and by the Panamanian government in an attempt to gain sovereign control and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and effective control over the operation of the Canal itself; and

Whereas, similar concessional negotiations by the U.S. in 1967 resulted in three draft treaties that were frustrated by the will of the Congress of the United States because they would have gravely weakened U.S. control over the Canal and Canal Zone; and

Whereas, the American people have consistently opposed further concessions to any Panamanian government that would further weaken U.S. control; and

Whereas, many leading scientists have demonstrated the probability that the removal of natural ecological barriers between the Pacific and Atlantic oceans entailed in the opening of a sea-level canal would lead to the spread of poisonous sea snakes and Crown of Thorns starfish into the Atlantic where they are now unknown; and

Whereas, these dangers, plus the probability of others that would be caused by such an upset of the natural balance now existing, which advocates of the sea-level canal ignore in their plans have not been satisfactorily investigated by scientists; and

Whereas, The American Legion believes that a treaty is a solemn obligation binding on the parties and has consistently opposed the abrogation, modification, or weakening of the treaty of 1903; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Chicago, Illinois, August 22, 23, 24, 1972, that the Legion reiterate its uncompromising opposition to any new treaties or executive agreements with Panama that would in any way reduce our indispensable sovereign control over the Panama Canal or the Panama Canal Zone; and be it further

Resolved, the The American Legion oppose the construction of a new "sea-level" canal, as advocated by the Atlantic-Pacific Canal Study Commission as needlessly expensive, diplomatically hazardous, ecologically dangerous, and subject to the irresponsible control of a weak Panamanian government; and be it finally

Resolved, that The American Legion reiterate its strong support for resuming the modernization of the present Panama Canal as provided in the current Third Locks-Terminal Lake plan legislation introduced and supported by so many Members of Congress.

ENVIRONMENTAL OVERKILL IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, concern for environmental quality has been of paramount interest to the Congress for the past decade. Through a whole new body of legislation, coupled with the resurrection of older laws already on the books, Congress has established stringent pollution controls. In some cases, however, the new standards are based more on desire for environmental overkill than on practicality. The utopian plateau of an absolutely pollution-free environment is a worthy goal, but to legislate such a goal as a standard, without adequate consideration of the costs involved, both economic and social, is to shirk responsibility as legislators.

The automobile emission standards of the Clean Air Act of 1970 are an example of Congress legislating beyond genuine need in terms of the realities of life, in terms of jobs and daily living. Under this law, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions are required by 1975 to be reduced by 90 percent of the 1970 standards for exhaust emissions.

Such a standard requires that by 1975 automobile emissions must be approximately 96 percent pollution-free. Estimates of the added cost to the price tag of a new car for compliance with such a standard range up to $1,000 additional per vehicle. The net vehicular operation cost to the consuming public for the last 6 percent over a 90 percent pollution-free requirement can run as high as $250 annually per car, based on a yearly road mileage of 15,000 miles.

This does not take into consideration the additional cost for extra gasoline required to operate the pollution control devices which will reduce mechanical efficiency and hence mileage-per-gallon on the order of one-third nor does it take into consideration the mounting concern over shortages in our petroleum supply.

These costs and this increased demand for fuel are both unrealistic and unnecessary.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to provide that automobile carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions be reduced by 90 percent over the actual emission of these pollutants. Such a reduction is within existing competence of technology and does not involve excessive additional cost to car owners. The remaining 10 percent, despite the dire predictions of the enthusiasts of overkill, will not poison the air humans breathe sufficiently to endanger public health, even in city streets.

Frankly, it is time for Congress to modify the present standards to a realistic level in relation to public health rather than setting a uptopian goal as a required standard that in terms of the present level of technology is unrealistic as to cost, result and public need.

My bill provides as follows:

H.R. 4313

A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the emission standards required for light duty motor vehicles and engines manufactured during or after model year 1975

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202(b)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act is amended by striking out "reduction of at least 90 per centum from emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons allowable under the standards under this section applicable to light duty vehicles and engines manufactured in model year 1970." and inserting in lieu thereof "reduction of at least 90 per centum from the estimate of the average emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons which would have been emitted from light duty motor vehicles and engines manufactured during model year 1970 had such vehicles and engines not been subject to any Federal or State emission standard for carbon monoxide or hydrocarbons. Such estimate of the average of emissions shall be determined by the Administrator under regulations.".

Excerpts from a recent Chrysler study of costs to the consumer resulting from environmental overkill applicable to automobile emissions standards are helpful in understanding the urgent need for legislative responsibility in the current situation. There is absolutely no justification whatsoever for requiring 96 percent when 90 percent will protect our people without requiring cars that cost up to a thousand dollars more and burn up to 33 percent more gas:

HISTORY OF EMISSION CONTROLS

The automobile industry is in total support of the drive for clean air. Over the years it has worked hard to protect the environment and improve air quality.

The industry became directly involved back in the 1950s, when the California Institute of Technology and Los Angeles County first began to identify the elements of photochemical smog, and the degree of responsibility that automobile emissions had for creating that smog. The automobile industry, working with government and university scientists, helped develop the instruments and test procedures needed to learn about the atmosphere, and as more accurate information became available, the industry's engineers set to work to eliminate the automobile as a major factor in the air pollution problem.

There was very little public recognition of the industry's achievements over the years, but there was a great sense of urgency about cleaning up the atmosphere. The result was the passage of the Clean Air Act of 1970.

THE 1970 CLEAN AIR ACT

Among other things, that Act requires that by the 1975 model year, automotive emissions of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons must be reduced 90 percent from 1970 levels. By 1976, emissions of oxides of nitrogen must be 90 percent below average levels of uncontrolled 1971 vehicles.

What is often overlooked is the fact that emissions of hydrocarbons are already 80 percent below those of uncontrolled vehicles. Carbon monoxide emissions have already been cut 70 percent, and oxides of nitrogen have been cut by 50 percent.

The fact is that the 1975–76 standards actually require a 97 percent reduction of hydrocarbons compared with uncontrolled vehicles, 96 percent on carbon monoxide, and 93 percent on oxides of nitrogen.

WHY CONGRESS SET THE 1975–76 STANDARDS

The 1970 Clean Air Act was passed at a time when many people feared that the country was already at the point of national asphyxiation, and the automobile was presumed to be the major source. This assumption was based largely on a report prepared within HEW, before the formation of EPA, suggesting the reforms needed to protect the public health and welfare.

This report presumed the worst possible combination of all conditions. It used the lowest levels at which emissions had any effect in laboratory studies, the highest recorded atmospheric concentrations, and the largest projected increase in vehicle population.

When Congress drafted the 1970 Act, it relied on this HEW paper, and also made a number of other assumptions of its own. Reflecting attitudes then generally held, the Congress assumed that the nation's air was getting steadily worse, and that the automobile was the primary cause. It assumed that automobile emissions were the major source of pollutants that are harmful to health. It also assumed that the automobile industry, with its history of technological progress, could easily reach almost total emission reductions if it really wanted to, or had to. Alternative power sources, such as turbines, electricity, and steam were often suggested as logical approaches to meeting the new standards.

Given all these assumptions, it is a little easier to understand how men who were sincerely trying to solve what they believed to be a very real problem could devise the 1970 Act. The motivation was strong, and in the absence of fact, a stringent approach seemed to be the most appropriate.

MEETING THE STANDARDS

The initial industry response, after the shock wore off, was to determine how to meet those standards. Our engineers explored the suggested alternatives—turbines, electricity, and steam. But extensive testing and experimentation led to the conclusion that within the time limits imposed on the industry, there seems to be no power source other than the internal combustion engine that will meet the requirements for driveability, durability, fuel consumption, and cost on schedule.

Basically the same drawbacks apply to the second option, emission control devices added on outside the engine. These catalytic and reactor applications leave a lot to be desired in terms of cost, efficiency, and durability.

The third option is to continue improving the internal combustion engine. The industry has already made a great deal of progress with this approach, and at a reasonable cost to the consumer. That progress was adequately summed up by Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit, head of California's Air Resources Board and the man who first discovered the automobile's role in photochemical smog, when he observed: "The problem is so far over the hump that I'm beginning to lose interest."

ASKING THE WRONG QUESTION

That conclusion points up what is wrong with the way many people in the automobile industry have been dealing with the issue. Certainly the automobile companies have an obligation to try to meet government standards. But they also have an obligation to express their opinion on bad law. Perhaps everyone has concentrated too much on the question of *how* these standards are to be met, instead of raising the far more relevant question: *why should they be met?*

CITY AIR IS GETTING CLEANER

The fact is, according to a recent study for the Council on Environmental Quality, there has been a marked improvement in air quality in communities of all sizes.

These improvements, of course, are a result of the work that has been done by other industries in controlling emissions from stationary sources, and also the replacement of older cars by those equipped with effective control devices—controls which were being developed long before ecology became a household word.

As these improvements continue, there will be continued improvement in air quality.

NATURE OUT-POLLUTES MAN

The fact is that nature itself, and not man, is the major source of the three basic atmospheric gases emitted by the automobile. Perhaps the most surprising discovery in the past year is the fact that natural sources constantly produce about 15 times as many oxides of nitrogen as man, about 10 times as much carbon monoxide, and six times as many hydrocarbons.

NATURE CLEANS THE AIR

Moreover, it has been determined that nature is not only a source for these substances, but it also has effective ways of disposing of them. As just one example of these natural disposal systems, fungus in the soil in the United States alone has the capacity to consume more than double the total carbon monoxide produced by all the motor vehicles and factories in the world. This is not to say there should be no motor vehicle emission controls, but it does help show that automotive emissions are not the problem many once believed.

AUTOMOTIVE THREAT EXAGGERATED

The fact is that while the automobile may be the source of 40 percent of this country's man-made emissions by weight, weight is not a valid measurement of harmfulness. Actually, concentration and toxicity are the important factors. In fact, looking across the entire spectrum of air pollutants, it is now estimated that motor vehicles account for only about 10 percent of the total problem of potentially harmful emissions produced by man.

EMISSIONS AT SAFE LEVELS

It is common knowledge that prolonged exposure to extremely high levels of any pollutants—including the automotive emissions—can have an adverse effect on health or behavior. However, the fact is that in heavily populated urban areas, there is no evidence that even prolonged exposure to average street level concentrations of automotive emissions is a threat to health.

For example, present studies show the carbon monoxide blood levels of non-smokers in the crowded cities across the country are already well below the two percent level that the EPA set as a goal for good health. That is also, incidentally, well below the CO blood level of smokers who are in the five to 12 percent range.

Certainly where controls are needed, controls should be imposed. And certainly automobile emissions should be controlled to a degree that the scientific evidence shows is necessary to protect public health and welfare. But to go beyond the point of effective control of automotive emissions is to divert resources that should be used to attack our many other environmental and social problems. The nation has no shortage of problems to be solved, but its resources are limited. We ought to use those resources wisely, applying them only to scientifically established needs.

1975–76 STANDARDS HAVE LIMITED BENEFIT

The facts indicate they are not. There were a number of inaccuracies in the assumptions used to establish the automotive emission levels. Accordingly, EPA is currently reviewing the calculations for the automotive standards. In addition, EPA has also said that the original ambient air quality standard for oxides of nitrogen may be too restrictive because of errors in the method used to measure atmospheric concentrations. As a result, the original standard for ambient oxides of nitrogen is also under review by EPA.

A MORE REALISTIC APPROACH

California, which is highly susceptible to air pollution problems, believes that the 1975–76 federal automotive emission standards are more restrictive than necessary. California has recommended 1975–76 standards which are very stringent, but more realistic than the federal standards, and which are tough enough to meet the requirements of the state with the worst automotive emission problem in the country. California is asking for a 94 percent reduction in hydrocarbons from uncontrolled levels, and 81 percent reduction in carbon monoxide, and a 75 percent reduction in oxides of nitrogen.

ENVIRONMENTAL OVERKILL

The fact is that each vehicle with present controls contributes extremely small amounts. If we apply the even more stringent 1976 automotive standards to other activities of the average car owner, we find that the vegetation in his back yard, just in the process of growing and decaying, would give off as many hydrocarbons as his automobile.

If he burns one log in his fireplace, he'll have used up his daily allotment of carbon monoxide. If he's using oil heat, he's limited to three gallons of oil each day, which will last about eight hours, or he'll be over the limit in oxides of nitrogen. This is the degree of overkill represented by the 1976 standards.

COSTS 8 TIMES GREATER THAN BENEFITS

A 1972 EPA report to Congress estimates that in 1977, when all controls on motor vehicles are in effect, the annual cost of those controls will be more than $8 billion. The projected national annual benefit to "material and vegetation" will be less than $1 billion. The EPA report points out that health benefits were excluded from the estimate "because of an almost complete lack of data" establishing the health effects of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and oxides of nitrogen at ambient levels.

Occasionally a small-scale isolated study does appear to show an adverse health effect from abnormally high concentrations, usually in combination with some other health or environmental factor. However, these same studies, when repeated under carefully controlled conditions representative of the normal city environment generally have not been validated. *The fact is that years of research, involving millions of people in hundreds of community studies, and in laboratory studies, have not developed any evidence showing any threat to health from average ambient levels of automotive emissions.*

WHY COSTS ARE SO HIGH

The cost estimate of these controls comes from a study by the Office of Science and Technology. According to this report, the 1975–76 federal standards could raise the price of a new car as much as $500. We estimate the cost of the California standards at about one-third of that.

The study committee concluded "that the nation is embarked on an air pollution program of enormous scope, complexity, and cost, with little measure of the relative harmfulness of the several pollutants being considered."

ENGINEERS CAN'T MEET THE STANDARDS

And seventh—the assumption was that the industry could meet the standards and with relatively inexpensive technology.

The fact is that we have no technology—expensive or inexpensive—that will meet all the requirements of the act. And as far as we know, no one—no manufacturer, no supplier, and no backyard inventor—has yet devised a control system that will meet the required emission levels for five years or 50,000 miles in customer service.

WASTE RESOURCES

The fuel cost penalty of as much as 30 percent associated with currently proposed emission control systems has to be included in any cost-benefit analysis. The additional cost to the nation's car owners could be as much as $10 billion a year.

The only emission control systems that we see with any hope of meeting the 1975–76 standards use catalysts which would require lead-free fuel. In 1975 about ten percent of the car population would require this new fuel, and a recent White House study estimates that it could cost the petroleum industry almost $5 billion for the new refinery equipment and the distribution system needed to get it from the well to the car.

A good share of that cost will go toward the development of an entirely new transportation system, separate from the leaded fuel system. Separate bulk storage tanks, tank cars and trucks, station pumps and storage tanks, and some sort of protection system to prevent accidental use of the wrong fuel in the wrong car. That's a big and expensive job, and we don't believe it's necessary.

Beyond this the current trend in the development of proposed catalysts involves the use of exotic and very expensive metals—platinum and palladium—which will add significantly to the cost of an automobile. These metals are sourced outside the United States, and the cost of importing about half the world's annual supply would have a negative effect on our country's balance of payments. The increase in fuel consumption would also add substantially to the nation's annual $4 billion outlay for oil imports with a further negative impact on our country's trade position.

These are the major facts that we believe have to be made known. There are others.

NEEDLESS CONFRONTATION

In light of the facts presented here, we believe the country is headed for an economic and technological confrontation which nobody needs or wants, and which will do nothing for the cause of clean air.

There is no reason why this confrontation has to take place. We would like to suggest an alternative.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First, the Administrator of the EPA should defer the 1975 standard as the law allows him to do.

This decision needs to be made soon. Time is running out. We must commit huge capital investments in new tools and facilities, make long-term agreements with suppliers, and make binding decisions now if we are to meet our production schedules for 1975. The oil industry must also make commitments for the new refineries, separate fuel transport systems, and storage tanks it will need for the lead-free fuel that will be required by the fall of 1974.

Second, Congress should suspend the 1975–76 standards, and transfer to the EPA the authority for establishing new automotive emission standards based on need, cost, and feasibility.

EPA already has this authority for emissions from stationary sources, and should have it for mobile sources as well.

If the present standards are maintained, we could then devote our full attention to an economical emission control system which Chrysler Corporation believes in all likelihood could meet the proposed California standards, on cars sold in California, by the 1976 model year. And we believe we could meet them without catalysts.

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS

If necessary, we believe we can meet those same California standards nationwide by the 1977 model year.

Not only are these California standards tough enough to protect the state with the most severe automotive air quality problem in the nation, but they could save the car buyer several hundreds of dollars in original purchase cost and in operating costs. The buyer would not have to pay for catalytic systems on his new car. He would not have to buy expensive replacement catalysts. He would not have to pay extra for lead-free fuel, or suffer a severe mileage loss. And he would still be helping the cause of clean air, because his car would have controls which are even beyond the needs of the nation's environment.

Our nation, in turn, would conserve its limited resources, protect its balance of payments from further erosion, and serve the cause of clean air with responsibility.

IN SUMMARY . . .

Even if automotive engineers could meet the 1975–76 federal motor vehicle emission standards, Chrysler Corporation would oppose them because they are wasteful, unnecessary, and unrealistic. In place of these overly stringent standards, the company recommends the following actions to conserve the nation's limited resources while proing the environment and the public health and welfare.

EPA should defer the 1975 standard as provided by law. This would avoid investing millions in the next few months for control systems the country does not need.

Congress should then carefully review its original legislation, revoke the 1975–76 standards, and transfer to EPA authority for setting any new mobile emission standards on the basis of current scientific information.

Chrysler believes it may be possible to meet the 1975 California standards nationwide by the 1977 model year without expensive catalysts. The stringent California standards which are adequate to protect the state with the most serious automotive air quality problem should be more than adequate for the rest of the nation.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Government Procurement, created by Public Law 91–129 as amended by Public Law 92–47, has submitted its report to the Congress. To meet the statutory deadline, a typescript copy was sent to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate at the end of calendar year 1972. Printed copies of the report will be available shortly—possibly by February 1—and each Member of the House will receive a copy. In the meantime, a staff summary of the recommendations in the report was prepared and printed, and a copy sent to each Member of the Congress.

As a matter of background information, I might say that the Commission on Government Procurement was established as a result of extensive hearings, under my direction, by the Subcommittee on [Legislation and] Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations. These hearings were held in March–June 1969. The enabling legislation for the Commission was approved by the President on November 26, 1969. The law provided for a 12-member Commission with appointments to be made by the President, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. The Comptroller General was made a member of the Commission by the terms of the statute.

The Honorable E. Perkins McGuire, an appointee of the President, was elected by the Commission members to serve as Chairman. As one of the Members appointed by the Speaker, I was elected as Vice Chairman. The other House Member appointed to serve on the Commission was Representative FRANK HORTON, of New York.

The two Senate Members, appointed by the President of the Senate, were Senator HENRY M. JACKSON and Senator EDWARD J. GURNEY. Senator JACKSON resigned and was replaced by Senator LAWTON M. CHILES, JR., in April 1972.

The two members of the executive branch, appointed by the President, were Frank Sanders, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy and later Under Secretary; and Robert L. Kunzig, then General Services Administrator. Mr. Kunzig resigned to become a judge on the U.S. Court of Claims and was replaced on the Commission in June 1972 by his successor, Arthur F. Sampson.

Five members of the Commission, according to the terms of the enabling legislation, were to be drawn from non-Government sources. The Speaker initially appointed Joseph W. Barr, who resigned in March 1972 and was replaced by James E. Webb, former head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The President of the Senate appointed Richard E. Horner, head of a small manufacturing company in Waseca, Minn., who formerly served in the Department of the Air Force. President Nixon appointed E. Perkins McGuire, now in private business, who formerly served as Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics; Paul W. Beamer, a business executive from West Boylston, Mass.; and Peter D. Joers, assistant to the president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Dierks Division, Hot Springs, Ark. As already noted, Mr. McGuire was made Chairman of the Commission.

The principal staff members are Donald E. Sowle, Director of Commission Studies; Orris S. Hiestand, Jr., General Counsel; and Hugo N. Eskildson, Executive Secretary.

The Commission's report will be printed in four volumes containing 149

recommendations for changes in procurement laws, regulations, and procedures. Many of the recommendations can be effected by Executive orders or administrative instructions; others will require legislative action.

A Commission release and an accompanying statement by Chairman McGuire at the news conference on January 22, 1973 describe briefly the subject matter of the reports and the Commission's study approach. I include the press release and the chairman's statement with my remarks:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT RELEASES SUMMARY OF ITS FINAL REPORT

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1973.

The Commission on Government Procurement released today a 119 page Summary of the Report which it recently submitted to the Congress as required by the legislation which established the Commission. The four-volume Report on the procurement process in the executive branch of the Federal Government culminates over two and one-half years of intensive study of Government procurement. Copies of the Report itself will be available through the Government Printing Office.

At a news conference held to brief reporters on the contents of the Report, Commission Chairman Perkins McGuire explained that the Commission has recommended changes to improve procurement laws and regulations, promote competition in Government contracting, and reduce administrative burdens for both the Government and its contractors.

In all, the Commission makes 149 recommendations supported by materials developed during its study.

Volume 1 of the Report covers matters that affect all types of procurement—the development of procurement policies, the statutory and regulatory framework, the execution of procurement activities, the procurement work force, funding, cost and profit issues, subcontracting, small business, procurement of professional services, social and economic programs attached to the procurement process, criteria to determine when the Government should supply its own needs or rely on private industry, and other matters.

Volume 1 contains recommendations, which, taken together, provide an integrated approach to Federal Government procurement; modernize the statutory and regulatory framework governing procurement; and provide a mechanism for shaping Government-wide procurement policies and for readily adapting the procurement process to changing conditions.

Volume 2 of the Report deals with the Government's acquisition of research and development and of major systems—i.e., large, costly, and generally technologically advanced products such as missiles, transportation networks, or space vehicles. With respect to research and development procurement, the Commission's recommendations are designed to support (1) the Nation's technological base, and (2) its capability of producing new products and rendering new sevices.

The need to improve the acquisition of major systems has been apparent from the criticism and charges regarding cost overruns, claims, contested awards, buy-ins, bailouts, and defective systems. The Commission recognizes that there have been successful programs, but focuses on the underlying problems that have plagued the major systems acquisition process, and describes the Commission's recommended approach to this subject. Essentially, the recommendations call for an integrated "systems approach" that would:

Establish a framework for conducting and controlling acquisition programs to highlight the key decisions for all involved organizations—Congress, agency heads, agency components, and the private sector.

Define the role each organization is to play in order to exercise its proper level of responsibility and control over acquisition programs.

Give visibility to Congress and agency heads to exercise their responsibilities by providing them with the information needed to make key program decisions and commitments.

Volume 3 treats with the acquisition of commercial products, construction and architect-engineer services, and Federal grant-type assistance programs. The recommendations pertaining to the acquisition of commercial products cover not only general off-the-shelf type commodities, but a number of products and services involving special considerations by Government buyers—products such as automatic data processing equipment, food, and the products and services of regulated industries. The recommendations relating to architect-engineer services and construction primarily deal with selection of contractors and the conditions governing the performance of construction for the Government.

Volume 4 of the Report covers the resolution of contract disputes, bid protests, revision of the law governing extraordinary contractual actions (P.L. 85-804); and debarment and suspension procedures for contractors found in noncompliance with various requirements. It also makes recommendations relating to liability for damage to Government property caused by defective products, and liability resulting from a catastrophic accident occurring in connection with a Government program.

Finally, Volume 4 contains recommendations concerning patents, technical data, and copyrights; for the establishment of a procurement code in the Federal statutes, including consolidation of a number of specific categories of statutes; and for revisions in the truth-in-negotiations, and renegotiation statutes.

The Commission believes that its recommendations, taken together, would lead to an integrated and more orderly approach to Government procurement; and that individually, each recommendation could stand on its own and contribute to an improvement of the procurement process.

The Commission was not unanimous in all of its recommendations, and where there are dissents or alternative recommendations they are spelled out in the Report. Also, in some areas, individual Commissioners had supplemental views which are presented.

STATEMENT BY PERKINS MCGUIRE, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT,
Washington, D.C., January 22, 1973.

The purpose of this meeting is to make available to you the Summary of the Report of the Commission on Government Procurement. Typed copies of the Report were delivered to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, as required by law. Those copies consisted of over 2,000 pages packaged in four volumes.

We would like to have had copies of the full report for you by this time, but the printing schedule calls for completion about the middle of February. In the meantime, our staff has prepared a 119-page summary that has been furnished to you along with other materials relating to the report, the Commission, and the study effort. Obviously, in the time we have it would be impractical to cover the entire Summary in detail. The document contains all of our recommendations.

I would like to give you a little background about how we developed the Report and touch on a few of the recommendations.

In the early phases of our study, we formed 13 study groups to explore some 400 problem areas and issues, many of which had been identified in the Congressional hearings on the bill creating the Commission.

The groups, in total, involved some 500 persons who were loaned, at our request, for varying lengths of time by industry, Government, and the academic community. In making up these groups we attempted to keep a balance of government and non-government backgrounds wherever possible.

Our objective was to utilize the reservoir of procurement knowledge wherever it existed and be sure that all sides of the problem were covered.

The study effort was deliberately designed with some overlap and duplication in study assignments. As a result of this "check and balance" approach, we had findings, and conclusions, as well as recommendations from different study groups which approached a subject from different aspects of the process. The Commissioners were responsible for sifting all this material, revising, accepting, and rejecting and, finally, for bringing to bear their own collective experience and judgment in arriving at recommendations. The resulting report is, therefore, the product of the Commission.

There was, I think, a surprising degree of unanimity among the 12 Commissioners. Of 149 recommendations, dissents were registered on only 12, which are noted in the report. I do not think it is plausible to expect that 12 Commissioners with such varying backgrounds, experience, and independence of thought would or could be unanimous on every aspect of the complex field of Government procurement.

The procurement process is very involved and complicated. Much has been said about its weaknesses, but when one realizes that it involves, on a yearly basis, some 16,000,000 separate transactions amounting to $57.5 billion and utilizing the efforts of some 60,000 government workers, it is bound to receive some criticism. The process, as we cover in detail in our report, has been subject to much patchwork correction which, in some cases, was successful and in other cases simply added to the problem in terms of paper work and people involved.

The Commission, in its deliberations, attempted to look at the overall process and to find common sense solutions rather than to be an investigative body examining specific procurement actions.

Among our recommendations are some to improve the legal and regulatory structure and the personnel and organizational arrangements operating within that structure. Specifically, we would combine the two basic procurement statutes and we also recommend means for assuring that regulations issued by agencies are consistent with stated government-wide policies. The need for improvements in such areas may be seen from the fact that we found over 4,000 procurement-related laws scattered throughout the U.S. Code. We also found a maze of regulations—often inconsistent and sometimes conflicting.

We recommend the improvement of personnel capability through better recruitment, training and career-development practices and by establishing a procurement institute where procurement officials could study the latest techniques and the latest procurement knowledge.

Permeating our whole study effort was the fact that there is no central point of leadership in the overall Government procurement process. Almost every study group recom-

mended some kind of central direction and leadership for the particular area of its interest, and the Commission was unanimous in adopting a recommendation to establish that central point of leadership.

For reasons which you will find in the report, it was our belief that this point of leadership, which we call the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, should be located in the executive branch of the Government, preferably in the Office of Management and Budget. You will also find in the Summary, a description of some of the duties for such an office.

Another issue which came up in numerous procurement areas pertains to the whole concept of competition. Our findings clearly and emphatically show that both formally advertised bidding and negotiation, when made competitive, or even sole-source procurement in certain specialized situations, are appropriate procurement techniques. But they must be used under the circumstances where they will achieve the best results for the government. The fact is that formal advertising is sometimes the most competitive technique; and at other times, negotiation produces not only more competition but also more meaningful competition. To use the one when the other is more appropriate decreases economy and efficiency without any corresponding benefit.

Another area that has been quite controversial is the so-called "make-or-buy" decision: under what conditions should the Government strive to fill its own needs with its own personnel and facilities rather than to rely on private industry? This matter has been a subject of controversy for a long time. While the stated policy of our Government, presently expressed in OMB Circular A–76, is essentially, that private industry should be relied on to the maximum feasible extent. There has been much contention that the policy had too many loopholes and was not being rigorously followed. We were unanimous in our belief that this policy should be expressed in law rather than leaving it in an agency circular. We also recommend some revisions in the criteria on which decisions are to be based, although we had some difference of opinion on the make-up of the new criteria.

Our report concludes that one of the main reasons Major Systems acquisitions have become increasingly complex and costly is that the current decision process locks-in an end product too near the outset which then precludes consideration of other potential solutions or verification of the selected system. Multiple design influences—from in-house laboratories, weapon centers, operational commands, and contractors become frozen as requirements. There are often incompatible and lead to unnecessary expensive design. The recognition of performance deficiencies also comes at too late a date. Although we found that improvements were being made, we concluded that further steps should be taken and these are spelled out in some detail in our report.

Our proposals are not a panacea for major systems acquisition problems. We have proposed a model which we believe would be helpful for any agency that acquires major systems. We think more attention should be given to the "front end" of major systems acquisition—that is, both Congress and the agency should understand and address themselves to the key decisions early in the process and in relation to our national resources and priorities.

There are numerous other topics in this report that I could touch on at length. For example, there are topics relating to the acquisition of commercial products, an area in which the government spends a very large sum of money ($25 billion last year) but the total government business represents only two percent of the total commercial output. Other areas include the resolution of contract disputes, the acquisition of research and development, construction and architect-engineering services, social and economic programs attached to the procurement process, funding issues, subcontracting, small business, profit criteria, patents, technical data, Federal grants, and other topics. Though time will not permit me to get into all those areas, you will find them all covered in the Summary.

In all, this Commission has produced 149 recommendations. A few of these recommendations call for further study by others. In a study of this magnitude, we had to concentrate on basic procurement issues, and in some areas, merely outline the thrust or direction for change of a given policy or procedure. The implementation must come from the people who have the responsibility for setting policy and for getting the procurement job done.

In other situations, we identified the problems and noted their impact on procurement; but did not attempt to make the ultimate policy judgment involved since they affect established national policies going far beyond procurement.

Another area that we have addressed and brought to the attention of the executive and the Congress is the impact of late funding on procurement. Efficient and economical procurement of goods and services requires thorough planning. Timing is the key factor in the planning process. The disruptions, inefficiencies, and waste caused by nonavailability of funds at the time they should be available are major impediments to efficiency and economy.

As I said at the start, the Summary covers over 100 pages and 149 recommendations. Since you have not yet become familiar with its contents, the staff is here today and will be available later to answer any detailed questions you might have.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), in calling attention to the report of the Commission on Government Procurement. I was privileged to be a member of the Commission, on which Mr. HOLIFIELD served as vice chairman. This was a hard-working Commission. The Commission was in existence for about 2½ years. As members we monitored the work of the study groups and then we met in many full-day sessions, often lasting 10 or 12 hours each, to consider the findings of the study groups and to make our own judgments, as Commissioners, of what should be changed in the Government procurement process.

The Commission's recommendations are directed to fundamental reforms in procurement. The report offers no magic formulas for instant success, nor does it indulge in name-calling, which probably explains why the report is receiving little attention in the daily press.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) explained, the Commission's report carries recommendations for both legislative and administrative action. In this respect, I am pleased to report that the administration takes the Commission's findings and recommendations very seriously. The Honorable Caspar Weinberger, when he was Director of the Office of Management and Budget, sent a memorandum to the heads of the executive departments and agencies, dated December 7, 1972, and entitled "Plans for executive branch review and implementation of report of the Commission on Government Procurement." I include that memorandum with my remarks:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C. December 7, 1972.

Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies.

Subject: Plans for executive branch review and implementation of report of the Commission on Government Procurement

Public Law 92–47 extended to December 31, 1972, the time for the Commission on Government Procurement to report to the Congress the results of its review of Government procurement. We understand that the Commission expects to submit its findings and recommendations within the prescribed period.

The recommendations of the Commission are expected to be of great significance to the procurement function of the Federal agencies. While the recommendations will focus primarily on the procurement process, we expect that they will also involve general management matters both within and without the actual procurement operation as performed in many agencies. Organizational concepts, legal remedies, and broad considerations of the acquisition process are some areas of expected recommendations which may deal as much with general management concept as they do with procurement techniques and procedures.

Because of the expected breadth and significance of the Commission's report, we believe it is imperative that the full resources of the executive branch be effectively employed in an expeditious review and appropriate implementation of the Commission's report and recommendations. To achieve that objective, it is essential that there be a focal point for problem resolution and for development of an administration position on major policy issues. Equally important is the need for an overall coordinator of these efforts. The Office of Management and Budget will provide this focal point and coordinating role with the cooperation of executive departments and agencies. Assistant Director Dwight Ink will have overall responsibility for this assignment.

To assist the OMB in this undertaking, you are requested to name an official representative of your agency to serve as the principal liaison officer with respect to all matters concerning your agency that would relate to the report and recommendations of the Commission on Government Procurement. Please furnish to Mr. Ink the name, address, and telephone number of your designee as soon as possible.

In the review and implementation of the Commission's report and recommendations, it is the intent of OMB to make maximum use of lead agency responsibility assignments. Other agencies that share interest in specific recommendations of the Commission will be encouraged to participate with the lead agency in the review and in proposing appropriate implementing action. The OMB will assure that all agency views are duly considered in the development of executive branch decisions.

As soon as the Commission's report becomes available, OMB will publish a listing of the recommendations together with a proposed lead agency responsibility assignment for your review. Agency comment will be invited as to lead agency and participating interests.

Agencies will also be asked to provide the name of the person in their agencies who would have day-to-day responsibility for the participating role with respect to each recommendation of interest to them. When these have been submitted and agency suggestions considered, the list of recommenda-

tions will again be published by the OMB, together with the name of the individual charged with the lead agency responsibility for each recommendation and also the names of representatives of those agencies which desire to participate with the lead agency in proposing an executive branch decision regarding the specific recommendations.

The above briefly outlines the plan for organizing executive branch resources for a concentrated effort to take earliest advantage of the results of the efforts of the Commission on Government Procurement. More explicit instructions will be given to you when the Commission's recommendations become known.

Questions regarding this matter may be directed to Mr. H. E. Tetirick, telephone 395-6929.

CASPAR WEINBERGER,
Director.

CONGRESSMAN HANSEN OF IDAHO INTRODUCES THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the last 5 years has seen a tremendous upward trend in the number of children receiving child care and child development services, in their own homes, in neighbor's homes, or in organized day care centers and nursery schools, in both licensed and unlicensed settings. This trend has resulted from the constantly increasing percentages of mothers of young children who are entering the job market as full-time employees outside the home. It has also happened because of the growing realization of parents and educators that the first years of a child's life are the most significant for the development and attainment of his potential.

Child care programs vary in quality from program to program, day care center to day care center. Quality can be measured in various ways. Certainly the Federal, State, and local standard regulating day care centers represent one way of determining the quality of programs—by looking at such things as the student-teacher ratio, the amount of classroom space per pupil, the attention given to nutrition and health and similar measures.

But one of the most important measures of the quality of any child development program, whether conducted in fancy or plain surroundings, is the kind of people interacting with the children. Anyone who has visited child care programs has sensed the difference that certain teachers or aides can make in the environment—they are warm, sensitive, obviously enjoy being with small children, and seem to know instinctively how to respond to their needs. These qualities are very difficult to define in quantitative terms, but we certainly know them when we see them.

While the quality of personnel coming in contact with the children is certainly of paramount importance, it is also crucial to provide enough personnel to staff child development programs. Judging from available statistics, we are heading for disaster, as far as quantity is concerned.

The estimated additional numbers of children who need child care services nationally are:

Kindergarten	1,300,000
Nursery schools	3,000,000
Daycare	1,310,000
Mini programs	1,890,000

To care for these additional numbers of children, an estimated 456,000 additional professionals and 529,000 additional paraprofessionals will be required. If national program capacity grew by 250,000 child slots a year, it would take some 24 years to complete growth to the projected maximum capacity. But even at this rate, some 19,000 professionals and 22,000 paraprofessionals would have to be added every year. This contrasts rather sadly with our estimated present rates of 5,000 professionals and 10,000 paraprofessionals. — Sugarman, Jule, "Joint Hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, and the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, on S. 1512, part 1, May 13 and 20, 1971, paragraphs 236–348."

A HEW official, Ray Collins of the Office of Child Development commented in December 1972, that the "teacher surplus" in elementary and high schools has not existed in the preschool programs. Quite to the contrary, he stated that there has been "a severe shortage of preschool personnel." In addition, he said:

> In addition, over one third of the staff of day care centers changes every year. Basic demographic and social trends, including increased participation rates of women in the labor force, have stimulated the dramatic growth in child care over the last decade and are still at work. The number of children, ages one through six, is expected to increase another three million by 1980, to about 28 million. Approximately 45 percent of mothers with children now prefer to work, and the figures are higher among minority and low income families. Parents are placing higher priority on providing their very young children with the advantages of a good preschool program.

To make matters even worse, the only Federal program making a systematic attempt to stimulate the development of professional personnel for early childhood programs will cease functioning in June, at the end of the fiscal year. I am speaking of part D of the Educational Personnel Development Act which for the past 3 fiscal years has provided $5 million, $5.9 million and $4.3 million respectively to train some 11,500 professional early childhood personnel. Another important contribution of this program was the training of many trainers of teacher trainers. Three steps removed from the actual classroom, these are nevertheless the personnel who form the backbone of any long term personnel development capacity. No funds have been budgeted for this program for FY 1973, and existing projects will terminate in June.

The Headstart program has made a significant contribution to training early childhood personnel and exposing large numbers of volunteers and parents to the principles of child development. In fiscal year 1970, for example, some 7,000 people were reached—2,000 in 6- to 8-week leadership development skill training courses, and 7,000 in college-level courses in child development. In addition, some 60,000 people received short summer orientation and inservice training.

The Department of Labor's manpower programs trained some 1,500 nursemaids and child care attendants in fiscal year 1970.

These two programs will be augmented by title IV–C of the Social Security Act—the Talmadge amendment—which will increase the work incentive program's training component. It is still too early to determine how many early childhood paraprofessionals personnel will be trained through this effort.

The new Federal income tax deduction for child care expenses incurred by working mothers, in effect, for the first time in 1972, is expected to encourage use of child care services.

The State governments, too, are responding energetically to the need for child development and child care services. Many States have developed statewide plans for early childhood services, established State-level offices of child development to stimulate and coordinate the development and improvement of services for young children. California has moved to extend the school starting age downward and other States are organizing and funding day care services.

In light of these Federal and State initiatives, it becomes even more clear that our existing training efforts are just not reaching enough people to keep pace with the rapidly expanding need for early childhood services.

This holds true from the standpoints both of sheer numbers and of the quality and caliber of personnel staffing the program. Programs are now expanding and will continue to do so throughout the decade. We will be hard-pressed simply to find enough people to work in these programs; to recruit and train the kind of people we want to staff these programs will be even more difficult.

THE EARLY CHILDHOOD PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT BILL

The legislation I am proposing today—the early childhood personnel development bill—approaches these problems through a variety of strategies.

First is the realization that although child development and child care programs are highly labor-intensive, it is not necessary, or even desirable, to require every person who cares for or comes in contact with the child to be a college graduate with training in child development. To do so would be wasteful of human resources and would raise the costs of early childhood programs to astronomical levels. A far more appropriate arrangement is to have a professional early childhood specialist who supervises the child workers who actually work with the children. This is equally true whether the child caretakers are grouped in a day care center or nursery school or work singly in their own homes caring for children from the surrounding neighborhood. For this reason, the bill specifies that at least half the funds

appropriated will be devoted to preparing paraprofessional child care workers.

One of the most significant developments in some time is the concept of an entirely new middle level profession of child care workers being developed by the Office of Child Development. These new professionals will be called child development associates—CDA's. Working with a consortium of national early childhood organizations, community colleges, training programs, child development centers, the Office of Child Development will facilitate the establishing of several kinds of programs and work with the states to see that CDA's are certified. Certification is perhaps the most important part of this new profession. All too often a person working in a child development program succeeds in climbing a few rungs on the career ladder only to find that this newly-attained status cannot be transferred to programs operated by a different agency or to a different city. The CDA status, once earned, will be valued anywhere in the Nation and will enable its holder to find employment in any situation needing certified, trained mid-level personnel. Roughly equivalent to the associate in arts college degree, the CDA's will be certified on the basis of the demonstrated abilities and skills, not on the basis of the number of courses they have taken. As the CDA career becomes established, it is possible that specialized CDA's will be trained to work with infants, handicapped children, disadvantaged children, or in children's homes. The early childhood personnel development bill specifically authorizes the expenditure of funds for the development of training programs for CDA's.

The development and acceptance of appropriate credentials is the key to a successful buildup of our supply of trained personnel at every level and is not limited to just the CDA program. A person certified by one State as a qualified nursery school teacher may not be able to find employment in another State without first taking certain college courses required by the second State. In a different vein, a person who has passed all the required courses and fulfilled all the specified requirements may nevertheless not be well suited to working with young children, and may not perform well in the position for which he has been certified. A promising means of coping with both of these situations would be the development of performance-based credentials for the early childhood professions which would be accepted by all the States. The bill provides funds to assist in the development and refining of certification criteria and techniques for both professional and paraprofessional early childhood personnel.

Although it is true that most child services are and probably will continue to be provided in home settings, the number of larger scale child care centers and schools is continuing to grow at a rapid pace. The provision of services in these large settings requires a great deal of organization and management expertise to see that resources are organized in a manner to provide the best care at the least possible cost. But frequently a person whose speciality is curriculum development is pressed into service as the senior staff member in charge of a day care center caring for several hundred children, and finds that the complexities of budgeting, personnel supervision, scheduling, food planning, supply ordering and so forth are an overwhelming task. What is sorely needed is a supply of people who have been trained to organize and manage child development and child care programs so as to squeeze the greatest possible benefit from every dollar and thereby stretch our limited resources, while still maintaining high quality programs. The bill provides for the establishment of programs to train child care administrators.

Recruitment of the kinds of people best suited to working with young children is almost as much a problem as training them. One clear-cut example is the need for men in early childhood programs which have traditionally been almost exclusively the domain of women. A few years ago growing numbers of young men were being employed in early childhood programs, at a time when these positions meant draft exemption. Changing the draft system to remove much of the uncertainty of the old system, has now resulted in fewer men in positions where they work with young children. This is unfortunate because the children—both boys and girls—need environments where they can be exposed to both male and female adults. This is especially important for the almost 2 million children under age 6 who do not have a father living with them. It is widely said that the "most important job in America" is raising the future generation; I would challenge those men who give lip service to this idea to take some of these most important jobs. The early childhood personnel development bill provides for attracting and recruiting men as well as women into training and subsequent employment in early childhood programs.

We have heard a great deal about the over supply of teachers in the United States. In many areas this is true, but early childhood is definitely not one of them. My bill addresses this imbalance by providing for the retraining of personnel who were originally trained and/or experienced in another level of education. A person who once taught elementary school, for example, might need very little additional training to be able to work effectively on the preschool level. To the extent that we can make use of these people, we will be doing both them and the early childhood programs a service.

As with many Federal programs, one asks the question: "When the Federal funds stop flowing, will this effort continue?" It is the intention of this legislation to stimulate the development of a permanent capacity for training early childhood personnel, not to merely train the personnel. Priority is placed on the development of personnel development programs which promise to become self-sustaining after Federal assistance has ceased. To do otherwise would create an artificial supply of personnel entirely dependent on continued Federal support. This may mean augmenting existing schools of education as well as establishing new training programs and facilities. It will definitely mean that efforts must continue to prepare the trainers of teacher trainers whose work is so essential to the long-term success of our objective.

The training programs will utilize a wide variety of institutions. Trainers of teacher trainers will study at a handfull of graduate schools specializing in this program. Colleges and universities will prepare professionals and management personnel needed to guide and supervise the early childhood programs. Community colleges, teachers colleges, private training corporations, and child development centers in every community will provide the inservice and preservice training needed by paraprofessionals.

Although taking advantage of many diverse training institutions is a valuable approach, it nevertheless carries with it the possibility that within a given community or State there may be a serious lack of coordination among all these efforts. At a conference I sponsored last year in Boise, Idaho, I heard about an example of this in my own State. A group of day care workers had been trained through a vocational education program but could find no subsequent employment; at the same time, child development services in the area were growing apace, operated by people who had had neither preservice nor inservice training of any type in many cases. For this reason, the bill provides that the Secretary of HEW will take steps to achieve the coordination of all federally sponsored early childhood personnel training programs already in operation with the program to be established under this act. It also authorizes him to work to coordinate training programs with employment opportunities.

No matter how many children receive child development and day care services, it will always be the parents who are the most influential educators of children in this country. Intervention programs can compensate to some extent for the effects of ineffective parenting, but the benefits that can come from good parenting can scarcely be provided through early childhood programs. Thus, the most important group of personnel to reach is the parents themselves.

There are a variety of ways to help parents provide their children with what is needed. One is to work with high school students who will in only a few years become parents themselves. Another is to include parents in the activities of child development programs so that they can observe effective techniques in operation. Several successful programs have been built around visits by trained child care workers to parents either in their own homes or in small neighborhood groups. The child care workers, themselves generally residents of the local neighborhood, demonstrate to the mothers different ways in which they can meet their children's needs and help develop in the mothers an awareness of the importance of what they do—

or do not do for their children. Television is a valuable tool in reaching large numbers of parents with advice on such important child development principles as good nutrition, health care, reading and talking with children, providing toys for children to play with, and so forth. Finally, many of the people trained as early childhood workers will be or become parents themselves, thereby providing an extra dividend to the personnel training effort.

This legislation provides for funds for working with parents, and high school students, and the development of television programing and accompanying materials aimed at development of early childhood personnel.

This bill which follows is directed at a purpose too important to be overlooked. As a nation, we are moving, step by step, into situations that require the care of children in large or small groups during all or a portion of the day. But as President Nixon pointed out when he vetoed the comprehensive child development legislation, we do not know the answer to "the crucial question of who the qualified people are, and where they would come from, to staff the child development centers." This bill is intended to provide an answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add as cosponsors to my bill: Mr. QUIE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues on the House Education and Labor Committee to introduce the administration's bill to extend for 3 years the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

I am pleased that the chairman of the committee, Representative CARL D. PERKINS; Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education which will handle the legislation; Representative EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, who is ranking Republican on the select subcommittee; Representative FRANK THOMPSON, who was the original sponsor of the first measure to create the two endowments; and Representative ORVAL HANSEN, are joining me in cosponsorship of the new bill. It speaks well for the bipartisan spirit which I expect to prevail as we begin our committee work on the enactment of this new legislation.

Members of the Select Subcommittee on Education who are also joining in cosponsorship are: Representatives PETER A. PEYSER, ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, and HERMAN BADILLO.

President Richard M. Nixon is to be commended for asking Congress to budget $168 million this year to support the two endowments, a doubling of last year's funding, and I am happy to lend him my support by sponsoring this legislation, for he is responsible for greatly expending Federal assistance to the arts and humanities in our country.

The program was begun in 1965 with initial funding of $6 million for each endowment. President Nixon has increased the budget request each year, and we are presently expending $38 million for each endowment.

I believe the stimulus of Federal money has been extremely valuable in my State of Minnesota. Citizens in remote areas, for the first time in many instances, are now participating in programs in the arts which have heretofore been seen only in the major metropolitan centers.

Miss Nancy Hanks, Director of the National Endowment for the Arts, is to be heartily congratulated for promoting the expansion of the arts in this fashion. Under her direction, grassroots participation in programs has been flourishing, and I am extremely grateful to her for her marvelous energy and vision in promoting the arts and providing for greater citizen participation in all the art forms throughout the 50 States.

Work by the National Endowment for the Humanities is less well known, but to my mind at least, such Federal support is necessary in this time of overwhelming scientific technology, when man is coming to feel more like a slot in a computerized card. I feel strongly that we should nourish these programs in the humanities which give better insight into the nature of man and his need for spiritual and moral growth.

Under the definitions in the act, "humanities" includes the encouragement of the study of both classical and modern language; literature; linguistics; history; philosophy; archeology; the study of the humanities to the human environment; and the study of comparative religions and ethics—which I helped add to the bill.

Encouraging State projects or productions in the arts would include: Music, dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, motion pictures, TV, and radio.

It has been of great personal interest to me to watch the development of the National Endowment for the Arts nationally, and to see how it has stimulated fresh approaches to education, brightened lives, and given impetus to new attitudes about improving the quality of life.

In my own State of Minnesota, I have seen how the encouragement of modest funds has enabled cultural institutions to expand their influence and services into many communities and to many citizens who might never otherwise have had this enriching experience. With the impetus of Federal moneys, major new private sources of funding for the arts have been developed.

A particularly good example of this is the poetry-in-the-schools project which has taken writers into schools since 1967 with heartening results in terms of student improvement in other classroom activities. The project began with poets reading and conducting teacher seminars in one city—Minneapolis. This year we have 16 poets all doing residencies of at least a week in 90 schools throughout the State, and we have an Indian writers' program working in the Twin Cities.

Indeed, this poetry-in-the-schools project has been so successful throughout the State that two of our great private foundations—the Hill Family Foundation and the Bush Foundation—have added major funding to the Federal moneys in order to insure its continuation.

The world-famous Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis is one of the two resident theaters in the Nation to be chosen for a pilot project in regional touring by such a regionally-based company. The project will take the Guthrie players into locations in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and represent an absolutely new theater experience for many audiences whose members may not have seen a live performance on stage before. The project underscores the work the Endowment for the Arts is doing in expanding opportunities for our citizens, supporting the artists and their institutions, encouraging new, innovative work on stage, and at the same time, maintaining the ancient, great traditions of the live theater.

Our excellent Minnesota Arts Council handled the coordinated residency touring program in dance and administered a circuit of dance performances that encompassed Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin. The Minnesota Orchestra Association has also toured nearby States in the upper Midwest with aid from the Endowment which again has made the neighborly sharing of our cultural resources possible.

One of the most interesting and truly exciting exhibitions ever to be held at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis was "American Indian Art," a joint effort that brought together for the first time the Indian Art Association with the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts.

The evidence we have seen in Minnesota of the ability of the National Endowment for the Arts to help organizations and to bring together new combinations of ideas and people in creative activity is repeated all over our country. It results from this Federal program which provides financial assistance, but requires matching monies from other sources—usually local—as well. This matching requirement in the legislation for the National Endowment for the Arts is an unqualified guarantee of local interest.

SCHOOLBUS SAFETY ACT OF 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and I

are introducing in the House today a comprehensive schoolbus safety bill.

For too long the Congress has permitted the Department of Transportation to drag its feet on the promulgation of safety standards for schoolbuses. Simply put, schoolbuses today are the unsafest vehicles on the road. While very few schoolbuses are involved in accidents, when they are, the results are often catastrophic.

According to School Bus Fleet magazine, 39 percent of the entire student population below the college level, or some 20 million youngsters, travel to and from school daily on schoolbuses. They travel a total of 2 billion miles annually. During 1971, there were a total of 47,000 schoolbus accidents; 150 people lost their lives and 5,600 were injured.

When asked about schoolbus safety legislation, the first thing that the Department of Transportation will point out is that schoolbuses are one of the safest forms of transportation. This is undoubtedly true. There are only 0.05 fatalities per 100 million passenger miles of schoolbus travel compared to 2.1 deaths per 100 million passenger miles of auto travel. The reasons for this are fairly simple: Schoolbuses ordinarily move at slower speeds, there are rules and regulations governing other vehicles when they are around schoolbuses, schoolbus drivers are extremely cautious and are generally good drivers, and most motorists are extremely careful around schoolbuses.

Given the comparatively low accident rates on schoolbuses, the Department of Transportation—DOT—argues that schoolbus safety regulation is an extremely low priority item. DOT maintains that in terms of a cost-benefit analysis, it is worth neither the time nor the effort of DOT to protect our schoolchildren from shoddily constructed schoolbuses. DOT is misusing the concept of cost-benefit analysis. No American schoolchild should be forced to ride in an unsafe schoolbus because DOT arbitrarily determines that schoolbus safety is a "low payoff" item.

What is wrong with our schoolbuses today, and why is it when they have an accident that the results are often catastrophic?

First, generally speaking, seat anchorages on schoolbuses are inadequate. When a schoolbus collides with another vehicle, seat anchorages often are torn loose, throwing the occupant and the seat itself forward. What originally was a neat row of seats is instantaneously transformed into a twisted shambles that can inflict serious injuries on the occupants of a schoolbus.

In addition to the weak anchorage of the seats, the typical seat on today's schoolbus includes a metal bar above the seat which is occasionally covered with an ineffective cosmetic padding. Even in the most minor of accidents, children are often hurled forward, smashing into the bar. The results are numerous facial injuries, chest injuries and often damage to the child's teeth.

The most unfortunate child in a schoolbus that is involved in an accident is the youngster who sits on the front seat of the schoolbus. He faces, if he is hurled forward, a whole array of steel bars, door-opening mechanisms, and stanchions. The vertical poles, commonly called stanchions, which are found on almost all schoolbuses, are considered by experts unnecessary and hazardous.

Another crucial problem in current schoolbus construction is the so-called structural integrity of the bus. Simply put, the lack of strong joints and the lack of a sufficient number of rivets often cause sheets of metal to twist and separate on impact in a serious accident. The result is that these sheets of metal become nothing less than "cookie-cutters," causing severe lacerations to any occupant of a schoolbus. The metal sheets rip apart upon collision producing razor-sharp edges which cause serious wounds.

Minor schoolbus accidents often result in fatal tragedy. For example, on December 26, 1972, there was a major schoolbus accident near Fort Sumner, N. Mex. Nineteen children were killed when the schoolbus collided with a tractor-trailer, which jackknifed on a bridge. Because of the poor construction of the bridge, a collision was unavoidable. A safely built schoolbus probably could have avoided some of the injuries and possibly even deaths of these innocent schoolchildren. The argument that schoolbuses are probably the unsafest vehicles on the road is indisputable.

What has DOT done? In a word, the Department of Transportation has done nothing to protect the 20 million schoolchildren who ride schoolbuses. In fact, DOT has made a series of empty, hypocritical and unfilled promises regarding the adoption and promulgation of schoolbus safety standards.

According to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the Department of Transportation undoubtedly has the authority to promulgate specific standards regarding the construction of schoolbuses.

Since February 1970, the Department of Transportation has been promising to adopt a standard specifically on the anchorage of seats in schoolbuses. DOT's first promise came in a February 1970 letter to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY. Senator KENNEDY had urged the Department of Transportation to take more concrete action to protect the occupants of schoolbuses. Secretary Volpe told Senator KENNEDY:

> The Department, in Docket 2-11, has already initiated the first rule-making action to upgrade substantially the safety performance of schoolbus seats.

For a year the Department did nothing.

But, in July 1971, it was clear the DOT had not forgotten its earlier promise to Senator KENNEDY. In congressional testimony, Mr. Douglas W. Toms, the administrator for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, told a congressional panel:

> We deem one of the best pay-offs in schoolbus standards would be to provide for friendlier seats. One thing we do not like are the seats with the hard metal rails and metal backs so as the youngster moves forward in any kind of crash, he strikes a solid, unyielding surface. . . . We are moving forward to see that seat backs in most of the interior parts of the bus are friendly.

Between July 1971 and April 11, 1972, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—NHTSA—did nothing. In April, NHTSA did issue a press release which stated:

> One proposed standard, to be issued shortly, deals with bus passenger seating and crash protection. It will require stronger seats and seat anchorages, elimination of lethal surfaces, substantial padding in the immediate area, and increased seat-back height.

In May 1972 Secretary Volpe told the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) in a letter that "a notice of proposed rule-making was slated to be published within the next few weeks" on schoolbus safety seats. Later in 1972, officials of NHSTA promised the Washington Star that "in a few more weeks, the agency said it will have notice of proposed standards for stronger, safer seats." Miriam Ottenburg, the Star's reporter, noted that "it has taken 6 years to get this far on a seat standard. No one will venture to guess how long it will take to get a standard on safer bus construction."

Mr. Speaker, today is February 8, 1973. The Department of Transportation still has done absolutely nothing.

The seriousness of this situation is compounded by the fact that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration refused to adopt any additional schoolbus standard until the seat standard is proposed.

An official of NHTSA told Siegel, Nahum and Runge, writing for the Society of Automotive Engineers in 1971, that a seat standard must come first. "Once we get that out of the way, we can go after other things," he reportedly said.

The track record of the Department of Transportation is clear—inaction, empty promises, and more inaction.

Since the Department of Transportation will do nothing, it is time for the Congress to act. Therefore, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and I today are introducing the Schoolbus Safety Act of 1973.

Practically identical legislation is being introduced in the Senate today by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Mr. MAGNUSON, my distinguished colleagues from Wisconsin, Mr. NELSON and Mr. PROXMIRE, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. WEICKER, and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEICKER.

Specifically, this legislation would require that the Secretary of Transportation by a specific order to establish Federal motor vehicle safety standards for schoolbuses within 6 months after the enactment of this legislation. Standards must be developed for emergency exits, interior protection for occupants, floor strength, seating systems, crashworthiness of body and frame—including protection against rollover hazards—vehicle operating systems, windows and windshields, and fuel systems. In short, this legislation provides for comprehensive safety standards to protect the 20 million schoolchildren who ride schoolbuses every day.

These standards will eliminate the flimsy schoolbuses that today are rolling deathtraps for our schoolchildren.

In addition, this legislation requires that the Secretary of Transportation procure an experimental prototype of schoolbus for research and testing purposes. This schoolbus should be purchased within an 18-month period within the enactment of the legislation. The legislation will also require that the major manufacturers and distributors of schoolbuses at the time of delivery provide certification that the schoolbus has been individually inspected and test-driven to determine if due care was used in the production of the bus.

The National Transportation Board will also be required to make rules and regulations governing the notification and reporting of each schoolbus accident which has caused a death and investigate each and every such accident. On the basis of such investigation, the Secretary of Transportation, after consultation with the Board, will make the necessary changes in rules and regulations to prevent similar accidents from occurring in the future.

In short, this legislation will provide standards, reporting systems, investigations, and necessary revisions so that every schoolchild in this country can ride on safe schoolbuses.

There is ample precedent for adoption of schoolbus safety rules. The Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission—VESC—a compact of 44 States established in 1958, has promulgated its rule No. 6, which provides comprehensive safety standards for the construction of schoolbuses. The States of Maryland and Illinois have adopted slight modifications of this rule. Presently, I am happy to report, the State of Wisconsin is seriously considering the adoption of the VESC rule No. 6.

While the specific provisions of VESC–6 may not be precisely the standards needed for schoolbus safety, they are a dramatic step forward in providing safe schoolbuses for the 20 million children who travel to and from school every day.

While the two schoolbus companies—Ward and Wayne—have already developed prototype safe schoolbuses, several companies in hearings concerning VESC–6 have protested that they are unable to conform to the Federal standards. However, a slightly modified version of VESC–6 was used as a basis for bids for the purchase of 52 schoolbuses by Montgomery County, Md., and all the major schoolbus companies did submit bids. It is encouraging to note that the average cost increase on buses conforming to the modified VESC–6 standards is between $200 and $350. Apparently the modified VESC–6 standard is a success in Maryland.

On August 25, 1971, the State of Illinois formally adopted rules similar to VESC–6. Formal requirements for the modified VESC–6 will not be enforced for approximately 6 months after a manual outlining specifications is issued. The manual will be issued within the next few months.

The State of Wisconsin has tentatively adopted VESC–6 rule. In fact, the Division of Motor Vehicles of the State of Wisconsin held a formal public hearing on Wednesday, January 31, 1973, to discuss the schoolbus safety measures.

The results of the experiments with VESC–6 indicates that schoolbus safety rules can work at a minimal increase in cost to local school districts. The need for schoolbus legislation is clear. Schoolbuses are extremely unsafe vehicles, and the Department of Transportation refuses to do anything. The solution is obvious—Congress must adopt legislation which will force DOT to promulgate decent schoolbus standards to protect the students who ride schoolbuses every day.

THE NEED TO ELIMINATE MEDICAID ABUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are angry because of the high cost of medical care. Middle income people in particular who are not covered by medicare or medicaid bear the greatest burden of all. They are hit by the high cost of medical care and the high taxes necessary to support medicaid costs that are sometimes multiplied by inflated charges of a few unscrupulous doctors and medical service organizations.

I am presently working on legislation which I plan to introduce after the recess to amend title 19 of the Social Security Act to help put an end to unscrupulous medicaid profits. The amendment would give municipalities such as the city of New York the option of using its municipal hospitals and community based medical divisions to treat all medicaid patients.

If enacted, my bill will not require all localities to treat its medicaid patients in community sponsored clinics; it simply would give those cities that have suffered escalating medicaid costs at the hands of unscrupulous physicians and private medical centers the alternative of creating a network of neighborhood health clinics to be staffed by salaried doctors to treat medicaid patients. Some localities where abuses have not been a problem may indeed opt to continue the present system of per-patient fee payments.

As presently written, title 19 is supposed to give medicaid patients freedom of choice as to which doctor he or she chooses to see. Some will argue that my bill will curtail freedom of choice, but I would submit that they are simply unaware of the facts. Freedom of choice does not exist in practice anyway.

At the present time, 20 percent of the doctors in this city do all the medicaid work, with an overwhelming number of doctors refusing to accept medicaid patients. Furthermore, 4 percent of the doctors are collecting 85 percent of the fees. So if freedom of choice does exist, it is freedom of choice not for the patients, but only for the doctors and at an inordinate cost to the taxpayers.

Medicaid costs have doubled between 1970 and 1971. From $666.3 million to $1.12 billion. The total cost is now $1.3 billion, a sum greater than the combined total of all other welfare costs. My purpose in amending title 19 is to insure that this money is no longer wasted on extravagant fees for negligent services. It would help to abolish situations where certain unscrupulous doctors charge excessive fees for little or no or even incompetent services.

The abuses have been disgraceful. We can no longer allow our money to be stolen from us. Nor can we allow the health of people to be abused or ignored.

I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues some cases which are indicative of the way our money is being wasted to fill the pockets of unscrupulous doctors. They are the following:

A radiologist in Brooklyn who received $556,053 from medicaid in 1971 and $400,000 in 1972 who has been charged with taking an average of 19 unnecessary X-rays per patient.

A Central Park West physician who gave all his medicaid patients injections of both penicillin and bicillin at a cost to medicaid of $1 per injection. These injections were judged to be needless and the physician has been ordered to refund $2,600 to medicaid.

A dentist who has billed medicaid for $4,500 worth of services to a woman and her 11 children. These services include fees for dental work on a 9-year-old child who for the last 9 years has been a patient at an upstate cerebral palsy clinic and has in fact never been in the dentist's office.

A private clinic in Hunts Point which mainly serves medicaid patients and has been judged "unsafe and unsanitary," the waiting area "filled with litter" and the clinic's disposal of used needles and syringes is "unsatisfactory and unsanitary."

It must be remembered that medicaid abuses are crimes and acts of larceny and just like other acts of theft they should be treated as criminal offenses with the appropriate penalties. At the same time, it is incumbent upon the Congress to act to safeguard the taxpayers and the medicaid patients from unscrupulous practices that result in high bills and poor health care.

U.S.S. "WILLIAM H. BATES"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues remember with a great deal of fondness the late Bill Bates, for so long a distinguished Member of this body from Massachusetts. His contributions to his State and his country are legion. Many of them live on although he was taken from us prematurely in 1969.

Not the least of his legacies to us is a strong, flexible Navy, over whose growth and preparedness he presided as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

It is fitting, therefore, that one of this Nation's newest attack nuclear submarines proudly carries the name U.S.S. *William H. Bates.*

I am pleased to share with you the latest report on the *Bates* which I recently received in a letter from Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover.

USS WILLIAM H. BATES (SSN 680),
New York, N.Y., February 5, 1973.

Hon. MARGARET M. HECKLER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. HECKLER: We are just returning from the first sea trials of the USS *William H. Bates* (SSN 680), our 60th attack type nuclear submarine. The ship completed all tests including full power operation, both surface and submerged. The *Bates* was built by the Ingalls Shipbuilding Division, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

William Henry Bates enlisted in the Navy in July 1940 and participated in the assaults on Iwo Jima and Okinawa. When he died in 1969, he was a captain in the Naval Reserve.

His legislative service began in 1950 when he resigned as a lieutenant commander after being elected to the 6th Massachusetts Congressional District to fill the vacancy caused by the death of his father, George J. Bates. Bill Bates was one of the foremost congressional authorities on national defense during his two decades of service. In his position as ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee and member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he was instrumental in strengthening our Navy. He was a proponent of nuclear power for naval ships, including this ship which bears his name. He contributed immeasurably to building our modern nuclear Navy—submarines, aircraft carriers, frigates—which is today a major factor in preserving peace.

The *Bates* is equipped with the latest navigation and electronics systems and a computer controlled weapons system which enable her to detect and attack targets at considerable distances. These characteristics, combined with the ability to operate at high speeds for long periods of time and the environmental independence provided by nuclear propulsion, make her a powerful weapon against surface ships and submarines alike.

In addition to the 60 attack type nuclear submarines, we also have 41 Polaris submarines and a deep submergence ocean engineering submarine, making a total of 102 nuclear submarines in operation. When all nuclear submarines presently authorized by Congress are completed, the United States will have 83 attack and 41 Polaris submarines.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

THE HEROIN TRAIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Newsday has just begun a 40-part series entitled "The Heroin Trail" based on a 6-month study by a number of its reporters. Yesterday's installment detailed charges that an official agency of the Bulgarian Government is involved in narcotics traffic.

While the Foreign Affairs Committee, on which I have the privilege of serving, has been aware of the use of Bulgaria as a conduit for heroin shipments in trucks from Turkey to France, these charges of official complicity lend new urgency to a resumption of our committee's investigation of the problem.

With the normalization of relations between the United States and the Balkan States, I think it essential that we secure the facts behind these allegations. Therefore I have requested both the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MORGAN, and the chairman of the Europe Subcommittee, Mr. ROSENTHAL, to investigate the charges that have been made.

For the information of all of the Members of the House, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE BULGARIA CONNECTION: A THROUGHWAY FOR DRUGS

(NOTE.—Members of the Newsday team that followed The Heroin Trail—Newsday Senior Editor (Investigations) Robert W. Greene and reporters Knut Royce and Les Payne—visited Bulgaria last summer as part of a nine-month investigation of the flow of heroin from its source to the streets of Long Island. The report, another in the series on The Heroin Trail, follows:)

The Bulgarian government has sanctioned the movement of morphine base through Bulgaria on its way from Turkey to France, Newsday has been told. The information came from law enforcement officials in two countries and from two smugglers who operated through Bulgaria.

Newsday received the reports about Bulgarian involvement while investigating the heroin business in Europe last summer and fall. Several of those who told us about it said the drug smuggling was done through an agency named "KINTEX," and that it was an export-import bureau of the Bulgarian government. But, they added, it also had been a clearinghouse for smugglers requiring safe passage through Bulgaria.

The story was denied Monday in Washington by a Bulgarian government spokesman. "This is not true, not true, not true," said Assen Yankov, first secretary of the Bulgarian Embassy. "Each government that respects itself will not allow this kind of dirty action—dealing in heroin and contraband. The same is true of the Bulgarian government." Yankov, noting that Bulgaria has just completed an agreement which provides for training of its border guards by U.S. anti-narcotics experts, warned that publication of the KINTEX story might damage the agreement. He said that it "may be in fact . . . a stick in the wheel."

But others tell a different story. According to one smuggler, certain Istanbul narcotics profiteers worked out arrangements with KINTEX for two-way smuggling: Morphine base was permitted to move through Bulgaria unimpeded; in exchange, the narcotics merchants were sometimes required to move, among other things, guns and ammunition back into Turkey, destined for members of left-wing Turkish revolutionary groups.

The Istanbul-Sofia-Munich road is the superhighway for smuggling of morphine base. More than half of the base that, converted to heroin, leaves France for its eventual destination in the arms of American addicts, is moved along that route. It is estimated that 80 per cent of America's illegal heroin supply comes from France.

SOFIA

It was our last day in Bulgaria. Our car looped Liberation Square, past the outdoor cafes and the statue of a Russian czar astride a bronze horse. It turned toward onion-domed Alexander Nevsky Memorial Church, cut left at the TSOUM department store and eased into a narrow, cobblestoned side street, busy with stores and people.

We were riding with the two smugglers we had met in Istanbul. The car stopped near a squat, new, concrete-and-glass building without a name on it. Several men stood near the entrance, looking at us.

"That's it," said one of the smugglers. "That's the new headquarters of KINTEX."

* * * * *

Galip Labernas, the former Istanbul narcotics squad chief, had heard of KINTEX. During one conversation in his Istanbul apartment, he said: "There is an important agency in the Bulgarian government that has given some of our biggest smugglers carte blanche to run morphine base through the country. We know it's happening, but we don't have many details. The agency is called KINTEX."

* * * * *

A U.S. Embassy source in Ankara: "We don't know much. We understand that KINTEX is the official import-export agency of the Bulgarian Peoples Republic. The agency is supposed to promote exports and regulate imports. Sounds like a standard government bureau."

* * * * *

There were fragments of the story in Istanbul. A leading opium dealer who was perfectly willing to discuss his colleagues by name grew silent when asked about KINTEX. "I've heard of it; that's the Bulgarian arrangement," he said. Then he pointedly changed the subject. An Istanbul police official, drinking his fourth martini at the Istanbul Hilton, said: "We know about it; we hear about it."

* * * * *

It had been a five-hour drive from the Kapitan Andreevo border-crossing to Sofia, the Bulgarian capital, close to the Yugoslavian border. A soft rain was falling at 3 a.m. when we arrived, without reservations, at the Grand Sofia Hotel, on Liberation Square.

The square was deserted, except for two parked cars nearby, with two men sitting in each. Their lights were out, but their windshield-wipers were moving. We hauled the luggage out of the trunk and went into the hotel. Behind us, we heard car doors shutting. The men from the cars followed us in. They did not appear to be tourists.

The desk clerk looked at our passports and visas. We told him we would be staying three days. "Very well," he said, "but your visas are for transit only. That means only 24 hours in Bulgaria. If you wish to stay longer, go to the police early in the morning. Otherwise you will be in very serious trouble." The four men who had been watching us lounged around the lobby.

We took the elevator up and looked down on the square from our windows. We saw the four men get back into their cars and settle down behind the moving windshield-wipers.

It took part of the next day with the police to straighten out the border guards' error about the visas.

* * * * *

The Sofia Press, a government-operated agency, assigned Georgi Ganiv, a blond six-footer, to assist us.

We requested an interview with the Bulgarian government official responsible for narcotics control, whose name we had not seen in our readings on the subject. Ganiv said that he didn't know the name of the official either, but that he would try to find out. "Do you know that Sofia was recently host to a Warsaw Pact conference on narcotics control?" he asked. We said that we had heard about it. Who headed it for the Sofia government? He said he would try to find out.

* * * * *

We reached the outdoor cafe in front of the Grand Sofia Hotel at noon. The two Turkish smugglers, who had come from Istanbul by train, sat at another table. We followed the plan agreed upon in Istanbul: We made believe we didn't see them; they made believe they didn't see us. Our Turkish driver walked by their table and the smoking smuggler asked him for a match. We returned to our hotel room. Soon, the driver joined us. We had already checked the room and found no electronic listening devices, but we turned up the TV to full volume—happy workers were singing about a new san-

itary sewer system in the city of Varna. We were to pick up the smugglers on a street corner four blocks away in 15 minutes.

We picked them up and went to another cafe 10 minutes by car from Liberation Square. We were on a second-level balcony. Thirty feet below, two men peered under the hood of a parked car. They stayed under the hood for the next two hours, while the smugglers went through two dishes of ice cream, and we drank a half-bottle of cold Manaslupska Usba, a local white wine.

One of the two smugglers, Ghassan, sketched in the details on KINTEX: "If you've got the right connection with that agency, you can pass morphine base through Bulgaria without the slightest ripple." Certain Istanbul patrons, he said, were allowed to move base through Bulgaria. In turn, the Bulgarian government sold American cigarets and Scotch whiskey to the patrons at a profit. The patrons smuggled them into Turkey.

The Bulgars had another interest in Turkey, the left-wing Dev Genc revolutionary movement. According to the smugglers, an Istanbul patron who was allowed to bring out his base was required to occasionally reciprocate by providing smugglers to move guns and ammunition from Bulgaria for the Turkish revolutionaries. The patrons were also expected, when asked, to supply intelligence information to the Bulgarian secret police.

"KINTEX is immensely powerful in this country," Ghassan said. "It's not just a governmental agency. If KINTEX decides not to let you smuggle through Bulgaria, you can have a tough time here."

Until recently, Ghassan said, KINTEX maintained warehouses in various parts of Bulgaria. Some of these were stocked with cigarets, whiskey or guns. The agency would sell the supplies to officially designated middlemen. In turn, these men would sell the merchandise to the Istanbul patrons. Within the past year, however, KINTEX has closed down many of its storage depots and has consolidated many of its operations in a new Sofia headquarters.

"KINTEX is getting more conservative," Ghassan said. "Apparently things were getting out of hand and the Bulgarian government was afraid of being exposed. Now KINTEX will only deal with big, old customers, some of the biggest Istanbul patrons. They can still get the approval to run a load through the country. But no one else, particularly no one new."

Before KINTEX began to tighten up last year, the smuggler said, it was relatively easy for a young Istanbul patron to establish a working relationship with the agency. "Let's say you want to smuggle American cigarets into Turkey," he said. "You contact a middleman who has done business with KINTEX. He puts your name through to Sofia for a check. Bulgarian agents in Istanbul run a background on you. If you are reputable in the [smuggling] business and have no police connections, you start doing business with KINTEX."

Bulgaria is the logical cork on the Turkish bottle, because Bulgaria is the only nation along the entire route from Istanbul to Marseilles to stop and check every car. But, Ghassan said, there is no problem for a man with KINTEX connections. "He sends a message to Sofia, giving a description and the license number of his truck or car. He also tells what time the truck is expected to cross the border. Then KINTEX sends a man to the crossing point to make sure that the truck goes through without any search."

We left the cafe. As we got into our car, the two men down the street lowered the hood of their car and got in. As we drove away, the smugglers gave us the names of the patrons KINTEX dealt with in Istanbul, all owning Transports Internationaux Routiers (TIR) trucks. We had heard the names before. They were on our list of heroin profiteers: Ali Hikmet Tekin, Mehmet Tuysusoglu, Mustafa Kisacik.

* * * * *

Later, we again sat at a table in the crowded outdoor terrace of the Grand Sofia Hotel, looking like tourists. Toward the back of the terrace sat the two smugglers. We had worked out this plan: When Ghassan scratched his ear, another new smuggler had come to his table. We were to take his picture. Ghassan would identify the smugglers later.

A man came to the smugglers' table, sat a few minutes and left. He was followed by others. Each time, Ghassan scratched his ear. We kept taking pictures.

Later we met. Ghassan asked: "Did you get the picture of Salim Yunan?" Yes, we said, we took pictures of all the smugglers. He looked puzzled. We explained that we took a picture each time he scratched his ear when someone sat down. "I forgot," he said. "Ear scratching is a nervous habit of mine."

Salim Yunan, he told us, had been smuggling guns into Turkey for KINTEX until about two years ago. Now he was building apartment houses in Beirut. Later we checked the films. A waitress had partially blocked the view of Salim Yunan; the back of his head was all that could be seen.

* * * * *

That evening we ran into Georgi Ganiv, the Sofia press official, while walking up a side street to the hotel. He seemed surprised. He told us that he had checked and that the minister for us to talk to was Lazar Bonev of the Bulgarian Finance Department. Good, we said. No, he replied, bad. A representative of the U.S. government was scheduled to come up from Ankara next month for joint talks on narcotics control with Bonev. The minister declined to give out any interviews before the meeting.

* * * * *

After looking at the KINTEX building, the next afternoon, we headed back to our car. We were now about three blocks away when a man in a white shirt began walking behind us. He followed us until we got into the car and drove off. On the way back to the hotel, we dropped off our smugglers on a street corner. They had information that a friend was bringing 200 kilos through from Istanbul. They wanted a piece of the action.

* * * * *

Istanbul, Turkey: A month later we called Ankara and asked Bob Munn, U.S. Embassy narcotics control coordinator, what happened at the scheduled meeting in Sofia between U.S. narcotics officials and Lazar Bonev of the Bulgarian Finance Department. Munn said that the meeting had been canceled by the Bulgarians. He didn't elaborate.

* * * * *

Vienna, Austria: We sat with Dr. Ernst Hoffman, chief of Austria's narcotics bureau, and talked about heroin. He spoke in slow, carefully enunciated English. Yes, he had heard of an agency in the Bulgarian government that had cooperated with narcotics smugglers moving through that country.

He explained that a wiretap had been placed on the home telephone of a suspected narcotics smuggler. "He talked freely to his wife on the phone. He told her there was nothing to be worried about in Bulgaria because they had contact with some government agency there and they could bring through narcotics without interference. Later, he signed a statement to the whole thing and was sent to jail."

Was Hoffman certain that the country was Bulgaria? Yes. And he recalled: "As a matter of fact, the prisoner wrote me recently asking if I could help him get out of jail. He said that he is reformed. But there is nothing that I can do for him." Was the prisoner working for any particular narcotics merchant in Istanbul? "Yes," replied Hoffman. "He said that he was working for a man named Mustafa Kisacik."

* * * * *

Washington, February, 1973: The Bulgarian Embassy denied that an official agency of the People's Republic of Bulgaria sanctions the smuggling operations of major Turkish morphine patrons.

"This is not true," said Assen Yankov, first secretary of the Bulgarian Embassy. "Each government that respects itself will not allow this kind of dirty action, dealing in heroin and contraband. The same is true of the Bulgarian government."

Yankov dismissed reports from government officials in Turkey and Austria attesting to Bulgarian cooperation with smugglers as "false." He said he had never heard of KINTEX. If morphine is smuggled through Bulgaria on the road from Istanbul to Munich it is despite Bulgarian efforts to stop it, Yankov said.

"This article," he said, "could lead to serious consequences which run counter to recent trends in the direction of mutual cooperation in this area. The chief of Bulgarian Customs has been a guest in this country—not just a visitor, but a guest—just because the customs bureau of your government recognizes the work we have done in the area, the effort we are making."

He said the KINTEX story "may be in fact . . . a stick in the wheel."

At the State Department, officials said that U.S. and Bulgarian diplomats and customs personnel recently concluded discussions that will lead to U.S. training of Bulgarian agents in narcotics enforcement procedures.

The State Department officials, who asked not to be named, said their files contained no data on KINTEX, but they said that their knowledge of the Bulgarian government made them believe that such an operation was "plausible."

A U.S. source experienced in Bulgarian-American relations said that it was possible that an agency such as KINTEX could be operated as an arm of the Bulgarian secret police, reporting only to high Communist Party officials and unknown even to some high-ranking Bulgarian bureaucrats.

U.S. diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, the source said, have been colder than with any other Eastern European nation. It is only in the area of narcotics control, he said, that the Bulgarians have moved to establish better contact with the U.S. "Much to our surprise," he said, "they seemed to want to cooperate on the customs level. But not on the enforcement level. They would deal with our customs agents, but not with the BNDD, which would correspond to their secret police. This is the way they run their country and they're not about to let anybody in on it."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Texas). Pursuant to the order, the Chair announces that the House will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes prior to the reconvening of the House.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

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

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS UNTIL 3 P.M. TODAY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be

authorized to declare the House in recess until the hour of 3 o'clock, or sooner.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair, not later than 3 o'clock p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Airport and Airways Improvement Act of 1973. The principal purpose of this bill is to abolish the discriminatory and capricious head tax on air passengers which has been arbitrarily imposed on travelers at more than 31 airports throughout the country. This tax is unfair because it not only falls on top of the 8 percent tax on tickets already paid by air passengers, but differs in amount from airport to airport. As a flat tax rather than a percentage tax, these head taxes are more burdensome on those flying short distances than long. They fly in the face of the uniform tax system established by the Airways and Airport Act of 1970; they are in effect double taxation on air passengers.

The bill recognizes the need for increased financing for airport development. The head tax is no solution to this problem—in some instances, the head tax receipts go into general revenues and are not even earmarked for airport development. The logical source for this financing is the trust fund established under the Airport and Airways Act. This fund, created by user charges, is already in substantial surplus. My bill would increase the Federal share in airport development projects from 50 percent to 75 percent. Many airport projects have been held back because of the inability of local sponsors to meet the dollar for dollar matching requirement. Hopefully, this increase in the Federal share will help to overcome these roadblocks.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is of the greatest importance to the millions of American air travelers.

RECESS TO 3:30 P.M.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the House to stand in recess until 3:30.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I shall not object—for the convenience of those Members who have delayed their travel plans and who are still waiting upon action either of the other body or elsewhere, if there is somebody in the Chamber who can enlighten us a little bit as to the present situation and the likelihood of our being able to take some action of a definitive nature at 3:30, it would be helpful.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who made the unanimous-consent request is not fully informed but he has the impression that the other body is now either considering or will soon consider the resolution in question. I am advised it began at 2:30.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will make this statement since there is no one from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce here. My understanding is they have agreed, but I see the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I can make a report.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. I can tell the gentleman we have reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a resolution which would provide for postponement of the final settlement of this work stoppage until the 24th of September, continuing into effect the present work rules unless they are changed as the result of an agreement between the two parties, and it would require the President within 60 days of the enactment of the resolution to file with the Congress a plan for the continuation of essential rail service throughout the Northeastern section of the Nation and over generally the lines thought essential to be retained out of the Penn Central, and at not later than 30 days prior to the expiration date or by the 23rd of August the President would report, giving a progress report of the work on the settlement of this very minute part of the problems of the Penn Central and such recommendations as are deemed desirable at that time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. And this resolution that has been voted out of both the House and Senate committees is now before the other body for consideration?

Mr. MOSS. It is slightly different from the one considered by the Senate committee. I do not at this moment know, because we just finished—I do not know the specifics of the Senate resolution, but it is very similar, if not the same.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of permitting me to ask a question of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. (BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, this question may be premature, but if the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) can give us a 30- or 60-second explanation as to why the time span for intervening in this collective bargaining dispute is so extended, I would appreciate it.

Why not a 30-day extension rather than a 6-month extension or a 7-month extension?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for purposes of answering that question?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss).

Mr. MOSS. I would say the problem of the Penn Central is far more complicated than just a work rule dispute. We are only talking about roughly $13 million, a high estimate, of the cost involved in this for 1973.

Over a period of 8 years the proposed changes would have an impact of around $90 million.

What we are talking about is the whole complex package of Penn Central. It is necessary that recommendations be made, and it was the judgment of the principal spokesman for the administration, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and the judgment of the representative of the Brotherhood, that a period of time beyond that which was originally suggested, which was 45 days from the report from the President until May 9 on the extension of the barrier against any further work stoppages, it was felt that it would be desirable to have more time if meaningful recommendations were to be made to the Congress.

It is for that reason that the House granted the longer period in order to permit the development of more equitable plans for the continuation of this very vital part of our transportation system.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would stipulate that this authorization is premature. I find my own workload in trying to master the responsibilities of a Member of the U.S. Congress are such that I really do not feel all that qualified to also serve as a labor-management arbitrator.

I intend to vote against this legislation and let the real collective bargaining process work, if it can.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 105(c), Public Law 624; 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as Members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members

on the part of the House: Mr. REES, of California; Mr. ROSE, of North Carolina; and Mr. CRANE, of Illinois.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 3:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 331) to extend the Railway Labor Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 331

Whereas a labor dispute exists between the Penn Central Transportation Company and certain of its employees represented by the United Transportation Union, arising out of the Penn Central Transportation Company's implementation of a plan to eliminate approximately 5700 train crew positions; and

Whereas the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board Number 180 did not result in a settlement of this dispute, and all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted; and

Whereas such dispute has now resulted in a cessation of the Penn Central Transportation Company's rail carrier operations; and

Whereas such cessation of operations by the Penn Central Transportation Company, a rail carrier which transports 225,000 passengers a day and 20% of the Nation's freight, and which provides many necessary connections with numerous other rail carriers operating throughout the Nation, threatens essential health and safety; and

Whereas the Penn Central Transportation Company is now undergoing reorganization proceedings under Section 77 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, and its court-appointed trustees have indicated that present reorganization proceedings will not be successful, even with the eventual elimination of 5700 train crew positions alone, and that a massive infusion of Federal financial assistance would be needed; and

Whereas the financial crisis of the Penn Central Transportation Company is so acute that cessation of its operations for even a short period of time, may make it financially impossible to resume operations; and

Whereas failure of the Penn Central Transportation Company to resume operations, in addition to the previously stated impact on vital transportation services throughout the Nation, will further threaten the continued operation of other financially-imperiled rail carriers in the Northeast section of the Nation; and

Whereas the President has not provided the Congress with any proposals for preserving essential rail services in the Northeast section of the Nation, including those services which would be jeopardized by financial collapse of the Penn Central Company; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are necessary to assure the continuity of essential rail transportation services: Now Therefore, in order to encourage the parties to the dispute to reach their own agreement, and to provide time for the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan for preserving essential rail services in the Northeast section of the Nation, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall apply and be extended for an additional period commencing at the expiration of the 30-day period provided for in the third paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) and ending at 12:01 a.m. September 24, 1973, so that during such period no change except by agreement shall be made by the Penn Central Transportation Company or its employees or by order of any court in the conditions out of which such dispute arose.

Section 2. Not later than 60 days from the enactment of this joint resolution the President shall submit to the Congress a report which, regardless of the settlement of the particular dispute between the Penn Central Transportation Company and its employees represented by the United Transportation Union, provides a full and comprehensive plan for the preservation of essential rail transportation services in the Northeast section of the Nation, including the President's proposals, if any, regarding Federal financial expenditures necessary for restoration or preservation of rail transportation services imperiled by the financial failure of rail carriers, and for alternative means for providing essential transportation services now provided by such carriers.

Section 3. Not later than 30 days prior to the expiration date specified in the first section of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report containing—

(1) the progress, if any, of negotiations between the Penn Central Transportation Company and its employees represented by the United Transportation Union; and

(2) any such recommendation for a proposed solution of the dispute described in this joint resolution as he deems appropriate.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was considered before our committee for 3½ hours, and the committee was very patient in listening to all the testimony that we had. I am sorry to come to this House with this resolution today, because it ought not to be here. But I would say that it is brought over here under the guise that this is a labor dispute—actually, it involves so much more than just a labor dispute.

The labor dispute, compared to the money involved, is so infinitesimal that it really does not amount to anything. We have a railroad that is in trouble, and according to the trustees it needs $600 or $800 million. But this is a way to dramatize the subject and to get the attention of the Congress.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEVINE. It was the understanding of the minority, and I think of a majority of the people on the floor of the House, that when the gentleman from West Virginia made his unanimous-consent request that this bill be brought up, the question was whether or not it could be brought up for immediate consideration without objection. There was no objection, but I am not sure whether I heard the Speaker correctly. The Speaker said that it was engrossed and read a third time and passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Chair had no knowledge of any other procedure. The only procedure the Chair had in his knowledge was it was going to be called up by a unanimous-consent request. Then the Chair said, "without objection, the bill is engrossed, read a third time, and passed." Any Member during that entire procedure could have objected if he desired to do so.

Mr. DEVINE. Is the gentleman from West Virginia now making a statement after the fact, or is this in support of the bill already passed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, as the Chair understands is doing what is often done on a unanimous-consent bill, and that is explain the bill to the House after passage.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for 5 minutes to explain and say to the gentleman from Ohio that I did not intend for this to be in this fashion; that I thought I would ask for unanimous consent to bring it to the floor, and that was my intent. The Speaker did make a statement that the bill was engrossed, read a third time, and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEVINE. In view of the statement made by the chairman of the committee that he had no intention that it be brought up under that set of circumstances, and the fact that the Chair has stated that a motion to reconsider has been laid on the table, I would ask the Speaker if a motion would not be in order to remove from the table the motion for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER. It takes unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask, therefore, unanimous consent to vacate the order of the Chair in connection with this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has asked unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the joint resolution was engrossed, read a third time,

and passed, and the motion to reconsider laid upon the table, be vacated.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. As I understood the matter, there was not any conflict or objection on the bill, and if that is the case, perhaps we could proceed so that if Members wish to place remarks in the RECORD to make their position clear, that could be done. If there is something else that is involved here that our side does not know about that the gentleman could indicate to me, I would yield to the gentleman for that purpose so he could do so.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, we had a very unusual situation wherein the chairman did not have an opportunity or take the opportunity to explain the merits of the legislation before the House, and it was passed even without the knowledge of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members of the House not to object to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Ohio is pending. The Chair follows the usual procedure. The gentleman has the right to make and has made the request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that the proceedings by which the joint resolution was passed be vacated?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to add to the reasons why I think the gentleman's request should be granted. In an effort to be helpful I was en route from the other Chamber to this body with a report, that I hoped would be helpful in settling this matter, as to what was occurring there and information as to some of the views expressed by the majority leader of the other body and others, and I think it would be a most unseemly thing for us to proceed with the finality of this action before we have even had the opportunity to explore some of those matters on this floor, so I take this time to urge Members in the interest of orderly procedure to honor the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain what the joint resolution will do and the reason for bringing it here. However, there is more to this matter than appears on the surface, more than just a mere labor dispute.

This is a railroad in bankruptcy. Its trustees have said publicly it needs $600 to $800 million to keep the railroad running. I believe this crew consist dispute was a dramatic way to bring the matter to the attention of the Congress in an effort to have something done. That is all I can figure. The railroad has even said that if everything they requested this year was granted, they would have great difficulty still.

As I say, this matter is only a small part of the whole problem.

I believe the resolution should be passed. It will put the men back to work. If the strike is allowed to continue there are thousands of commuters who will be stranded, tons of freight will not be moved to its destination, other rail lines which interconnect with the Penn Central may have to shut down.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only explanation I am going to offer at this time unless there are some questions.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia why we have selected the date of September 24, 1973? What is the meaning of that date? Is it related to anything at all?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, sir. Nothing that I know of at all. It was picked out of the clear air by a member of the committee and offered as an amendment and it was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, that was put in unanimously by the committee. If the gentleman will read the resolution, he will see the President is called upon to make two studies, the first of which relates to the solution of the railroad problems in the northeast quarter of the United States where we have eight railroads and their backers. Obviously the original 30-day figure did not give enough time for the President to make this study and report back to the Congress. The second study is the one the President is called upon to make with respect to specific problems in the specific legislation before us, which brings us to consider this matter, and report back here. In order to give the President time enough to come forward with recommendations and the Congress time to act upon those recommendations, we settled upon this date, which gives us the best time for determination of the legislation and time for an orderly consideration of the problems which are before us, both in terms of railroad service, which appears to be deteriorating rapidly in the Northeastern section of the United States, and with regard to the labor problems which bring us here today.

Mr. GROSS. My only question is that it seems to be a long time for intervention on the part of the Congress. Perhaps the House will accept the gentleman's explanation, but it seems to be an unusually long time for intervention in a matter of this kind.

Mr. STAGGERS. Are there any further questions? If not, I will yield to the gentleman on the other side.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take a position of strong opposition or a position of being in favor of this legislation, but I would like to point out a few matters that should be called to the attention of the House.

Those of us who have served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee over the years are weary and sick and tired of having to go up and down, up and down the hill on the same issue just about every year. I am not sure that management or the operating brotherhoods are sincerely following the collective bargaining process, because they fiddle around and spend months and months; extension after extension; board after board; and they come back to our committee and say, "Do something."

Yet, they are adamant about their opposition to compulsory arbitration and things like that.

With few exceptions, we have been called upon to delay crippling railroad strikes for about 10 straight years. Last year we missed for the first time in 10 years. The issue seems to be about the same. Lately, there has been a new one added. I can document this, whether by happenstance or not—it does not appear to be happenstance—we come to a critical strike period at midnight, the night before Congress is going into one type of recess or another and this has been the case the last three times.

I think that is more than coincidence. I think it should be taken into consideration when we deal with this matter.

The use of these emergency strike boards has actually become a farce. Whichever President has been in charge, we have had three or four during the time I have been here, and three or four emergency strike boards with experts, scholars, eminent people, and many recommendations, and still it comes to the Members of Congress to grant more time and another moratorium and goes on and on and on.

It is unfortunate that this type of situation cannot be resolved. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to pass emergency strike legislation, as we tried to do 2 years ago, and last year. I hope the chairman will recognize the fact that again we are faced with the almost annual situation, and I hope he will call up and schedule for hearings the emergency transportation strike legislation now pending.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the resolution that is now before the House from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it would provide for September 24 date, and no changes in the work rules could be made until that date, save by agreement between the parties. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. STAGGERS. Except by legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I feel obliged to inform the House, and it may have already been mentioned in a pre-

vious colloquy, that it is my understanding that the other body has already passed legislation providing for a 90-day period during which the present work rules would be continued in full force and effect, that is until the date, I believe of the 9th of May 1973.

I would further be constrained to advise my colleagues that in my conversations with both the minority and the majority leaders of that body, that they were adamant in their insistence on a 90-day as opposed to a 7½-month delay in any change in the work rules.

I wonder if it would not, therefore, be the better part of wisdom, in view of the situation in which we find ourselves, for the distinguished chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or someone, to be willing to offer an amendment so that we could conform this legislation to the date that I have just mentioned.

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

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

Mr. RHODES. I agree with the gentleman. However, I should like to make an inquiry. If any Member knows, is the legislation which passed the other body identical with the legislation reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, other than for the period of suspension?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I regret I am not in a position to answer the gentleman's question.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. There are two basic changes. They occur on page 3 of the legislation.

The first change is in the date during which the cooling off period would be established.

The second is because this arises under a court order, together with the promulgations by the trustees, and there is language that provides for the effective date for the type of work rules that will go into effect, and it was amended in the committee to be certain that the work rules that were in dispute and were being negotiated by collective bargaining remain in effect rather than a new set of rules that had been put into effect at 12:01 this morning.

So there are two changes in the legislation.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would respond as to why there is a difference in the date between the Senate and the House as to how long this period should last. I am not certain whether the Senate had the testimony of Mr. Usery at the time they were considering the legislation in the committee, but this particular problem, as explained by Mr. Usery, on behalf of the administration, is not really a labor dispute, because we are dealing with an employer here who is no longer in existence. Instead, it is with a series of trustees and the judge. So we must solve the problem of whether there is going to be an employer at all, or what kind of an employer, before we can have the bargaining process go further.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. In view of what the gentleman has said—and it is true that the Penn Central is governed by the provisions of section 77 of the Bankrupcy Act of the United States—why should it not be necessary or indeed would it not be advisable for this legislation, coming out of the committee, to include language to the effect that the Secretary of Transportation should submit to the reorganization court that has jurisdiction over the Penn Central a plan, and that then the court be given by this legislation power to carry out that plan for the reorganization of the railroad.

It does not do any good, as I see it, to pass this and dump the matter back into our hands, whether it be 90 days or 7½ months, without giving that court the power to act in the situation.

Mr. ADAMS. The problem is that the court does not have the power to continue the service that is considered essential in the northeast corridor. The trustees came before the court in their January 1 report, and had four conditions which had to be met before the Penn Central could continue running for any period of time.

The labor issue which is in this strike was one of the lesser of the four.

The major problem is that they have a negative cash flow. They simply are not able to stay in business unless there is a rationalization of their plan.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and for other purposes.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Unless the trustees are placed in a position—and only the Government is going to be able to do this; this appears in the trustee's report of February 1—where they can rationalize the plant, which means either to cut through the abandonment procedure, or to provide that the Government take over the rights of way and in some way provide some capital improvement, so that they can run the trains on the track, the trustees are not going to be able to create an employer that can be bargained with.

So that if you gave the administration the power to go directly to the bankruptcy court, the court's answer to the administrator would be the same as his answer to the trustees: You do not have a viable reorganization plan. You cannot create one, and the effect of the Bankruptcy Act is thereby to stop the railroad from running and it will be liquidated.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why we were trying to provide some time for the administration to work with the Congress to see if it were possible.

It may not, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, be possible to save any kind of a Penn Central system as such, but the point that was raised by the gentleman from Ohio earlier and by several other Members is that there are seven other railroads in the same condition in the Northeast.

So we are talking about the whole northeast quadrant, as far as rail service is concerned, not just the Penn Central. That is why we are asking for some time so the administration can make a proposal as to how we should handle it. This Congress could then act on that proposal and when that is done, there would be some type of an employer. Then within 30 days the administration will recommend a means to settle this dispute, or the collective-bargaining system will be brought into operation and they can settle it themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one further comment?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion I made was that I felt that the Secretary of Transportation should be charged with the responsibility for submitting a plan within 45 days or some such period, a plan for the reorganization and rationalization for the running of this railroad, with all of its assets and fixed plans and so on.

But in addition to charging him with that responsibility, then we ought to in the same piece of legislation give the bankruptcy court the power to carry out the plan.

That is the second necessary step, and I do not see that that is in the resolution reported out of your committee.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says the Congress shall consider the plan, but does it not make more sense to say that the referee in bankruptcy or the bankruptcy court, which I believe has had this matter under consideration for 2½ years, is better equipped, has more knowledge, and has more expertise to deal with the matter and to judge whether or not the plan as submitted by the Secretary of Transportation is sound? They would know more than we in the Congress.

I do not propose to know how we should draw a map for the railroad and say that we should eliminate tracks here or somewhere else, but presumably the bankruptcy court, after two and a half years of living with this problem, ought to know.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, this is the precise problem. The trustees in their report of February 1 have said, in effect, that they cannot do that without a massive infusion of about $600,000,000 to $800,000,000. Our committee is not in position and the administration is not in position at the present time to come to

this body and say: "This kind of a system is what we should have or this is how we should operate."

If we were to simply have the administration go to the bankruptcy court, the bankruptcy court would then have to come back to this body immediately. That is what we were trying to avoid.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there was a court order from the district court in Philadelphia for a work plan that was submitted and agreed to by the Penn Central trustees on December 22; is that not correct?

Mr. ADAMS. For the crew consist, yes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And if we pass this legislation today, we are in effect in an argument with the court and setting that aside; is that correct?

Mr. ADAMS. No, they extended that by agreement up through last night.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Right.

Mr. ADAMS. And what the court order in effect said was that they as trustees are authorized to proceed with this kind of new work force proposal.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And the trustees agreed to that plan?

Mr. ADAMS. The trustees as of last night promulgated a change.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And so if we pass this legislation, we are in fact overriding that plan?

Mr. ADAMS. We are overriding the trustees' plan or, rather, we are postponing it; that is what we are doing.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. What is the financial effect on this bankrupt company if we do that?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, that is very difficult to determine.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am sure the committee looked into it, because you are concerned about the problem of bankruptcy. What is the effect of overriding the court order which was done after careful consideration? Will that impose additional debt on this company?

Mr. ADAMS. The reason why I said to the gentleman that it is difficult to answer is the railroad went on strike as of this morning and it is not operating at all. It had a tremendous effect on the bankrupt's estate.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So one of the things we are doing in effect is creating additional financial problems for this bankrupt company by overriding this court order. Is that not true?

Mr. ADAMS. No, not at all. We are selecting alternatives as best we in the Congress can for the benefit of the public and the people that are before that court, because if this goes on for 6 days, you simply cannot bring it out of reorganization.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Now, to continue the colloquy, if we can. That means, in effect, that if we legislate here today by overriding this court order, we are imposing additional costs on this bankrupt company that the court and the trustees already agreed upon was a proper reduction in force. Is that true?

Mr. ADAMS. That is what I said to the gentleman. It is not, because if this railroad, which went on strike because of that order, stays shut down for 6 days, according to the testimony, then they cannot start it up again. So the secured creditors and people before the court lose everything. It was testified that the maximum savings if the court order went into effect would be a potential of $15 million. So if you want to compare the fact of the entire property going into liquidation and the losses occurring from that as compared to $15 million, then the gentleman can make his own judgment as to whether or not the committee tried to act responsibly and select the proper alternative.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. But is there any guarantee in this legislative plan that it will not be further aggravated, anyway?

Mr. ADAMS. There is no guarantee as far as the Penn Central is concerned about anything.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. And we may be back here again in 60 or 90 days for the same problem, as the Senate bill provides.

Mr. ADAMS. I can say to the gentleman without qualification that the Penn Central problem will be before this conference for the rest of the year. Whether or not it stays shut down and they strike or whether we keep it alive for a period of time and whether the order goes in or not—before the first quarter of next year the Penn Central is going to have to have some type of action taken, and that action may be a liquidation.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) if we legislate today as suggested, would we not be in a position of allowing a labor union to overrule a court order while there are thousands and thousands and thousands of mothers and fathers in Prince Georges County who are not allowed to overrule the court order with regard to busing of schoolchildren? Is that not a fact?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. There is no doubt about that. Maybe the gentleman from Washington will want to respond to that question.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not believe there has been any overruling of the court order.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The gentleman from Washington just got finished saying that if we pass this, we will in effect overrule the court order of December 22 for a temporary period of time.

Mr. ADAMS. Not at all. What I said would happen is that the effect of the order would be postponed for a period of time, and if we did not do that, the court would have to come in with another type of order deciding what they were going to do with the property that is not functioning.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Then would it not be better to postpone the decision on this for only 90 days rather than 7 months?

Mr. ADAMS. If we were only to do the——

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Because we must face up to the issue sooner or later.

Mr. ADAMS. The problem is they have to decide over in the administration and among the witnesses that appeared before the committee what service, if any, is going to continue to exist in the whole northeast quadrant. We have a lot of people living up there in the United States. The testimony we have had before the committee both on prior occasions and on this one is that that part of the country cannot continue to function without railroad service.

So that is our alternative of trying to see that services continue to be provided in that area, and get to a solution as quickly as possible, and these time limits were the ones indicated to us as being of primary necessity.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the resolution, and to try to clarify the question of what the court order was. I think, as the gentleman from Washington said, in a sense the court order is set aside, but what is the court order? The court order is not an order which would ultimately and finally determine the working conditions to be established for the Penn Central and its employers. The court order is simply a directive that an employer in bankruptcy—or, more accurately, reorganization—take certain unilateral action as an employer.

In an ordinary labor situation, under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, when the employer does post such a notice and when it does unilaterally change the working conditions which have existed for a period of time, and all cooling-off periods under the Railway Labor Act have run, then what will ultimately constitute the working conditions, after the economic joust, will depend on such a test of strength.

Now, that is all we set aside. The court has not decided that the conditions of service should, or would, ultimately be those which the employer is urging. The court does not determine the ultimate result of the crew consist issue. Rather, the court, as the authority directing the Trustees, calls upon the employer to open the issue, to make a unilateral decision. The court is not making a juridic judgment but is directing what it determines to be a prudent economic judgment for the employer.

In an ordinary labor dispute such unilateral action on the part of the employer may result in the employees striking, on the one hand, and the company insisting on a rule, on the other.

Now, what we are doing here is not overriding a court's juridic determination on the labor dispute over the crew consist issue. We are overriding the action of the court in behalf of the employer triggering a strike. We are simply,

as we have done many times before, preserving the status quo. We are suspending a change of the status quo which triggered a strike. And why are we doing that? Because all of the testimony and all of the facts that we have been able to get hold of indicate that, if a strike continued, this railroad would simply go out of existence as an integrated, operating railroad property.

Now, what is the answer to the whole question? Actually, this labor dispute is really a very small portion of the problem of the Penn Central. The problem is the problem of continuing a viable railroad in the Northeast, where it has been difficult to continue railroad operations under traditional economic conditions, conditions that have existed for a long period of time. We have simply got to grapple, not so much with the labor problem here, as with the economic question of the railroads in the Northeast. Therefore, we are not dealing with a court order that says finally that this should be the decision with regard to work rules; the court does not make this kind of decision. The court in this case is acting in behalf of the employer because the railroad is in reorganization, and it tells the employer that it should, or must, do something as an employer which simply opens the labor dispute to a more or less free-for-all. The company, pursuant to the court order, says we want you, our employees, to work under these conditions, and the union says we do not want to work under these conditions—we want to strike. So it is not a matter of the court order, or the overturning the court order, that ultimately decides the dispute; it is the contest in a strike situation that ultimately determines the work rules. Here we are simply staying that triggering process that would result in a devastating strike. That is all in the world we have done with respect to the court order.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to explain what has happened. The Senate has passed a bill and sent it over here, which is somewhat different from ours as to the dates.

I want to explain to the House the motion I want to make when the time comes to withdraw the House resolution before the Congress, and then to request unanimous consent to bring up the Senate-passed bill and offer an amendment to it, and I want to explain the amendment.

It is at the end of the bill; there will be no changes in the moratorium, during this moratorium period, except by agreement between the transportation company and the employees. We put in the words "or by order of any court," because we know the court has a large role in the bankruptcy proceedings. The court should not have the authority to come in and just say, "Well, we are going to do this," or, "We are going to do that," during the moratorium. We think the court should be included and that there should be no changes during the moratorium except by agreement. We think the change is fair, and we think it is necesary to carry out the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request to have House Joint Resolution 331 considered by the House at this time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) to extend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I merely ask the chairman if the introduction of his new version does not preclude debate or amendments or any further discussion on the joint resolution.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it does not preclude anything. We are taking up the Senate measure.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, are there any copies of the Senate proposal available?

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that I will explain the differences between the House and Senate versions.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 59

Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act and for other purposes

Whereas a labor dispute exists between the Penn Central Transportation Company and certain of its employees represented by the United Transportation Union, arising out of the Penn Central Transportation Company's implementation of a plan to eliminate approximately 5700 train crew positions; and

Whereas the recommendations of Presidential Emergency Board Number 180 did not result in a settlement of this dispute, and all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act have been exhausted; and

Whereas such dispute has now resulted in a cessation of the Penn Central Transportation Company's rail carrier operations; and

Whereas such cessation of operations by the Penn Central Transportation Company, a rail carrier which transports 225,000 passengers a day and 20% of the Nation's freight, and which provides many necessary connections with numerous other rail carriers operating throughout the Nation, threatens essential transportation services vital to the national health and safety; and

Whereas the Penn Central Transportation Company is now undergoing reorganization proceedings under Section 77 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, and its court-appointed trustees have indicated that present reorganization proceedings will not be successful even with the eventual elimination of 5,700 train crew positions, alone, and that a massive infusion of Federal financial assistance would be needed; and

Whereas the financial crisis of the Penn Central Transportation Company is so acute that cessation of its operations for even a short period of time, may make it financially impossible to resume operations; and

Whereas failure of the Penn Central Transportation Company to resume operations, in addition to the previously stated impact on vital transportation services throughout the Nation, will further threaten the continued operation of other financially-imperiled rail carriers in the Northeast section of the Nation; and

Whereas the President has not provided the Congress with any proposals for preserving essential rail services in the Northeast section of the Nation, including those services which would be jeopardized by financial collapse of the Penn Central Company; and

Whereas the Congress finds that emergency measures are necessary to assure the continuity of essential rail transportation services: Now therefore, in order to encourage the parties to the dispute to reach their own agreement, and to provide time for the submission to Congress of a comprehensive plan for preserving essential rail services in the Northeast section of the nation, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall apply and be extended for an additional period with respect to the above dispute, so that no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the Penn Ceneral Transportation Company or by its employees, in the conditions out of which such dispute arose prior to 12:01 antemeridian of May 9, 1973.

SEC. 2. Not later than 45 days from the enactment of this joint resolution the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Congress a report which, regardless of the settlement of the particular dispute between the Penn Central Transportation Company and its employees represented by the United Transportation Union, provides a full and comprehensive plan for the preservation of essential rail transportation services in the Northeast section of the Nation, including the President's proposals, if any, regarding Federal financial expenditures necessary for restoration or preservation of rail transportation services imperiled by the financial failure of rail carriers, and for alternative means for providing essential transportation services now provided by such carriers.

SEC. 3. Not later than 30 days prior to the expiration date specified in the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report containing—

(1) the progress, if any, of negotiations if any, of negotiations between the Penn Central Transportation Company and its employees represented by the United Transportation Union: and

(2) any such recommendations for a proposed solution of the dispute described in this joint resolution as he deems appropriate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Strike out the first section and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the provisions of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) shall apply and be extended for an additional period commencing at the expiration of the 30-day period provided for in the third paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160) and ending at 12:01 a.m. May 9, 1973, so that during such period no change except by agreement shall be made by the Penn Central Transportation Company or its employees or by order of any court in the conditions out of which such dispute arose."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I assured the gentleman from Iowa I would explain the differences between the Senate resolution and the House resolution. The change mainly has to do with the change of the date. The House resolution would retain the status quo until September 24, 1973, the Senate version would only extend it until May 9 or about 90 days. Also, instead of the President reporting to the Congress as in the House version, the Secretary of Transportation will report with regard to the preservation of transportation in the Northeast within 45 days of the enactment of this resolution. The Secretary of Labor will submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report not later than 30 days before the expiration of the resolution on the Penn Central crew consist dispute and on his recommendations for settlement of the dispute. We have changed the date, as I said, from September 24 as reported from the committee to May 9 as in the Senate version.

Mr. GROSS. And what about court orders?

Mr. STAGGERS. We put the court orders in. No court can order a change in the situation as it was immediately before the strike began. These are the essential changes.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the House the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the lengthy dock dispute which dragged on for 6 months last year and cost the American economy $1 billion; dramatically pointed up the deficiencies in current labor legislation. Once the limited resources of the Taft-Hartley Act had been exhausted—the court-ordered injunction had already expired on the west coast and ran out in the east coast and gulf ports the following month. The President had no further recourse under present law, national emergency or no national emergency. All he could do was submit the case to Congress as a special crisis requiring a separate legislative solution. This "solution" is really none at all, for it bucks responsibility to the Federal Government which should not become embroiled in labor litigation. Repeated congressional intervention violates the principle of collective bargaining and is a costly and inefficient waste of congressional energies.

Nevertheless, protracted transportation work stoppages, of which the United States has suffered a veritable plague in recent years, cannot be allowed to cripple the economy indefinitely. Some way must be found to represent the interests of the American public in these disputes. Thousands, perhaps millions of people who have no direct connection with the longshoremen or their employers have suffered heavy losses as a result of the dock strike, yet no way now exists to make their voices heard in the bargaining session between labor and management. No one would deny the dockworkers their legitimate right to a reasonable return for their labors. At the same time, it must be realized that others are being denied the fruits of their labors because the longshoremen closed virtually every major port in the Nation to gain their ends.

Farmers have suffered perhaps most of all. But lost farm income, estimated at a million dollars a day during the strike, is not an isolated economic occurrence. Sympathy for the farmer's woes will rapidly turn to empathy as the impact of agriculture's shrunken dollar is felt in other sectors of the economy. Agricultural loans will have to be renegotiated, new purchases of farm machinery will be deferred and consumer purchasing patterns in farm States will decline sharply.

Nor are farmers the only exporters to feel the pinch. Other producers of goods for foreign markets not only sacrifice current sales; like the farmer, they also risk permanent loss of their overseas customers to competitors who can guarantee reliable delivery on a steady basis. Precautionary stockpiling can cushion the blow for manufacturers to some extent, as it cannot for farmers who are at the mercy of seasonal harvest and perishable commodities, but even these measures do not entirely compensate for the uncertainties of a long strike. Thus the businessman on Main Street, the worker in the factory—union and nonunion alike—and the farmer in the field are all penalized for work stoppages in the transportation industries.

In order to avert another such disaster for the economy, I plan to introduce a bill in the new session of Congress revising the Taft-Hartley Act to broaden its coverage to the entire transportation industry, including rail, air, maritime, longshore, and trucking. My proposal would also extend the President's powers to deal with national emergencies in the industry, and would redefine "national emergency" to include regional strikes with national impact, a concept not now recognized under Taft-Hartley. When the present provisions of the law have been exhausted, my bill would give the President three additional options which could be exercised singly or in succession, as his judgment of the situation warranted.

First, he could extend the cooling-off period up to 30 days more. This option would be useful if a settlement appeared imminent. In the event that no end to the dispute seemed to be in sight, he could direct the workers to resume partial operations, just enough to insure essential transportation services. Finally, if the participants were unable to reach agreement, he could empanel three neutral parties to act as judges. Labor and management would each submit a final offer and the three would then select one of the two. No arbitration would be permitted. Whichever offer was chosen would become the binding contract between labor and management. This solution should induce the participants to submit reasonable and realistic proposals since the panel would obviously reject extreme demands in favor of a more moderate position. It is hoped that the "final offer selection" device will obviate the need for arbitration by providing the necessary incentive for compromise.

It is my belief that this bill represents a viable solution to the impasse provoked by protracted transportation strikes. Despite the demonstrated need for such legislation, however, Congress has so far been reluctant to act. President Nixon submitted similar legislation almost 2 years ago. It is still languishing in committees in the Senate and the House. AFL–CIO President George Meany rejected these proposals when they were introduced, contending that they nullify the principle of collective bargaining and impose compulsory arbitration under another name. This is both inaccurate and short-sighted. All three additional options provided in my bill are actually incentives to labor and management to settle their own disputes. The deficiencies of the present law, on the other hand, virtually insure Federal intervention because Congress is forced to step in with special legislation in default of any other procedure for resolving labor-management differences.

Hopefully, the majority of my colleagues will recognize the fallacy of this reasoning and its partisan motivation. We must act promptly in the public interest to forestall future recurrences of strangling strikes. My bill offers one way to accomplish this. Those who reject it should be prepared to furnish a better solution.

The material referred to follows:

SAD SOYBEAN STORY IN IOWA RAIN: FREIGHT TRAIN BREEZES PAST $15,000 SHIPMENT IN OPEN GONDOLA CARS

(By Arlo Jacobson)

(The Register's-Agri-Business Editor)

FARLIN, IA.—It was impossible to tell Thursday if the trickles of moisture running down Larry Dingman's cheeks were tears of frustration or just some of the rain ruining $15,000 worth of soybean loaded in open gondola cars.

Farlin, located just five miles northwest of Jefferson, is so small that it isn't listed on road maps. About the only outsider aware of its existence is the Milwaukee Road.

Dingman, manager of the elevator here, was assured last week by a railroad representative that—because of the current boxcar shortage—the railroad would give priority to corn or soybeans loaded into open gondola cars because of their vulnerability to rain or snow.

So Dingman thought he had a safe bet when he received three gondola cars on Tuesday when the Milwaukee shuttle between Perry and Rockwell City made its run northward. The train was to return on Wednesday and pick up the cars.

Rain was forecast for Thursday, but Dingman only had to get the soybeans to the Cargill plant in Des Moines. He had two of the loaded gondolas waiting Wednesday when the freight made its trip back south.

BREEZED PAST

But the train breezed right on past the elevator, never even stopping.

Alarmed, Dingman got in his car and, following county roads, beat the train to a crossing two miles east of the elevator. There he flagged down the train.

But the conductor would not agree to pick up the cars. Dingman said the conductor maintained he had no instructions to give priority to open gondola cars.

The conductor told Dingman he had orders to pick up cars at the Jefferson elevator loaded with Commodity Credit Corp. (CCC) corn that the government had dumped onto the market.

The train couldn't pick up Dingman's cars he was told, because it would put the train over its limit of about 50 cars on that particular branch line.

EXPRESSES INDIGNATION

Dingman expressed his indignation in no uncertain terms.

But the train pulled out without the gondolas. Wednesday night it started raining. Thursday when the train trudged through Farlin on its run north, the rain was pouring down. By afternoon it was rain mixed with snow.

The 3,600 bushels of soybeans were getting wetter and wetter. Soybeans expand when they get wet. They've been known to pop open steel bins. On open gondola cars they'll just expand upward and spill over the sides—like popcorn.

Dingman couldn't predict how many soybeans would be left in the gondola cars this morning. But he estimated at least 20 percent would be lost from spillage and spoilage.

"It's a mess," Dingman said. "It really is—when they haul away the government corn instead of something like this.

"They told me at that meeting at Ames they'd give priority to take gondola cars as soon as they were loaded. It'd be different if they hadn't told me they would take them."

EMERGENCY SESSION

The meeting at Ames last week was an emergency session to try to find solutions to the grain transportation dilemma that has the entire Midwest in a bind. The Milwaukee representative who attended is no longer superintendent of the Perry division, which serves Farlin.

"I've heard a little about it (the Farlin situation)," commented the trainmaster at Perry, who declined to give his name.

WAS OVERLOOKED

"It apparently was a matter of the conductor having a message to pick up cars at Jefferson and the cars at Farlin would have put him over the allowed tonnage.

"The matter was brought to me and there will be a correction and the crews will be informed. Apparently the message on priorities for gondola cars loaded with grain was overlooked.

"In fact, the crews have been informed to never leave open top gondola cars—to take them in preference to anything else. It was just a mistake. People make them every day."

In Farlin, Dingman was muttering something about the mistake as the moisture trickled slowly down his face.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, we are plowing the same ground we have plowed many times before. We have gone up the mountain and down the mountain, as I said, eight or 10 times in the last 6 years. Let me recite a bit of history for Members of the House.

In 1966 Congress was in the process of ordering striking machinists back to work in a dispute with the union and five major airlines when the parties reached a settlement ending a 42-day-old strike. In 1967 Congress acted three times to deal with a threatened nationwide rail strike, the first strike in 20 years. Two actions postponed the strike, the third ended the strike after a 2-day walkout. This problem involved the shopcraft unions versus the railroads.

In the spring of 1970 Congress headed off a rail strike first by postponing the strike for a month or so, and later by enacting legislation that imposed a 17-month moratorium between the management and four shopcraft unions. In December 1970 Congress was beat to the crossing. We tried to avoid another strike by enacting an 81-day moratorium, but action came too late to stop a brief walkout. This dispute also involved the shopcraft unions and the railroads.

In May of 1971 a short strike prompted Congress to approve emergency legislation that sent 13,500 signalmen back to work and ordered the railroads to give the workers an interim 13.5-percent wage increase. In November of 1971 this dispute was settled.

Of course, we all remember the west coast dock strike of 1971–72.

Mr. Speaker, that is eight or 10 times in the last 6 years that we have come here at the 12th hour or at 5 minutes before 12 and we have acted as an arbitration board, in effect the other body and this body comprising a body of 535 Members on an arbitration board.

We are engaged in a debate as to whether it is actually a dispute or whether we are actually contravening a court order. The trustees have recommended that by the process of attrition they reduce the crew from one conductor to one brakeman over a period of time and that action this year could save as much as $13 million this year and could save up to maybe $90 million over a period of 8 years or more.

We are trying to pass judgment on whether we are right or wrong, but I say, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that anyone can say whether we are right or wrong, and I think it is difficult for us to pass judgment on whether these men should be allowed to be released on an attrition basis. I think it is questionable whether we should try to decide whether they should be kept on a regular basis.

We ought not to be involved in the merits of the case, but that is what we are doing. We are doing the same thing we have done 8 or 10 times in the last 6 years. When are we going to set up some kind of transportation strike machinery?

We did try to have some kind of hearings last year, but could not get it out of the subcommittee. We on the committee recognize that this is not an easy answer. The chairman of the committee agonizes over this matter as much as anyone. Every member of the committee on both sides recognizes that there is no good answer except, in my opinion, the answer must lie in the establishment of some kind of machinery which will settle national transportation strikes.

We shall not come face to face with an answer when we have hearings in an ad hoc manner like this. This is not the solution.

I do not know what I would later be prompted to do if we turned this joint resolution down, because it is a very painful decision to make, but I am not going to vote for this resolution.

I think we ought to face the responsibility of setting up some kind of machinery which can prevent this type of thing year after year after year. What assurance do you have, if massive Federal assistance is given to Penn Central, and we may well have to do that, that this is going to settle this particular strike?

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I certainly agree with what the gentleman is saying about the need for machinery to correct this thing and about it going on year after year after year.

We need a mechanism for dealing with this kind of thing. I certainly hope the great committee the gentleman is serving on will take up the matter.

Mr. PICKLE. I know the chairman will ask our subcommittee to have immediate hearings on some kind of strike legislation. We have got to face it. We might as well do it. I hope we can do it immediately.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

(Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matters.)

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Emergency Employment Amendments of 1973, a bill to provide for funding the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 for 2 additional years.

The public employment program, created initially by Public Law 92–54, is a response to two urgent problems: people need work and States and cities need public services their tax money cannot produce. Public employment has provided the unemployed and underemployed with work in such fields as education, safety, housing, health care, conservation, and may other fields of public need.

Special consideration is given to Vietnam veterans, welfare recipients, older workers and youth.

Persistent high unemployment and claims of unmet public sector needs provided the major impetus for the original Emergency Employment Act. Since the

program was authorized and signed into law by the President in July 1971, the rate of unemployment has continued to remain at an unconscionably high 5 percent. This means that over 4 million workers who want jobs are unemployed.

The basic concept of the Emergency Employment Act is that the Federal Government will subsidize the wages and other job-related costs of persons employed under the act. It provides the Secretary of Labor with the power to contract with States, local governmental units, and public and private nonprofit agencies and institutions to carry out public service programs when unemployment remains at 4.5 percent for 3 consecutive months.

In addition, section 6 of the act provides a special fund for "areas of substantial unemployment" which have a rate of unemployment equal to or in excess of 6 percent for 3 consecutive months.

Unemployment is affecting not only our unskilled but our Ph. D.'s. In both cases, it saddens me to think of the anguish inflicted on these people and their families as well as the waste of talent of those who want to work to earn a living.

Although manpower training has to its credit many accomplishments which more than justify its costs, we still have large-scale unemployment. In part, our high unemployment rate is due to inadequate funding and the limited scope of training programs. But, in larger measure, it is the result of the false assumption that jobs exist in the private sector in sufficient number to bring down the unemployment rate. Expansion of the public service jobs program to create more employment would actually create more employment instead of just promising employment.

In the 92d Congress, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, held 22 days of hearings on manpower. As a result of these hearings, not only was I convinced that the public employment program must be continued—it must also be expanded.

The Full Employment Act of 1946 stated that it was the policy of the United States to assure all Americans seeking work opportunities useful, regular, full-time employment at reasonable wages. Today, over 25 years later, this goal is still not a reality for millions of Americans.

I am appalled and distressed to see the continually high unemployment rate across our country—8.3 percent in Bridgeport, Conn.—6.3 percent in Detroit—8.7 percent in Lowell, Mass.—8 percent in Seattle—5.6 percent in New Orleans—and 7.6 percent in Jersey City, N.J.—in my own congressional district.

The main thrust of my bill is to extend the Emergency Employment Act for 2 additional years and increase the funding under section 5 for the fiscal year ending June 1974 to $1.3 billion and the fiscal year ending June 1975 to $1.5 billion. The bill also increases the funding for section 6—special employment assistance—to $700 million for the fiscal year ending June 1974 and $1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 1975.

In addition, my bill deals with such other topics as the problem of promotional opportunities, submission of comments by labor organizations, and the definition of "unemployed." In practically every other respect, it leaves the highly successful Public Law 92–54 intact.

It is my opinion that this bill will be one of the most important to come before Congress this year, because realistically and philosophically we have arrived at the point that we must recognize that a public service employment program is the most direct way to alleviate unemployment.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States must begin to exercise greater responsibility in its fiscal and budgetary operations. Our appropriations process, rather than operating within a budgetary framework, deals separately with a number of funding bills. This approach can result in an overall spending level that exceeds projected full-employment revenues.

In order to enable Congress to reassert its role in developing fiscal and budgetary policies, I have sponsored the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1973. The bill would require Congress to set an overall expenditure limitation within 45 days after the President's annual economic message. By setting such a limitation, Congress would be forced to consider the appropriations bill in the light of limited dollars and competing priorities.

The bill would also move the Federal fiscal year from July 1 to January 1, thus giving Congress more time to consider budgets properly and reducing the need for "continuing resolutions" which are now used to permit agencies to spend at their old budget levels when their new budget has not been approved by the July 1 deadline.

The Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act also deals with the matter of presidential impoundment of funds. Once the Congress has reassumed the responsibility of relating outlays to available resources, it has the duty to preserve its constitutional prerogative to determine national priorities. The Executive must not be allowed to assume legislative responsibilities. Once the legislative branch has appropriated funds, they should be spent, unless circumstances have significantly changed in the period following passage, and the Congress agrees not to spend them.

Mr. Speaker, the time to bring order and reason to the budget process has come. We all have our personal priorities and we should all continue to fight for those priorities. We must recognize, however, the constraints of a spending framework that is determined, in part, by our revenues.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following material concerning the activities of the Select Committee on Crime for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

APPENDIX—SELECTED DOCUMENTS RELEVANT TO CRIME COMMITTEE ACTIONS

1. "A National Reseach Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis" Report Recommendations.

2. "Amphetamine Politics on Capitol Hill", article in *Trans-Action* Magazine, January 1972.

3. May 18, 1971, letter from Chairman Claude Pepper to the United States Attorney General regarding movement of two amphetamine-type drugs (methylphenidate and phenmetrazine) up to Schedule II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

4. June 7, 1971 letter from the Crime Committee Members to colleagues in the House of Representatives requesting support of legislation to move these two amphetamine-type drugs up to Schedule II of the Act.

5. December 16, 1971 letter from Chairman Claude Pepper to the United States Attorney General protesting the excessive quotas proposed for amphetamines and methamphetamines, and requesting that these quotas be substantially lowered.

6. August 16, 1972 letter from Chairman Claude Pepper to the United States Attorney General protesting the excessive quotas proposed for methylphenidate and phenmetrazine, and requesting that these quotas be drastically lowered.

7. June 9, 1971 letter from Chairman Claude Pepper to colleagues regarding the Committee's model heroin paraphernalia bill.

8. July 12, 1971 letter from Chairman Claude Pepper to all State Attorneys General advising of the Committee's model heroin paraphernalia bill.

9. February 1, 1972 letter from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Chairman Claude Pepper commending him on his October 1970 hearings concerning the drug paraphernalia problem, and attributing Pennsylvania legislation and Pennsylvania Pharmacy Board action to the Committee hearings.

10. List of 35 states which enacted heroin paraphernalia statutes subsequent to Crime Committee hearings in 1970 which published a model paraphernalia statute.

11. March 31, 1972 letter from Dr. Jerome Jaffe, Director of the President's Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention commending Chairman Claude Pepper for his work towards passage of legislation providing vitally needed tools to combat the drug abuse crisis.

A NATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM TO COMBAT THE HEROIN ADDICTION CRISIS

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Congress Should Appropriate $50 Million for Fiscal Year 1972 To Be Used for Emergency Scientific Research To Create a Drug Which Will Effectively Treat, Prevent, or Cure Heroin Addiction.

Congress should authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, to contract with drug manufacturers to accomplish this emergency research. The drug industry has the necessary experience, manpower, and facilities to pursue this goal. The Federal Government should provide 90 percent of the cost of each research and development project undertaken by private industry. The Government's contribution should be refunded from any profits derived by the company from marketing the addiction control agents to be developed.

The Federal Government's clinical testing facility, the Addiction Research Center at Lexington, Ky., should be expanded to ensure that promising drugs are expeditiously

evaluated and tested. Other existing laboratory facilities used for the selection, screening, and clinical testing of potentially promising new drugs should be adequately financed through existing grants programs. If need be, new clinical facilities should be created.

Federal programs now being implemented by the National Institute of Mental Health involving this research must be accelerated and expanded. The appropriation of $50 million guarantees that these presently existing programs will be intensified.

Action on these recommendations should be taken immediately. As President Nixon said, "Every day we lose compounds the tragedy which drugs inflict on individual Americans."

Legislation to effect these objectives will be introduced today, a copy of the bill is annexed to this report.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1971.

Hon. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL: You are to be congratulated on your decision to move amphetamines and methamphetamines from Schedule III to Schedule II. As you know, the House Select Committee on Crime has recommended this for a long time and we had hoped that these drugs would be controlled in Schedule II over 8 months ago when the "Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970" was enacted.

Though it is commendable that you should finally agree with the findings of our Committee, it is unfortunate that your move is but a half measure. We believe that it is unwise to move amphetamines and methamphetamines into Schedule II while leaving methylphenidate and phenmetrazine in Schedule III. The potential for abuse of methylphenidate (Ritalin) and phenmetrazine (Preludin) has been well documented in the medical journals and has been vividly evidenced on a wide scale in Sweden.

For two reasons we believe that it is imperative to consider the whole class of central nervous system stimulants in the same manner and not to single out amphetamines and methamphetamines for special control. First, control of the whole class is essential in order to avoid the pattern of abuse that developed in Sweden when one central nervous system stimulant was tightly controlled while others remained readily available. Second, as you well know, under the provisions of the International Convention on Psychotropic Substances which the United States signed on February 21, 1971, in Vienna, Austria, amphetamines, methamphetamines, methylphenidate and phenmetrazine were placed in Schedule II. The controls of Schedule II in the International Convention closely parallel those of Schedule II in P.L. 91513. The Schedule III controls of amphetamine-type drugs of P.L. 91–513 are inadequate to comply with the treaty. Also, we understand that at the Conference the United States introduced a resolution, which was subsequently adopted by all member states, urging all states, where possible, to implement the provisions of the treaty prior to its official ratification. At a time when we are calling for international cooperation in the field of drug abuse control, in order for the United States to maintain its credibility, we should do everything in our power to conform to the treaties we have helped draft and signed.

For these reasons, today, with a bipartisan majority of ten members of the House Select Committee on Crime, I have reintroduced a bill to amend P.L. 91–513 to have amphetamines, methamphetamines, methylphenidate and phenmetrazine transferred together from Schedule III to Schedule II. In order to bring the United States drug laws in line with our pending treaty obligations and to avoid further central nervous system stimulant abuse, we urge you to support our bill, which we expect will have early and favorable consideration in the Congress.

Kindest regards, and
Believe me.
Always sincerely,
CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You know the Select Committee on Crime has long been concerned with the widespread abuse of amphetamines and related drugs. We believe that this abuse will continue until we limit by law the production of all amphetamine-type drugs (central nervous system stimulants) so that an adequate supply is available for medical uses only.

The "Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970" provides for the control of amphetamine production and distribution under Schedule III. Hearings held by our Committee in San Francisco and Washington, D.C., and our continuing investigations, have conclusively demonstrated the need for tighter controls than those presently imposed on amphetamine drugs in Schedule III.

We need only point to the now infamous case of an American firm shipping millions of amphetamines to a fictitious Mexican address that would have corresponded to the 11th hole of the Tijuana Country Club Golf Course to support our contention that the present controls are ineffective.

We believe that the current overproduction of amphetamine drugs and diversion from legitimate sources could be curbed if all amphetamine drugs were transferred to Schedule II, where they would become subject to production quotas based on legitimate medical needs, strict import/export controls and tighter prescribing regulations.

On May 18, 1971, nine of my Colleagues and I, a bipartisan majority, of the Select Committee on Crime, introduced an amendment to transfer amphetamines, methamphetamines, methylphenidate (Ritalin) and phenmetrazine (Preludin) from Schedule III to Schedule II. We intend to reintroduce the bill with co-sponsors on June 17, 1971.

On May 26, 1971, the Attorney General initiated administrative proceedings to transfer amphetamines and methamphetamines to Schedule II. Unfortunately, this is but a half measure. Ritalin and Preludin remain in Schedule III. The potential for abuse of Ritalin and Preludin has been well documented in the medical journals and vividly evidenced on a wide scale in Sweden.

For two reasons, we believe it is imperative to consider the whole class of central nervous system stimulants in the same manner and not to single out amphetamines and methamphetamines for special controls:

A. First, control of the whole class is essential in order to avoid the pattern of abuse that developed in Sweden when one central nervous system stimulant was tightly controlled while others remained easily available. Abusers switched readily to the available drugs.

B. Second, under the provisions of the International Convention on Psychotropic Substances, which the United States signed on February 21, 1971, in Vienna, Austria, amphetamines, methamphetamines, methylphenidate and phenmetrazine were placed in Schedule II. The controls of Schedule II in the International Convention closely parallel those of Schedule II in P.L. 91–513. The Schedule III controls of amphetamine-type drugs in P.L. 91–513 are inadequate to comply with the treaty. At the Conference a resolution introduced by the United States, and subsequenly adopted by all member states, urged all states, where possible, to implement the provisions of the treaty prior to its official ratification. This is exactly what our bill would do.

In addition, the following are some pertinent facts concerning amphetamine-type drug production and abuse:

1. Between 5 and 8 billion doses of amphetamine-type drugs are produced annually. Medical authorities estimate a legitimate need for a few hundred thousand doses, for the treatment of narcolepsy, hyperkinesis, and the early stages of weight control.

2. Over 50% of the legally manufactured amphetamines are diverted into illegal channels.

3. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs estimates that over 80% of the illicit amphetamines it seizes were legally manufactured.

4. Drug companies have not voluntarily curtailed their amphetamine-type drug production, and there has been an increase in abuse of amphetamines.

5. The street term for high dosage amphetamine abuse is "speed"; use of "speed" causes euphoria and hyperactivity; it often results in paranoid psychosis and other personality disorders; users have often been known to attack others or cause serious injury to themselves. Other side effects are hepatitis, malnutrition, and exhaustion. There have been recorded cases of brain damage and death.

If you are interested in joining us in this effort and in co-sponsoring the amendment, please contact Miss Deb Hastings on Extension 5–8143 no later than Wednesday, June 16.

Sincerely,
Charles E. Wiggins, Sam Steiger, Larry Winn, Jr., William J. Keating, Claude Pepper, Chairman, Jerome R. Waldie, Frank J. Brasco, James R. Mann, Morgan F. Murphy, and Charles B. Rangel, Members of Congress.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1973.

Hon. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You are aware of the Select Committee on Crime's continuing concern with the serious national problem created by drug abuse with amphetamines. In 1970, we urged your Department to bring the excessive production of these dangerous drugs under control. In July of this year, you advised the Committee that the Justice Department had initiated a program to limit the production of amphetamines.

The most qualified medical experts who testified before our Committee clearly and convincingly established three major points. First, Doctor Sidney Cohen, who was the director of the Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse of the National Institute of Mental Health, estimated that this nation's maximum yearly requirement for amphetamines is one million dosage units. Other medical experts agreed that there are only two legitimate treatment purposes for which these powerful stimulants may be used—the treatment of hyperkinesis in children and narcolepsy. The medical authorities' final point was that the present widespread and indiscriminate abuse of amphetamines in crash diet situations creates a health hazard far greater than any therapeutic value these drugs may have in the treatment of obesity.

The Committee has recently been advised that the Department of Justice has set production limits for amphetamines and methamphetamines which are equivalent to 1.5 billion dosage units for 1972. When contrasted with the estimates of the experts who testified before our Committee, it is apparent that these production limitations are grossly and entirely inadequate. A true perspective of the 1.5 billion amphetamines may be obtained when it is compared with the nation's population. The suggested production quotas would permit more than

seven doses of amphetamines a year for every one of our citizens—man, woman and child.

This country, Sweden, Japan and other nations have found through tragic experiences that the continued availability of massive amounts of amphetamines creates a hospitable climate for extensive and deadly drug abuse. In many situations these extremely dangerous drugs have created health hazards of epidemic proportion.

Under these circumstances, the Committee respectfully requests that you re-evaluate your decision in relation to the permitted quotas, and suggests that the amphetamine production allowances be substantially curtailed so as to provide solely for legitimate medical requirements.

The Committee would greatly appreciate being advised of any further developments in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1972.

Hon. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Our continuing drug crisis is a horrendous problem which has concerned the Select Committee on Crime for the last three years. As you know, we have persistently proposed legislation and governmental action which is designed to contain and control drug abuse throughout the nation.

Drug abuse with amphetamines and similar compounds has been a critical area in our investigations. In 1970 we urged the Department of Justice to bring the excessive production of these dangerous drugs under control. Almost a year later, in July 1971, your department initiated a program to limit the production of amphetamines. In December 1971 we protested as entirely inadequate the Department of Justice's proposed 40% reduction of amphetamines production. After our protest, the Department more than doubled the production cutback—raising it to a more reasonable 82%.

In the course of our original investigation in 1970 we found that Ritalin (methylphenidate) and Preludin (phenmetrazine) were drugs exactly like the amphetamines insofar as drug abuse was concerned; we concluded that they should be placed under the same stringent controls as the amphetamines. We pointed out that Sweden had previously experienced a damaging drug abuse epidemic with these drugs. Specifically, school children began utilizing these drugs when they were just sixteen years of age. In Sweden 81% of juvenile drug addicts used Preludin and 36% abused Ritalin.

On January 1, 1972 the Department of Justice—belatedly and after a reversal of its position on the matter—rescheduled Preludin and Ritalin placing them under the strict controls we originally advocated in 1970. There is no doubt in my mind that the needless delay in imposing these restraints, apparently caused by bureaucratic inertia, has contributed to the drastic increase in drug abuse among our school age youth. It is also unmistakable that the death of a large number of teenagers from overdoses of Ritalin and Preludin would have been avoided. Our recent hearings in New York and Miami and our preliminary investigations in Chicago and San Francisco have clearly demonstrated these facts.

I think you would agree that a forceful, decisive and conclusive attack on drug abuse with these substances is long overdue.

It is, therefore, with deep regret that I learned of the presently proposed production reduction for Preludin (40%) and Ritalin (50%).

As with the original amphetamine cutback, these reductions are entirely and grossly inadequate. Indeed, it is obvious that cutbacks for these drugs should be greater than those adopted for the amphetamines. Since the amphetamine production quotas were established, almost twenty state medical groups have voluntarily adopted restrictions on the use of these drugs.

More importantly, the production quota for all of these dangerous drugs should be predicated solely upon the necessity to provide medication for those individuals who are actually suffering from narcolepsy and hyperkinesis.

Under these circumstances we respectfully request that you reevaluate these production curbs and drastically revise them so this avenue of drug abuse will be effectively closed to our nation's youth.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You know drug abuse is an extremely serious problem that daily becomes more serious. Drugs are directly threatening the mental and physical health of our youth. Drug related crimes are overwhelming Federal and State police. Drugs are seriously threatening the orderly operation of our court systems and correctional institutions. And now we find that drugs are undermining the integrity of our Armed Forces. The Nation has not faced a more serious domestic threat in the last one hundred years.

The Select Committee on Crime has studied and investigated the drug problem for the past two years. The Committee findings are contained in House Report No. 91–978, Marihuana, House Report No. 91–1807, Amphetamines, and House Report No. 91–1808, Heroin and Heroin Paraphernalia. A fourth Report on drug related research and rehabilitation is forthcoming. We know that strict criminal sanctions and effective law enforcement are part of the solution. We have moved to make the laws of the District of Columbia prohibiting drug trafficking more comprehensive, and we ask your support.

The Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (P.L. 91–513), provides adequate sanctions for unlawfully dealing in drugs themselves. However, the drug trade is broader and more complicated than just drugs. "Legitimate" businessmen who might never see illicit drugs, are essential to the trade. These persons provide needles to the heroin addicts and "speed freaks". These persons provide the pusher with essential tools of his trade; cutting agents and diluents for the drugs, and containers to package drugs for the street. Any such person who enriches himself by intentionally supplying support to drug traffickers must be stopped. The bill we proposed also provides penalties for possession of drug paraphernalia with the intent to carry on or promote the drug trade. Too often police, armed with a search warrant enter the drug pushers' "factory" seconds late. The drugs are flushing down the toilet. All that remains are the gelatin capsules and the cutting agents. As the law stands now, chances are the pusher has escaped arrest. If our bill is enacted, he would be caught dead to rights.

Section (a) provides that trafficking in drug paraphernalia shall be subject to the same penalty for trafficking in that particular drug as provided in P.L. 91–513. In other words, selling pipes for smoking hashish will have the same penalty as selling hashish. Possessing mannite to cut heroin for sale will have the same penalty as possessing heroin for sale.

This bill in Section (b) prohibits possession by the drug abuser of needles, syringes, pipes or other instruments he uses to take his drugs. Typically, a heroin addict will carry a "kit" consisting of a bent spoon, a needle, and a bottle cap or "cooker", that he uses to shoot up. We provide the same misdemeanor penalty for possession of paraphernalia by the user as is provided in P.L. 91–513 for possession of the drug by a user.

This bill is proposed with full realization that drug paraphernalia in other contexts has legitimate and desirable uses. Every pharmacy in the District of Columbia stocks hypodermic syringes, mannite, gelatine capsules, and other paraphernalia. Clearly these pharmacists should not be fearful of prosecution or intimidated from freely pursuing their business. This bill completely protects against such results. The prosecution must establish beyond a reasonable doubt that any person charged with a violation of this law specifically intended to promote illegal drug trafficking (Section a) or specifically intended to use a drug in an unlawful manner himself (Section b).

This bill was introduced on May 18, 1971, (H.R. 8569), with the sponsorship of the eleven Members of the Select Committee on Crime and Mr. John McMillan, Chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee. The measure is to apply to the District of Columbia in the hope that it will not only help narcotics enforcement officers here, but will serve as a model for the States to emulate. Such a comprehensive approach to unlawful trafficking in drug paraphernalia has been made by only Virginia and Maryland to date.

This same bill will be reintroduced on June 24, 1971. If you are interested in joining us in this effort to curb the drug trade, please contact Andrew Radding on Extension 5–8140 as soon as possible.

Kindest regards, and

Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman.

CHARLES E. WIGGINS,
Member of Congress.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1971.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Select Committee on Crime was created by House Resolution 17 on May 1, 1969. The Committee was authorized and directed by the House of Representatives to investigate and study all aspects of crime in America. This broad mandate allows the Committee to assist the Standing Committees of the House to meet their legislative responsibilities. We also have the duty to advise Congress and so the American people, on methods of meeting the challenge of crime.

The Committee has investigated and analyzed the social, economic, medical and legal aspects of the drug abuse crisis for the past two years. I need not detail to you the serious implications of drug abuse with regard to the administration of justice. Our investigations of illicit drugs included public hearings in Massachusetts, New York, Nebraska, California, South Carolina, Florida and the District of Columbia. The Committee findings in this area are contained in Reports from the Committee to the House of Representatives. The Reports are *Marihuana* (House Rep. 91–978), *Amphetamines* (House Rep. 91–1807), and *Heroin and Heroin Paraphernalia* (House Rep. 91–1808). A fourth Report on the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts is forthcoming.

The eleven Members of the Committee and sixty-three other Members of Congress have introduced the bill I have attached hereto. We are respectfully forwarding it to you in the hope you will consider its applicability to your State. It is the judgment of the Committee that criminal sanctions such as this should be enforced by local Government and so this bill is drafted to apply to the District of Columbia.

This bill is intended inter alia to meet several types of criminal behavior. The drug trade in your State has more dimension than individuals buying and selling contraband drugs. A parallel trade in "drug paraphernalia" is essential to support the drug traffic. Often "legitimate" businessmen, who typically never possess or sell drugs operate the paraphernalia trade. They provide the syringes and needles to heroin addicts and amphetamine abusers. They provide pipes for marihuana, hashish, and peyote smokers. They provide the pushers with cutting agents to dilute heroin for street sale. They provide the pusher with the "bags" or containers for the drugs; typically small gelatin capsules or glassine envelopes. Committee investigators uncovered a pharmacy in New York City that sold, in a three-year period, four tons of mannite, 40,000 ounces of quinine hydrochloride 47 million glassine envelopes and 55 million No. 5 gelatin capsules, such items sold mainly to be used in the illicit drug trade. New York State and the City of New York had no specific law to stop this operation. Although this is not a typical example because of the uniquely heavy consumption of heroin in New York City, this type of operation on a smaller scale undoubtedly exists in other areas in proportion the intensity of heroin use.

Your State or cities may well have an "implements of a crime" type statute, often enacted to apply to the possession of burglar tools. Attempts have been made to apply this law to paraphernalia dealers in the District of Columbia without success. Additionally, these statutes may also carry only misdeameanor penalties. We believe a specific law which carries felony penalties and contans forfeiture provision is more desirable. Specific sanctions also have an educational and deterrent effect.

The second specific set of facts we intend to cover arises when police officers armed with a search warrant enter the drug pusher's "factory" seconds too late where the drugs have been flushed down the toilet; a relatively common occurrence. Often what remains available for seizure are the tools of the pusher's trade; glassine envelopes, and the cutting agents. Chances are, as many State laws now stand, the pusher has escaped arrest.

This bill is proposed with full realization that drug paraphernalia in other contexts has legitimate and desirable uses. Every pharmacy stocks hypodermic syringes, mannite, gelantine capsules, and other paraphernalia. Clearly these pharmacists should not be fearful of prosecution or intimidated from freely pursuing their business. This bill protects against such results. The prosecution must establish beyond a reasonable doubt that any person charged specifically intended to promote illegal drug trafficking (Section a) or specifically intended to use a drug in an unlawful manner himself (Section b).

The penalty provisions of this bill parallel the penalties provided under the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (P.L. 91–513). Section (a) provides that trafficking in drug paraphernalia shall be subject to the same penalty for trafficking in that particular drug as provided in P.L. 91–513. In other words, selling pipes for smoking hashish will have the same penalty as selling hashish. Possessing mannite to cut heroin for sale will have the same penalty as possessing heroin for sale.

Section (b) prohibits possession by the drug abuser of needles, syringes, pipes, or other instruments he uses to take his drugs. Typically, a heroin addict will carry a "kit" consisting of a bent spoon, a needle, and a bottle cap or "cooker", that is used to shoot up. We provide the same misdeameanor penalty for possession of paraphernalia by the user as is provided in P.L. 91–513 for possession of the drug a user.

The Select Committee on Crime believes this bill, if enacted, will greatly assist the law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia to combat drug related crime. Of course you may desire to modify language in the bill in order to meet the needs of your State. In that connection, I would urge you to contact our Associate Chief Counsel, Michael W. Blommer at 202–225–8142, who would be happy to aid you or your staff in answering any questions that arise.

Kindest regards, and

Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

STATE HEALTH CENTER,
HARRISBURG, PA., *February 1, 1972.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, Select Committee on Crime, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Re. Leonard S. Cohen, Senate Drug Store, Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: I have enclosed a copy of an article which appeared in the January 19, 1972 edition of the Harrisburg Patriot-News regarding the above subject.

Acting on a complaint filed by this office, the Pennsylvania State Board of Pharmacy cited Mr. Cohen for "grossly unprofessional conduct" in connection with his extensive sales of controlled paraphernalia used in narcotic trafficking. After the hearing, the Board suspended Mr. Cohen's license for one year and ordered an indefinite revocation of his pharmacy permit. Mr. Cohen's attorney later appealed this action to the Commonwealth Court, which upheld the suspension and revocation on January 18, 1972.

Without a doubt, the hearings held by your Committee in October, 1970, concerning the drug paraphernalia problem in general and Mr. Cohen's activities in particular provided the impetus for the Pharmacy Board's action. In addition, the Pennsylvania Legislature is now considering the passage of new, comprehensive drug legislation which includes provision banning the sale of controlled paraphernalia.

Your interest and cooperation in this matter have been greatly appreciated by our unit and many other local law enforcement agencies.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. LIVINGSTON,
Division of Drug Control.

Subsequen⁺ to crime committee hearings in 1970, which published a model paraphernalia statute, 35 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, plus the Virgin Islands and Guam, enacted and are now enforcing drug paraphernalia laws.

Those States are:

Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana.

Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missori, Nebraka, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Wisconsin.

New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, Washington, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, North Dakota, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Oregon.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1972.

Hon. CLAUDE D. PEPPER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: I am writing to thank you for all that you did in moving the legislation to establish the Special Action Office toward its final enactment on March 21, 1972.

This new law provides vitally needed tools for the achievement of our mission to combat the drug abuse crisis which our nation faces today.

I appreciate your support and look forward to working together with you in the future.

Sincerely,

JEROME H. JAFFE, M.D., *Director.*

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following material concerning the activities of the Select Committee on Crime for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AND GOALS

As a special investigative Committee, the Select Committee on Crime of the U.S. House of Representatives has assisted the Congress in the development of significant legislative enactments and administrative actions designed to reduce crime in the United States. In addition to filing Reports and making substantial recommendations to Standing Committees, the Chairman and Members of the Select Committee on Crime have individually and jointly sponsored anti-crime legislation and appeared before Standing Committees of the House and Senate to urge enactment of legislation suggested by the Crime Committee as well as other Committees of the Congress with legislative jurisdiction in the criminal justice field.

Hearings held in the 91st Congress formed the basis for recommendations to and legislative action by Standing Committees in both the 91st and 92nd Congresses. A number of Crime Committee recommendations resulted in administrative actions of various Federal Government agencies and departments. Accomplishments as of February, 1973, in which the Crime Committee assumed a dominant role include:

Amphetamine controls. The Crime Committee discovered early in its field hearings (San Francisco, October, 1969) that illegal drug trafficking was not solely responsible for a national drug emergency. In testimony gained in field hearings and in Washington, the Crime Committee heard evidence sharply criticizing pharmaceutical firms for promoting and packaging six to eight Billion amphetamines or "pep pills," half of which were being diverted and resold in the black market. In injectable form, amphetamines became known to a youthful drug culture as "speed" and were responsible for numerous instances of death and brain damage. Grossly over-prescribed for weight control, amphetamines were misused by millions of adults. Medical witnesses testified in Washington ("Crime in America—Why 8 Billion Amphetamines," November 1969) that the pills were clinically trivial for dietary purposes. In November, 1970, Members of the Crime Committee found the opportunity to amend pending legislation and attempted a fight on the House floor to place amphetamines under quotas and controls. Losing in the House, the Committee succeeded in finding support in the Senate where such legislation passed only to be deleted in House-Senate Conference. ("Amphetamine Politics on Capitol Hill." Trans-Action magazine, January, 1972).

On January 2, 1971, the Crime Committee renewed its attack on the over-production of amphetamines with a report entitled "Amphetamines." The Committee recommended quotas and controls on the pills and the production of only enough pills to meet the medical needs of two rare diseases, narcolepsy and hyperkinesis. Legislation

was introduced and hearings begun before Standing Committees of the House and Senate. The Crime Committee continued to demand in communications to the Attorney General, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, that amphetamines be rescheduled and subjected to quotas and controls. Finally, in 1971, faced with increasing pressure from Congress, the Justice Department announced that quotas and controls would be placed on amphetamines. Later in the year the B.N.D.D. announced an 82 percent cutback in 1972 over the number produced in 1971, even while the pharmaceutical manufacturers were requesting a 50 percent increase. Advised that the reduction was the best that could be hoped for, the entire Committee protested that the equivalent of 500 million pills were still too many to meet the legitimate medical needs of the country. On January 18, 1973, the F.D.A. announced that it recommended to the B.N.D.D. that a further 60 percent cut be ordered.

Heroin research. Hearings held by the Crime Committee in Washington ("Narcotics Research, Rehabilitation and Treatment," April and June, 1971) convincingly established the need for the appropriation of funds to stimulate medical research to discover non-addictive drugs as alternatives to methadone for the treatment of narcotics addicts. The Committee in prior hearings established that at least half of what is commonly referred to as "street crime," offenses against person and property, are committed by individuals seeking funds to sustain their addiction. In a Report entitled "A National Research Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis" (November 18, 1971), the Committee recommended a $50 million appropriation for scientific research to find a drug or combination of drugs to treat herion addicts. As a direct result, PL 92-255, creating the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, adopted in March, 1972, contained provisions for $75 million for research on heroin blocking agents. (See letter dated March 31, 1972, from Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, Director, SAODAP, to Chairman Pepper). The Crime Committee received excellent cooperation from the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this legislation. The Public Health Subcommittee recently announced that promising results were being achieved in working with naloxone, a heroin antagonist.

Funds for corrections. Testimony at the Crime Committee's first public hearing (The Improvement and Reform of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the United States, Washington, D.C. August and September, 1968) suggested that a set percentage of all funds appropriated under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to fight crime be allocated to corrections. Following the hearings, Chairman Pepper and other Members of the Committee appeared before Standing Committees of the House and Senate urging that a minimum of 20% of all funds to fight crime through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration be allocated for correctional institutions and facilities. It was also urged that the funds be used for decentralization of large prison facilities. As a result of the efforts of the Crime Committee, the Administration, and Standing Committees of the House and the Senate, a new section, Part E, was added to the authority of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which provided that beginning in fiscal year 1972 an amount equal to not less than 20% of all Action Grants (the greater part of all funds channelled to the states through the L.E.A.A.) must be reserved for correctional institutions and facilities.

Heroin paraphernalia statutes. As a result of hearings ("Crime in America—Heroin Importation, Distribution, Packaging and Paraphernalia," New York, June, 1970, and Washington, D.C., October, 1970) and a Report issued January 2, 1971 ("Heroin and Heroin Paraphernalia"), a total of 34 States have enacted legislation based on a model bill submitted by the Crime Committee to make it unlawful to intentionally promote or facilitate illegal drug trafficking by possession, sale, or distribution of heroin paraphernalia. All eleven Members of the Committee sponsored such legislation for the District of Columbia (H.R. 8569, 92nd Congress, May 19, 1971) and hearings were held in 1972 by the House District of Columbia Committee. In recent weeks, the existing District paraphernalia statute governing evidence seized was ruled unconstitutional. Crime Committee Member Charles Rangel, a new member of the District Committee, has agreed to lead an effort in the 93rd Congress to enact the legislation sponsored by the Crime Committee.

Juvenile Justice Research Institute. Following a five state site inspection of juvenile correction facilities (July, 1970) and hearings in Baltimore (Crime in America—Youth in Trouble) and Philadelphia ("Crime in America—Youth Gang Warfare"), legislation was introduced by Chairman Pepper, other Members of the Committee and additional colleagues to establish a Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center (91st Congress, H.R. 19327). The Pepper bill was merged with legislation sponsored by Congressman Tom Railsback, ranking minority member of House Judicial Subcommittee No. 3 and passed by the House of Representatives. Action was not completed in the U.S. Senate and similar legislation has been reintroduced in the 93rd Congress.

Marihuana laws. Testimony contributed during field hearings across the country led to a Washington, D.C., hearing in October, 1969, on the need to reform the marihuana laws ("Crime in America—Views on Marihuana"). The hearings resulted in a Crime Committee Report ("Marihuana," April, 1970), which reviewed the disparity of penalties for marihuana possession in the several states and recommended that possession of small quantities be made a misdemeanor rather than a felony with sentences no longer than seven days. Six months later Federal statutes were amended to make possession of small quantities of marihuana a misdemeanor.

Crime funds. In a speech to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, Chairman Pepper in October, 1969, following hearings in Washington, D.C., Boston, Omaha, and San Francisco, called for a Federal commitment of $1 billion a year through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to fund various anti-crime programs. The Chairman appeared or presented statements to legislative committees urging a more ambitious effort through L.E.A.A. and other agencies. Funding of the L.E.A.A. has increased from $63 million in fiscal year 1969 to the $855 million recommended in the Administration's FY 1973 budget. (Total Administration anti-crime and drug abuse efforts for FY 73 are approximately $2.5 billion).

Hijacking. Chairman Claude Pepper was the first Member of the Congress to submit legislation (July, 1970) authorizing the appropriation of Federal funds to the Federal Aviation Agency to install weapon detection devices at all 531 commercial airports in the country. The purpose was to resolve a jurisdictional dispute between the F.A.A., the air carriers, and the airports, as to whose responsibility it was to pay for the devices. The Chairman made numerous appearances before Standing Committees in support of this and similar legislation. In May, 1972, all eleven Members of the Crime Committee demanded that the F.A.A. take immediate steps to assure the installation of weapon detection devices at all airports. In August, 1972, an appropriation of $3.5 million was made to the F.A.A. for the purchase and installation of weapon detection devices. A supplemental appropriation for $5.5 million for additional costs is pending before the House and Senate Appropriation committees.

Among the priorities of the Select Committee on Crime should it be reconstituted in the 93rd Congress will be the implementation of recommendations contained in four forthcoming reports on "Drugs in the Schools," "Organized Criminal Activity in Sports (Racing)," "Conversions of Worthless Securities Into Cash," and "American Prisons in Turmoil."

The Committee is also considering hearings into "Street Crime," the term commonly invoked to describe crimes against person and property; and hearings to consider the effect of drug advertising on television and radio and what correlation, if any, exists between such advertising and what the Committee will describe as a "drug epidemic" in our schools in a forthcoming report. Such a hearing would also consider what voluntary restraints are adopted at February and March meetings of committees of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Among legislative recommendations the Crime Committee plans to pursue before Standing Committees of the House in the 93rd Congress will be bills to provide:

Drug abuse education funds. The Crime Committee based on field hearings in six cities is determined to press for funds for school districts so that adequate drug counseling and on or off campus programs can be created in the next school year. Following the Committee's hearings in Chicago, the School Board passed a resolution seeking $4.4 million in Federal funds for a $5.8 million program to hire teachers with drug training backgrounds and for detecting and finding help for adolescent drug abusers. The Los Angeles School Board following hearings there requested $3.4 million for a drug abuse program in the schools. Funds to survey the Dade County School System (Miami) were authorized by the School Board following hearings in that city. The Crime Committee is convinced that a massive infusion of Federal funds is necessary if the schools are to participate in a national effort to combat the drug abuse problem. Many school boards are broke. The Committee was advised by Chairman Carl Perkins of the House Education and Labor Committee last October, following the appearance of Chairman Pepper and Oakland School Superintendent Marcus A. Foster before his Committee, that funds for drug abuse education and related programs would be considered this year.

Barbiturate quotas. Based on testimony obtained in field hearings in New York City, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, Kansas City, and Los Angeles, the Crime Committee will recommend legislation to bring under controls and quotas nine fast acting barbiturate compounds and two barbiturate-like compounds identified as abused drugs by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The Crime Committee has found that these barbiturates are more deadly than heroin and that withdrawal, unlike most cases involving heroin, can be fatal. Fast-acting barbiturates are widely dealt in elementary and secondary school campuses throughout the country and are especially deadly when taken with alcohol.

Amphetamine quotas. The Crime Committee will press for a further 60 percent cutback in amphetamine production as recommended by the Food and Drug Administration. This will reduce legal production of amphetamines to the equivalent of approximately 200 million pills, down from a high of six to eight BILLION pills which the Crime Committee exposed as a form of "legal" drug trafficking in 1969.

A District of Columbia heroin paraphernalia statute. Congressman Charles Rangel, who serves on the Crime Committee and was assigned to the House District Committee for the 93d Congress, will move to replace a recently court-rejected D.C. paraphernalia statute with one drafted by the Crime Committee and adopted in 34 states. Hearings on the Crime Committee bill, H.R. 8569, were held in the House District Committee in 1972.

Juvenile Justice Institute. Legislation to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice (H.R. 45 and identical bills) has been reintroduced in the 93d Congress. The House approved the bill in 92d Congress.

Pari-mutuel racing. Federal legislation and recommendations for state action in the area of pari-mutuel racing will be presented this month in a Crime Committee Report entitled "Organized Criminal Influences In Sports (Racing)."

Securities Fraud. The Crime Committee in a Report entitled "Conversion of Worthless Securities Into Cash" will recommend steps to prevent criminals from using phony statements of assets to obtain favorable credit ratings and swindle legitimate businesses as exposed in hearings last Congress.

Correctional reform. Recommendations based on hearings entitled "American Prisons In Turmoil" held in Washington, D.C., New York City, and interviews with inmates, guards and prison authorities at Attica, New York, will be made this month.

RECORD OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following material concerning the activities of the Select Committee on Crime for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RECORD OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

I. INTRODUCTION

The Select Committee on Crime of the U. S. House of Representatives was authorized on Law Day, May 1, 1969, by a record vote of 343 to 18. The legislation creating the Committee enjoyed the bipartisan sponsorship of 116 Congressmen. The Committee was empowered to probe "all aspects and elements of crime" in the United States, and to report to the House of Representatives its findings, "together with such recommendations as it deems advisable." The original membership of the Committee was comprised of seven Representatives, all of whom were attorneys, under the chairmanship of Claude Pepper, D.-Fla.

In the spring of 1971, the Committee was reconstituted by a voice vote of the House, and the demand by Members to be appointed to the Committee was such that its membership was increased to eleven by the 92nd Congress. The Committee is presently composed of Claude Pepper, D.-Fla., Chairman; Jerome R. Waldie, D.-Calif.; Frank J. Brasco, D.-N.Y.; James R. Mann, D.-S.C.; Morgan F. Murphy, D.-Ill.; Charles B. Rangel, D.-N.Y.; Charles E. Wiggins, R.-Calif.; Sam Steiger, R.-Ariz.; Larry Winn, Jr., R.-Kansas; Charles W. Sandman, Jr., R.-N.J.; and William J. Keating, R.-Ohio.

The Select Committee on Crime held 18 sets of public hearings in Washington, D.C., and numerous cities across the width of the Nation. Not content simply to have the experts come to Washington, D.C. to testify, the Committee took its hearings to the public in the following 15 additional cities: Lorton, Virginia; Boston, Massachusetts; Omaha, Nebraska; Lincoln, Nebraska; San Francisco, California (twice); Columbia, South Carolina; Miami, Florida (twice); Fairfax, Virginia; Riverdale, Maryland; Baltimore, Maryland; New York City (three times); Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Chicago, Illinois; Kansas City, Kansas; Los Angeles, California. The Committee held more than 100 days of public hearings in these cities and received testimony from more than 1,000 witnesses at these hearings. In addition, the members of the Select Committee on Crime visited correctional institutions in Attica, New York; Red Wing, Minnesota; Plainfield and Pendleton, Indiana; Detroit, Michigan; Meridian, Connecticut; Leesburg, Trenton, Rahway, Newark and Hackensack, New Jersey; and Camp Hill, Pennsylvania.

Of course, Committee staffers interviewed many thousands of potential witnesses and other persons knowledgeable in the various areas investigated by the Committee. Contacts were made with countless Federal, state and local officials. At the Federal level, cooperation was received from the United States Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Director of the Law Enforcement Administration, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, the Board of Parole, the U.S. Marshal; the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Commissioner of Education; the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service; and various independent agencies including the National Science Foundation, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the General Services Administration and many others. State officials who cooperated with the Select Committee on Crime included Governors, Attorneys General, State Police Commissioners, Judges, Department of Corrections officials, Department of Education officials, State Racing Commissioners, University officials, Department of Health officials, and Board of Pharmacy officials. Cooperation was received from many local officials, such as Mayors, Prosecuting attorneys, Chiefs of Police, Sheriffs, Drug Abuse officials, Juvenile and Criminal Court Judges, Probation Department officials, Public Defenders, Medical Examiners and other professionals, correctional officials, and others too numerous to mention.

II. SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The hearings of the Select Committee on Crime are briefly listed as follows:

"The Improvement and Reform of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in the United States." Washington, D.C., and Lorton, Va., July 28, 29, 30, 31, August 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, and September 17, 18, 1969.

The hearings touched on all aspects of crime and served as an overview, to help the Members of the Committee focus on specific problems in need of further study.

"Crime in America—Drug Abuse and Criminal Justice." Boston, Mass., August 25, 26, 1969.

This hearing focused on the phenomenal increase in the use of narcotics and dangerous drugs, and the critical need for better programs for the enforcement of narcotic laws, rehabilitation of drug addicts and drug abuse education. Another major theme was the critical need for the improvement of correctional institutions at the state and local level, and the role the Federal government can play in this regard.

"Crime in America—A Mid-American View," Omaha and Lincoln, Nebraska, October 9, 10, 11, 1969.

This hearing clearly demonstrated that the major problems of crime—narcotics and dangerous drug abuse, the rise in violent crimes, the increasing involvement of juveniles in criminal activities—are the same in medium-sized cities of the Midwest as they are in the major urban concentration of the country. The Committee especially focused on the development of suggestions for areas in which the Federal government could more effectively assist local government in fighting crime. The Committee elicited much helpful testimony on the subjects of drug abuse and addict rehabilitation, juvenile justice and corrections, improving and upgrading the police, and the eradication of the native marihuana supply in the United States.

"Crime in America—Views on Marihuana," Washington, D.C., October 14, 15, 1969.

Following up on material gathered at the Omaha/Lincoln hearing, the Committee held this hearing to specifically address the problem of widespread use of marihuana. Testimony was received from government officials concerned with the problem, as well as from doctors and researchers versed in the area.

"Crime in America—Illicit and Dangerous Drugs," San Francisco, Calif., October 23, 24, 25, 27, 1969.

This hearing was held to determine what course of action should be taken by the Federal government to restrict the movement of dangerous drugs from legitimate manufacturers to illegal drug distributors. Testimony was received from government officials, drug company representatives and the operators of illegal drug laboratories. The hearing documented the vast overproduction of amphetamines and the laxity of controls on their distribution.

"Crime in America—Why 8 Billion Amphetamines," Washington, D.C., November 18, 1969.

Following up on its work in San Francisco, the Committee convened this hearing to take additional testimony concerning the legitimate and illegitimate uses of amphetamines and methamphetamines. This hearing and the Committee's San Francisco hearing became the foundation of the Committee's drive to greatly curtail the legitimate but abused production of amphetamine drugs.

"Crime in America—Response of a Midsouth Community," Columbia, S.C., November 21, 22, 1969.

The focus of this hearing was the new and successful programs of the South Carolina correctional system. These programs included extensive vocational training, pre-release centers, and programs to mobilize community support for under-financed juvenile justice systems. The Committee took two field trips during this hearing; the first to meet with inmates of the Richland County Jail; the second to visit the Columbia Pre-Release Center, an innovative program to equip inmates for the society they are reentering.

"Crime in America—Aspects of Organized Crime, Court Delay and Juvenile Justice," Miami, Fla., December 4, 5, 6, 8, 1969.

The Committee received testimony that indicated that cocaine, a narcotic previously used only by the wealthy, is now in strong competition with drugs like heroin for use among the middle class. Testimony was also taken on the problems of cocaine smuggling, treatment and rehabilitation of the drug addict, and the need for better drug abuse education in the schools. The Committee also devoted time to the problems of violent street crime, youth crime and juvenile justice, as well as the effect of court delay on the quality of justice.

"Crime in America—In the Nation's Capital," Washington, D.C., Fairfax, Va., and Riverdale, Md., February 25, 26, 27, 28, 1970.

The Committee was concerned with the growth of street crime and its effect on citizens, and believed it could get a more accurate picture if the hearings were held in

the community. Two days of hearings were held in elementary schools in the Capital, and two days in the suburbs; one in Prince George's County, the second in Fairfax, Va. The District hearings focused on the plight of the ordinary citizen and businessmen and the deleterious effect of crime in their everyday life. The suburban hearings concerned the so-called spillover of crime from the District and the indigenous crime problems of the suburbs themselves.

"Crime in America—Youth in Trouble," Baltimore, Md., March 19, 20, 1970.

The Committee took wide-ranging testimony on the problems of youth crime, drug abuse and corrections. The tensions between the police and youth were explored, and a panel of youths told the Committee how they thought young people could be kept out of criminal activities.

"Crime in America—Heroin Importation, Distribution, Packaging and Paraphernalia," New York, N.Y., June 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 1970.

This hearing was a major effort to collect information concerning the importation, distribution, and packaging of heroin. With at least 200,000 heroin addicts in the United States today, the Committee was convinced that heroin addiction was a major cause of crime, particularly the types of crimes that citizens fear most—burglary, robbery and mugging. Testimony received revealed the difficulty of halting heroin smuggling and the frustration caused by court delay in prosecuting those indicted. The Committee also conducted an intensive investigation into the materials used to dilute and package heroin for street sale. As a result of this investigation, these materials became substantially more difficult to obtain and seriously hindered the normal heroin traffic in New York. The Committee also took an unpublicized visit to a church in the South Bronx to see first-hand the devastation caused by heroin addiction. Subpoenas to testify were served on several reputed organized crime members allegedly active in the heroin trade, but they declined to testify.

"Crime in America—Youth Gang Warfare," Philadelphia, Pa., July 16, 17, 1970.

The Committee's investigation revealed that there were 93 organized gangs operating in Philadelphia, with approximately 5,300 members ranging in age from 12 to 23. In 1969, 41 persons lost their lives in gang incidents, and, as of June 30, 1970, 17 persons had been slain in gang-related rampages. A long tied-up grant from LEAA was given to Philadelphia to fight gang warfare shortly after the Committee hearings there, and the Committee's work was cited at the time of the announcement.

"Crime in America—The Heroin Paraphernalia Trade," Washington, D.C., October 5, 6, 1970.

The purpose of this hearing was to inquire into the possible need for legislation to control the manufacture, distribution and sale of items used to dilute and package heroin for street sale. This heroin "paraphernalia" is essential to the pusher to dilute and package heroin into street doses, and the Committee discovered that many pushers were obtaining their paraphernalia from so-called legitimate businessmen. As a result of this hearing, one major drug company discontinued its production of the small gelatine capsules used to package heroin, and another major firm instituted stricter order controls.

"Narcotics Research, Rehabilitation and Treatment," Washington, D.C. April 26, 27, 28, 1971.

The hearings covered four separate but related areas of narcotics addiction. The complex problems of drug abuse and drug dependence were examined and solutions offered in a field the Crime Commisison has explored since its inception in May 1969.

"Narcotics Research, Rehabilitation, and Treatment," (second part) Washington, D.C., June 2, 3, 4 and 23, 1971.

The Crime Committee probed the phenomena of heroin addiction and revealed that there was a serious lack of medical knowledge and scientific exploration into new drugs to counter the effect of heroin.

On October 13, 1971, the Select Committee on Crime issued its report: "A National Research Program To Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis" which received favorable comment from individuals and associations across the country concerned about heroin addiction.

"American Prisons in Turmoil," Washington, D.C., November 29, 30 and December 1, 2, and 3, 1971 and February 25, 1972 (2 parts).

Following the tragic episode at Attica state prison in upstate New York which left 43 people dead, the Crime Committee initiated a series of hearings in Washington and New York City.

Testimony was taken from more than a score of witnesses including elected officials, prison authorities, line-personnel, prisoners and members of the academic community.

"Organized Crime: Techniques for Converting Worthless Securities Into Cash," Washington, D.C., December 7, 8 and 9, 1971.

This is the first of a series of hearings designed to show how extensively organized criminal elements have infiltrated the banking, securities, and insurance industries. The evidence uncovered thus far shows that important racketeers have combined with lawyers and accountants in developing schemes which have defrauded the general public as well as companies in the banking, securities, and insurance industries of hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

"Organized Crime in Sports," Washington, D.C., May 9–11, 15–18, 22–25, 30, 31; June 1, 7, 13–15; July 18–20, 25–27, 1972.

Following our inquiry into the infiltration of elements of organized crime into 3 areas of legitimate business, banking, securities and insurance, we began hearings designed to determine the extent of influence organized criminal elements have in sports and sports-related activities. The predominant focus was on the activities of major racketeers and their involvement with, and control of, sports activities. This inquiry included investigations of both the ownership and operation of sport facilities and teams as well as rigging sporting events to effect gambling activity.

The Committee also inquired into the roles of those ostensibly honest businessmen who cooperate with and assist leading racketeers in their infiltration into sports.

"Drugs In Our Schools," New York, June 19, 20, 1972; Washington, D.C., June 21, 27, 1972; Miami, Florida, July 5, 6, 7, 1972; Chicago, Illinois, September 21, 22, 23, 1972; San Francisco, California, September 28, 29, 30, 1972; Kansas City, Kansas, October 6, 7, 1972; Los Angeles, California, December 8, 9, 1972.

As indicated above, the Committee held six hearings on "Drugs In Our Schools" during the last six months of 1972. The hearings were designed to elicit testimony from teachers, school administrators, parents, students and other private and public officials concerned with drug abuse problems of the young.

The hearings clearly demonstrated that school students in every city the Committee visited were familiar with and were using and abusing a wide variety of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

The hearings further demonstrated that large scale, organized school programs to prevent drug abuse and to rehabilitate student drug abusers are virtually nonexistent.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following material concerning the activities of the Select Committee on Crime for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Committee's five Reports already submitted to the Congress embodied the results of studies on "Marihuana," "Heroin and Heroin Paraphernalia," "Juvenile Justice and Corrections," "Amphetamines," and "A National Research Program to Combat the Heroin Addiction Crisis." A brief summary of each of these Reports follows:

MARIHUANA

This Report summarizes evidence received at Committee hearings on the prevalence and dangers of this substance. It reviewed state and federal laws on marihuana and recommended that it be treated as a misdemeanor rather than felony with sentences no longer than seven days. Over 20,000 copies were printed and made available to Members of Congress at their request.

HEROIN AND HEROIN PARAPHERNALIA

Summarizing the historic use of heroin and morphine in the world and in the United States, in particular, this report outlines the scope of the problem and examines possible solutions. The 21 recommendations, many of which have been enacted, form the basis for a wide-ranging attack on heroin, both at its source overseas and in this country. A model paraphernalia law which has since been adopted by Virginia and Maryland, is included in the report. After Members of the Committee found out how disruptive to heroin trafficking restrictions on heroin paraphernalia could be, a bill was introduced for the District of Columbia.

JUVENILE JUSTICE AND CORRECTIONS

This Report examines the state of juvenile justice and corrections in the United States today and proposes methods for improvement both for the consideration of the Federal government and state and local governments. It recommends passage of a Juvenile Research Institute and Training Center Act drafted by the Committee after consultation with a distinguished panel of juvenile justice experts. In April 1972 the House adopted a bill to set up such an institute.

AMPHETAMINES

This Report traces the epidemic abuse of amphetamines in Japan and Sweden and warns that the United States may well experience such an epidemic if the proper controls are not instituted. This Report summarizes the Committee's wide-ranging investigation of these often abused and often ignored dangerous drugs, and calls for passage of the Committee's amendment to the present drug laws to limit by quota the production of these drugs. Although the amendment was defeated, quotas 82% lower than in 1971 have been established.

A NATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM TO COMBAT THE HEROIN ADDICTION CRISIS

This Report examines the state of the art concerning research into drug abuse and recommends an all-out national effort, similar to the Manhattan Project, to solve the problem of heroin addiction.

It explores the nature and potential value of antagonist drugs, such as cyclazocine and naloxone, and recommends that $50 million be appropriated to be used for emergency scientific research to create a drug which will effectively treat, prevent, or cure heroin addiction. At the urging of the Select Committee on Crime, PL 92–255, creating the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, passed in March 1972, contained provisions for $75 million for research of this type.

The Committee's four reports to be sub-

mitted shortly to the Congress embody the results of investigations and hearings on "Drugs in Our Schools," "Conversion of Worthless Securities Into Cash," "Organized Criminal Influences in Horseracing," and "Improvement of Our Correctional Systems." A brief summary of each of these Reports follows:

DRUGS IN OUR SCHOOLS

The school age youth of our country are being inundated with a wave of drugs from California to the New York Islands. Children are dying from acute reactions to heroin injections, from hepatitis caused by contaminated drug paraphernalia, and from the consumption of barbiturates and alcohol. Children are becoming dependent upon—or addicted to—an astonishing variety of narcotics and dangerous drugs. While preliminary investigation had indicated that schools were experiencing significant drug problems, the actual scope revealed in the course of the full investigation exceeded our worst expectations.

Drugs—drugs in all forms—are readily available (and frequently at very low cost) to school students. Sales of drugs take place with alarming regularity in school cafeterias, hallways, washrooms, playgrounds, and parking lots. With little or no effort our teenagers can obtain amphetamines, barbiturates, LSD, and marihuana. Cocaine and heroin are also generally available in schools. In one suburban school in Chicago a 17-year-old girl who was assisting the Committee purchased in a two-day period $100 worth of heroin, barbiturates, amphetamines, LSD and marihuana. A school official from Chicago told us that it was easier to buy drugs than notepaper in school. Unfortunately, Chicago is not unique in this regard.

Drug abuse surveys conducted by reliable authorities indicate that drug abuse in our schools is widespread and growing. The National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse found that 6% of the country's high school students had used heroin and that 2 million youngsters have tried hallucinogens. Other state and local surveys are even more alarming: a New York survey estimated that 20% of New York City junior high school students were drug users. A five-year study of drug abuse in San Mateo, California, confirmed that drug abuse increases dramatically as students progress from the freshman to the senior year in high school—drug abuse doubles in this span of time.

Drugs are incredibly dangerous and they kill the very young: heroin kills more young people in New York City than any other single cause including automobile accidents, homicides and suicides. In New York City in the last five years, drug deaths of the very young have increased a shocking 700%. Heroin caused the death in 1969 of a 12-year old boy in New York City; in Los Angeles County as many as 50 people overdose on drugs each day; Florida a teenage boy, under the influence of drugs, strangled his five-year old sister as his mother listened helplessly outside a locked bedroom. These are but a few of the "horror stories" related to the Committee during its investigation.

What causes these tragedies among our Nation's 52 million school students? Heroin, cocaine, barbiturates, amphetamines, methamphetamines, LSD, mescaline, peyote, marihuana and other psychedelics are all available—and all are dangerous. Heroin, cocaine, LSD and other drugs are produced illegally but others such as amphetamines and barbiturates are legally purchased by the billions and find their way into the hands of students.

Programs to help students do exist. Imaginative programs such as Fort Lauderdale's "Seed" program, Chicago's Gateway Houses Foundation, Kansas City's DIG (Drug Intervention Groups) and New York's Alpha School offer hope that children hooked on drugs can be rehabilitated. But widespread, organized and proven programs are few and far between. Only a massive Federal effort directed at the schools can succeed. Schools have the resources to combat student drug abuse—they have trained teachers, the facilities and more importantly they have the students. The Federal government must provide the leadership and the resources to mobilize a total assault on drug abuse in the schools.

CONVERSION OF WORTHLESS SECURITIES INTO CASH

The Committee's Report, "Conversion of Worthless Securities Into Cash", has been considered and revised, and will be filed shortly by the Select Committee on Crime. The Report culminated a lengthy investigation and three days of hearings by the Committee into organized criminal activities in the securities frauds area.

The Report focuses on two major frauds: the Baptist Foundation of America, Inc. (BFA) and the Dumont Datacomp, Inc. stock manipulation. In both cases the fraud perpetrated on the public was unwittingly aided by respectable members of the business community who lent their names and prestige to the swindles.

The Report details how the BFA used its own confidence-inspiring name plus a report on the foundation by the credit reporting firm, Dun & Bradstreet, to sell its worthless notes to unsuspecting parties. The Report vividly illustrates the complete lack of diligence by Dun & Bradstreet to report information accurately in its reports. The fact that Dun & Bradstreet accepted BFA's financial statement listing assets totalling $19 million without verifying the information contained in that statement is a startling revelation. That report by Dun & Bradstreet greatly enhanced BFA's chances of success in selling its worthless notes. The Committee has made recommendations that deal specifically with business practices of credit reporting agencies.

In the Dumont-Datacomp case the Report looks into a fraudulent stock manipulation, where in fact BFA notes were used in the transactions. The Report reveals how another member of the business community, the prestigious accounting firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company also played a role, albeit unwittingly, in the illegal manipulation. In that case, Peat, Marwick accepted a financial statement from another auditor and incorporated it into its own report on the Dumont Corporation. In fact, the independent auditor was involved in the manipulation and his audit report was totally fraudulent. Unfortunately for the public his report was incorporated under the Peat, Marwick masthead and hence credibility lent to it.

A major problem in the securities fraud area is the inadequate enforcement of the securities laws by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Committee adopted a recommendation that will, if enacted, greatly enhance the SEC's ability to protect the victims of illegal manipulations. All too often those defrauded are left with no recourse—the manipulator could very well be in jail—but the funds lost by those defrauded are forever gone. The recommendation will remedy this situation to the benefit of the innocent investor.

ORGANIZED CRIMINAL INFLUENCES IN HORSERACING

The Select Committee on Crime commenced its hearings in May, 1972, to determine the extent of influence organized criminal elements have had in sports and sports-related activities. The predominant focus was on the activities of major racketeers and their involvement with and control of the sports activities. The inquiry included investigations of both the ownership and operation of sports facilities and teams as well as rigging sporting events to effect gambling activity.

The Committee also heard of the roles of ostensibly honest businessmen who cooperate with and assist leading racketeers in their infiltration into sports.

The Committee's hearings also included testimony of fixed and rigged sporting events in order to effect gambling results, and uncovered extensive evidence of fixed horse races on many tracks in the country. Evidence of racketeers' hidden ownership of racetracks, horses and other sports-related activities was developed.

Another facet of the problem which became evident was a pattern of official corruption in relation to sports activities. The Committee also found that bribes or other illegal payments had been given to public officials in order to obtain helpful legislation, the necessary licenses, favorable racing dates, and other advantages.

The Committee Report, to be released this month, will call for legislation to make it a Federal offense to bribe a jockey, drug a horse, or otherwise conspire to tamper with the outcome of a race.

Other recommendations will be made to the 31 states engaged in partimutuel racing with the suggestion of possible further Federal action if efforts are not made to better police the sport.

IMPROVEMENT OF OUR CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS

In November and December, 1971, after the disaster at Attica, the Select Committee on Crime of the United States House of Representatives held extensive hearings on prison conditions—hearings which went far in substantiating the fact that our penal system has failed.

The deplorable status of the American prison systems is not a new condition, nor a condition susceptible to dispute. Quite the contrary, some of the most vocal critics of the prison system are prison administrators themselves. Yet, little is being done to remedy these admittedly deplorable conditions. In the words of Dr. Karl Menninger writting in *The Crime of Punishment*, the American penal system is a "creaking, groaning monster through whose heartless jaws hundreds of American citizens grind daily to be maimed so that they emerge implacable enemies of the social order and confirmed in their criminality."

On an average day, approximately 1.6 million people—a number greater than the individual 1970 populations of 15 separate states—are under correctional authority in our country: roughly one-third of whom are in penal institutions, while the balance are on parole or probation. However, 80 percent of the correctional dollar and 75 percent of correctional manpower are allotted to supervise the one-third of the offenders who are incarcerated in penal institutions. Little is being spent to treat and supervise the two-thirds of the offenders who are in the community on parole or probation. Less is being spent to develop alternatives to incarceration which could, according to correctional authorities, decrease the inmate population by 40 percent and, for the money spent, produce at least as good results.

Prisons have proven to be revolving doors that have cut offenders off from schools, families, jobs and other supportive means necessary to minimize an offender's return to crime. Furthermore, inmates who are released from prison find that society tends to continue to punish them for their transgressions. Persons convicted of felonies and certain serious misdemeanors frequently lose—for varying periods—their rights to vote, to hold appointive and elective public office, to serve as jurors, to testify in court, to obtain professional, business and occupational licenses, to enter into contracts, to take or transfer property, and to bring civil suits. It is no wonder that on a nationwide basis, 80 percent of all felonies are committed by ex-

inmates, and two out of three men released from our country's prisons are returned to prison within four years for new crimes or for parole violations. The cumulative effect of our present penology system is to breed deep and bitter disrespect for social order among offenders and ex-offenders who, in the words of Dr. Menninger, [become] "implacable enemies of social order and confirmed in their criminality."

Subsequent to the tragedy at Attica and major disturbances in correctional institutions in Florida, California, and New Jersey, the problems of our prisons have been maintained in the public spotlight by almost daily reports of major and minor correctional disturbances, and sensational escapes from "escape proof" or "maximum security prisons." These disturbances also point up the serious and uncorrected deficiencies which exist in many of our prisons and correctional systems. These are but symptoms of decay and failure. We must now move to provide better prison riot control techniques; more importantly, we encourage widespread reform to make rehabilitation a fact rather than a slogan.

THE REAL CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Jefferson said:

> It is in the natural course of events that liberty recedes and government grows.

I am glad to join the President, my colleagues in Congress, and millions of Americans in helping reverse that trend.

As the Federal Government's growth has mushroomed over the last decade, and as the percentage of personal income going for taxes has risen, the individual citizen has begun to lose control of his own economic destiny. Concomitantly, his faith in public leaders and government has plummeted. These realities stem from the increasing remoteness of the government from the governed. The once-cherished concept of self-government is rapidly becoming a page in history. It is a foreboding thought, but I fear it is true. If we subscribe to James Madison's view that "the only safe repository for human freedom is in self-government," we cannot help but be alarmed. The time for the reinstitution of self-government is before us.

It is from these deep-seeded convictions that I find great satisfaction in the new direction of government the President is helping set for the Nation, and that is outlined in his budget message.

Since the President submitted the budget to Congress several weeks ago, many of us have felt the full weight of conflicting demands, requirements, needs, and goals which can bear down upon a representative of "all" the people. The budget has focused on the complexity of problems which Congress is supposed to deal with and has made clear to me how difficult it is to integrate what seem to be conflicting but apparently justifiable human needs into policies which are equitable to all.

And our input does not make the job any easier. We are overwhelmed with a wealth of general information—analyses of the State of the economy, prognoses of recession and inflation, arguments proclaiming the horrifying effects of terminating this program or that, cries about the size of the defense budget, expressions of shock over the dismantling of OEO and certain areas of HEW. At the same time we have a paucity of information which indicates in any meaningful way if various programs in the social field have helped or hurt the people for which they were intended. We are constantly approached by a great variety of lobbyists, many with moving tables of woe and human suffering which are "inevitable" if cutbacks prevail in many areas of social welfare. Nowhere are we in Congress able to get good hard information which would make possible intelligent debate over the course of action embarked upon by the President and so starkly manifested in the new budget.

Gradually though, as the smoke from the battle clears, as the despair seems to grow in Congress, and as the White House maintains its appearance of intractability, some of the underlying causes which have created such a disturbing climate are becoming clear. I am impelled to hearken back to an illuminating article by Irving Kristol in which he gives a brief history of the changing nature of rhetoric throuhout American political history. In it he explains the changing relationship between visionary utopian eloquence and the more sober, subtle eloquence of the dispassionate, objective mind:

> The United States has always had, by historical standards, quite ambitious ideological ends of a timeless and universal nature. George Santayana, echoing the worldly wisdom of Old Europe, could dismiss the Declaration of Independence as "a salad of illusions." But these "illusions" represented a deep emotional commitment by a new national community to the idea that government—all government, everywhere—should be subservient to the citizen's individual life, his personal liberty and his pursuit of happiness. But, in another sense, the United States can also be said to have been one of the least ideological of nations. For, in addition to the philosophy of the Enlightenment, as incarnated in the Declaration of Independence, there was another and, for a long time, equally powerful political tradition that prevailed in the United States. This political tradition, rooted in centuries of British political experience and in British constitutional-juridical thought, found expression in the Constitution—a document that (unlike the contemporary French Revolutionary constitutions) was far more a lawyer's job of work than a social philosopher's. There is nothing particularly grand or visionary or utopian in the language of the Constitution. Its eloquence, where it exists, is the eloquence of British jurists as carried over and preserved in American legal education. And it proceeds to establish a mundane government based on a very prosaic estimate of men's capacities to subordinate passion to reason, prejudice to benevolence, self-interest to the public good.
>
> For more than a century, these two traditions coexisted amiably if uneasily in American life. The exultant prophetic-utopian tradition was always the more popular; it represented, as it were, the vernacular of American political discourse. It was, and is, the natural rhetoric of the journalist and the political candidate, both of whom instinctively seek to touch the deepest springs of American sentiment. In contrast, the constitutional-legal tradition supplied the rhetoric for official occasions and for the official business of government—for Presidential messages, debates in Congress, Supreme Court decisions and the like.
>
> Sometime around the turn of the century, the impact of the Populist and Progressive movements combined to establish the vernacular utopian-prophetic rhetoric as the offical rhetoric of American statesmen. It happened gradually, and it was not until the nineteen-thirties that the victory of the vernacular was complete and unchallengeable. But it also happened with a kind of irresistible momentum, as the egalitarian, "democratic" temper of the American people remorselessly destroyed the last vestiges of the neo-Whiggish, "republican" cast of mind. By now, we no longer find it in any way odd that American Presidents should sound like demagogic journalists of yesteryear. Indeed, we would take alarm and regard them as eccentric if they sounded like anything else.
>
> The effects of this transformation have been momentous; though not much noticed or commented upon. High-flown double-talk has become the normal jargon of American Government. This flatters and soothes the citizenry, but at the same time engenders a permanent credibility gap.

If what Kristol says is correct, and I believe it is, then our present ordeal in Congress, exemplified by the debate over the budget, seems to me to be the inevitable climax of a gradual movement in which esoteric utopian social goals have come to wholly dominate the congressional vision of what government should do for the governed. Objective realities and dispassionate reason have been left by the wayside.

The evidence of such movement is incontrovertible. The growth of the Federal budget over the past decade is phenomenal. Great streams of spending have resulted from little springs of good intentions, and the Congress has abdicated what should be its responsibility to see to it that its intentions are being carried out. Federal programs that begin on a modest scale often expand swiftly into the billions-a-year class—and keep right on growing. Recent programs of noncash subsidies, such as food stamps, medicaid, and social-service grants, have zoomed as a result of expanded goals, loopholes in the legislation, or unforeseen abuse. The costs of job-training and placement have been swelled by duplication of State and local efforts. These programs that start small and grow fast account for a lot of the expansion in Federal spending in recent years.

The total domination of social policymaking by the "social utopians" has caused not only a mushrooming budget, but also has brought the burden of taxation to the breaking point. Aside from the fact that most Americans are fed up with the amount of money they pay to the Government from their weekly paycheck, economic history indicates that excessive Government spending causes inflation, which is perhaps the greatest social evil of all. British economist Colin Clark suggested that the breaking point in taxation lies at about 25 percent of national income. Fortune recently pointed out that there are those

who argue that when peacetime taxation rises above that 25-percent level, a "slow but inexorable process of strangulation sets in, leading ultimately to the loss of both freedom and national stability." The fact is that combined Federal, State, and local government tax collections have risen from 13 percent of national income in 1929, to 26 percent in 1950, and 34 percent last year. And despite all the hard talk coming out of the White House, the trend is up unless Congress has the courage to stop it.

Perhaps even more alarming than the outcry of the American taxpayer is the threat that utopian rhetoric poses to U.S. institutions. It is clear to me that we are on the verge of overloading our public, and particularly Federal institutions. The overblown demands on them exceed their capacity to perform. And as greater financial commitment is made to them, always given with the implied expectation of absolute measurable improvement in whatever their pursuit, the gap between expectation and performance widens. James Perkins states the case remarkably well:

> It must not be assumed that if capacity for increased performance lies latent in our society, we can continually increase our demands on our institutions and that performance will automatically rise to the level of our demands. When you raise the ante, you do not improve the cards. This notion is the central fallacy of our times.

But Congress has not subscribed to that seemingly self-evident truth. Sadly, there are many whose devotion to an institution rises above the devotion to the goal the institution was originally intended to achieve. And uncontrolled distribution of moneys to public institutions in pursuit of an unattainable goal seems to have caused a disorientation which blinds some into thinking that if only additional funding can be found, the goals will be more nearly achieved.

There is no doubt that initial motivation for expending public moneys has been, to a great extent, valid. Clear examples abound where the private sector has fallen short and, in behalf of the general interest, Government has intervened. Environmental protection is an immediate example. But the prevailing thought seems to have become that only those on the public payroll can work in the public interest. That distortion must be immediately and successfully corrected.

Now that billions of dollars have been spent on the public payroll, and now that the American people have called for a halt to unsuccessful and only marginally successful public programs, we are faced with a dilemma—to continue to finance the Federal sector in "hopes" of more rapid social gains in the future, or to return resources and power to State and local governments with the expectation that those people closest to the problems are best equipped to handle them.

I cannot help but think that the latter approach is more likely to succeed. I will leave the espousal of the first argument to others; it is certainly not lacking for advocates. My support for returning power and moneys to local governments stems from something that the people seem to understand a good deal more explicitly than many in Congress—that Government is intended to function with the "consent of the governed." As the President put it:

> The American people as a whole—the governed—will give their consent to the spending of their dollars if they can be provided a greater say in how that money is spent and a greater assurance that their money is used wisely and efficiently by government. They will consent to the expenditure of their tax dollars as long as individual incentive is not sapped by an ever-increasing percentage of earnings taken for taxes.

While the President may be stretching his mandate from the people, there can be no doubt that he correctly perceives the American peoples' frustration over the misuse and inefficiency of Government funds. He is correctly, I think, reversing the flow of political power, taking decisionmaking out of Washington and putting it back in the hands of the people being served.

But Congress has not done, nor is it able to do, its fair share of the job. Maintaining a growing economy, halting inflation, keeping the budget under control, establishing national priorities—all these are areas of national concern which Congress, at present, is not capable of dealing with. Of the four identifiable phases in the budget process, three are presently in need of overhaul—budget execution and control, review and audit, and congressional authorization and appropriation.

Congress has abdicated its authority simply because it lacks the machinery to use its authority wisely. The top priority of this Congress should be to develop a vehicle which will allow us to get a handle on the budget, to view it in totality, and establish a ceiling on the budget, before the usual rituals of logrolling and pork-barreling begin to make their bid for what's available. We might learn from the British system. As the Christian Science Monitor explains it:

> In Britain the budget is one complete comprehensive whole. It is written each year in the Treasury. It is presented as a whole to the Parliament. It is debated as a whole and voted up or down as a whole. The British system of a single-budget is an improvement not yet emulated by Washington.

I have cointroduced legislation which will help meet the challenge to Congress to "reform its own fragmented and piecemeal approach to budget-making." The bill, originated in the Senate by Senator BROCK of Tennessee, would establish the machinery to enable Congress to arrive at its own spending priorities.

Our bill would require not only Congress as a body, but each individual Member, to face up to his duty to curb spending and stop the steady erosion of budgetary power to the executive branch.

The bill covers five major points:

First. Designate a joint congressional committee to formulate legislative budget and evaluate the federal budget in terms of priorities.

Second. Require the projection of all major expenditures over a 5-year period.

Third. Require all major spending programs to be evaluated at least once every 3 years.

Fourth. Require consideration of pilot testing of proposed major Federal programs.

Fifth. Require all Federal expenditure programs to be appropriated annually by Congress.

I know that other legislation addressing itself to these same areas of concern will be under consideration during this session. They must be acted upon promptly. While the notion of impoundment of funds does not sit well with me, I cannot in good conscience condemn an action which aims to achieve a result in the general interest which cannot in any other way be met.

There are specific impoundments with which I am in disagreement, particularly water pollution control moneys, certain elements of the higher education amendments of 1972, and others, but until we can establish the machinery for setting spending priorities, the President's approach will have great attraction.

His budget message concludes with an appeal to commonsense. It is a practical guide and goal, as well as a challenge which Congress should heed. If we do not, the President will, for lack of an alternative, continue his own methods of "serving the general interest." He said:

> Commonsense tells us that government cannot make a habit of living beyond its means. If we are not willing to make some sacrifices in holding down spending, we will be forced to make a much greater sacrifice in higher taxes or renewed inflation.
>
> Commonsense tells us that a family budget cannot succeed if every member of the family plans his own spending individually—which is how the Congress operates today. We must set an over-all ceiling and affix the responsibility for staying within that ceiling.
>
> Commonsense tells us that we must not abuse an economic system that already provides more income for more people than any other system by suffocating the productive members of society with excessive tax rates.
>
> Commonsense tells us that it is more important to save tax dollars than to save bureaucratic reputations. By abandoning programs that have failed, we do not close our eyes to problems that exist; we shift resources to more productive use.

While those admonishments might impel us toward a new approach to the budget process, an equally important area of concern is the establishment of methods and standards by which the costs of new and old Federal programs can be measured against their effectiveness or value to the taxpayers. Henry Wallich offers some thoughts on what should be the criteria for the worthwhileness of public expenditures.

HOW TO SPEND

(By Henry C. Wallich)

The budget squeeze has promptly separated the bad guys from the good guys. The bad guys are marked as plainly as in any Western. They like the new budget because they don't care about the poor or the environment, they ignore our great social needs, they don't want to pay taxes and want only to cater to their crude materialistic values.

The good guys do care, and they are outraged at the program cuts. They are willing to see taxes go up, and they can point to any number of ways of bringing in revenues by taxing types of income they may wish they had but do not.

This tendency of the good guys to fund their social concern with other people's money explains why right now they sound so unconvincing. But the propensity to tax Peter in order to pay Paul involves much more than the present budget hassle. It points to a fundamental dilemma in the fiscal process that needs careful diagnosis. The defect stems from the Federal budget's attempt to do two things at once: to redistribute income and to provide needed government services. This is bad economics. Today, it is also bad politics.

REDISTRIBUTING

I shall focus on bad economics. Our tax system embodies the principle of redistribution of income produced by the market as too uneven. We therefore tax the rich more than the poor so as to even things up a little. A progressive tax system is sound economics, although one could debate how much we should do in the way of redistribution. There are fairly persuasive reasons why we want to stop short of perfect equalization of incomes. But the principle of redistribution simply says that we should take money from the rich and give money to the poor. Where we get in trouble is by giving, not money, but government services. When redistribution gets mixed up with the provision of services the result is a bad use of the money—"misallocation of resources" in economese.

Suppose we found a way of breaking the whole process of taxing and spending into two steps. In the first step, we simply take and give money. This being done, we then ask people what amount of government services they would want, provided everybody had to pay for the full cost of the services rendered to him. This would allow the beneficiaries of redistribution to keep some of their benefits in cash, instead of having to take them in kind. If they think that the services they now get are worth what they cost, they could vote for them and pay the cost in taxes. If they do not think so, they would be better off with cash.

Under the present system, the beneficiaries of redistribution do not have this option. The only way a low-income person has of getting more redistribution is to demand more government services. He may not consider these services particularly valuable. He might not vote and pay for them if he had to pay the full cost. But he is in fact buying them below cost, because others are paying more than cost. Thus he is ahead, even though he would still be better off if he could get cash instead of government services.

Today the Federal government spends $30 billion to help some 25 million poor. This averages out at $4,800 per family of four, which if given in cash would put such a family well above the poverty line even if none of its members worked. But many of the benefits are given in kind. The worthwhileness of this spending is never properly weighed because the cost differs so enormously for different taxpayers.

HOW TO DO BETTER

The test for the worthwhileness of a public expenditure is very simple. Find out whether a majority will vote for it if it had to be financed without progressive taxation. Let it be examined on the assumption that everybody pays for what he gets. No comeons promising easy payments through loophole closings and other forms of making other people pay. By cutting the link to redistribution, the true value of the program will be revealed. If a majority still wants it, fine. If not, they are better off keeping their money.

This does not interfere with redistribution. Rejecting some expenditures will cut the tax bill. But the smaller tax bill can be made more progressive. Low-income people can be taken off the rolls, loopholes can be closed, regardless of the level of spending. Then we shall have redistribution without the price of unwanted government services.

Unless we can develop some way to measure effectiveness of Government programs, programs and costs will continue to be determined by special interests, emotions, and ideologies. Congress must make provision to have access to information from the various elements of the executive branch for which Congress is responsible, and unless the legislative branch can effectively oversee and review the results of its own initiatives, it will remain impotent to effectively debate program cutbacks, reorganization, or national priorities with the White House.

I have great faith in this body to improve its capacity to govern. We cannot function in some hoped for euphoria, nor can we disregard the real needs of the people. But a reduction in utopian rhetoric, a new sense of realism and understanding of what our institutions are capable of, real reform of the budget process, and a renewed understanding of the will of the people, should help put Congress back in the prevailing winds of the Nation.

The Buffalo Evening News correctly puts this challenge to Congress in proper perspective and I include it at this point:

NIXON'S BUDGET CHALLENGE

President Nixon has summoned Congress to what could easily become Washington's most significant debate of the year—particularly if Vietnam finally fades as a contentious issue—with today's proposed federal budget of $268.7 billion for the 12 months beginning next July 1.

The budget calls for no tax increases. It urges major re-allocations of funds sure to ignite controversy, and it correctly argues against federal spending of more than the $268 billion total.

Despite Mr Nixon's tight-fisted spender rhetoric, however, Congress ought to go him one better and trim that total even further—whatever the final decisions on specific items.

This is because the budget projects a $12.7 billion deficit. Budget deficits, to be sure, can helpfully stimulate economic recovery in a period of recession and sluggishness. But all signs now point to a period of robust economic activity, if not boom, in the year covered by this budget. Indeed, the administration itself forecasts that 1973's national economy will grow by a hefty $115 billion, more than the $102 billion spurt of last year. One of the current risks is rekindled inflation, especially with the relaxed wage-price controls advocated by the administration.

Thus, it seems to us, this deficit starkly poses the alternative of either less spending or more taxes than the President recommends. If Washington doesn't avoid spending more than it collects in periods of economic health, when should it avoid them?

This is not to claim that the President hasn't already made some difficult choices. He has. We agree with his arguments for consolidating many individual programs into broader revenue-sharing areas, such as education, urban community development and manpower training, a recommendation Congress has spurned in the past.

And he has challenged Congress with proposals to drastically reduce, or totally abolish, well-known programs like Model Cities, the Office of Economic Opportunity, urban renewal and farm price supports. We will reserve judgment on these and other proposed economies until later. But he has made hard choices, and this should obligate Congress to apply rigorous standards of whether results have justified the amounts of money spent rather than simply the popularity or authorship of these programs. The aim should not be to abandon the social-welfare goals, but to find better means to those goals.

We are not convinced, however, that the same rigorous standards of performance that the Nixon administration has applied to such programs as low- and middle-income housing, as well as community action counsels in the anti-poverty effort, have been applied to the vast array of subsidies to business and agriculture and the increased military spending. These are fields where budget-cutters ought to whet their axes.

The President is certainly right in urging Congress to reform its own fragmented and piecemeal approach to budget-making. He and others have suggested reforms—such as legislating an over-all budget ceiling—that could improve existing practices as to both the total budget and specific items.

The budget poses serious questions of national economic policy. It deserves serious consideration—concerning its total impact on the economy, its priorities among competing programs, its suggested procedures for reaching those decisions. This year is an ideal time for it to get just that kind of debate.

THE COMMUNITY SERVICES FELLOWSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, late in the last session of the 92d Congress, I introduced the Community Services Fellowship Act. Realizing there was not sufficient time to act upon it, I hoped its introduciton would provide a forum for the academic community, public agencies, local services organizations, and my colleagues here in the House to express their view of the bill. The response in support of the legislation has been most encouraging, and the suggestions I have received will certainly strengthen its provisions.

Today I am reintroducing the Community Services Fellowship Act—confident that it will provide the incentive necessary for many citizens of all ages to involve themselves in needed community service programs. The fellowship concept will provide postservice educational benefits to those who are willing to meet the challenges of community services.

This concept is designed to:

Rekindle the idea of voluntary service to the community and the Nation;

Create a new way to work one's way through college;

Enhance the ability of young people to make career decisions based on experience;

Develop a socially acceptable mechanism for those students who are not ready to enter—or continue—in college to break the academic lockstep;

Provide opportunities for participation in socially needed activities;

Facilitate vocational redirection, for those adults who wish to alter their career patterns;

Enable older and retired workers to impart their years of experience and understanding to community projects; and

Help locally based community service

agencies with an infusion of enthusiastic citizens to perform needed work in a creative manner.

BREAKING THE ACADEMIC LOCKSTEP

Twenty-five years ago, less than one-quarter of America's youth enrolled in college. Today, more than half do. As the proportion increases, there are strong social pressures on most high school graduates to embark on higher education as soon as their secondary schooling is completed.

For many young people, the college experience can be less than beneficial if they are not ready to continue their academic careers. For the reluctant student, the choice of study can be inappropriate or uninformed. Moreover, few students possess experience for choosing a career; we have allowed an artificial barrier to arise between the world of work and the world of learning. We must find ways to eliminate that barrier, to give our young people an opportunity to participate in the mainstream of society in a manner consistent with continuing their education.

YOUTH AND THE COMMUNITY

There are other vital reasons for granting educational benefits for community service. We must strengthen the bond between youth and our Government through a process that will build faith in society and our institutions. We must bring vitality to the concept that working for a betterment of our society is a task for which every citizen can voluntarily devote a part of his life.

We must also move to make the best use of youthful enthusiasm, and afford opportunities to young people who wish to provide full-time service to the community. We are currently in the midst of a dramatic expansion of part-time volunteer activities on campus and in the communities. While these programs have served many useful functions, experience has shown that localities benefit the most from full-time participation in programs lasting from 6 to 21 months. Such endeavors give the participants sufficient time to become proficient in their work. Programs of such length also are of the necessary duration for participants to develop meaningful relationships with the communities they serve.

VISTA and the Peace Corps have filled some of the need. Yet no one would argue that all service programs should be totally dependent on Federal funding or controlled from Washington. The fellowship program allows local public service agencies and nonprofit organizations to supplement the quantity and quality of their personnel by offering an additional incentive over and above—not in lieu of—normal remuneration. It will encourage these agencies to develop projects meeting the greatest need in areas of human and ecological concern, and to design jobs in an innovative fashion.

WORKER ALIENATION

While the bill was originally aimed at breaking the education lockstep, it became apparent that it could have much broader application in an area of growing concern: Workers trapped in dead-end careers. While perhaps most strikingly exemplified by the strike at the Lordstown automobile assembly line, the so-called blue collar blues has been explored in some depth by such recent studies as HEW's just published report, "Work in America" by Jim O'Toole, and Hal Sheppard and Neil Herrick's book "Where Have All the Robots Gone?" It should be emphasized that job dissatisfaction is by no means confined to blue collar workers and is perhaps as prevalent in management as well.

Though the dimensions of this problem are not clear at this time, the situation stems from at least two primary developments. First, many American workers by mid-career have achieved in the postwar economic boom what their parents had labored all their lives for: Freedom from poverty and the attainment of a level of comfort that is the envy of the entire world. But the second car and the summer house have not brought the happiness or the fulfillment that had been anticipated. Second, while time and motion studies have helped bring about record productivity through task specialization, they have deprived the worker from seeing the value of his efforts in relation to the quality of the finished product. The end result of these factors many times is an alienated worker. The opportunity to offer one's specific skills to the community for a year or two to gain preparation for a new career is one many workers would find exciting.

The concept would not only increase the number of options to the individual, but would make great sense from a labor economics point of view as well. Given the increasing impact on our economy of international trade—that is, the electronics industry—the increasing impact of changes of Government and domestic spending patterns—that is, the aerospace industry—and the continuing boom of technology—that is, automation—it is virtually certain that the individual graduating from high school or college today will not remain in the one mythical career presumed by many guidance counselors in the past. He may perhaps have to pursue four or five different careers, interspersed with periodic re-education and training. Packaged, lock-step education will no longer be adequate for either the individual or society. A program of the type envisaged by this legislation would ease the transition between the world of work and the world of education and help provide the greater elasticity in the labor force future labor markets may require.

OLDER AND RETIRED PERSONS

Mandatory retirement often abruptly ends productive careers long before the individual is ready. For those persons who would choose to offer their expertise and invaluable perspective to worthy community efforts, it is foreseen that this program could emulate the successes of such examples as the Foster Grandparents program and the Senior Corps of Retired Executives—SCORE. Not only would it assist in retaining the senior citizens in the mainstream of our society, but would allow them to subsequently pursue a degree they had always wanted or a field of longtime interest.

THE PROPOSAL

The Community Service Fellowship Act provides those persons who serve in select community service programs the right to educational benefits. These benefits would be accrued on a month-to-month basis; that is, for each month that a participant served in a community service program, he or she would subsequently receive 1 month of educational benefits when enrolled in an acceptable postsecondary program. The rate of educational benefits is $150 per month, for up to 24 months, when the fellow's participation in the program is pursued on a full-time basis.

The program will be administered by ACTION, to draw upon the experience of this Agency in developing and administering community service programs.

A national board of 15 members will provide policy advice and program recomendations to the Director of ACTION. Individuals serving on the Board will represent the educational community, community service agencies, young people, and the general public.

To encourage program decentralization, regional boards will be established such that each State or part thereof which is included in a region shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the regional board for such region. Utilizing the criteria developed by the national board, the regional boards will select community service projects, choose fellows to participate in these projects from among those nominated by community service organizations, keeping itself continually informed of the conduct of the projects in its region, and encourage the use of fellows by local community service organizations. The chairman of each regional board will sit on the national board, thereby facilitating the coordination of operational problems with the development of national policy.

Administrative arrangements are designed for minimal Federal involvement. Local input is strongly encouraged in the development of programs and the selection of community service fellows.

Both public and nonprofit institutions may apply to have jobs approved for educational benefits. As a protection to present workers, certain safeguards are built in. Jobs are to be paid at levels commensurate with similar occupations. Further, employment benefits are to be parallel to those given to similar workers within the community service agency. In no event are jobs to result in the displacement of current workers or job positions.

The legislation anticipates applications from adults as well as young people. Increasingly, more mature citizens have the time and desire to engage in community service. Education is no longer restricted to youth, but is seen as a lifelong process.

It is the intent of the legislation, that the administration of educational benefits tie into the experience and mechanism of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Director of Action, is therefore, required to use HEW facilities for the administration of such benefits, to the extent feasible.

Full benefits will accrue on a month-to-month basis for up to 24 months for full-time students. Recognizing that an individual's participation in this program may impose financial hardships on

his or her family, a beneficiary provision is included which will allow the educational benefits that were accrued to be passed on to the spouse or children.

As the legislation intends to encourage education in a broad sense—making training available in many vocational and educational areas—the definition of education and training is identical to the broad-based definition available to veterans qualifying under chapter 34, title 38, United States Code.

Finally, to permit adequate program evaluation, the program begins with a manageable level of 10,000 fellowships in 1974.

I insert the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 4309

A bill to provide postservice educational benefits for those who have participated in community service programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Service Fellowship Act".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to establish a community service fellowship program which will confer entitlement to assistance for further education, which program will also—

(a) encourage the development of meaningful learning experiences through full-time work in community service jobs throughout the country;

(b) help break the academic lockstep by providing legitimate options to the immediate continuation of formal education courses;

(c) allow our Nation's citizens who so desire to contribute their energies for a set period of time to the betterment of conditions in our urban and rural areas; and

(d) help provide creative and energetic manpower for presently undone but needed community tasks.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

SEC. 3. The Director of ACTION (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") shall develop and carry out a community service fellowship program, as provided in this Act.

NATIONAL BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Director shall establish a national board to assist him in carrying out this Act. The national board shall consist of not more than fifteen members who, by reason of background and training, are representative of the general public, educational institutions, young people, and community service agencies participating or planning to participate in the program. No person who has served as a member of the national board shall be eligible to be again appointed to such board. Such members (and members of the regional boards provided for in section 5) shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, but subject to the provisions of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The term of office of members of the national board shall be three years, except that (1) of the members first appointed five shall be appointed for a term of one year, five for a term of two years, and five for a term of three years, as designated by the Director at the time of appointment, and (2) members appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom they succeed, except that where such unexpired term has a year or less to run, they shall be appointed for three years plus the unexpired term of the member whom they succeed.

(c) It shall be the duty of the national board to advise the Director, particularly with respect to—

(1) establishment of criteria for the selection of community services projects to participate in the program which shall include consideration of (A) the extent of community participation in the project, (B) the contribution to the community which will be made by the project, (C) the availability of manpower for the project from other sources, and (D) the extent to which the project shows creative and innovative methods of meeting community needs,

(2) approval of applications for community service projects,

(3) names of persons it deems suitable for appointment to regional boards,

(4) evaluation of community service programs being carried on under this Act, and

(5) recommendations for the improvement of programs carried on under this Act.

REGIONAL BOARDS

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall establish not to exceed ten regional boards for regions which he shall establish. Each such board shall have a membership appointed by the Director with the same qualifications as the national board. One member of each regional board shall be a person who is a member of the national board and who shall be the chairman of the regional board. No person who has once served as a member of a regional board or as a member of the national board shall, after the termination of such service, he again appointed to a regional board, except pursuant to the preceding sentence. To the extent practical, the regions established under this section shall be of substantially equal population. Each State or part thereof which is included in a region shall be entitled to have at least one representative on the regional board for such region.

(b) It shall be the duty of each regional board—

(1) to select for approval community service projects which meet criteria established by the Director with the advice of the national board,

(2) to keep itself continually informed with respect to the conduct of community service projects in its region,

(3) to obtain from organizations carrying on community service projects recommendations of persons for designation as community service fellowship holders (hereinafter referred to as "fellows"), and, with concurrence of the national board, to select from among the persons so recommended those who are to be appointed fellows within the limits of quotas which the Director shall establish for each such board,

(4) to encourage the utilization of fellows by local community service organizations, and

(5) to perform such other duties as the national board may assign.

APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

SEC. 6. (a) Any public or private nonprofit agency which wishes to participate in the program while carrying out a community service project shall submit an application to its respective regional board, which may not recommend an application unless—

(1) it provides for the employment of fellows in activities which contribute to the social well-being of the community, such as work in corrections, mental health, law enforcement, protection and enhancement of the environment, recreation, housing, or drug abuse;

(2) it will result in the creation of new positions, and will not result in the displacement of currently employed workers, or elimination of present occupational positions,

(3) the wages to be paid are comparable to those being paid persons in similar positions who are not fellows, and in no event shall the wages to be paid be at a rate higher than a maximum rate which the Director shall prescribe after consideration of recommendations of the National Board,

(4) the other terms and conditions of employment are not less favorable to fellows than they are to other employees performing comparable duties,

(5) the fellows participating in the project are prohibited from engaging in political activities which might be identified with the community service fellowship program,

(6) the fellows will not be engaged, as a part of their activities under the project, in religious or sectarian activities,

(7) it provides for certain planned activities which will help fellows understand the broad context and role of community services within the area represented by the applicant, and

(8) it provides for the submission of such reports in such form and containing such information as the Director may require to carry out his duties under this Act and to enable him to establish the educational benefits to which the fellows are entitled.

(b) In approving applications selected by the regional boards meeting the requirements of subsection (a), the Director shall consider the extent to which applications conform to the criteria established by the National Board as required by section 4 (c) (1). Allocation of community service fellowships among projects shall be made by the several regional boards, in accordance with criteria established by the National Board.

(c) If, after affording due notice and an opportunity for a hearing, a regional board determines any applicant agency has violated any assurance given in its application, it shall terminate further participation by that applicant agency in the program. In such a case the agency may appeal the determination to the national board which shall review the case and make recommendations to the Director for his final decision. If the applicant agency's participation in the program is terminated, the Director shall make every effort to place the fellows participating in the program in other projects carried on under this Act.

SELECTION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE FELLOWS

SEC. 7. The Director shall develop a procedure which will permit each agency carrying on a community service project to nominate persons to participate in the program as fellows. The regional boards shall approve fellows from among those persons selected by community service agencies (in accordance with criteria which the Director shall prescribe) based on their qualifications to become fellows.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

SEC. 8. (a) Each fellow participating in a community service project shall accumulate entitlement to educational benefits for use by him for his educational expenses when he resumes his education. He shall accumulate entitlement at the rate of $150 a month. For purposes of this subsection, a fellow is participating on a full-time basis when he devotes 40 hours a week to participation in the project. The maximum period of participation for which a fellow may accumulate educational benefits is twenty-four months. No such benefit may be paid a fellow more than seven years after he has completed his participation in a community service project.

(b) Educational benefits may be paid only while a fellow is pursuing a course of education or training which, when pursued by eligible veterans, qualifies them to receive an educational assistance allowance under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code. Benefits may be paid only when the fellow is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study he is pursuing and is in good

standing with the institution in which he is enrolled, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution.

(c) If a fellow incurs disability or death arising out of his participation in a community service project, the educational benefits which he has accrued but is unable to use shall be made available to his wife or child or children to assist them to meet their education expenses. Such benefits must be used within seven years of the disability or death, in the case of a widow, or before he reaches twenty-six, in the case of a child. Where there is more than one person eligible for and seeking benefits under this subsection, such benefits shall be made available to, or apportioned among, the eligible recipients as the disabled fellow may prescribe, or, if he is dead, as the administrator or executor of his estate may prescribe.

(d) In carrying out this section, the Director shall, to the maximum extent feasible, use the resources and services of the Office of Education. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this section are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 9. (a) The Director shall provide for evaluation of community service projects. He shall also disseminate broadly information about the community service program to potential fellows and project sponsors.

(b) For purposes of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a community service project shall be treated as a program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

(c) No provision of this Act shall be construed to restrict any fellow from receiving retirement, social security, veterans' benefits, or other benefits of like kind at the same time he is receiving benefits under this Act. However, no individual shall receive educational benefits of any type authorized by any Federal agency for performing the same functions that entitle him to educational benefits under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 10. During the fiscal year 1974, the maximum number of fellows shall be ten thousand; during the fiscal year 1975, the maximum number of fellows shall be thirty-five thousand; and during the fiscal year 1976 and thereafter, the maximum number of fellows shall be one hundred thousand.

GAS-GUZZLING CARS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks to the House yesterday concerning the relationship of car size to fuel consumption and air pollution, which appeared on page 3728 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I stressed the need for a comprehensive study on this subject.

Today I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues some additional information concerning the extent to which our big gas-guzzling cars waste our natural resources. I have been informed that, based upon actual data as to gasoline consumption during 1969, 1970, 1971, and the first 6 months of 1972, it is estimated that southern Californians will consume an average of 400,000 barrels of automobile fuel per day during 1973. This does not include fuel consumed for other purposes such as diesel engines, aircraft, locomotives, the generation of electricity, industrial uses, propane or anything else. There are an estimated 11 million people in this region of California. With 42 gallons of fuel per barrel, this means that we are consuming 1½ gallons of fuel per day for every man, woman, and child in southern California; that is, for everyone, including infants and centenarians.

If we assume that the average automobile in this area consumes 1 gallon of gasoline for every 12.5 miles traveled, which is the national average, then we can figure that all of the cars of southern California will travel a total of 210 million miles every day, and most of this is on the freeways and city streets.

On the other hand, it is within our engineering capabilities to produce and use smaller autos which can get as much as 25 miles per gallon.

This would result, under the figures I have mentioned above, a savings of 200,000 barrels per day, a most substantial saving of our irreplaceable natural resources.

The Washington Evening Star published an excellent editorial on this subject in the February 6, 1973, issue which I would like to insert in the RECORD.

ENERGY GLUTTONS

As the energy shortage begins to hurt, to the extent that talk of fuel rationing is heard, an accusing eye has fallen upon that almighty American dream machine. The big fast-getaway gas-guzzling car is being cast as a villain, and that image was magnified the other day by William D. Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency.

He claims that the automobile industry has caused extravagant consumption of gasoline, by turning out cars of excessive weight, and loading them with too many gadgets. For its part, the industry complains that pollution-control devices required on new cars will cause them to devour much more fuel, and there's no denying that. This year's models are said to use 7 percent more, for that reason. But Ruckelshaus counters that the unnecessary weight of massive first-line cars, and all the "power options," cost up to 20 percent in mileage. "A 5,000-pound vehicle consumes 100 percent more gas than its 2,500-pound counterpart," he says.

What he's talking about is an enormous wastage that the country may be able to afford less and less in the years ahead, as domestic and oil shortages worsen and imports must be relied upon increasingly. A drop in the average maximum car weight to 2,500 pounds, he contends, would "reduce crude oil imports by 2.1 million barrels a day in 1985, and the projected balance of payments deficit by $2.3 billion annually." That, coupled with the national determination to curb pollution, seems a powerful incentive for more Americans to break off their love affair with the big automobile. It isn't inconceivable that someday, if the fuel crunch gets bad enough, legal limits on weight and horsepower will be considered.

The trouble is that our whole system has been geared to the idea of maximizing consumption—of everything. That's one reason why we are now wasting at least 50 percent of the fossil energy we burn. Just lately, in the face of a crisis in supplies, has there been some blinking recognition of the need for conservation. It's possible, and feasible, to design buildings, appliances and vehicles so as to reduce the electricity and fuel they use.

American technology must turn itself to that task. If some prodding by the government is required, so be it.

LAW OF THE SEA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution calling for early agreement on an equitable international treaty governing the uses of the ocean. The resolution is being introduced in the other body today also, with Senator PELL as the principal sponsor. I am very pleased to be joined in sponsorship by 13 of our colleagues, representing both parties.

This resolution gives strong support to the ocean policy objectives of this and preceding administrations, which are now being pursued by the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Seabeds Committee in preparation for the Law of the Sea Conference scheduled to begin in New York late this year. The work of the U.N. Seabeds Committee and the forthcoming Law of the Sea Conference is of vital importance to all nations of the world, and in particular the United States because of the enormous economic potential of ocean resources and the inadequacy and absence of present sea law to deal with the challenges of ocean use.

Some estimates place the recoverable oil under the seabed at 1,600 billion barrels, compared with 500 billion barrels produced in the United States—the world's greatest source in the last century. Many billions of pounds of nickel, copper, and cobalt lie in manganese nodules on the deep seabed. World fisheries are a $12 billion industry, and with modern methods, one nation's fishing may drastically reduce another nation's catch. Whales and other ocean mammals have been decimated, and certain fish species are seriously endangered.

Ocean commerce has quadrupled since 1945. Increase has been heaviest in petroleum and its products. The ocean is the chief location for more stable deterrence by nuclear submarines as well as for movement of Armed Forces by sea or air.

Ocean pollution has increased at an alarming rate from land runoff, from polluted air, and from dumping or accidents, especially involving giant supertankers at sea. Some ocean areas are "dying" in the sense that certain types of ocean life can no longer exist there. If the trend continues long enough, ocean pollution might become irreversible, and with it the march to the end of human existence.

Furthermore, the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the earth's surface, are this planet's last frontier, as well as the last great storehouse of resources. As such, scientists seek to explore and expand man's still scant knowledge of this vast and fascinating part of our world. But they are increasingly hampered by national restrictions.

These new developments have made the old law of the sea unacceptable and ineffective. The alternatives are to modernize the law of the sea by multilateral agreement, or to face ocean conflict and anarchy.

Already, some nations are claiming sovereignty over the oceans out to 200 miles from shore, and seizing foreign fishing boats. Already, nations are claiming special economic or fishing rights, or the right to determine what ships constitute pollution hazards, in zones off their coasts. Already nations are threatening to impose restrictions on use of international straits. Already, preparations are being made to mine deep seabed hard minerals, without waiting for international agreement.

Fortunately, the United States has exercised wise leadership. We passed a good ocean dumping bill that contributed to an International Dumping Convention which is a first step toward eliminating that cause of pollution. We have also provided creditable leadership in the United Nations Seabed Committee.

A Law of the Sea Conference will convene in November to December 1973, which will greatly affect the future of the oceans and of mankind for decades ahead. The United States delegation has done excellent work during the period of preparation and is making wise and generous proposals, giving due consideration to our national interests as well as those of the world community. Full support by Congress will strengthen their hands, and contribute to a successful outcome for the Law of the Sea Conference.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE STEPHEN LAMB

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 7, 1973, a very prominent Chicagoan and a good friend of mine, Stephen Lamb, passed away. Officially, Steve Lamb was the business manager of the Chicago Journeymen's Plumbers Local Union No. 130 and international vice president and member, executive board of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada. Unofficially, he was this and a whole lot more to the people of Chicago. His interest in civic affairs and in charitable activities is virtually legend. He was well known as the general chairman of the famous Chicago St. Patrick's Day parade. Much time was also devoted by him to the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, and to the Jerry Lewis Labor Day Telethon of which he was general chairman for Chicagoland.

In the labor movement, Steve Lamb was not only active in all phases of the journeymen plumbers operations, but he also found time to serve as first vice president of the Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union Council since 1968.

His interests and achievements, Mr. Speaker, are too many for me to enumerate here. Let it be said, though, that his contributions to his community and to his city shall surely remain as a lasting tribute to his memory. I deeply regret his passing for I shall indeed miss him.

In closing I should like to offer my sincere condolences to his widow, Lucilla, and their two daughters Suzanne and Mary Ann.

OBSCENE RADIO BROADCASTING—IV

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, over the last few days I have inserted in the RECORD letters I have written relative to offensive language used in radio talk shows in Cleveland and other cities around the country. The first letter went to the U.S. attorney in Cleveland, the second to the Federal Communications Commission, and the third to the Office of Legislative Counsel. This fourth letter, which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD, deals with still another aspect of this troublesome question. I am certain it will be of interest to all Members of the House, because of the vogue that these radio talk shows are achieving around the country. The letter to the Justice Department follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1973.

Hon. RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLEINDIENST: Because of an acute problem relating to offensive radio programming in Cleveland, Ohio, I have written letters to the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, to the Federal Communications Commission and to the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives. I enclose copies of those communications for your perusal, since they deal with an issue over which the Justice Department has jurisdiction.

I have made inquiries pertaining to your enforcement of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1464, which states: "Whoever utters any obscene, indecent, or profane language by means of radio communication shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years or both."

From the Congressional Research Service, I received this report about your activities:

"There are apparently a number of unreported decisions involving indictments under sec. 1464 but the precedent value of these proceedings seems to be limited. The General Counsel's Office of the FCC indicated that when a case is referred to the Justice Department for criminal prosecution under sec. 1464 the Department may not prosecute where it appears that the language in question would be protected under the First Amendment. The FCC General Counsel's office explained, however, that local U.S. District Attorneys, under community pressure, may obtain indictments and that the defendants often plead guilty to these indictments. The Justice Department, according to the FCC, does not rely upon these proceedings as precedents."

In conversations with officials of the Federal Communications Commission and your own Justice Department, I was able to confirm that what the Congressional Research Service reported to me is indeed true. I learned also from these conversations that your Department does not keep track of guilty pleas that may have been entered in various Federal trial courts around the country—i.e. that such cases, when they occur, are not necessarily reported to your office in Washington.

In view of this fact, I want to say respectfully that I fail to see how it is possible for the United States Attorney General to achieve a uniform enforcement policy around the country with respect to Section 1464 if certain facts that might prove useful to you are not reported to you.

If indeed there are guilty pleas being made to violations of Section 1464, wouldn't you want to know what accounts for your success in each case? Wouldn't such knowledge suggest to you strategy for action with respect to new complaints as you receive them? In other words, wouldn't the circumstances under which you might be achieving success in one area prove instructive to you with respect to other parts of the country?

Again respectfully, I would like to suggest that you circularize your United States Attorneys across the Nation, asking them to report to you all prosecutions and dispositions in recent years under Section 1464.

It could be that such information would be of particular value to Mr. Coleman in Cleveland, who is considering whether to institute proceedings against Station WERE there.

As your superior, President Nixon, asserted on October 24, 1970:

"So long as I am in the White House, there will be no relaxation of the national effort to control and eliminate smut from our national life. . . . Pornography can corrupt a society and a civilization. The people's elected representatives have the right and obligation to prevent that corrupation. . . . The Supreme Court has long held, and recently reaffirmed, that obscenity is not within the area of protected speech or press. Those who attempt to break down the barriers against obscenity and pornography deal a severe blow to the very freedom of expression they profess to espouse."

I am certain that you want to have in effect the kind of enforcement policy that implements the President's feelings on this matter. Therefore, I would appreciate your comments not only on this letter but also on the three others which I enclose.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL CHECK YOUR VEHICLE EMISSIONS MONTH

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, members of the oil and automobile industry have sparked an enthusiastic program to encourage automobile owners to participate in a program to substantially reduce air pollution by testing the emissions from their automobiles. Today I am introducing a resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim April as the "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month" to add further fuel to their efforts.

The resolution calls upon motorists and the automotive industry of the United States to take appropriate steps during the month of April to reduce substantially air pollution from motor vehicles operating on streets and highways. Congress passed a similar resolution last year, and the members of the industry engaged in a widespread educational program to encourage drivers to check the content of the emissions of their automobiles and to make repairs when needed. Assistance was given to mechanics and service station owners to

develop techniques for checking emissions.

These activities are an important part of the total effort to clean up the air. While new automobiles must comply with Government standards for emissions, older automobiles on the roads continue as the worst offenders of the environment. Tests have indicated that simple adjustments and minor tuneups can result in a minimum of 15 to 25 percent reduction of automobile air pollution. For example, engine misfire caused by a malfunction of the ignition system is a major cause of hydrocarbon emissions. Carbon monoxide emissions can be controlled by the adjustment of the idle air/fuel ratio and idle rpm. When such adjustments are made, motorists can expect an additional direct benefit in money saved because engine life is increased, performance improved, and operating costs reduced.

While the automotive and oil industry must assume a major responsibility for cleaning the air, we cannot expect them to shoulder complete responsibility. The educational effort which was conducted in accordance with the resolution passed last year, and will be conducted again this year, brings to motorists' attention the fact that they can actively contribute to improving the quality of the air we breathe. Furthermore, it may serve to discourage motorists from asking mechanics to adjust their new automobiles to provide better performance but dirtier emissions.

Should we successfully prevail upon the President to once again proclaim April as "Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month," I am certain that we can count on the support and active involvement of industry groups, citizen organizations, car dealers, oil companies, vehicle and parts manufacturers, retailers, and consumer groups to make the campaign a success. An indication of the enthusiastic support for the program is the fact that the industry-wide Vehicle Emissions Check Committee recently announced the support of the U.S. Jaycees. Some 2,000 Jaycee chapters plan to promote April Check Lanes in local shopping and recycling centers before and during April.

Attached is a copy of the resolution.

Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1973 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month"

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of April 1973 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month," and call upon the motorists and the automotive industry of the United States to take appropriate steps during the month of April to reduce substantially air pollution from the motor vehicles operating on the streets and highways.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SMITH of New York, for the period February 19 to March 8, 1973, on account of minor surgery.

To Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of physical testing and evaluation.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAFALIS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WHALEN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THORNTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DANIELSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, on February 20.

Mr. ECKHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STUDDS), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOCH, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUBER in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAFALIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. MICHEL in five instances.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. HEINZ.

Mr. GUDE in five instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. BAFALIS in six instances.

Mr. COHEN.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. SARASIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THORNTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in six instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. MURPHY in two instances.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. ECKHARDT.

Mr. PICKLE in six instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STUDDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALDIE in two instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. DANIELSON.

Mr. BYRON in 10 instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. HANNA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON of California in four instances.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. KOCH in six instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 583. An act to promote the separation of constitutional powers by securing to the Congress additional time in which to consider the Rules of Evidence for U.S. Courts and Magistrates, the Amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which the Supreme Court on November 20, 1972, ordered the Chief Justice to transmit to the Congress; to the Committee in the Judiciary.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution relating to the date for the submission of the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the President's Economic Report.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to designate the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Tex., as the "Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center" in honor of the late President.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 105, 93d Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 19, 1973.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 105, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to as follows:

392. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, and the Acting Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

393. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, transmitting notice of a finding that amendment to the Flammability Standard for Mattresses (DOC FF 4–72) may be needed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

394. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a survey of the manpower situation of organizations and institutions involved in managing the Nations' solid waste, pursuant to section 210(c) of Public Law 91–512; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

395. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

396. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the comments of the General Accounting Office on the report of the Secreary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget entitled "Second Annual Report to Congress on the Budgetary and Fiscal Data Processing System and Budget Standard Classifications", pursuant to section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1140); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such act; to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. MCSPADDEN):

H.R. 4183. A bill to establish more effective community planning and development programs (and expand the related provisions of existing programs) with particular emphasis upon assistance to small communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 4184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to promote the production and marketing of farm-raised fish through the extension of credit, technical assistance, marketing assistance, and research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. DORN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. TEAGUE of Texas):

H.R. 4185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to stabilize and freeze as of January 1, 1973, the Veterans Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945 edition, and the extensions thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mrs. BURKE of California, and Mr. BELL):

H.R. 4186. A bill to establish the Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize safety design standards for schoolbuses, to require certain safety standards be established for schoolbuses, to require the investigation of certain schoolbus accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 4188. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide rules for the treatment of prisoners in Federal correctional institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENITEZ (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. LEHMAN, Ms. JORDAN, Ms. CHISHOLM, Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 4190. A bill to require the termination of all weapon range activities conducted on or near the Culebra complex of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18, United States Code (relating to kidnapping), to remove from such section the exception relating to abduction of a minor child by a parent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to revise the special pay structure relating to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 4193. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish procedures providing members of the Armed Forces redress of grievances arising from acts of brutality or other cruelties, and acts which abridge or deny rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States, suffered by them while serving in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4195. A bill for the relief of certain residents of northern Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4196. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for grants to cities for improved street lighting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income certain amounts in the case of certain prisoners of war and other individuals; to exclude certain amounts in the case of their wives; and to amend title 37 of the United States Code to exempt from State and local income taxes the salaries of such prisoners and other individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself and Mr. HEINZ):

H.R. 4198. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American Forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4199. A bill to extend the Education of the Handicapped Act for three years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4200. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 4201. A bill to provide that, in the selection of persons to participate in federally assisted manpower training programs, Vietnam veterans shall be afforded a priority; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 4202. A bill to repeal the Connolly Hot Oil Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 4203. A bill to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 4204. A bill to provide for funding the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 for 2 additional years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. E DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 4205. A bill to amend the act of April 7, 1956, relating to the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4206. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4207. A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to require the return of certain vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4208. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4209. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to safeguard American citizens from racial and religious discrimination by foreign nations while traveling abroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIGGS (for himself, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 4210. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to safeguard American citizens from racial and religious discrimination by foreign nations while traveling abroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4211. A bill to amend section 801 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall make the selection of air carriers in international route matters, subject to veto by the President within 90 days after such selection; to the Committee on Inerstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4212. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require ticket agents to observe currently effective tariffs for air transportation; to grant the Civil Aeronautics Board access to certain records of ticket agents; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4213. A bill to provide for a moratorium on State taxation of the carriage of persons in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4214. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such act; to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain State taxation of persons in air commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4215. A bill concerning the allocation of water pollution funds among the States in fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4216. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the duty-free entry of mica films; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4217. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting a new title X to authorize aid in developing, constructing, and operating privately owned nuclear-powered merchant ships; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4218. A bill to prohibit the sale of "Saturday night special" handguns in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 4221. A bill to establish a Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. FULTON, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4222. A bill to provide adjustment assistance to prisoners-of-war of the Vietnam era because of the inhumane circumstances of their incarceration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 4223. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain related existing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4224. A bill to establish an Emergency Medical Services Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist communities in providing professional emergency medical care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. MCFALL, and Mr. PRICE of Illinois):

H.R. 4225. A bill to name the U.S. courthouse and Federal office building under construction in New Orleans, La., as the Hale Boggs Federal Building, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 4226. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 4227. A bill to provide to members of the Armed Forces and Federal employees who were in a missing status for any period during the Vietnam conflict double credit for such period for retirement purposes and certain additional pay and allowances, to provide such members certain medical benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WON PAT and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4228. A bill to improve the quality of child development programs by attracting and training personnel for those programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4229. A bill to provide for the transfer of authorizations for military assistance programs for Laos and Vietnam to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 4230. A bill to authorize financial assistance for opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4231. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any social security benefit increases provided for by Public Law 92-336 be disregarded in determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4232. A bill to require States pass along to public assistance recipients who are entitled to social security benefits the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4233. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract with private facilities near the homes of veterans for the medical care and treatment of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 4234. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require life imprisonment for certain persons convicted of illegally dealing in dangerous narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4236. A bill to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MCKINNEY, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. NIX, Mr. REES, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to conditionally suspend the application of certain penal provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ECKHARDT, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4240. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that blood donations shall be considered as charitable contributions deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. FULTON):

H.R. 4241. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1978) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Commission on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 4242. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1978) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1978) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GIAIMO, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 4244. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. KETCHUM, Miss JORDAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARASIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H.R. 4245. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways aind Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. KING, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 4246. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. RARICK, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. ROE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 4247. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (200-mile limit) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. GUDE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. FLYNT):

H.R. 4248. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. DOWNING, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 4249. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. BURTON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. VEYSEY, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 4250. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for widows, widowers, and minor children of employees who have died while employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier after 25 or more years of such employment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 4252. A bill to designate certain lands in the Farallon National Wildlife Refuge, San Francisco County, Calif., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. WYATT, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. NIX, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI):

H.R. 4253. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed POW/MIA of Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ROE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 4254. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed POW/MIA Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. WYATT, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. YATRON, Mr MOAKLEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. NIX, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI):

H.R. 4255. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed handicapped Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ROE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 4256. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. WYATT, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. NIX, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI):

H.R. 4257. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans in employment reflecting experience or providing training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mrs HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ROE, Mr. WILSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 4258. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans in employment reflecting experience or provid-

ing training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. WYATT, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. NIX, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI):

H.R. 4259. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4260. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARAZITI (for himself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ROE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BAFALIS):

H.R. 4261. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4262. A bill to promote the employment of unemployed handicapped Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HICKS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Miss JORDAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Service Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PREYER, Mr. REES, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROWN of CALIFORNIA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HAYS, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the advice and consent of the Senate for appointments to Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PIKE, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4266. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to require the advice and consent of the Senate for appointments to Director of the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. METCALFE (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4267. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALFE (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. KOCH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BURTON, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Ms. CHISHOLM, and Mr. MURPHY of Illinois):

H.R. 4268. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize an insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activity; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALFE (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. FRASER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. PODELL, Ms. CHISHOLM, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 4269. A bill to assist in reducing crime by requiring speedy trials in cases of persons charged with violations of Federal criminal laws, to strengthen controls over dangerous defendants released prior to trial, to provide means for effective supervision and control of such defendants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILFORD:

H.R. 4270. A bill to establish the Big Thicket National Park in Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $5,000 the amount of outside earnings which (subject to further increases under the automatic adjustment provisions) is permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4272. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to consolidate and expand the coverage of certain provisions authorizing assistance to small business concerns in financing structural, operational, or other changes to meet standards required pursuant to Federal or State laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4273. A bill to provide for auditing of the Federal Reserve System by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4274. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4275. A bill to insure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4277. A bill to provide for the duty-free importation of bitters containing spirits but not fit for use as beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to assure that Federal financial assistance to the child nutrition programs is maintained at the level budgeted for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to eliminate the present requirement that relocation payments be excluded from the recipient's income for public assistance purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to reduce the amount a State, regional, or local agency may be required to reimburse the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for certain rail passenger service provided by the Corporation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4281. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4282. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4283. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 4284. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that there shall be allowed as an income tax deduction those contributions on the part of civil service employees toward personal retirement annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4287. A bill: The Anti-Hijacking Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. MAZZOLI and Mr. BADILLO):

H.R. 4288. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relative to percentage depletion rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON of New York (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DENT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Ac-

quisition Policies Act of 1970 to extend for 3 years the provision for full Federal payment of relocation and related costs for victims of Hurricane Agnes and of certain other major disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4291. A bill to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4292. A bill to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, for 1 year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.R. 4293. A bill to provide for a National public employee merit system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York:

H.R. 4294. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces and Federal employees who were prisoners of war or missing in action for any period during the Vietnam conflict may receive double credit for such period for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 4295. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States or of a military attack upon the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4296. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation programs or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 4297. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4298. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 4299. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to exempt certain private aircraft entering or departing from the United States and Canada at night or on Sunday or a holiday from provisions requiring payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 4301. A bill to extend for 1 year (until June 30, 1974) the temporary increases in railroad retirement annuities and pensions provided by Public Laws 91-377, 92-46, and 92-460; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4302. A bill to provide compensation for the injury, illness, disability, or death of employees in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional personal exemption of $750 for the disability of the taxpayer or his spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 4305. A bill to establish a Water Pollution Control Trust Fund containing amounts to be used for the construction of waste treatment facilities under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to provide revenues for such Fund through the imposition of a 3-percent income tax surcharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4306. A bill to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. BURTON, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROY, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 4307. A bill to provide death benefits to survivors of certain public safety and law enforcement personnel, and public officials concerned with the administration of criminal justice and corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 4308. A bill to provide for greater and more efficient Federal financial assistance to certain large cities with a high incidence of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4309. A bill to provide postservice educational benefits for those who have participated in community service programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 4310. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require that certain corporate income tax information shall be open to public inspection, shall appear in the annual shareholders report of such corporation, and shall appear in annual corporate reports submitted pursuant to section 13 or 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend titles 39 and 5, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 4313. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the emission standards required for light duty motor vehicles and engines manufactured during or after model year 1975; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. THONE, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to establish an upland game conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 4315. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and to create a new title in the Consumer Credit Protection Act in order to license consumer credit investigators; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. O'HARA):

H.R. 4316. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and to create a new title in the Consumer Credit Protection Act in order to license consumer credit investigators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 331. Joint resolution to extend the Railway Labor Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAFALIS (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. TREEN):

H.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations made by the United States shall not exceed its revenues, except in time of war or national emergency; and to provide for the systematic paying back of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.J. Res. 333. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second full calendar week in March 1973 as "National Employ the Older Worker Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to freedom from forced assignment to schools or jobs because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution to establish the Tule Elk National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1973 as "National Check Your Vehicle

Emissions Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 338. Joint resolution to authorize a National Memorial Grove of trees dedicated to those Americans who died in the Indochina war; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution prohibiting U.S. rehabilitation and reconstruction aid to the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, or any other country in Indochina until certain conditions have been met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the last full calendar week in April of each year as "National Secretaries Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 341. Joint resolution relating to sudden infant death syndrome; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 342. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the fourteenth article of amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of April 9 through 15, 1973, as "National Drafting Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WON PAT (for himself and Mr. DE LUGO):

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution relating to a national Indian policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to establishing a no-fault system of motor vehicle insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (for himself, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., and Mr. SPENCE):

H. Res. 208. Resolution; Canal Zone sovereignty and jurisdiction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself and Mr. HUBER):

H. Res. 209. Resolution calling upon Radio Free Europe to initiate radio broadcasts to the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. PIKE, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. PODELL, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. DEVINE, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H. Res. 210. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GROSS, Mr. HUBER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. ROUSSELOT, and Mr. VEYSEY):

H. Res. 211. Resolution to declare U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 213. Resolution to establish a House-authorized budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H. Res. 214. Resolution to authorize a marker in Statuary Hall for the location of Abraham Lincoln's desk during the 30th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Res. 215. Resolution to establish a House-authorized budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. MORGAN):

H. Res. 216. Resolution on U.S. oceans policy at the Law of the Sea Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H. Res. 217. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 130; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. Res. 218. Resolution expressing concern over freedom of emigration for citizens of all countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. Res. 219. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4317. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 4318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna R. Bacon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.R. 4319. A bill for the relief of Rajinder N. Dewan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Kenneth M. Schmitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 4321. A bill for the relief of William H. Spratling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

38. The SPEAKER presented petition of Trudy Scocozzo, Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to the rights of American Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Thursday, February 8, 1973*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, grant us strength and wisdom through this day to do not what we like but what we ought; to work with alacrity but with the deliberateness of thorough workmen; to follow Thy will, not our own desires.

Help us, O Lord, in all things to set duty above pleasure, to meet graciously those who are ungracious, and to work at tasks though they be dull and unpleasant. Grant that conscience may be our only master, and that our true motive may be to earn Thy divine approbation.

When evening comes and our duty is done, may we know the deep contentment of work completed which honors the Nation and glorifies Thy name.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 7, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING 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 ACTING 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 under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first nomination.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those nominations be considered en bloc.